

January—February, 1925

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901



The Stolen Lands Of England

J. W. Graham Peace

At the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle

By E. Wye

The Baiting Of The Cow

David L. Thompson

The Schalkenbach Bequest

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00

SINGLE COPIES 20 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York
JAMAICA OFFICE, 72 Johnson Avenue, Jamaica, Long Island.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

WILLIAM J. WALLACE, Pres. 491 Mt. Prospect Ave. Newark, N. J.

OSCAR H. GEIGER, Treas. 150 Nassau St., N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec. 165 Broadway, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico,
\$1.00 per year. Payable in advance.

Entered as Second-class Matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New
York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

JANUARY—FEBRUARY 1925

VOL. XXV

No. 1. WHOLE No. 127

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

ARGENTINE: Dr. Maspero Castro, Buenos Aires.

URUGUAY: Dr. Felix Vitale, Montevideo.

SPAIN: Antonio Albendin, Zamora.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: Prof. Robt. Braun, Budapest.

PORTUGAL: Dr. Herrera y Reissig, Uruguyan Legation, Lisbon.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

Current Comment	3
The Stolen Lands of England <i>J. W. Graham Peace</i>	8
At the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle <i>E. Wye</i>	12
The Baiting of the Cow <i>David L. Thompson</i>	15
The Rent Question to the Fore Again <i>Henry L. Peckham</i>	17
The Schalkenbach Bequest	18
Address of Carl D. Thompson	20
Adam Smith on Taxation	25
Correspondence	30
News Notes and Personals.....	31

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product.

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXV

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1925

No. 1

Current Comment

MR. "ZERO"—otherwise Mr. Urban L. Ledoux—has been in this city for some weeks seeking shelter for the homeless in church edifices. His attempts have not been very successful. Perhaps the novelty of the suggestion has stood in the way. Most people are startled at any proposition to apply the teachings of Jesus. Jesus had very democratic ideas regarding the poor. He felt with instinctive knowledge that poverty was institutional. He even declared that he came to break the bonds of those that were enslaved; he cited the ease with which the fowls of the air made a "living." We know that the Son of Man had not where to lay his head. Ever since his time men able and willing to work have sought vainly for crust and a shelter.

IT is not recorded that Jesus anywhere sought to justify the neglect of the poor by easy reference to the few who do not want to work, with which so many modern wise men brush aside the cry of the needy. We can not gather from His words that he believed the "crime of poverty" due to individual delinquency. Otherwise he would not have shown such a liking for the society of the poor. He would have dealt with them according to their delinquency. It is a matter of record that he did not.

THE churches have improved on the teachings of Jesus by beating them pretty thin. Christianity has erected magnificent cathedrals and massive edifices, and all have iron railings and locks and padlocks. The pews are private for the most part, and sermons evade the practical application of the texts. Religion is too often, not something for daily use, but appeals to a rather remote religious experience and consciousness. The sermons partake of the conventionalities of the time, as, for the most part, they have done in all history. At times the silence is broken by a Savonarola, a Beecher, or a Theodore Parker. But we are asking too much if we demand that ministers of the Gospel speak and act independently of their environment. It is a bread-and-butter question after all.

MR. LEDOUX forgets this. Partly he forgets it because he is not well informed on his economics. He thinks the question is to be solved by getting a few jobs for the unemployed. Matters would not be much improved, might indeed be made worse, if all the churches opened their doors at night to the unsheltered. The pity

is that quests such as Mr. "Zero" has entered upon, with all the devotion of a fine nature and intense sympathy for the distressed, serve to divert attention from the real problem, which is "What is the cause of unemployment?" If it is institutional, inherent in a defective form of society, a product of economic maladjustment, as examination will reveal it to be, then Mr. Ledoux's mission is not only futile, but worse than futile. For it is an expenditure of energy that can accomplish nothing permanent.

THE sympathy to which he appeals, however, is not to be despised. For it is not enough to *know*; it is necessary also to *feel*. Luke North put it aptly when he said that the only difference was between those who *cared* and those who did not. There are many who know but do not care; "Mr. Zero" cares and does not know. It is first necessary to know and then to care; knowledge must direct the sympathy that is expended; otherwise the sympathy is wasted. If one has the knowledge yet does not care he is as useless in the present crisis as those whom Luke North sought to stigmatize. If the Single Tax movement could borrow even a modicum of Mr. Ledoux's fine crusading spirit it would cause something of a stir in the world.

GEORGE W. HINMAN is a writer on the *New York American*. In the issue of that paper for Jan. 9 he discusses the question of unemployment. As this writer's view-point is that of many modern teachers of economics we quote:

"A man and a woman cannot occupy the same job. If the women can do the work and will do it, the men must go elsewhere for work. If there is nowhere else to go, he joins the rank of the unemployed. In England, apparently, he often has to do this. In the United States, where employment is more plentiful, where in good times there is work enough for all, he often has only to change his job or his occupation."

And again:

"Only one thing is sure. It is, that when the times are poor more men are unemployed if many women work; that only in this country is there at any time work enough for all workers of both sexes, and that in an old and settled country like England women's employment means a certain amount of men's unemployment year in and year out."

And finally:

"In general, there would not be so many men sitting on park benches if there were not so many women employed in what were once men's places."

WHAT is involved in this economic concept? That just so many jobs exist, less in an old and settled country and more in countries not so old and settled—for reasons not clearly indicated. Just what is the proportion of jobs to population in either case, we are not told. The theory seems to be that jobs decline as population increases, not because access to land becomes more difficult as it rises in price and more and more of it is withdrawn from use, but because the number of jobs is arbitrarily fixed in the nature of things, though varying in good and bad times. As two objects cannot occupy the same space at the same time, and there are just so many spaces, so to speak, in this employment question, it must follow that if a woman steps into the place occupied by a man, the man must step out. Mr. Hinman has said it: "A man and a woman cannot occupy the same job." Accepting the premise, the conclusion follows, of course.

IT will probably surprise Mr. Hinman to be told that jobs are infinite. There is no limit to them save only as they are limited by the fencing in of natural opportunities, and that is an artificial limitation. Land furnishes the only opportunity for employment. Mr. Hinman sees that in new and unsettled countries jobs are plentiful and he is strangely misled as to the cause. Adam Smith, writing over a hundred years ago, noted the phenomenon of high wages and workers fully employed in the colonies of the New World. He attributed it, with his usual keenness of judgement, to the cheapness of land and easy access to it—the primary determining cause of high wages and constancy of employment.

OBSERVING the phenomenon of falling wages and unemployment that often accompany population, economists like Mr. Hinman accept what appears to be the obvious solution of unemployment. Surely if there are only so many jobs—so many unfilled spaces to be occupied, so to speak, in a given population,—a doubling of the population ought to cut employment opportunities to one half. Yet who is not aware that no such thing happens. And why? Because every man that is employed in producing anything is making a demand on the labor of some one else—and thus creating jobs for others. This is what economists call "effective demand." It follows, therefore, that the more population the more jobs. It is only when rent begins to press upon wages and land speculation sets in that the "effective demand" is reduced. Industry halts and wages decline. Women and children are crowded into the labor market at lower wages than men with families can afford to work for, and the condition is presented, for an explanation of which Mr. Hinman, instead of seeking the deeper solution, seizes upon the fanciful interpretation of a certain fixity in the number of jobs in a given population, determined, it would seem, by divine predestination!

THE death of Samuel Gompers removes from the labor movement one whose talent for generalship is not likely soon to be equalled. But this is the most that can be said of him. As much as the great "captains of industry" he was a monopoly builder. He sought to perfect an organization strong enough to extort from capital more than the return determined by the natural flux of labor and capital. At best, or worst if you please, such organization could include but a very small percentage of those remuneratively employed. And the advantage wrested from capital by the organized group must be at the expense of the unorganized in higher prices for commodities and higher cost of living. To this extent the influence of Samuel Gompers was an evil one. In so far as he led workingmen to think in terms of labor monopoly, he was a greater enemy of labor than any of the capitalists anathematized by the American Federation.

SAMUEL GOMPERS used to point with pride to the fact that he had prevented many strikes. No doubt this was so. But the temporary absence of strikes marks merely a truce between two hostile forces. The ultimate resort is a strike, as every one understands, just as the ultimate aim of great armaments between nations interested in the same stake, is *war*. To maintain that industrial peace can be brought about by an armed truce between capital entrenched and labor militant, is an idle dream. What Mr. Gompers and those who think with him are preparing for is war, not peace. Peace is not possible where the producing forces of the world stand divided and where Labor striking blindly at the capitalist man of straw sees not the figure of Monopoly with hands abstracting the joint earnings both of Labor and Capital. Mr. Gompers and those who think with him lend to Socialism nearly all its strength, and because Mr. Gompers hated the Socialism which he was helping unconsciously to strengthen, Socialists were right in despising him.

IT was believed that the leader of the American Federation of Labor saw what was involved in the conflict between Labor and Capital. It will be recalled by readers of LAND AND FREEDOM that he was stirred to something like anger into replying to our criticism of his position. It had been rumored that he was a Single Taxer. He was very proud of his friendship with Henry George and referred to it on several occasions. It did not seem to us that his pronouncements gave any hint of his having acquired anything of value from that acquaintance. We challenged the fiction that had been industriously built up around him and that credited him with a belief in the economic philosophy of the Great Emancipator.

IF Mr. Gompers were a believer in this philosophy, he was a sinner against the light. But now that he is gone and rests secure from praise or blame, it may be well to

announce our belief that a real disservice was done him by the friends who were accustomed to speak of him as a believer in Henry George. It is a very serious charge that a man knowing a great truth should persistently ignore it. His name may now be rescued from that imputation. He did not merely ignore the truth because it was to his interest to do so. He really never understood it. That much must be said in all fairness to his memory.

WE have received the following letter from a subscriber whose name we withhold: "On page 183 of the last issue of your publication appears 'Peace with Injustice,' which I have read without pleasure but without surprise, for it is in harmony with an earlier editorial.

"On page 179 Mr. Baldwin publicly announces condemnation of the taxation of land values. Your criticism of Lord Robert Cecil must therefore be extended to include the majority of the British electors and without doubt the American electors as well.

"A real critic is one who improves upon that which he criticises. Will you therefore kindly nominate a person more entitled to receive the prize for his actual accomplishment toward international peace than Lord Cecil, and oblige."

THE challenge is a fair one. To a Single Taxer the answer would appear to be perfectly obvious. We do not agree that the League of Nations as now constituted is an especially powerful agency for the preservation of peace. Since its organization there have been too many little wars that it has shown itself powerless to prevent. When Mussolini boldly challenged the authority of the League and bombarded Corfu, it managed to save its face only by a make-shift compromise. Spain makes war upon Morocco and the League is silent; it was silent, too, in the series of events that culminated with the Egyptian crisis. But even if the League of Nations really amounted to something, Viscount Cecil would be an unhappy representative of the compact. He is himself part of the government that helped to strangle Egyptian aspirations for greater freedom. He defends that policy with the smug phrases which are familiar words in his mouth. "Relations between England and Egypt," he tells us, "are of a very special character." It was not an "international matter."

WHEN Henry George sent a copy of *Progress and Poverty* to the Duke of Argyll he said: "I knew the Duke of Argyll only by his book. (The Reign of Law). I had never been in Scotland or learned the character as a landlord he bears there." When our correspondent commends Viscount Cecil as an apostle of peace he may be similarly unacquainted with his record and that of his family. Cecil has been the staunch upholder of all that makes for social injustice and therefore of the fundamental cause which drives the nations into conflict. He has been for years the chief defender of the monstrous wrong that

makes the masses of the Englishmen trespassers in the land of their birth. He was the leading opponent of Lloyd George's attempt to impose a small tax on the incomes of those landlord parasites of which the Cecils are a type, who live on the earning of what the British aristocrat calls the "lower orders." Were Viscount Cecil a mere passive recipient of landlord loot and not an active defender of the system that permits these titled idlers to live without work, something might be said in his defence. But to call this man standing for the things he does "a worker for social justice" is to do violence to the meaning of words.

