

ber will take the position of teacher of philosophy in the University of North Dakota. This is the essay read at the convention of the American Philosophic Association in this city in December, 1929, and highly commended by those who heard it.

Young Mr. Geiger, son of our Oscar Geiger, is master of the philosophic vernacular. "Values" means ethics, but only in part; the term is broader and more inclusive.

The article is a survey of tendency in economic discussion, and its purpose is to call attention to a much neglected part of that philosophy as currently treated, due, as Prof. Geiger points out, to a very natural reaction from 18th century standards. This shift has been toward a reactionary concept in economic theory, though Mr. Geiger discerns a trend toward a newer postulate in which economics, while rejecting the more metaphysical interpretation of the doctrine of natural rights, inclines to what he terms the "normative," and a new evaluation.

Before sounding this note of encouragement to those who hope for better things he does not spare the economists. He says: "Moral values have long since been expelled from the physical sciences and now they are being squeezed out of the social sciences. Indeed, it would begin to appear that the exorcism of standards and norms is now a prerequisite for any enterprise which desires to achieve respectability."

There is a depressing hardness in this very definite accusation. But it must not be thought that the article conveys quite so hopeless an outlook. Prof. Geiger has done a thoughtful, impressive and scholarly bit of work.—J. D. M.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE IRRELEVANT AND THE RELEVANT: A REPLY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The argument of Mr. Antonio Bastida in May-June LAND AND FREEDOM is presented most courteously. And, indeed, I sympathize sincerely with much that he has said in it. Yet he has certainly, though perhaps through my own lack of clearness, entirely misapprehended my meaning. For I never intended to suggest that land tax advocates should, as a group, adopt any such irrelevant issue as free silver, membership of the United States in the League of Nations, socialism, prohibition, public ownership, or even free trade. I have little faith that the advocates of these policies would, in any appreciable numbers, be thus converted to our cause or help us in it.

Not such, however, were the kinds of current controversy that I had in mind. Rather did I have in my thought controversies or issues which *clearly involve* the principles in which we are especially interested. And I mentioned particularly the current slogan, "tax relief for real estate," which implies putting taxes elsewhere and definitely proposes taking taxes *off of land*. This is a proposal that unquestionably *does* involve, by flouting them, our most fundamental principles. And by entering into the controversy, in which we shall have many allies who do not now understand our philosophy, but who are opposed to taking taxes off of land and putting them elsewhere, we may do much to bring our principles into public discussion.

When, in my "Open Letter," I urged our joining actively in the fight over this specific issue, I took occasion to remark that the slavery question came into practical politics and came to be a really burning issue, not as a question of abolition but as a question of further extension versus territorial limitation. *And slavery disappeared*. We have now a real issue to fight over, an issue which arouses wide popular interest far beyond the boundaries of our little group of active workers for the land-value tax, yet one which can be fought out largely on the principles we profess. It is not an issue, like that of free silver, *unrelated* to our principles or, like that of free trade, related only remotely and contingently to the idea of appropriating publicly-produced value to public uses. On the contrary, it *directly and clearly* involves these principles and this idea.

We are confronted at the same time by a magnificent opportunity to get attention for the principles we hold fundamental and also

by a most dangerous threat to the small application of these principles that America already has.

If in our desire to preach our full and complete doctrine regardless of how few will listen, we ignore this opportunity to get our principles before the public through a controversy which interests many, we shall prove ourselves, in my opinion, hopelessly inept in political skill. And if, for the privilege of spending time repeating to each other's admiring ears the glories of our one-hundred-per-cent. programme, we give up on an issue made, as if for the very purpose of bringing our principles into discussion, and let the landowners secure, without a fight, that "tax relief for real estate" which they are so vociferously demanding, then, it seems to me, we are practically recreant to our great cause.

It should be our job to make the current slogan "tax relief for real estate," not only unpopular but "a hissing and a by-word" among all persons who pretend to any slightest degree of liberal sympathy. And in doing so we can make the economic facts about land and the reasons for taxing it instead of labor and thrift, for *greatly raising* rather than lowering the tax on land, more and more clear to an increasing number of voters.

