

we ready for fulfillment; he knows that we cannot regulate the cosmos, or even the natural history of the people, by enactments. Slowly: by removing handicaps here and there; * * * by teaching, by suggestion; by a public recognition of the problem, even though not one of us sees the end of it."

"It is now easy to understand the sinfulness of vast private estates that shut up expanses of the surface of the earth from the reach and enjoyment of others that are born similarly to the privileges of the planet. * * * There is no inalienable right in the ownership of the surface of the earth. Readjustments must come * * * and in the end there will be no private monopoly of public or natural resources."

"If we may fraternalize territory, so shall we fraternalize commerce. No people may rightly be denied the privilege to trade with all other peoples. * * * It would be a sorry people that purchased no supplies from without. Every people, small or large, has right of access to the sea, for the sea belongs to mankind. It follows that no people has a right to deprive any other people of the shore, if that people desires the contact. We now begin to understand the awful sin of partitioning the earth by force."

His chapter on War and the Struggle for Existence is a unique attack on one of the arguments of militarists.

The author was born on a Michigan farm near the shores of Lake Michigan. Early he developed capacity for study of the physical sciences, and, when he entered the Michigan Agricultural College as a student at the age of 17, he was well grounded in the science of botany. After graduation, he remained as a teacher of horticulture in that institution, until Cornell University called him, and he was connected with its agricultural college for a quarter of a century. Then he retired, built himself a home in Ithaca, where he has a large herbarium, and devotes his time to the study of botany and to literature. He has been a voluminous writer and a busy editor in the field of natural science but he occasionally publishes essays and verses.—H. M. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

A FAMOUS DOCTOR MAKES A DIAGNOSIS

EDITOR LAND FREEDOM:

Your clear and incisive comment in the July-August number, on Norman Thomas's failure to understand the importance of the land question, and his reluctance to admit that a single remedy may set right a complicated social illness, recalls the familiar medical illustrations, which may be put in dozens of ways, but has not lost its point.

One physician fails to "think through." He fastens his attentions on symptoms—anemia, breathlessness, lassitude, mental and bodily feebleness, dizziness, etc., and would give a medicine—perhaps a mixture of drugs—for each. The other does think through. He seeks a common cause for all the complex symptoms, and finding it (say hookworm infestation), uses a medicine (say thymol or carbon tetrachloride to kill and expel the parasite) that will remove it. Then he takes proper precautions to prevent recurrence.

Landlordism is the social hookworm. So long as it is permitted to drain the body politic, and to inject its poison into the stream of the circulation, so long will the consequent ills continue. There is one means, and only one, to bring about social health. Kill and expell the parasite by collecting the rent of land for the public treasury—thus becoming able to abolish unjust taxation.

S. S. C.

Philadelphia, Pa.

WILL PAY NO MORE FOR CAPITAL THAN IT IS WORTH

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

"Capital" appears to be only technically a factor in the production of wealth. It is merely an auxiliary to labor.

"In truth, the primary division of wealth in distribution is dual, not tripartite. Capital is but a form of labor, and its distinction from labor

is in reality but a subdivision, just as the division of labor into skilled and unskilled would be. In our examination we have reached the same point as would have been attained had we simply treated capital as a form of labor, and sought the law which divides the produce between rent and wages; that is to say, between the possessors of the two factors, natural substances and powers, and human exertion—which two factors by their union produce all wealth." ("Progress and Poverty," Bk. III, Ch. V.).

Then to consider it as one of three factors is misleading:

"Yet this, to the utter bewilderment of the reader is what is done in all the standard works * * * they proceed to treat of the distribution of wealth between the rent of land, the wages of labor and the profits of capital." ("Progress and Poverty," Bk. III, Ch. I.).

Capital produces no more than Hope, or News, or Currency, or Food. We might pour quantities of all these, say, into a mine and they would be dead till labor came. All are mere aids to labor: "Capital * * * is in reality employed by labor." ("Progress and Poverty," Bk. III, Ch. I.).

"In truth, the primary division of wealth in distribution is dual, not tripartite." ("Progress and Poverty," as above). Land and Labor produce all wealth.

The returns to "Capital" are then either rent or wages.

It follows then that whatever part of "interest" is due to increased return to Labor will increase, as Henry George wrote. But whatever part is due to Monopoly will disappear entirely.

But in any case we need not worry over interest. Under free conditions no one will pay for capital more than it is worth to him.

N. Y. City.

BOLTON HALL.

CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Two questions have been running through the columns of LAND AND FREEDOM that should be settled among Single Taxers sometime and dropped, leaving the space for something better. They are (1) Whether rent is added to price? and (2) What is the cause of interest and whether interest will persist if or when the Single Tax prevails?

The first is answered by Ricardo's "Law of Rent:" that rent is the excess value of any land over the poorest land in use. This excess value is taken by the land owner. It may be observed by any one from the fact that wheat grown on the poorest land sells on the market for the same price as wheat grown on the best land; or from the fact that one may go from a country village to the business center of Chicago or New York, and buy as cheaply as at the village store.

The second may be answered by saying that if and when the Single Tax prevails, capital will be what it is now, a stored up labor product and if one has capital which he does not want to use presently and another needs it for present use, the latter will pay the then market price for its use, if any, as there probably will be. That is as far as we need to know at present. Let nature take its course. It will anyway. Our present duty is to work for the Single Tax.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

Oshkosk, Wis.

DEFENDS PROHIBITION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I read the letter of Howell Clopton Harris, of Cordele, Ga., in your May-June issue with pleasure, for prohibition made me a teetotaler. I recall that some years ago a fellow-Single Taxer used to dwell on the idea that if we had the Henry George land value tax in effect, liquor would be exempt from taxes and in consequence the stuff would be so cheap that very little would be sold and as a result temperance would be promoted. I believed that theory then, but I don't now. Alcohol beverages are a habit-forming drug and the cheaper the stuff the more would be drunk and the more drunkards made.

I am as much in favor of personal liberty as any Henry George man but I do not take much stock in the personal liberty gag as applied to booze. I believe that the Ten Commandments and all laws, rules and