AFTER all, we who stand for social justice know the meaning and causes of war. No one who accepts the philosophy of Henry George needs to be told what is its primary cause, whatever may be said concerning contributory causes. They know that no enduring superstructure such as the League of Nations can be built upon present foundations.

THE *Commonweal*, of London, England, quoting what we had to say about Viscount Cecil, adds this interesting note regarding the Cecil family which may be of interest to our subscriber:

"Lord Robert's brother, Hugh, declared a while back that he did not believe that God gave the land to the people. He wouldn't. Their father once stated in the House of Lords that the farmer provided the capital, the laborer provided the labor, and the landlord *provided the land*. Sir Anthony Welden, the historian, relates how the Cecils got some of the land they call theirs:—

"Sir Robert Cecil, created Earl of Salisbury by King James I, to whom he was Lord Treasurer, advised the King in rewarding his poor Scotch suitors with lands, but Salisbury had one trick to get the kernel and leave the Scots but the shell, yet cast all the envy on them. He would make them buy books of fee-farms; some £100 a year, some 100 marks (13s. 4d.), and he would compound with them for £1,000, which they were willing to embrace because they were sure to have them pass without any control or charge, and £1,000 appeared to them, that never saw £10 before, an inexhaustible treasure. Then would Salisbury fill up this book with such prime land as should be worth £10,000 or £20,000, which was easy to him, being Treasurer, so to do; and by this means Salisbury enriched himself infinitely, yet cast the envy on the Scots, in whose name these books appeared, and are still upon record to all posterity; though Salisbury had the money, they, poor gentlemen, but part of the ways. . . . So was the poor King and State cheated on all hands."

A list of the grants of Crown and Church lands obtained by this family would fill two pages of *The Commonweal*. Suffice it now to say that the Marquis of Salisbury holds 20,202 acres, with a yearly rent-roll of some £66,826; but this does not include the valuable estates in the Strand and Charing Cross Road, London. The bulk of the estate was stolen from the Church—the Cecils have always been strong Churchmen—but it is quite clear from the evidence of history that God did not give the Cecils these broad acres."

Mr. Hopkins Again Bobs Up

MANY of us recall the platforms of the Committee of 48, which was gradually (or so it seemed) taking shape into something definite which believers in economic freedom could approve. There was, however, a tendency to modify these demands in response to what appeared expedient to those intent on forming a new political party. Mr. Hopkins was delightfully accomodating in accepting from time to time successive modifications.

We have received from the office of the committee of 48 a communication inviting us to enroll in the Progressive party. The platform once presented has disappeared and the demands once coming very close to something real have now "gone glimmering." The issue is now stated to be "the breaking of the combined power of private monopoly over the political and economic life of the people." How delightfully vague!

The advantage of a declaration of this kind is that it offends nobody. Of course, you cannot build a political party on it. It is not an "issue" at all, for voters will ask with some curiosity, "How do you propose to do this?" That, of course, is the "issue."

Mr. Hopkins and his amiable associates do not know and apparently never will know and never will understand. Amateurs to the last, they will persist in imagining that political parties are evolved out of thin air and that they are of any value when evolved.

How Wealthy Are We?

WE would not wish to be included among those who are said to find satisfaction "taking the joy out of living." Nevertheless, when a statement such as appears in the press of January 15th, based upon a statement issued by the Census Bureau, is printed without warning upon the front page of our leading dailies it is time to call a halt, and ask ourselves what are the real facts.

The wealth of America is put at \$321,000,000,000. This works out at about \$3,000 per capita or \$15,000 for the normal family of five. It is stated that this is an increase of 72.2% in a decade. Recently it was figured that the present dollar was worth only 58 cents, as compared with the dollar of 1914. Hence if our present wealth were computed in dollars of the value which the dollar had in 1912, our total wealth would be only \$186,000,000,000 instead of \$321,000,000,000, and it seems to be true, if we add 72.2% to \$186,000,000,000 we get as the result \$321,000,000,000 which is stated to be our present national wealth, so that in a decade we seem to have remained practically stationary!

But worse remains behind. The item of greatest value in the category of the national wealth was real estate, and its improvements subject to taxation, which is computed at \$155,000,000,000. We do not think that there

are any figures available showing the separate valuation of the land and the improvements on it, but it would probably be fair to estimate that at least \$75,000,000,000 of this represent land value. In addition to this there is \$10,000,000,000 of exempt land value and probably close to the same amount of land value of railroads, so that we will not be far astray if we estimate that \$100,000,000,000 of the so-called wealth of the country represents this very nebulous form of wealth, which chiefly consists of the power possessed by certain owners to make the other people pay them rents.

That is to say, it is an obligation for one group and an asset for another, so that as a whole it has no proper classification under the head of wealth, because wealth, by economic definition, is merely material modified by human labor so as to be capable of satisfying some human desire or need. If, instead of being used to satisfy human need or desire, it is utilized for the production of goods it becomes capital. So that while we must keep in mind the fact that the \$100,000,000,000 at which the value of land is computed is given in the inflated dollar of 1924, and is therefore subject to some discount, it is still an enormously important factor in the computation of the wealth of the country.

What we wish to insist upon is the probably unintentional, but none the less misleading, mis-statement of the wealth of the country which is put out by the Census Bureau. We might even go further, and point out that of the nearly \$16,000,000,000 which is given as the value of telegraph, telephone and power systems, street railroads, canals and irrigation, a very large proportion is not wealth in any strict sense of the term, but merely capitalization of special privilege, which the corporations engaged in those services enjoy.

There is even a further aspect of this over-statement. We are insisting upon the payment of the debts which the Allies owe us, but if we had any such vast and *real* wealth as the figures given out by the Census Bureau would indicate, we would be very mean not to write it off. Certainly this is how it must seem abroad where the people do not seem to realize that the cancellation of their obligations to us merely means that we shall go on for a decade or two paying those debts ourselves, because the ownership of these debts is not in public, but in private hands.

If this computation were to be taken at its face value it would form a most logical defense of the rejected Democratic administration of the ten years of 1912 and 1922, which we passed under Democratic rule, and these figures would seem to prove that this was by far the most prosperous period in the history of the United States. All of which goes to show how difficult it is to make deductions from statistics unless you understand them.

Skimming The Milk of Other Men's Cows

ABOUT the middle of November there passed away a man who was nearly an octogenarian who was known as the Dean of New York Realtors. The usual conservative and stern *Record and Guide*, the organ of the New York Real Estate Interests, becomes lachrymose over his demise, and prints an editorial entitled "His Vision Brought Merited Rewards."

We would be the last to question the importance of the role which the realtor plays in city development, but we cannot quite see what public service a man renders by being able to see that a given site will sell for a marked advance if it can be held either idle or only partially used until somebody comes along who is willing to pay a profit for it. There is no evidence at all that the deceased gentleman ever put up a building, though he may have done so. He simply bought about one hundred Broadway corners for himself or clients, which were all sold at a profit.

The following table gives some indication of the growth of values, within the period of a century, and would seem to prove that it did not need extraordinary foresight to reap rich rewards in such a rising market.

HOW THE PRICE OF LAND HAS GONE UP WITHIN THE LAST CENTURY

The book "Fifth Avenue Old and New," published for the Centennial, gives the following comparative table of real estate values:

District	Date	Value	1924 Value
Arch to 13th street.....	1826	\$ 14,600	\$ 8,128,000
13th to 23d street	1836	405,000	29,541,500
23d to 34th street	1838	246,500	61,947,000
34th to 40th street	1838	138,800	71,802,000
40th to 86th street	1841	397,000	259,287,000
86th to 110th street ..	1841	173,000	22,287,000

The man who uses his brains and energy for the improvement of his community by launching new enterprises and constructing new buildings is truly entitled to the respect and regard of his fellow citizens, but the man who spends his life in skimming off the top of the milk which he takes no hand in producing, does not deserve the eulogy pronounced upon him by a paper like the *Record and Guide*.

LOS ANGELES police have started a crusade to drive all the mediums, clairvoyants and other "psychics" out of town. What's the use? They'll still have the real estate dealers.—J. W. ROPER in *Cleveland Press*.

Free Trade, Free Land, Free Men

LATE in January there met in Washington a National Conference to consider the Cause and Cure of War. May men and women of prominence, leaders of thought in many fields, were present. Speeches were made and theories outlined to prevent the recurrence of war. In these proceedings there was little of interest to those who would drive beneath the surface of things for the primary cause of war. All the speakers dealt with the contributory causes as if these were the real ones.

Not all. There was one exception. That exception was Prof. Warren Thompson, of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. He began his address by asserting that the "differential pressure of population" was the chief cause of war and that the cure was birth control.

We refrain from comment on this theory, very widely held and very popular, but not nearly as conclusive as some imagine. There are too many facts against it. But Prof. Thompson did not stop here. As the newspapers report his address, he added that the following economic measures could be put into effect by the advanced nations to equalize the pressure of population and render armed conflict less likely:

1. The abolition of all barriers which now prevent free access of all peoples to the world's resources.
2. The abolition of all customs barriers.
3. The abolition of all barriers to migration.

While declaring that birth-control was the cure for war, Prof. Thompson said that this was a "relative matter," pressure of population becoming a menace to peace "when a people feels that it is being kept within narrower limits because other peoples are unjustly monopolizing too large a portion of the earth's resources."

Prof. Thompson seems to argue for a condition Single Taxers used to summarize in "Free Trade, Free Land, Free Men." But we are not quite clear on this point. Access of "peoples" to the natural resources of the earth may not mean access for all "persons" on equal terms, inside as well as outside the national boundaries. Yet undoubtedly the denial of this right of access is the potent cause of civil strife as of international warfare. That the Professor should immediately have followed his first recommendation with his second, "the abolition of all customs barriers," would seem to indicate that he had in mind a state of society in which equal access to natural resources by "persons" as well as nations was implied, since the second might be said to render the first unnecessary if the more limited implication is construed.

We are a little curious and would have been glad of further amplification. But at all events, Prof. Thompson is very "warm", as the children say in their games, even if

he is nothing more. And amid the superficial utterances of this well-intentioned gathering a note was struck that if not quite clear will echo with more familiar resonance in future conclaves.

Present at this gathering were Rabbi Wise and Carrie Chapman Catt. The former is reputed to be a Single Taxer; the latter was a member of the Fels Fund Commission, and so presumably of the faith. An opportunity was presented for either of these forward looking persons to come forward in support of the Miami professor. They had nothing to say in defence or elaboration of his contention, the nearest approach to anything fundamental in all the "blatherings" of the Conference.

To The Landlord— The Processes of Petrification

TO the landlord belongs, not only the land, but the slow processes of petrification through uncounted centuries. Mark Twain tells the story of the man who collected echoes; future generations may tell the tale of those whose newest "fads" will be the amassing of petrified forests.

The *Dearborn Independent* tells interestingly of Ollie Bocker, a lady who owns the only petrified forest in California which she bought of a "realtor" for \$16,000. California is the Mecca of landlordism, and it is appropriate that the newest development of landlordism should be found in that state. To own a petrified forest sets one aside from the common run of mankind as a unique personage.

Organizer Robinson Permanently In The Field

IT is good news that James A. Robinson, National Organizer of the Commonwealth Land Party, is now permanently engaged as lecturer and organizer for the party.

Mr. Robinson has left California and will proceed direct to Cleveland. From this point he will begin his work, filling lecture dates and organizing party groups wherever possible. Those wishing to secure him for addresses before labor unions, church associations, chambers of commerce, etc., in Ohio, will communicate with J. B. Lindsay, 7410 Franklin Avenue, Cleveland.

