



It would indeed be surprising if no "weakness" had crept into the News during the last year, but I have not noticed anything as weak as the effort by W. H. Pitt (July) to "strengthen" the ideas of those who believe that services are not to be included in our term wealth.

The definition suggested by Mr. Pitt, which he says "we will probably find George himself gives somewhere" is, "all goods and services exchangeable in the market." Far from including services, Henry George, in his definition of wealth, in his chapters on Nature and Genesis of Wealth (*Science of Political Economy*) argues most convincingly in the following passages that services are not wealth:

"Thus wealth, as alone the term can be used in political economy, consists of natural products that have been secured, moved or combined by human labor. . . ."

"Nor yet does the expenditure of labor result in wealth unless there is a tangible product which retains the power of ministering to desire."

"Land and labor are the two necessary factors in the production of wealth." "Those from whom I obtain the service (of carrying his bag) receive from me some article of wealth or representative of wealth, which they in turn exchange either for wealth or for direct services from others."

"It is thus, and only thus, that the great body of exchanges of *direct* services becomes possible."

E. B. DONOHUE  
Croydon, Australia

In your issue of June 1970 you print without comment, and with seeming approval, a poem by Edwin Markham, first quoted by Hamlin Garland

and subsequently by Edward J. Rose. It has also been seemingly approved by those present at the graduation banquet and by the School of Economic Science in Calgary.

Markham says: "Three evil fingers knotty and bent are Profit, Interest and Rent." Since when have U.S. Georgists begun to support Marxism, if only by default?

If profit, interest and rent are to be classed together as evil, then presumably only wages are virtuous. And if this isn't pure unadulterated Marxism I don't know what is.

I trust you will draw this matter to the attention of your readers and those who have blindly accepted this as representing George's thoughts.

S. TUCKER  
London

A recent article in the German publication *Der Spiegel* on "Usury in Square Feet—Unjust Land-Regulation in Germany," discusses the development of German land reform.

It shows that the enormous increase in the amount of "land" required for building purposes in Germany's rapidly expanding cities and new urban developments has resulted in unearned increments that surpass by far what we call "usury" in the usual sense. In some recorded cases the cost of building sites reached 26.7 percent of the purchase price of an identical parcel of "barren land" when it was needed for necessary road construction. Mention was made of the various encyclicals of Popes Pius XII and John XXIII which vigorously condemned the unsocial attitude of individuals to the detriment of the communities and the common good.

The article closed with a pessimistic outlook on the future because of the vested interests of some legislative bodies and politicians.

HENRY A. GIEFFERS  
New York