Such a method of propaganda most certainly does *not* mean that if landowners should agree no longer to request reduced taxes (how likely!), we would thereupon cease our agitation.

To Mr. Bastida's suggestion that what I am urging means emphasis on the public appropriation of land rent from the "fiscal" point of view only, I most earnestly object. Does Mr. Bastida know what I have said, in articles and books, regarding rent as a payment which some men are able to exact from others, for permission to work and live on those parts of the earth which community growth and development, together with the past operation of geologic forces, have made relatively desirable? Is such, in his view, a *merely* "fiscal" discussion?

May it not turn out, after all that Mr. Bastida and I are more nearly in agreement than he appears to think?

Central Lake, Michigan.

HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

### A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE N. BEACH

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Believing that at least some of our readers may hark back in memory to the little group of Texans who were active in spreading the gospel of the Single Tax in the eighties of the last century, I take it upon myself to record the passing of a crusader for free land, free trade and free men of that period in the death of George N. Beach, who escaped the tax gatherer at the Veterans Hospital in San Antonio during the latter days of May.

George N. Beach was working at the printer's trade in Waco, Texas, when his attention was called to "Progress and Poverty" by a friend who had read the book and, impressed by its message, induced George to read it. The young printer "saw the cat," and was fired with enthusiasm for the vision of freedom and equality of opportunity, which he thought no one could fail to see if only the message were carried to him. With the co-operation of Freeland, John R. Spencer, another printer, and a few other Waco friends, he issued a call for a conference to be held in Galveston. Regardless of the fact that there was already in existence in Texas a Single Tax organization, of which Beach knew nothing, the call brought together a goodly assemblage, and one speaker announced that "A Daniel has arisen among us," and arrangements were made for Beach to make a tour of the state delivering lectures on the Single Tax and organize local societies. The tour lasted but a short time, as financial difficulties arose, but George N. Beach never failed, until the breath left him, to expound the gospel at every favorable opening.

Impressed with the assurance that a beneficent Creator had provided sufficient to meet the wants and desires of every created being, he spent his days for many years, except for the time necessary to earn his living working at his trade, and in searching the untrodden wastes of New Mexico, Arizona and Old Mexico for the precious metals. He met



with success on more than one occasion—success so far as uncovering promising leads, but invariably lost his holdings in the attempts to finance production.

George Beach's loyal wife, Mrs. Jeddie Beach, who worked and hoped for the best with him during all the years, herself also a union printer, a daughter and son-in-law, Billy and Bessie Beach Truehart, survive.  
San Antonio, Texas. A. W. HARTMAN.

#### A. FREELAND ADDS HIS TRIBUTE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

On May 20th at San Antonio death claimed George N. Beach, probably the most dynamic and indefatigable of Texas' great body of Single Tax stalwarts. He had been preaching the doctrine, in and out of season, for years; had established various Labor organs in Dallas and elsewhere and in the later 90's organized a State Labor party; later he organized the State Labor Union, then in 1900 he founded the Texas State Federation of Labor, the first and second conventions of which refused to endorse Single Tax resolutions; now it adopts them as a matter of course, without discussion.

Over thirty years ago George brought his big tent to Waco and preached Single Tax. He was persuaded to found a daily newspaper in that city. on Labor Union principles. Later his paper, *The Herald*, was merged with *The Times* and is now known as the *Times-Herald*. After unionizing the city for the printers he moved to Beaumont and published another Labor organ, in which he published serially "Progress and Poverty."

Mr. Beach was a near-genius. When one of his various papers would be about ready for the press some one would remind him that he had not furnished copy for the serial story he was writing. Forthwith he would grind out the weekly chapter. On Washington's birthday Mr. Beach was 72 years old. He had been living in Arizona for the past twenty years and had just returned to Texas when he died of heart trouble and was buried in Houston on May 22nd, leaving a wonderful little wife and an adorable daughter, Bessie, now Mrs. Truehart, of the Truehart Studios, Houston, Texas. She and her Daddy were real pals. Texas and the George movement have lost one of its great crusaders in the death of our idolized friend, George N. Beach.

Seattle, Wash.