From Ohio Mr. Robinson will proceed to other states, where his lecture engagements will be in other hands. Financial support for this work should be forthcoming, for there is no man in the movement whose services are more valuable. Mr. Robinson is an eloquent expounder of the economic gospel as it is in George, a ready debater, and a real power on the platform. We shall furnish from issue to issue of LAND AND FREEDOM full reports of his work as it proceeds.

The Stolen Lands of England

THE Right Hon. Stephen Walsh, M. P., Secretary for War in the late Labor Government, has succeeded in arousing the Landlords of Britain to attempt a "Reply" to his charges of "Stolen Lands." Mr. Walsh has been making very good use of the historical information published by the C. L. P. in their weekly journal, *The Commonwealth*, and, of course, the press has had to take notice of the utterances of a Cabinet Minister. So it comes about that the Central Landowners' Association, alarmed at the unusual publicity given to their monopoly, have rushed into print with an "Official Reply," published in *The Times*, for December 16th last. The article is a piece special pleading which, so far from "refuting the charges," as was hoped, confirms them. If this is the best defence that the Landlords can put up, then the oftener they do it the better. Readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will be interested to read the "reply" for themselves and accordingly it is reprinted in full hereunder.

"Land and The People." "Socialist Charges Refuted." "A Page of History." These are the captions under which the article appears in *The Times*.

"A speech made by the Right Hon. Stephen Walsh, then Minister for War, at Radcliffe, Manchester, was reported in *The Times* of October 27, 1924. In that speech Mr. Walsh is reported to have spoken of 'the restitution of the stolen lands to the people' and of 'the awful robbery' of land by landlords in the 18th and 19th centuries. 'No more infamous records,' he is reported to have added, 'had been established in England,' and 'no more infamous robbery.'

"The insistence on the recurrent phrases of 'stolen lands,' 'awful robbery,' 'infamous robbery,' constitutes a serious charge against the landowners of this country. It is unthinkable that Mr. Walsh would have given the weight of his public services and the authority of a Minister of the Crown to so grave an accusation, unless he had believed it to be true. We therefore desire to put on record some historical facts which, in our opinion, show the charge to be unfounded.

"The restitution of the stolen lands to the people' necessarily implies that the land of this country was at one time owned by the people. In the earliest records of Saxon times there is no trace of such ownership; but there is abundant evidence that land was owned by individuals. For more than 13 centuries, therefore, the State has sanctioned private ownership.

"But Mr. Walsh specifies the particular period—the 18th and 19th centuries—at which, as he alleges, landlords robbed the people of the land. Apparently he refers to the operation of the Enclosure Acts, which broke up the village farms by redistributing their common-fields and common-pastures in compact freehold blocks. It is, of course, true that in 1760 one-half or one-third of the cultivated land of England was occupied by groups of occupiers who tilled and grazed it in common, and that, by 1875, practically the whole of the land was occupied by individuals who cultivated it with the aid of wage-earning workers. This transformation was part of the industrial movement which within the same period changed

a thinly populated agricultural and pastoral country into the densely crowded manufacturing and commercial England of today. So far as land is concerned, the chief instrument of change was enclosures. If, therefore, we know why they were brought into operation and what they actually did we shall be in a position to meet the charge of 'awful,' 'infamous robbery.'

VILLAGE FARMS

"A village farm consisted of a small acreage of meadow, a great expanse of tillage, and a pasture-common. The arable land was cultivated by the village farmers in common, each occupier holding a bundle of scattered strips, generally oblong in shape, varying in size, separated from one another, and often a mile apart. In virtue of this arable holding each occupier enjoyed grazing rights over the pasture attached to the farm and, after the crops were cleared, over the meadows and ploughlands from harvest to seed-time. From this common user of the land that tillage was spoken of as the common-fields and the pasture as the common. In most villages there were also privileged cottages, the occupiers of which, though not holders of arable land, enjoyed grazing rights over the common pasture. No member of the general public had any rights over the common tillage and pasture of the village farm. Both were integral parts of the holdings of the village partners, who jealously guarded them from the intrusion of strangers and their live stock. They in no way resembled those commons of today which are dedicated to public use.

"Holders of arable land in the common-fields and of the rights that it carried over the common pasture held it by every sort of title. Some of the occupiers owned their holdings as freeholders; others occupied them as copyholders of various grades—as leaseholders, for lives on terms of years; as tenants, from year to year or at will. Cottagers occupied their cottages by similar variety of tenure: some as freeholders, other as copyholders, others as leaseholders, and so on. Some were squatters who had either gained freeholds by lapse of time or occupied on sufferance. The variety of tenure and of title is a matter of supreme importance in the discussion.

"Village farmers farmed as they farmed centuries before. They were bound by the same rigid rules of cropping, followed the same unvarying rotation of corn and triennial fallow, used the same implements, kept the same class of live-stock. They raised enough food for themselves; they produced little, if anything for sale. They formed isolated, self-supporting, self-sufficing communities. In those easy-going days it did not matter. Before the middle of the 18th century no demand for change arose, either from an improved agriculture or from a growing population. But from 1760 onwards pressure was increasingly felt from both directions. The resources of agriculture were multiplied by the use of such new crops as roots and artificial grasses, and by improvements in the science and art of stock-breeding. The means were known by which the production of food could be doubled. But so long as village farmers turned their cattle and sheep on to the common arable fields from harvest to seed-time it was impossible to grow either turnips or clover, and so long as their stunted live-stock were promiscuously herded on the worn-out common pasture it was idle to think of improving the breeds. If an urgent demand for food arose, it could not be met from land occupied by village farmers. After 1760 that demand came with rapidly increasing insistence. With the invention of machinery

manufacturers developed; domestic handicrafts were swept into factories; population leaped upwards; it gathered in great industrial centres; it shifted from the South to the North. New manufacturing districts cried out for "Bread and Meat," and, as the century drew to its close, the cry was swollen by the panic-stricken clamour of a nation engaged in war and haunted by the spectre famine. In this difficult crisis village farms seemed to prevent land from being put to its most productive use, to be a menace to the national supply of food, and an obstacle to the manufacturing expansion of England.

THE ENCLOSURE ACTS.

"Economically, the compulsory break-up of village farms may be justified by the urgent necessity of increased supplies of food, and by the success of the new system in securing the required increase. In 1840 England fed from its own sources a population which since 1760 had doubled. If the nation was to develop on manufacturing lines, the village farmer must be sacrificed to the artisan. But no reasonable man can say that the social and economic results of the sacrifice, taken together, have been wholly good or wholly bad.

"Proceedings in the enclosure of the common-fields and pasture-common of a village farm began with a petition to Parliament, signed by a three-fourths or four-fifths of the owners, the majority being based on values and not on numbers. When the petition reached Parliament a Private Bill for the enclosure of the locality was by leave of the House introduced, read twice, and then referred to a Committee of selected members. The Committee, after receiving counter-petitions and hearing evidence, reported that the Standing Orders had or had not been complied with; that the contents of the petition were or were not true; and that the required majority of owners had or had not consented. On the Committee's Report the Bill was either thrown out or read a third time, passed, and sent to the Upper House.

"After 1801 the proceedings were shortened by the passing of a General Act. When the Act was finally passed the Commissioners, usually three or five in number, visited the village, held public meetings, heard claims, and prepared their award. On valuations of land or of common-rights their decisions were final; on questions of title an appeal was allowed to Quarter Sessions or the Assizes. Surveyors were also employed to measure and value every distinct parcel of land. Many of these award maps are beautifully drawn and show the care with which the work was done.

"The general principle of the award was to substitute the ownership of a compact block of freehold land for the ownership of a bundle of scattered strips and rights of common. It was the duty of the Commissioners to make the substituted land as nearly as possible the equivalent in value of the former holding. Enclosures did not necessarily involve a transfer of ownership from one person to another; what they did was to change the nature of the property owned. All occupiers who could show an independent title were recognized as owners and were awarded a block of land. On the other hand, occupiers, whether of land or privileged cottages, who paid rent for their occupations, were not recognized as owners and received no allotment. As a matter of fact, the immediate effect of an enclosure was to increase rather than diminish the number of freeholders, since copyholders of inheritance and leaseholders for lives, as well as commoners, were often admitted.

TWO EXAMPLES

"The awards speak for themselves. They show that the enclosed and redistributed common-fields and commons of a village farm were owned by the same owners as before enclosure. Two instances may be quoted, one the beginning, the other at the end of the period specified by Mr. Walsh.

"In 1767 the land of the village farm at Steeple Aston, Oxfordshire, was enclosed. The area dealt with was 988 acres. Twenty-three owners were recognized and received freehold allotments of land corresponding in value to their former holdings. The principal landowners of the neighborhood, Sir C. Cottrell-Dormer, received 63 acres; Jacob Watson, Lucy Buswell and Judith Lamely received respectively 116 acres, 84 acres, and 56 acres. One leasehold claim was recognized. One cottager received 1 acre 23 poles for his rights of common. The expenses of the enclosure were, it may be added, borne by the 15 chief allottees in proportion to their allotments; but nothing was charged to the smallest owners.

"The second instance is taken from the Return of the Enclosure Commissioners in 1876. It shows that from 1845 to 1875 590,000 acres were enclosed and divided among 25,930 people. Of these, on an average, 520 Lords of Manors received 44½ acres each, and 21,810 common-right owners 24 acres each. Of the classes among whom the land was distributed, 12,527 were "yeomen and farmers, shopkeepers and tradesmen, laborers and miners and artisans."

It may be admitted that the proceedings of Enclosure Acts were high-handed, as they always are where compulsion is applied; that a Parliament of landowners may not always have been disinterested; that there was room for favoritism; that mistakes were made and injustices done. But, however much is made of all these admissions, the results falls infinitely short of Mr. Walsh's charge. Let him take the awards themselves, the most reliable proof of what was done, and, in the face of their evidence, let him justify his charge against landowners, if he can."

THE COMMONWEALTH LAND PARTY'S REPLY TO THIS "REPLY"

THE reply of the Central Landowners' is not very convincing. "The restitution of stolen lands to the people," they say, "necessarily implies that the land of this country was at one time owned by the people." The authors of the reply know better than to deny that this was so, but they seek to limit inquiry to the period subsequent to "earliest Saxon times." They should know that in this matter history begins prior to Saxon times, and that tribal ownership in common was the universal rule. The equal right of every member of the tribe was secured by well-defined tribal law and custom.

Today, less than one million of the present inhabitants of Great Britain hold all the land, while 42 million others are entirely dispossessed. The truth is just this: by many devious tricks which I have not space to set out here, the whole of the land has been stolen, and, no matter how innocently he may have acquired it, every holder of land is actually in possession of stolen property. In this connection, the recent judgment of Lord Darling in the noto-

rious "A" case is of interest. Dealing with the question of the ownership of the £150,000, the proceeds of Sir H. Song's cheque, the learned judge said: "Whose money is it? If it is stolen from him, in my judgment it remains his still. Nobody can give anybody else a title to it, no matter what transactions are gone through with regard to it." This precisely states the case with regard to the land. It is the people's land still.

"For more than 13 centuries," they say, "the State has sanctioned private ownership." This is not true. Never yet in the history of the British people have they had the chance of "sanctioning" or otherwise. All the "laws" under which land was held were placed upon the statute book by parliaments in which the people had no representation whatever. But suppose "the State" had "sanctioned private ownership," the State can change its mind, and when it does, it will be interesting to see what attitude will be adopted by those who now would seek to rely upon this broken reed of argument. The lawyers who drew up the reply know full well that the State, even in the limited sense of a landlord parliament, has never at any time acknowledged "Private Ownership." The great jurist Coke, (Institutes, p. 488) says "All lands or tenements in England are holden mediately or immediately of the King. For in the law of England we have not any subjects' land which is so holden." I could quote many other authorities to the same effect. Private possession as tenants of the King (typifying the people) but always subject to the right of "eminent domain," as the lawyers themselves denote the power of the Crown to resume possession of any land at any time.

