

endency is away from liberty and toward restriction, and that the real issue before the people is slavery or freedom. The real reason why so-called capitalists refuse to become interested in Single Tax is that they realize to some extent, at least, the present system is dependent entirely upon an abundant supply of cheap labor.

Single Tax, we believe, would free labor, and continuance of employment under existing conditions would be impossible. The laboring people considered as a whole do not realize what causes their present situation and vainly strive to bring about some improvement through organization. The capitalists, on the other hand, realize to free the worker would bring about a change in our present set up.

The real issue must eventually be faced. Are we going to continue the system which depends on slavery or are we going to free the laborer and bring about a complete change in our present system.

The present system received its big impetus when the tenures in England were abolished in the twelfth year of the reign of Charles II. Had the burden on land not been removed the system as we know it would not have developed.

Troito, Michigan.

HENRY C. L. FORLER.

### A CHANCE FOR WIDE SPREAD PROPAGANDA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Congressman Eekert's speech on "The Wagner Bill, Land and Labor," is an excellent and readable presentation of the Henry George plan; it will attract the attention of both the supporters and the opponents of the Wagner Bill and will offend neither of them.

Copies can be had from Congressman Charles R. Eekert of Pennsylvania for distribution franked for postage. It may be ordered and used to advantage by anyone.

Some fifteen thousand copies have already been circulated among every George people and prospects. If desired by the thousands, the cost of printing would be required, which is about four dollars a thousand.

BOLTON HALL.

### A SUGGESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It is my constant wish that your splendid editorials in LAND AND FREEDOM might have a wider circulation. It is ridiculous to observe enormous circulation that is given to so much that is trash. What do you think of *The Freeman*? I am hoping that it will do the work that the old *Standard* did so well, and that *The Public* did so very well in a little different way. I have often thought that we might arrange two or more pages in some weekly journal of wide circulation like *Liberator's* or *Liberty*, provided of course that we could get the right man to provide just the right copy for it and that we could get enough subscriptions from our own people and their friends to justify that. I used to suggest this to Louis Post in the old days.

Wichita, Kansas.

HENRY WARE ALLEN.

### A PLEA FOR TOLERATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I must confess to a growing irritation at the constant quibbling amongst ourselves over non-essentials. In your January-February issue Alan Thompson is at it again with more than insinuation that Beckwith is neither an economist nor a scientist, and all because the two do not happen to agree upon Beckwith's mannerisms—if they may be called—the *casus belli* just now being their disagreement upon the matter of interest.

To my mind, the philosophy of Henry George is clear and explicit in every economic question necessary to the establishment of justice in our social order. Rent is always, and everywhere a social issue, hence should be collected by society, not turned over to every man (or unlucky) Tom, Dick or Harry for their private exploitation. The collection by society would immediately open the resources of

nature to all upon equal terms; would force unused, rent bearing land into use and uneconomically used land into its full economic use. And I'm pretty sure that both Beckwith and Thompson will give 100 per cent assent to this statement.

The vast majority of men I meet do not care enough about anything to save their own supposed self interest even to give any economic question a thought; why, then, attempt to interest them in a subtlety which has no more bearing upon the truth we all agree upon than the phases of the moon upon the movements of Jupiter? And if one who has been convinced of this truth can be deterred from its espousal by any doubt of George's correctness or incorrectness upon the cause of interest or his espousal of the Ricardian theory of rent he is not worth a damn to this or any other cause involving the fundamentals of social life.

Just exactly what is the difference whether one sides with Thompson or with Beckwith in this matter? If, as Thompson declares, "interest will disappear when economic rent is collected in lieu of all taxes," why, presto, it will do so, no matter which is right; and does he suspect that Beckwith is any less devoted to such collection of rent than himself? Then why all the pother? And since it is pretty difficult for anyone to follow any other method of propaganda than that which seems to him most effective, let us be just a trifle tolerant of the other fellow's method. Long before our common goal has been reached both these valiant protagonists of this truth will have taken his abode in "the narrow house," so vindication of the contention of either will have scarcely an academic interest for either disputant.

Remember the two yokels who were dragging their cart across the marsh and got it mired in the mud; one declared for a hickory lever to get it out, but the other would have nothing but oak, and while they disputed, the cart sank so deeply that it could not be retrieved.

In my estimation Mr. Beckwith is one of the most valuable advocates of the Georgeian truth we have, and Mr. Thompson is another. Let us direct our attack against the enemy, not wrangle amongst ourselves. But let us not forget that *homo sapiens* has not been out of the trees long enough to have progressed far toward the human life.

Marathon, Iowa.

T. J. KELLEY, M. D.

### THE GOSPEL OF PLENTY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

You put it strongly and, I believe, most truly: "Poverty is the foe of all social advance, of spiritual and intellectual as well as material progress." I suppose you include not only poverty itself but the fear of poverty and the myriad superstitions that are born of fear.

Your hope, you say, is in the young. You are a younger product of my own era—I am eighty years old. I think both you and I have the right to hope that the new spirit that manifests itself is a spirit of peace and makes converts and apostles of us all.

I agree with you most enthusiastically: "In the philosophy of freedom is the germ of a new renaissance."

Our civilization has brought into play greater freedom than ever was known in the world before. This freedom has led to the plenty which Henry George was the first to declare and prove, and which has forced itself upon attention of observers and thinkers everywhere.

Evidently referring to the followers of Henry George, you say: "Ours is a tremendous responsibility." Once more, I very heartily agree. But I think we do not discharge that responsibility by any of the methods we have adopted. I approve of all methods that are in line with the Henry George philosophy, but I think we have made a big mistake in not beginning where George began. When he announced in the very first words of "Progress and Poverty," that the age of plenty had begun, he flatly contradicted the thought of his time. But today the belief in plenty is universal. But the world's self-appointed spokesman dare not follow the plain road that George marked out leading to the abolition of poverty.