A. FREELAND.

#### WORK OF MARGARET HALEY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I read with great interest Mr. Olcott's article in May-June issue on "Chicago's Financial Difficulties." I have just re-read it in the light of a *Collier's* article as condensed in *The Reader's Digest*. I am not in a position to criticise, and have no wish to do so. But both these articles carry back to the activities of Miss Margaret Haley, business agent of the teachers federation. My recollection is that Miss Haley was often mentioned years ago in Louis F. Post's the *Public*. The impression I carry is that this movement, in its earliest stages, was almost definitely and perhaps quite exclusively a Single Tax movement. And, from what I heard at the Henry George Congress in Pittsburgh, I gathered that it is a Single Tax movement today.

Speaking as an outsider, I desire to say on my own behalf and on behalf of those who agree with me—especially the old-timers—that, if the Single Tax influence has been nearly as strong and as continuous in this big reform as I suspect, we would greatly appreciate an article in LAND AND FREEDOM definitely setting forth that side of the case.

But, if I am wrong, or if my suggestion cannot be, or ought not to be, carried into effect, I shall still look forward to every succeeding issue with keen interest and shall read it with high appreciation of the splendid work you have done and are doing.

Ottawa, Canada.

A. C. CAMPBELL.

#### AGREES WITH PROFESSOR BROWN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I heartily endorse Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown's "Open Letter to Single Taxers" in your last issue. While many of us are intent upon dispensing our own doctrines from a more or less ivory tower, the enemy is making serious inroads upon us.

Both the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Association of Real Estate Boards are openly engaged in a nation-wide campaign to "relieve real estate" by substituting a State Income Tax for the general tax upon property. Fifteen or sixteen states have already succumbed to this fallacy, and the Real-tor's National President recently listed four or five more where "progress" had been made.

Besides being the direct antithesis of the land values tax, the State Income Tax will probably be harder to dislodge than any other form of taxation. Some of our friends feel that the adoption of the National Income Tax, which has largely taken the place of the Tariff as a Federal revenue producer, was for that reason a serious error.

Be that as it may, the State Income Tax is now being urged because our Government has largely abandoned the "benefit theory"—and is here more or less strictly applying the doctrine of Ability to Pay.

As Prof. Brown says, here is a splendid opportunity to enlist the masses in a fight for real tax principles, whereas abstract discussion fails to stir them. The inquisitorial nature, the enforced regimentation and the fraud and evasion inseparable from a State Income Tax will arouse opposition that will listen to arguments on the other side—listen and lend a hand—as it will never do to further an academic theory.

Catonsville, Md.

CHARLES J. OGLE.

#### CONTINUES TO HOPE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM,

In your issue of May-June, Mr. J. O'D. Derrick criticizes Mr. Snowden's action on the Budget, and it appears that Mr. Snowden has lost rather than gained ground by failing to insert the Valuation Bill.

As Mr. Derrick states (page 81) "Why put off the struggle that will in any case ensue? If opponents throw the finances of the country into chaos, well let them. Their doing so would only rouse the country all the more to secure Budget Taxation of Land Values."

I enclose an editorial from the *Erie Dispatch-Herald*, "British Labor's Year" which is indicative of how the press is ready to approve the Labor Party policies as being not too radical. "On the domestic front socialistic trends were pronounced, though not extreme. The measures enacted have been far from radical and Chancellor of the Exchequer Snowden has shown himself to be a thoroughly qualified defender of the capitalistic system against the assaults of extremists in his own party."

So it seems that the failure of Mr. Snowden to take a clear-cut stand for Land Value Taxation has given the conservative press little or no occasion to severely censure him, which Single Taxers (welcoming publicity as they do) will deplore, and on the other hand many Single Taxers will be disposed to censure him for this failure.

However, Mr. Snowden insists that he will introduce soon a Land Valuation Bill as opening up the way to Land Value Taxation and so let us continue to hope.

Erie, Pa.

JAMES B. ELLERY.

#### NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

FREDERICK VERINDER writes us under date of June 20, "We had a flying visit from Anna George deMille last month on her way from Europe to New York."

KATHLEEN NORRIS, whose letter to President Hennessy of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, appears on another page, is a well known