There is, of course, the moral aspect of the question, but lawyers are not greatly concerned with morals.

The account given by the Landowners of the "Village Farms," while of interest historically, is quite beside the point since they omit to make clear the fact that the Enclosures simply completed the theft of the peoples' land which commenced at a very much earlier period. To the present generation, a common signifies an open space reserved for purposes of recreation; what it meant to our grandfathers is well shown by the Hammonds in their book "The Village Laborer."

"The arable fields were divided into strips, with different owners, some of whom owned few strips, and some many. The various strips that belonged to a particular owner were scattered among the fields. Strips were divided from each other, sometimes by a grass band called a balk, sometimes by a furrow. They were cultivated on a uniform system by agreement, and after harvest they were thrown open to pasturage.

"The common meadow land was divided up by lot, pegged out, and distributed among the owners of the strips; after the hay was carried, these meadows, like the arable fields, were used for pasture.

"The common, or waste, which was used as a common pasture at all times of the year, consisted sometimes of

woodland, sometimes of roadside strips, and sometimes of commons in the modern sense."

It is quite true that the open-field method of cultivation was wasteful and uneconomic, but it did at least secure to every villager—not some only, as the Landowners would have us believe—a share in his native land. This share could have been preserved to him when enclosing became necessary had the full rental value of all land been taken for public revenue, as proposed by the C.L.P.

One would suppose, reading the apology of the Landowners, that every consideration was shown to the poor. So sure do they seem of this that they urge Mr. Walsh to take the awards, which they say "speak for themselves," and which are "the most reliable proof of what was done." They give "Two examples." Here are other two, taken at random from the records in my possession made from personal inspection of a large number of the Enclosure Awards.

Braunston, a village in Leicestershire. One thousand five hundred acres of common-fields enclosed in 1801. The rector got 1-7th, and the Duke of Rutland got off with 6-8ths.

Kettering Common, Northamptonshire, 2,300 acres enclosed in 1804. The award runs: "The Right Hon. Lewis Thomas, Lord Sondes, 6-10th parts and the Most Noble Henry, Duke of Buccleuch and Elizabeth his wife, Lord and Lady of the Manor of Kettering, 4-10th parts."

Sometimes there was an award of land to the poor. Such lands were usually vested in the "vicar and churchwardens" who, in many instances applied the revenue to the *repair of the church*. In this way very many acres throughout the country have come into hands of the Church.

The following examples of typical "Poor's allotments" will "speak for themselves," as the Landowners say. They are taken from the Records for the county of Suffolk.

Date	Parish	Acres enclosed	Poor's Allotment
1803	Somerleyton	900 acres	11 acres
1805	Trimley St. Mary	500 "	4 "
1807	Mildenhall	7,000 "	100 "
1807	Brandon	4,500 "	116 "
			"of sterile land"

By the Enclosure Act, of 1845, alone, some 320,855 acres of common rights were taken away from the poor. The Royal Commission of 1868 disclosed the fact that only 2,119 acres were allotted to the cottagers.

The Landowners are discreetly silent upon the other Enclosures. They confine themselves to what was done by Parliament Acts. Not a word about the non-Parliamentary theft. Dr. Gilbert Slater has the following to say upon this.

"Early in the eighteenth century there began the great series of private acts of enclosure, of which 4,000 in all, covering some 7,000,000 acres, were passed before the

General Enclosure Act of 1845. *During the same period it is probable that about the same area was enclosed without application to Parliament.*" (Dr. Gilbert Slater, "The Land," Vol. 1, p lxxii.)

It is worthy of note, too, that during the period of the Napoleonic wars, the Landlords were particularly active. A Return issued in 1814 gives a list of 5,328 enclosures, of which 8 only bear date prior to 1700. In 3,067 instances the area enclosed is not given, while for the remaining 2,261 it is stated as 2,520,684½ acres. No less than 1,925 of these enclosures were made when the poor were away fighting for "their country." (1796 to 1815).

Many authorities might be quoted to disprove the suggestion sought to be conveyed by the Landowners. I must content myself with the following. "The strongest argument against enclosures was the material and moral damage inflicted upon the poor . . . the injury inflicted upon the poor by the loss of their common and pasture, whether legally exercised or not, was indisputably great." Mr. R. E. Protheroe, (now Lord Ernle) Land Agent to the Duke of Bedford, in "English Farming, Past and Present."

A large book might be written upon this subject, filled with actual instances collected from the overwhelming mass of evidence in existence, but the foregoing should serve to dispose of the impudent attempt of the Landowners' paid lackeys to falsify history in the interests of the immoral privilege they seek to defend. In a later article I shall describe in detail the procedure of Enclosure, and show how the common was distributed.

Happily signs are not wanting that all such dishonest methods will speedily fail, for on every hand now the question of Land and its ownership is being increasingly discussed. To such discussion there is only one possible issue. The C.L.P. everywhere should seek to re-double their efforts to awaken the common people to the true nature of the fraud now perpetrated upon them by the Landowners.

Not by purchase, nor by step-by-step taxation will this fraud be ended. Only by the immediate collection of all the rent of all the land for the community can "restitution of the stolen land to the people" be effected.

—J. W. GRAHAM PEACE.

THIS is a cruel slam in the *Pittsburgh Post*:

"A Hazelwood reader has written:

"I am glad to see your repeated reference to the new excellent term, 'big booklet.'"

"We have long wanted a descriptive term for the bulky volumes put out by our university men who dub each other 'professor of economics.'"

"It was most delightful to discover that you had hit upon the exact title that in two words so aptly and unmistakably indicate both their size and their importance—big for their quantity, booklet for their quality."

At the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle

CONDUCTED BY E. WYE

"AS I was saying to Mrs. Dowdy but last night, 'I lift my hat to the late Samuel Gompers.' Whereupon Mrs. Dowdy rejoined to me, 'Ephraim, how you have changed your mind!' True, my dear, returned I smiling, *Tempora mutant et nos mutamur in illis*." The Professor was standing with his back to our cheery fire at the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle, and he teetered backward and forward with all the rhythm of contentment. "In these days of renewed uplift, especially of uplift on the Stock Exchange (here the Professor looked at us very waggishly) I have become an enormous optimist. My criticisms are a thing of the past, my cynicism has dissolved into thin air. I now maintain that this is the best of all possible worlds, and of this world our own dear country is the best, facile princeps—while the late election would seem to show whom, as our chosen leader, we most delight to honor." "You starta with some flower for old Sam Gompers," interrupted Giuseppe Bonfiglio, a recent accession to our circle. "To be sure," returned the Professor, "I do admire Gompers, for his mastery of the difficult technique of handling men. In this he was a wonder. I kept watch on his career, and at every annual convention I expected to see him unseated. But he rode through to the end in triumph. No small achievement!" "Scusi," broke in Giuseppe rather excitedly, "I know the whola game. Until I accepta da Single Tax I shouta for da old man same as you. I have been in da Federation many year. Dey tella me da old man was friend of Henry George. How dat possible?" "Our friend here," continued Professor Dowdy, not at all ruffled, "probably forgets that Mr. George on many occasions pointed out that he too had been a member of a trade union and that under economic conditions as they exist he approved of trade unions. To what base level, he asked, might not wages sink without them?" "Oh, cutta dat out," cried Giuseppe impatiently, with rising voice, "I knowa all dat. I am Single Taxer, hundred per centa. I no want a machina, artificial lika da Union, to regulate my wages. I am for freea land and freea men! When I no lika my job I wanta my own farm to go to and raisa my own crops. I taka my chance den. I hand over my landa rent with a kiss. It belonga not to me, but to all, because my landa may be better landa or better locate dan Giovanni's landa. We collecta all da landa rent, see, and maka it pay for da government, see, and cut out alla da taxes. No taxa on my house, on my car, on my wife sewing-machine, no income tax, no poll tax—only da collecta once a year of da landa rent, what you call da Single Taxa, see? It maka a great sum, da cities pays it lika da country, and

it grow so big dat every family get a pension from whata is left over each year. Whata in hell do Sam Gompers' trade union do for a workingman compare to dis? I am for Single Taxa, hundred per centa!" We were about to call the attention of the Professor to the interesting prediction made by Giuseppe of a pension to everybody out of the surplus of rent, remembering that William Saunders, a member of the first London County Council, stoutly affirmed that such a pension would be available, when the Professor rather hastily said that he had an appointment and begged to be excused.

* * * *

Mr. George Bernard Shaw, who is now a wealthy and very respectable character, is in line probably for the first Socialist peerage. The formula of bamboozle and paradox which he worked so industriously over his early readers—imitated by his fat friend Chesterton and followed by a whole school of smaller fry—is now developed into commanding pronouncements uttered oracularly at intervals, as by one having authority. This great man ought among other distinctions to be the presiding justice of the New World Court, so that his opinions might be broadcasted ex cathedra and his decisions have the finality of a *deus ex machina*. Nothing, we believe, would suit him better. Shaw is not a modest man, and he is not a republican: for him the purple has mystic lures. The Fabian Society, with its circles within circles, ever contracting like Dante's Hell, ends in an inverted apex, in which Shaw, the Webbs and one or two other devilish fine cronies stand on their heads and kick their heels at their gaping co-members, as well as at the world at large. Continuous self-landation and advertising have made of Shaw's pet, the Fabian Society, with its two thousand members, a sort of Jacobin Club, with much of the pretension but little of the acumen or backbone of the latter. The Fabians being by nature intellectual wobblers are in practice intriguers and trimmers. Their contributions to the press have been voluminous, but their contributions to the body of economic commonsense have been illusive.

* * * *

Just now, after the late unpleasant political cyclone in the British Isles, the unabashed and unabated Shaw has been prowling by midnight over the field of battle meditating on the fallen and the slain. He has it in for the followers of Karl Marx. It was these, he finds, who upset the well-laid official dinner-table spread before the Fabians, the Trade Unionists and the Socialists of the British persuasion, united in the love feast of the Labor government. It was these who clumsily tripped over a scrap of paper

while bringing in from the kitchen the unsavory course known as the Third International—with the result that there was a terrible smashing of crockery and a truly dreadful confusion and racket. Gentle reader, do you wonder that we have dared to intimate that among the the British Socialists the name of Karl Marx is in eclipse? In strictly Shavian circles the name is anathema. For to tell the truth, the Shavians have a ritual of their own, the finest Socialist mumbo-jumbo that ever came across. Whence it happens that Mr. Shaw takes the occasion of the late smashing of crockery to lecture divers and sundry Socialist cults not his own on What's What in Socialism, but especially does he belabor the Soviet variety of Moscow.

* * * * *

Well, what does an outsider gather about Shavian British Socialism as oposed to the Russian brand? In the first place we know positively what British Socialism is not, nay, we have been told categorically what Socialism itself is not. Item, it is not the issuance of a declaration of common right to the Land, founded on the Bill of Rights of 1689. Item, it is not the introduction of a Finance Bill calling upon each landholder to pay to a common Land Rent Fund the economic rent of the land he holds as a tenant of the common estate. We know these things, because when these resolutions were presented to the 31st Annual Conference of the Independent Labor Party in April, 1923, endorsed by six of the nine Divisional Conferences, they were side-tracked by the managers of the Conference, headed by Ramsay MacDonald. "This is not Socialism!" declared MacDonald angrily—and that's how we know it. What then is Socialism? Unlike Pilate, we have waited for a reply—and here it is. Socialism, according to Messrs. MacDonald, Snowden, Webb, Shaw and the other pillars of the Fabian State (including the eminent cabinet trade unionists who dined with the King) consists in buying out the landlords of Great Britain at twenty years purchase of the present land rent, issuing government bonds to their lordships for the total amount (some billions of pounds sterling), paying them perpetual interest thereon, and setting up Circumlocution offices for the regulation of morals, the housing of the unemployed and the bestowal of doles to the worthy poor. This is genuine British Socialism, of the Stratford-atte-Bowe variety. Can you wonder, gentle reader, that the sellers of this brand of Socialism hate the rivalry of the unspeakable Russians—the Russians, who adhere to the well-established Marxian brand, the only and original gold-label brand of the Communist Manifesto? Listen to some of the mottoes printed on the label: Land and Liberty; the Rent of Land belongs to the people and must be collected for public revenue; expropriators must be expropriated; revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat where necessary: workingmen of the world, unite!—you have nothing to lose but

your chains! Yes, there does appear to be some difference between the British and the Russian brands.

* * * * *

Mr. Shaw wants Moscow to get rid of the Third International and to tell M. Zinovieff that he must stop all his schoolboy nonsense or take the consequences. "The bourgeois idealism of the Third International and the childish inexperience of men and affairs which it betrays in every line have given a serious shock to the friends of the Soviet in England." "From the point of view of the English Socialists the members of the Third International do not know even the beginning of their business as Socialists." "Until Moscow learns to laugh at the Third International and realizes that wherever Socialism is a living force instead of a dead theory it has left Karl Marx as far behind as modern science has left Moses, there will be nothing but misunderstandings, in which the dozen most negligible cranks in Russia will correspond solemnly with the dozen most negligible cranks in England." "For many years after the death of Marx, Friedrich Engels kept the German Social Democrats estranged from all really effective English Socialists, because he was unable to conceive that he and Marx, two old men living in most jealous isolation from all independent thinkers, had been swept aside and left behind by the very movement they had themselves created. Nearly ten years elapsed before Liebknecht and Bebel woke up to the real situation, which was, and still is, that the living centre of English Socialism was in the Fabian Society and the Independent Labor Party, and not in a suburban bourgeois villa, where the survivor of the two great pontiffs of the Communist Manifesto lived in complete political solitude."

* * * * *

We wonder what it can be that makes Mr. Shaw call names like these and be so very savage? We are inclined to think that he but remains true to form and again betrays his inability to see things level and see them whole. In the Fabian Essays, published in 1889, he had an essay, the first in the book, on The Economic Basis of Socialism. In it he gave as pretty a demonstration of the law of rent as you would want to read. Not satisfied with one appearance in the book he must needs favor us with another essay, entitled The Transition to Social Democracy, in the first part of which he again achieves a notable exposition of the law of rent. "Socialism involves economically the transfer of rent from the class which now appropriates it to the whole people. Rent being that part of the produce which is individually unearned, this is the only equitable method of disposing of it. There is no means of getting rid of economic rent. So long as the fertility of land varies from acre to acre, and the number of persons passing by a shop window per hour varies from street to street, with the result that two farmers or two shopkeepers of exactly equal intelligence and industry will reap unequal returns from their years' work, so long will it be equitable

to take from the richer farmer or shopkeeper the excess over his fellow's gain which he owes to the bounty of Nature or the advantage of situation, and divide that excess or rent equally between the two." Ab uno disce omnes. But wait a moment, says Mr. Shaw. There is the State, the Socialist State, to consider. What would be the effect of all this natural economic rent being dumped into the lap of an undeveloped, unregulated, unorganized, unready Socialist State? Too terrible to contemplate. And the balance of the essay is a series of trembling ifs and ands which constitute a "Shewing Up" of Mr. G. B. Shaw as the most lily-livered of all the Fabians. Being of a cowardly temperament he would let I dare not wait upon I would, like the cat i' the adage.

* * * * *

Perhaps enough has been said. Yet a word more. In his diatribe against the Russian Marxians and the Third International, which was printed in the *London Herald* Mr. Shaw throws a bouquet at M. Trotsky just at the moment when M. Trotsky would seem to have lost his own grip and fire and begun to weaken and backslide. Says our friend Mr. Shaw, "The Russian writings which make the most favorable impression here are those of M. Trotsky, but even he has allowed himself to speak of H. G. Wells with contempt, which shows that he has not read Mr. Well's 'Outlines of History,' and has therefore no suspicion of what an enormous advance on 'Das Kapital' that work represents." And then this final blast. "It is this amazing Russian combination of brilliant literary power and complete emancipation from bourgeois illusions, with absurdly superstitious reverence for the early Victorian prophets of the London suburbs (there he goes again!) that makes the literature of the Russian revolution at once so entertaining and so hopeless." We can almost picture G. B. in the smoking-room of the Fabian Society leading his Right Honorable ex-cabinet minister friends (all of them now drawing comfortable pensions) in a rousing chorus of "Trotsky's a Jolly Good Fellow!"

* * * * *

The foregoing considerations are but indicative of the pleasant colloquies that are held at frequent intervals at the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle. It must be understood that the above is a mere paraphrase of a much lengthier discussion, in which many of our acquaintances took a part. We intend in closing to set down an interesting story recounted by Larry Wiggins, as bearing quite intimately on the criticisms made by Mr. Shaw on the subject of Karl Marx and "Das Kapital." We had been observing that it seems so strange that the unequivocal directness of Marx in the Communist Manifesto should have been followed by the tiresome obscurities of "Das Kapital." And then Larry (Greased Lightning) favored us as follows. We cannot give verbatim the exact stream of Larry's words, the voltage is too high—but his story ran about like this. "One day lately in a Second Ave. El train," said Larry, "I sat next to an old man who

was reading a Yiddish newspaper. Glancing at the sheet my attention was attracted to a portrait of Karl Marx. 'Hello,' thought I to myself, 'there's no news story afoot about that worthy,—it must be a reprint of Das Kapital. 'Karl Marx?' I asked, turning to the old man. He nodded. 'Great stuff!' returned I. The old man smiled faintly and went on reading. 'Das Kapital?' I queried, and the old man registered another affirmative and went on reading. 'Great Scott!' thought I, 'to think of the time when Henry George's portrait was seen in New York newspapers and when Progress and Poverty was printed verbatim! What is there in that man Marx that makes him so perennially popular? I never have been able to understand it.' And after watching for a while the old man reading the printed Hebrew backwards, I had reached my station and got out. About a week later one morning while dressing I suddenly found myself shouting, 'Eureka! I have deciphered the cryptogram! The old man reading his Karl Marx backwards gives me an idea. The Jewish workingman, is usually able to read Hebrew, and he is par excellence the student of Das Kapital—he understands it, he believes in it, it is his second Bible. Is not the beginning of a true Hebrew book at what we call the end of the volume? Starting from the last page one proceeds backwards toward the first, and each page in turn is read from right to left. Could Karl Marx,' I queried in my excited ratiocination, 'through certain obscure atavistic impulses have planned his great work, perhaps unknowingly, in this way? Was the key to the puzzle made known by Marx to his intimate circle and by them meticulously and surreptitiously disseminated among the more intelligent of the masses, among whom this Marxian legend continues its stranglehold? Either Marx was guilty of the most abominable craftsmanship in writing this work or he deliberately set about to perpetuate a literary and economic puzzle. I say and maintain that the key is to be found in his Hebraism, in the racial characteristic of looking backward. What I want to find is a publisher who will issue an edition of Das Kapital on the principle of the deformed transformed or the first shall be last. Following this principle of reversed order one can readily see that the land question was at the beginning of all his argument. I maintain that Karl Marx was a great man and on occasion he stated his convictions in a great way. In the Communist Manifesto of 1848, as a first demand he called for the abolition of private ownership of land and the collection of ground rent for the use of the community. Could anything be more to the point? That in Das Kapital Marx saw the radical and drastic portents underlying the land question might never be suspected by the casual reader, for it is safe to say that nine tenths of the gentiles who begin the book never get to the end of it. But following my discovery, if we begin at the end, what do we find? The divorce of the laborer from the land was and is the cause of the enslavement of the laborer in the towns. The enclosure of the commons

preceded and was part and parcel of the industrial revolution. Crowded into towns, where the new steam power and machinery awaited him, the lot of the laborer became a terrible one indeed, and this lot Karl Marx analyzed and dissected in its relations to industrialism with an understanding, thoroughness and keenness not known before his time. But since, as I have said, nine tenths of the readers of *Das Kapital* drop from fatigue before reaching the milk in the cocoanut of the last chapters and since by reason of this fact the Marxian movement in economics, before the Russian application of the Communist Manifesto, had become stultified and abortive, dropping into the hands of hairsplitters and becoming inextricably involved and obscure, surely it was time that, by the simple expedient of reversing the chapters, the casual reader should be introduced to the cogency and strength of Marx's underlying position and allowed the intellectual pleasure of his strictures upon the capitalist regime. "I sincerely believe," said Larry in conclusion, "that a rearrangement of Karl Marx's book, such as I have suggested, would do more than anything else to straighten the kinks out of the average Socialist's mind and get him to see aright the land question in its relation to the workingman."

The Baiting of the Cow

SIXTY years ago, or thereabouts, the first labor union in this country was organized. In due time it called a strike and was beaten. A dozen policemen ousted the strikers from the factory and replaced them with new men. That should have been, in the words of President Coolidge on a recent occasion, "a lesson to labor." But labor must have "played hookey" that day for the lesson was lost on it.

Then other unions were formed from time to time and occasionally one struck, but doing it singly, was defeated as the first one was.

Then the idea of concerted action suggested itself. When one union struck it was supported by the others, morally and financially. That made the movement more formidable and called for stronger measures to defeat it. So the militia was called upon to supplement the police. The fear of this kept the lid down for awhile, but by and by the seething forces underneath blew it off and the militia acted, leaving a number of the strikers dead on the ground. This created a situation sinister and tense and called for greater caution. The persuasive muskets were returned to the armory and those who had instigated their use cast about for some means of suppression equally effective with that abandoned, but less drastic. It was decided to head off the strike, if possible, while it was only impending. So the courts were applied to and an injunction procured restraining the strike leaders from acting, under penalty of a jail sentence if they disobeyed. This was partly successful in one instance, but only by the over-

awing presence of a part of the regular army, the state troops not participating because a courageous governor had refused to order them out.

This was a temporary check to the unions but it disclosed their temper and produced an intolerable situation which precluded any long continuance in this violent method of suppression. The positions of the unions, however, was not impregnable—concerted action was not yet complete. One aristocratic organization, composed of highly specialized workers and holding a position of considerable if not commanding importance, had always held aloof from striking. It had been singled out, therefore, from the first for special coddling. Its annual meeting had always been attended by some prominent member of the employer class who delivered the principal address, in the course of which he dispensed to the members liberal allowances of what the unregenerate call "soft soap." So successful was this for awhile that at a meeting of eleven hundred members of the order they solemnly resolved that their interests lay with the employers and not with the public.

But the day of toadying and cajolery passed quickly. The hoodwinked chief of the order died, and was succeeded by one more courageous and of clearer vision and, shortly after, the *elite* organization was swept from its moorings and found itself engulfed willy-nilly (but especially willy) in the swirling maelstrom of dissatisfied labor.

The way was open now for a decisive struggle. Then when each side had marshalled its forces and everything was keyed up for a final clash, a mysterious thing happened—the dove descended upon the employers' camp.

The growing membership of the unions had lifted them into political importance.

The effect was magical. The grim determination of the employers became "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." Their warlike spirit oozed away and the white flag of armistice was raised. Outside influences then suggested arbitration—arbitration, which implies a yielding of something by one side or the other, when each had declared that it could yield nothing.

Justification and excuse followed. The employers disclaimed any hostile intention. They even said that they had all along been in favor of labor organizing. It was plain to everyone then that the armed guards at the gates of their plants were stationed there by the owners to prevent a pleasure-loving public from crowding in too fast to the merry-go-rounds inside and the high fences built round them and topped with electrically charged barbed wire, were simply a device of theirs to keep out humming-birds.

Thus the matter stands now between labor and monopoly. The approach of these two opposing currents to something like equality of strength, has brought about everywhere in the industrial world a slackwater condition of suspended effort, doubt, suspicion and apprehension,

with the question "What next"? uppermost in the public mind and no one qualified to answer.

It is interesting now to recall the attitude of the organs of public opinion during those troubled days. The press, always ready to uplift the down-trodden, gave fatherly advice. It said that order must be maintained and the law obeyed. These two things were particularly stressed. It said that the employer could not be expected to pay a higher wage than the one agreed upon with the employee, bargaining with him individually, saying nothing about the latter being compelled to take whatever the former choose to offer. It said that contracts must be lived up to, keeping dark about the fact that rising prices might force the weaker party to the contract to violate it if he hoped to live. It said that every citizen in a republic had a right to choose his job and continue at it unmolested, without letting on that the jobs were fewer than the jobbers and the refraining molester might starve. Especially did it caution the strikers not to forfeit the esteem of that potent factor of success, "the sympathy of the public"—that altruistic, tender-hearted public, which in order to increase its ability to help, denies itself every luxury, puts itself on a Spartan diet of bread and water, and lies awake nights, tossing on its pillow, in its yearning for the welfare of the underdog. Then, too, those prime movers in all fundamental economic research—the ministers—took the matter up and pointed out in their illuminating way that capital and labor were partners and ought to live together in harmony—a brand new truth which had escaped general notice. The practice of these self-constituted umpires continues and will continue so long as the blind, according to the proverb, accept the one-eyed as king. If some day, however, with larger knowledge and in an unaccustomed mood of candor, they review their record in the matter, their state of mind will be a trifle qualmish, like that of a healthy palate on tasting an ad-dled egg.

Such in brief, and to date, is the story of organized labor. The subject of that story is no longer clubbed or shot down or jailed—it is not even openly flouted or despised. Circumstances have groomed it into respectability. It takes its seat now at the council table with monopoly, an equal and at peace—each still, however, with watchful eye and its right hand on its hip-pocket.

Of course, from now on there is no hope; chaos is upon us and modern civilization is marching straight down the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire.

There is a curious uncouth animal in Florida—the manatee or sea-cow—which lives on the bottom of the rivers there and feeds upon aquatic plants. A collector, wishing to obtain a specimen, undertook to build a crate around one for transporting it. At first the sluggish creature paid no attention to what was going on, but by and by suspecting, apparently, that something was being done to restrain it of its liberty, it just stretched itself lazily and tore the crate to pieces.

That experiment, in its essentials, bids fair to be repeated shortly but in a wider field and on a grander scale. There are signs that the great American proletarian sea-cow is getting ready to stretch. When it does, the crate which special privilege has been building round it these many years—made up, as it is, of land monopoly, wage-fixing, tariffs, exorbitant freight rates, court injunctions, company stores, black lists and the like—will be shattered beyond repair.

The crate builder is not allowing for the stretch.

—DAVID L. THOMPSON.

Questions on Taxation

IS there not an infinite difference between the value of the products of industry and the value of the land?

Is not the existence of the buildings due to the industry of the builders, while the value of the land is due to the presence of the population and to public improvements?

While the increased assessment of the buildings is an indication of the increase in their abundance, is not the increased assessment of the land an indication of the greater relative scarcity of the land? Where the first settler found a thousand acres available, today we may find a thousand people crowded on to a single acre in the center of the city.

While the buildings diminish in value year after year, and require cleaning and repairing to keep them habitable, and eventually have to be renewed, the value of the land remains generation after generation so long as the population remains. The stock of food must be supplied by labor thrice daily; who ever heard of the renewal of the land value by the owners daily?

While labor must work continuously day by day to maintain the life of humanity on the planet, how much toil must the owner of the valuable land exercise to maintain the enormous rentals that he can collect yearly?

While the value of the land has increased from one dollar per foot to ten thousand dollars per foot in the last one hundred years in the center of this city, where did any man ever hear of a building increasing ten thousand fold in a hundred years?

With the use of the improved printing press, the use of the locomotive, the use of the automatic machinery and other appliances, labor can now accomplish a thousand times as much as our grandfathers could accomplish. In this way the prices of some products have been reduced to a mere fraction of the prices of old times. Does labor receive the benefit of this increased power? While industry has been devising all kinds of contrivances to make goods cheaper and more abundant, the owners of the town sites have been enabled to make the land dearer and dearer. As he can say with every increase in population: "Pay me more, pay me more." Do we not thus place industry under an indebtedness that grows and grows, driving the

two poles of society further and further apart. Does not this make palaces unearned at one end of society and slums unmerited at the other end?

While one end of society is thus getting wealth without work, must not the other end do all the work and lose the wealth. Does not this divide society into oppressors and oppressed, instead of brothers rendering service for service?

So long as we allow people to appropriate that peculiar value, which comes to the land from the presence of society, is not this part able to enjoy all the benefits of society without any of its burdens? Does not this mean that we impose all the taxation on industry, and at the same time compel the industrious classes to support the luxuries of the palace.

In the adjustment of taxation should we not place the burdens on the value of the land so as to remove the possibility of the land being used for extortion, and so that every one will be induced to do his best with his opportunities for the benefit of his fellows. Should we not strive to establish the relation of benefit for benefit, and remove for ever the relation of oppressor and oppressed?

—W. A. DOUGLAS.

The Rent Question Again to the Fore

THE rent question is again a topic of great interest in Washington. The Rent Commission, which was created during the late World war, when the influx of population caused crowded housing conditions, has been put out of action by the Supreme Court; new aggression by the landlords is again causing trouble; the President of the United States has recommended that some action be taken to curb the *merciless profiteers*; and hearings are being conducted before a joint committee of Congress to determine the cause of increased rentals and to provide a remedy.

The rent question, like every other question which has to be settled, must be analyzed and perfectly understood (diagnosed, as the physician would say) before an effective remedy can be prescribed, and the rent question is one of the oldest questions in the world, for, although mankind was not always conscious of this question, it dates back to the time when man first began building huts to live in. The rent question involves the driving of a bargain in which one man has something to sell which another wishes to buy; but in order that this bargain shall be free and fair there must be freedom of choice, freedom of action, on both sides. Now in the rent question, as it exists today in Washington and everywhere else, this freedom of choice on both sides does not exist. Some men, the landlords (Lords of the land), have something to sell which they may or may not sell, as suits their fancy; but the tenant *must buy*. There is therefore injected into this bargain an element of inequality, so that it is *not free*, and this element of in-

equality is caused by the recognition of private property in land. Now the rent question, involving as it does the question of private property in land, cannot be properly and finally settled until the land ownership question, which injects the element of inequality and monopoly into the rent question, is itself solved. That this question of land ownership is today a question at all is a *marvel of the ages* and a *crowning shame and disgrace* to our civilization, for this question of the ownership of land was settled four thousand years ago by the highest tribunal of which we can possibly conceive, namely, *God himself*, when he gave the law, the only authoritative law there ever can be on this question, to Moses on Mount Sinai, in these words: "*The land shall not be sold forever (in perpetuity) for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.*" (Lev. XXV. 23). Now if we accept this decision of the highest tribunal of which we can ever have any knowledge, and thereby eliminate from the bargain between owner and tenant the element of land ownership, we reach a plane of bargaining on which both owner and tenant are free and equal. The Single Tax is a *name* applied to an *idea*, which is the modern scientific interpretation of the law, or decision, handed down by God to Moses, whereby the element of monopoly is eliminated from land ownership, and the rent question is forever solved. This law is a clear concise statement which draws a line of demarcation between what logically constitutes property and what constitutes nature, between what a man may properly own and what he may not own because God owns it.

In application the Single Tax is childlike in its simplicity for it is placed in full and complete operation by simply exempting from taxation all property (improvements, that which is the work of men's hands), and taking over for public uses the entire value of land due to population. The bargain between owner and tenant then becomes a bargain for the improvements, (house or other buildings and their appurtenances and fixtures), without regard to the land on which these stand, which land is an inalienable inheritance of all the people from God, who owns it because He made it.

Now violation of law and court decisions implies a penalty, even though that law has only human authority; but violation of God's Law incurs a penalty which cannot be evaded, for God's Law is automatic in its action and carries with it its own peculiar and relentless sting. We learn from holy writ that God's chosen people were rebellious and stiff necked, and that they refused to obey His Law; and we are told that because they disobeyed the *land law* (the law of the Sabbaths) they were carried captive to Babylon for seventy years until the law of the Sabbaths was fulfilled, and then scattered over the whole face of the earth. This should have served as a warning of the penalty to all nations and peoples which

must come to all those who refuse to be obedient to that law; but has it? Every nation and every civilization whose name is found in history, but whose place knows it no more, has gone down because of violation of God's Law, for this violation is *sin* and the wages of sin is *death*, both to the nation and the individual; and the nations that survive today will go the way of the others unless they repent; for "not one jot or one tittle shall pass from the law till all be fulfilled," even the law which God gave to Moses on Mount Sinai. "The land shall not be sold for ever (in perpetuity) for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me." —HENRY L. PECKHAM.

The Schalkenbach Bequest

ROBERT SCHALKENBACH, whose death was chronicled in the November-December issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, has made munificent provision for the cause which enlisted the activity and devotion of so great a part of his life. The wording of the bequest in his will drawn up by his attorney, Frederick C. Leubuscher, is as follows:

"Being firmly convinced that the principles expounded by Henry George in his immortal book entitled *Progress and Poverty* will, if enacted into law, give equal opportunity to all and tend to the betterment of the individual and of society by the abolition of involuntary poverty and its attendant evils, I give, devise and bequeath all the rest, residue and remainder of my estate, including lapsed legacies, unto John H. Allen, James R. Brown, E. Yancey Cohen, Richard Eyre, Walter Fairchild, Bolton Hall, Charles O'Connor Hennessey, John J. Hopper, Charles H. Ingersoll, Frederick C. Leubuscher, Joseph Dana Miller, John Moody, John J. Murphy, Arthur C. Pleydell, Louis F. Post, Lawson Purdy, Charles T. Root, George L. Rusby, Albert E. Schalkenbach, Samuel Seabury, Frank Stephens, and to such of them as may survive me and consent to serve, in trust nevertheless, to expend the same and any accretions thereof, in such amounts, at such times and in such manner as to the corporation hereinafter directed to be formed may seem best for teaching, expounding and propagating the ideas of Henry George as set forth in his said book and in his other books, especially what are popularly known as the Single Tax on land values and international free trade; and I direct that as soon after my decease as may be practicable, the said persons, or as many as may be willing to serve, shall form or cause to be formed a corporation under the laws of the State of New York, or if necessary, by act of the legislature of the State of New York, for the purpose of more effectively carrying out the above objects of this trust and shall transfer to such corporation all the moneys they may have received from my estate for said purposes. I direct that the Board of Trustees or directors of such corporation shall consist of twenty-one (21) persons, and that the

above named persons shall constitute the members of the first board, the places of those refusing or unable to serve to be filled by those consenting to serve, such board having the power of filling vacancies therein caused by refusal, resignation or death. Such board of directors may pay to one or more of the directors such compensation for services rendered to the corporation as it deems best. I also direct that the charter of such corporation shall empower it to receive gifts, bequests and devises for the purposes aforesaid."

This declaration which is at once a bequest and a profession of his abiding faith in the principles in which he believed, may serve as a model for similar bequests. It commits the trustees of this fund to no half-hearted acceptance of the principles of "that immortal work, *Progress and Poverty*." Robert Schalkenbach did not minimize the doctrine while living; and there is no uncertainty in the message that he passes on to us now that he is gone.

It is true that he differed with some of us as to methods, and differed strongly, for his was a positive nature. But he was large minded and tolerant; where differences of opinion existed they were free from personal bias, so far as he was concerned. He conceded the right of Single Taxers to work each in his own way, and he helped even the activities with which he was not wholly in sympathy. He claimed no infallibility for his opinions, and respected the convictions of others while holding tenaciously to his own.

It is characteristic of him that he should have selected as trustees to administer this fund men who have worked in different ways for the cause; they are representative of all the groups between whom sharp divisions of opinion and methods have arisen. It was his design to bring them together for joint effort in the common cause; the nomination of the trustees so selected was his great gesture of love and benediction to those who had worked with him, and at other times apart from him, since the days of '86.

All those designated as trustees by Mr. Schalkenbach have accepted. The place left vacant by the death of John J. Hopper will be filled by a committee to whom nomination has been assigned. A meeting of the Board has been held, fifteen of the twenty named being present. This is an augury that gives assurance of cooperation in the days to come.

It would be strange indeed if the great ideal Mr. Schalkenbach had in mind were unworkable. At all events, each member of the board will feel the obligation binding upon him to work for those things with which all may agree, in harmony with the spirit of the declaration as contained in the will. Without asking any one of them to abandon the work he is doing, without asking him to sacrifice a jot or tittle of his convictions as to method, it will surely be possible to unite on some programme in which all will agree. If not, then we are wholly unworthy of the truth it is given us to see.

This bequest may amount to \$100,000 or more in the near future, and this will ultimately be increased by \$225,000 in life interests. In addition to the trust fund, independent bequests are made of \$5,000 each to the Manhattan Single Tax Club and the Single Tax Publishing Company.

The news of this bequest found place in the columns of the papers throughout the country, the *World* and *Times* of this city giving it special prominence. It called forth a number of editorial comments.

In a leading editorial, the *Sun* had this to say under the heading, "An Odd Bequest:"

"It is relatively seldom that the student of present day economics hears of Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty.' Present day economists have passed it by, and hardly ever refute it. But in 1879, when it first appeared, it made a great splash in the world. Its rumbles were heard across continents, and it attracted many a passionate convert. What gave the work its notoriety and what still keeps it wholly from death today is not the originality or the logic of its ideas, but its superb eloquence, for George knew how to write words that blister and sting.

A faint echo of the hubbub which his book created in the '80's comes now with the filing for probate of the will of a wealthy printer, leaving the sum of \$250,000 "to form a corporation for the purpose of teaching, expounding and propagating the ideas of Henry George in his said book and other books, especially what are popularly known as the Single Tax on land values and international free trade."

The grounds on which the bulk of modern economists reject the "Single Tax" are numerous. The modern income tax, when properly administered, is obviously much more fair. A tax which took the whole economic rent of land would deprive a man of \$10,000 worth of land even if that represented all the earthly wealth he possessed, while another man, with \$1,000,000 wholly in Government bonds or in securities of a corporation which rented all its buildings, would, if he owned no real estate, go scott free.

The Single Tax, moreover, is inelastic. If it took the whole economic rent of land it would bring in a volume of revenues wholly unconnected with the required expenditures of the Government; the excessive amount of these revenues would lead the Government into every sort of extravagance. If the Single Tax did not take the whole economic rent of land, but was varied each year in accordance with the needs of the Government, the case would be almost as bad. The values of given prices of property would change violently. Every purchase of land would be a highly venturesome speculation.

Even if the Single Tax were regarded as thoroughly sound by current thought, a will which provides for the indefinite propagation of any given man's set of ideas courts future difficulties. Suppose future thought decides against current thought? Suppose the reforms aimed at are accomplished by other means? Suppose even they are accomplished by the means advocated? Must propaganda in favor of the reform go on and on forever?

This called forth a number of letters. One from the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM as follows:

EDITOR N. Y. *Sun*:

Your editorial article entitled "An Odd Bequest," on the Schalkenbach fund to popularize the doctrines of

Henry George, suggests rather the oddity of your question as to what will become of this fund if the Single Tax should be established, or the reforms aimed at are accomplished by other means before the fund is expended.

There is no doubt a legal way of solving such difficulties by application to the authorities by the executors of such fund. But why should *The Sun* worry? What remains of this fund after the reform is established could be expended for the education of simple minded editors, or it might go to relieve the distress of landlords deprived of an easy method of living and to teach them how to become useful members of society. I hate to appear frivolous, but as the question is apparently asked in all seriousness, it may be suggested that the answer could be furnished by any qualified attorney.

There is one other point which I trust you will permit me to touch upon. That is the intimation that the superb eloquence of Henry George, and not the logic or originality of his ideas, keeps his doctrines alive. That is a familiar statement. May I venture to suggest that while it is possible for men to be strongly moved by eloquence, the number of hard headed business men who comprise a rather large minority of George's disciples have not been convinced in that way. Men can hardly be sufficiently influenced by words written in a book fifty years ago to make large donations for the propagation of mere "eloquence." So to imagine is to suspect that they are proper subjects for the alienists, and this suggestion is furnished free to *The Sun* writer.

As a matter of fact, it is a convenient mode of explaining the spread of a doctrine by those too indolent to examine the ethical basis for its support."

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

Other letters in reply appeared from Stephen Bell, Earsen I. Sopen (E. M. Caffall) and others.

The *Brooklyn Eagle* commented editorially as follows:

"The persistence of an idea, once clearly and plausibly and logically stated, by a thinker of poise and coolness is admirably illustrated in the trust fund created by the will of Robert Schalkenbach, eventually dedicating \$250,000 to the booming of the cause of the Single Tax as advocated in 'Progress and Poverty.' Some of us remember when Henry George ran for Mayor of old New York, first insisting on the written pledge of 50,000 qualified voters to deposit their ballots for him. He came close to winning in a three-cornered fight. His admirers always said that Hewitt was counted in. Later in the course of a campaign for the first Mayoralty in the consolidated city, George died. He was a man of calm, almost cold judgment, temperamentally much like Charles Stewart Parnell.

The Single Tax has not been and will not be accepted by scientific political economists, or by the average voter. It has too many "angles of opposition" to be popular. Yet its hold on a large number of minds cannot be rationally denied. It is a tradition with the Single Taxers that Tom L. Johnson paid a fat fee to the best lawyer he could pick to point out to him the fallacy, the logical fallacy of "Progress and Poverty." And when the lawyer reported that he could find no fallacy the big railroad man became a Single Taxer."

The Philadelphia *North American* said:

"More than two score years have passed since Henry George propounded his Single Tax idea and rapidly won

for it many adherents. The author of "Progress and Poverty" died without seeing his reform adopted, but the vitality of the theories he put before the world is proved by the fact that they are still advocated by groups of undiscouraged believers. The latest evidence is a bequest of \$225,000 by a business man of New York to be used for propagation of the George doctrines. This is not the first large contribution to the cause. Joseph Fels, of Philadelphia, devoted to it a large share of his fortune and the greater part of his time during the closing years of his life. His widow, loyal to his memory and to the faith she shared, continued the generous support.

Yet despite intelligent and enthusiastic advocacy the system has made comparatively small headway. To a limited extent it has been tried in Australia, in the city of Vancouver and in some small communities; the Single Tax town of Fairhope, Ala., has been in existence for nearly thirty years, and seems to have prospered. In California some of the irrigation projects were forced to adopt the Single Tax principle because large owners profited from improvements created by ranchers. But why has the world shown no disposition to make any large-scale test of the program which its advocates insist offers the only scientific and equitable method of taxation, besides relief from the economic evils due to land speculation? Even a \$225,000 fund provides a small lever for the task of moving the dead weight of public indifference on this question."

In addition to these editorial comments our old friend of the eternal platitudes, Dr. Frank Crane, speaks of the Schalkenbach Bequest in the *Evening Journal*. He evidently regards the bequest as of questionable value to the movement. His article is entitled "The Power of the Dead Hand." He begins by giving us a definition. "The dead hand means the power of money left for a certain purpose and is administered for that purpose."

With all due respect, this is not what is meant by the "dead hand" in law or common understanding. The "dead hand" is such form of bequest as vests itself in the control of the dead; money left for the advancement of education in any department of knowledge, and *subject to democratic control*, cannot by any latitude of meaning, be said to belong to the class of bequests stigmatized under the "dead hand." It is not necessary to indicate the kind that can be so called, that seek to bind future action, that act as obstacles to the modification of institutions of learning in response to new discoveries, or seek to render static the curriculum of colleges or universities. All this is so obvious that we ask to be pardoned for pointing it out.

A Real Fiscal Reformer

IN the unpublished manuscripts of the late Theodore Roosevelt are many shrewd observations on men and things. One paragraph is arresting:

"In all great reforms the wise thing is to proceed somewhat as the great French reformer, Turgot, strove to proceed—and Turgot was as far from the spirit of Bourbon reaction, embodied in Louis XIV and Louis XV, on one side, as from the spirit of evil revolutionary violence embodied in Robespierre and his colleagues on the other side."

Address of Carl D. Thompson at Fairhope

FAIRHOPE, the flourishing Single Tax colony on the shores of Mobile Bay, celebrated its 30th Anniversary on Jan. 1st of this year. About 200 guests, composed of Fairhope colonists and visitors from Mobile and elsewhere sat down. The secretary of the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation and editor of the *Fairhope Courier*, E. B. Gaston, gave an interesting report for 1924 and Carl D. Thompson, secretary of the Public Ownership League of America and a Single Taxer for many years delivered the principal address. We extract from the *Courier* the report of this very eloquent and uncompromising statement of our doctrines:

He had chosen for his subject, the most appropriate one: "Henry George the Prophet of Social Righteousness."

Preceding the development of this subject, Mr. Thompson said:

"For years I have been hearing of the Fairhope Colony. Every now and then some one out of the great world outside, would leave to go to Fairhope and every now and then somebody would come back to us from Fairhope aflame with the inspiration of 'what they are doing at Fairhope.' Every week I read the *Fairhope Courier* alive and alert to the call of our day and its tremendous opportunities; 'till I said: maybe Fairhope is the Bethlehem of our social salvation. Some day I'll go there and see.' So I was glad when this invitation came. I am glad to be where the Kingdom has come—at least so far as the land question is concerned. It hasn't come in Chicago yet."

Launching then into his subject, Mr. Thompson said that as a boy he had puzzled over what he later knew as the "unearned increment," and gave an experience familiar to everybody who has been in a rapidly growing community; seeing land bought for \$5 an acre and after ten years, without any improvements being made (upon the particular parcel), selling for \$50. "Not a furrow plowed, no buildings, no improvements—nothing. My boyish question was: 'who made the extra \$45 an acre?' Why should the absentee get it?"

"Twenty years afterward," he said, "while studying in the University of Chicago, I found the answer. While pastor of a little church in Elgin, Ill., one of my church members brought me the answer. Here it is:—holding up copies of *Progress and Poverty* and *Social Problems*, by Henry George.

"Every now and again," continued the speaker, "God seizes upon some man and makes a prophet of him. He infuses into him unusual qualities; gives him vision, inspiration, resolution; takes away his reason, or what most people call reason, makes him immune to the ordinary appeals of human kind that divert the usual man from the

quest of truth; and becomes a pillar of fire, of unquenchable passion for truth and devotion to it. He gives him endurance, so that thru a lifetime of disheartening, trying, discouraging experience of renunciation, contempt, persecution, he holds to his course, until his message is burned into the life of humanity and a GREAT TRUTH IS LEARNED. Such was Henry George.

"Every religion has its prophets, every age, every country.

"We have had ours.

"Henry George was one of them."

Henry George's contribution to the cause of social righteousness, according to the speaker, was that he "saw the fundamental wrong and found the remedy."

The wrong was *private ownership of land*. He emphasized this and established his position by quotations from both *Progress and Poverty* and *Social Problems*, using well-thumbed copies.

He said he felt it necessary to emphasize this point, because he had found Single Taxers who denied this and who insisted that Single Tax did not strike at land ownership, but merely at certain evils of land ownership.

He told of one occasion when he was an officer (clerk) of the city of Milwaukee and when Henry George Jr. made a speech there. Mr. George made a splendid speech. It was a convincing speech. It moved him powerfully and he wanted to show his appreciation of it. More, he wanted officially to take up as it were, the banner of the City of Milwaukee (then under a Socialist administration, of which he was a part) and set it alongside the banner of the Single Taxers, and show that they were comrades in the same great cause, but when he said that he agreed with Henry George that private ownership of land, of the great resources of nature, with which the creator had endowed man was the great fundamental wrong and that land must be made common property, to his amazement Mr. George took the first opportunity to repudiate the idea that Single Taxers sought to make land common property.

Quotations which were read from the works of Henry George the first, (which the *Courier* thinks it will be highly profitable for Single Taxers—and others if there be such readers of the *Courier*)—to read, but which space forbids our reproducing will be found as follows: whole chapter XIX of *Social Problems*; also page 265 same: "Our fundamental mistake is in treating land as private property;" *Progress and Poverty*, pages 326, Chapter I, Book VII, Chapter I, of Book VIII; also page 382.

The speaker said he did not know how his position would be taken at Fairhope even, but he was given abundant reason to know that his position was approved by the Single Taxers present.

He said he qualified his statement often that he "was a Single Taxer" by saying that "he was a Henry George Single Taxer" and was always prepared to prove it by the words of the immortal George himself.

Due attention was given to Mr. George's presentation of "the taxation of land values as the remedy" for the evil of land monopoly, but this must be taken in connection with his declaration against the private ownership of land, and for thus making land "in effect common property."

The speaker also presented as one of the evidences of Mr. George's greatness that he did not claim his remedy as a panacea, but admitted that there would be other wrongs requiring remedy, even after the equal right to the use of the earth was secured. And he gave illuminating quotations from Mr. George along this line.

Mr. George saw his remedy not merely as a fiscal measure, but a great moral reform. Those who emphasize only the fiscal side of the Single Tax, belittle it; take away its power to stir the heart and warm the blood.

Henry George "kept the faith." His moral courage and unfaltering faith and personal devotion, were perhaps his greatest contribution.

He understood also that social reform and progress depend upon education. And this is the present task of all who would help in the great cause of human progress, with all that it means to the world of today and that of the future.

"The reporter is conscious of but feebly presenting the great address of Mr. Thompson.

"He brought to the subject such a wealth of illustration, such a power of argument; each impassioned appeal to his hearers to stand for the full gospel of the great leader, whose inspiration was behind the founding of Fairhope, with all that was involved in its application to all questions of human freedom, the right of men to have that more abundant life, which Christ came to give them, that the printed word can do it but scant justice.

"It was a treat indeed and made all feel grateful to Mr. Mr. Thompson for coming all the way from Chicago to Fairhope to bring it to them."

A Great Journalist on Henry George

THE following is from the pen of the late H. W. Massingham, editor of the *London Nation* from 1907 to 1923. The article appears in the *London Spectator*, a Conservative weekly, and was intended to form part of a volume of reminiscences. It was written but a short time before his death.

"Through him (Stewart Headlam) I came in contact with Henry George. It was my first introduction to the man of genius. George was taken here for a type of American crank, but he never talked like one, being in fact one of the great natural thinkers who reduce the detail of life to pure vision. Doubtless he was one-ideaed. He saw society restored to happiness by the way of land restoration, and that, in its turn, achieved by the method

of the Single Tax. At one time that idea, as the popularity of the wonderfully written Progress and Poverty showed, looked as if it would capture the whole democratic movement, leaving it, as the Crusades left Christian Europe, in a state of complete disillusion. Its final and useful function was to implant in our urban population the almost lost sense of their right to the land—that is, to its enjoyment in a properly organized State. Henry George was just the type of man to fix a moral idea such as this. All the Socialist leaders of my time and before it—Marx, Bakunin, Kropotkin, Hyndman, Shaw, even William Morris—were middle-class intellectuals, some of them sophisticated intellectuals. George, the ex-compositor, was a man of the people, a Rousseau without Rousseau's vices. He drew direct from life, expressing his thought with the simplicity of Cobden and Bastiat, but with more feeling."

Progress In Wisconsin

TAXES on land values rather than on farm values and other forms of industrial development would lighten the burden of the state and federal taxes on farming communities, Edward Nordman, state commissioner of markets, said in a statement issued today.

Assemblyman Carl Grimstad has announced that he will introduce again his "land tax" bill at the coming session of the legislature.

"Land values and farm values mean the same thing to the average person, and yet there is a big difference in the significance of these two terms," Mr. Nordman said.

MASSSES MUST BUY

"Land values are based on the net profit which bare land is capable of yielding after deducting the cost of operation. Farm values on the other hand, are the land values of a given tract plus the replacement values of the improvement thereon. However, if the land is unproductive or if it has an undesirable location, neither the land nor the improvements will have any value.

"Now it may appear paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that when land prices are high, farm values are low and that when land prices are low farm values are high. This apparent inconsistency is explained by the fact that in all history, high or inflated land prices have curtailed the opportunities of the masses and cut short their purchasing power.

INFLATION BASIS OF EVIL

"When the masses lack the purchasing power to buy what they produce, there is surplus production and resulting poor markets. Poor markets make poor prices and when prices for a given commodity are low, the equipment for producing that commodity is likewise low in price.

"Improvements, livestock and machinery are the equipment for producing farm wealth. There is now, and for

a number of years there has been, a poor sale for this equipment because it can not be put to profitable use and as a result farm values are low.

"The cure for this situation, and in fact the only permanent cure for it, is to remove the cause of the trouble by taking the inflation out of land values."

—*Milwaukee Sentinel*.

The Land Question In Mexico

THAT is the situation. A great and necessary and profoundly revolutionary change is steadily taking place in Mexico, though slowly and painfully and at a heavy cost. Ten million backward agricultural laborers, two-thirds of the population, have been given a very concrete hope of becoming small proprietors, and several million are already well along the road to a stable possession and the prospect of almost certain development as agriculturists. Today they still count for comparatively little, though they are beginning to count. In a generation they may be Mexico.

* * * * *

So that we see the masses of the Mexican people inspired today not only by the prospect of a great and constructive and indispensable land reform, but also by a new idea of their own power—often merging into the will to seize by violence what each individual may suppose to be his.

Beyond question Calles has undertaken to train and dominate this will to power and to use it to carry through the humanitarian and constructive land reform of Soto y Gama and the agrarians. This is what Mexico needs. But has Calles the power? Possibly—if the foreign creditors and owners of Mexico give him time.

—WILLIAM ENGLISH WALLING in New York *Herald-Tribune*

Land Reform Is Issue In Poland

THE question of agrarian reform is one of the most hotly debated issues in Poland today. Out of the twenty ministries which have governed the Polish Republic since the World War, a considerable number went down to defeat because of their unsympathetic attitude on this question. The generally accepted explanation for the slow progress which has been made by Poland as well as by several other governments in reaching a settlement of this problem is the catastrophic depreciation of the currency and the resulting dislocation of the economic equilibrium of the country.

It has often been stated by responsible Polish statesmen that under the present currency and general economic conditions a more radical treatment of the problem would entail government bankruptcy.

How slowly the work of the land distribution is proceed-

ng can be seen from a government compilation of the data concerning the area of the land distributed. According to his compilation, only 11,060 hectares were distributed in 1923, as contrasted with the corresponding figure for 1922, viz., 52,000 hectares. These conditions obtain despite the fact that the Polish regulations concerning the expropriation of the land are rather drastic. Generally, sixty hectares is exempt from expropriation in overwhelmingly industrial districts. The corresponding limit in purely agricultural districts is 160 hectares. Some members of the Polish Parliament charge that these low limits were fixed as a measure of political revenge against those landowners whose past or present political activities are not to the taste of the government.—*Current History Magazine*.

Defining The Unearned Increment

SIR WILLIAM JOYNSON-HICKS used to be plain Joynson but, like the late Prime Minister Campbell-Bannerman and the recent but still living Secretary of the Board of Trade, Sir Philip Lloyd-Graeme, he found it financially advantageous to hyphenate his name in return for a substantial legacy. He hyphenated it with Hicks.

* * *

Nobody minded at all, because this is, after all, in queer, unexpected ways, a very free country. But the new Joynson-Hicks made the fatal mistake of rushing into politics during the height of the Lloyd-George, Henry George, By George movement, which was all about the Single Tax. He might have rushed into politics and even rushed around without harm, but he made the fatal mistake of trying to stop Lloyd-George in a similar rush around; he defied Mr. Lloyd-George to define the word "unearned increment."

The Welsh wizard paused for that fraction of a second in which he does his thinking, and then, amidst national merriment, dismissed the new Joynson-Hicks from effective British politics for a season by remarking that "the unearned increment might be defined as that which had accrued to Mr. Joynson-Hicks from the hyphen."

N. Y. World, Correspondence.

Great Words From Max Hirsch

BUT though it seems as if the fight for human freedom were unending, though it has lasted from the very dawn of history to the present day, yet we know there must come a time when victory will be achieved. From age to age the area over which this battle has been fought has become more and more contracted. From century to century the secured area of human freedom has become enlarged. As it has been in the past, so it will be in the

future. Justice will prevail at last. But stone has to be laid upon stone with infinite toil; the mortar that holds them together has to be mixed with human sweat and suffering, in order that mankind shall at last possess a fit habitation for a perfect social state. To have been a faithful soldier in this fight, a faithful soldier in the army of freedom, to have laid one stone in this glorious building, to have done so little to bring the Kingdom of God upon earth, surely to have done this—nay, even to have attempted it with all one's might—is sufficient reward for all the work, the fret and toil and the sacrifices that are involved in it." —Extract from Max Hirsch's farewell Melbourne address.

Belgium

THE efforts made to establish a new revenue system based on collective ownership of the land have resulted in very satisfactory results in certain countries. Nevertheless, there are some countries which remain refractory and even hostile to the ideas so eloquently presented by their own authors as well as by foreign socialists among whom I will mention only your countryman Henry George and my compatriot the Belgian, de Colins.

In Belgium as in France, some years before the war, small groups of intellectuals, with the best intentions sought to interest the public in the land question and in the solution which it offered of the problems of revenue reform. Particularly in France, aided by the liberality of an enthusiastic American supporter, Georges Darien launched a vigorous campaign in behalf of the Single Tax and there was reason to hope that the public would finally wake up to the economic and moral importance of the policy proposed and that it would accept the solution offered by Darien at that time (1910-1914). Unfortunately the war intervened and as he no longer controlled the necessary financial resources, Darien remained inactive until his death in 1922. Since then the most complete silence on this subject has settled down on France.

As for Belgium, the followers of de Colins gave no sign of life and exercise no influence on the economic life of the country. In spite of this discouraging situation, and stimulated by activities in England and Germany, I have thought that it was our duty to make one more trial. For this reason the Tax Reform League has been started and it has been decided to publish a bulletin to be known as *The Land (La Terre)*. If our league had the disposal of adequate funds there seems no good reason why, in a small country like Belgium, we should not be able to overcome the ignorance and indifference of the masses, as has been done in Denmark. We have already pointed out in *Land and Liberty*, of London, that it was not astounding that no one here knew the theories of Henry George. The edition of the two works which were published in French were exhausted twenty-five years ago. Hence our League has undertaken to republish "Progress and Poverty" in

French. But that takes money. How shall it be found.

Please inform the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM of our difficult situation. We would be glad to receive subscriptions to a new French edition of "Progress and Poverty." Be good enough to make an appeal for this purpose. Americans are rich, they can easily help us if they will. —ALBERT CAUWEL.

The Vanishing Home

IN the city of Detroit there are 218,973 "homes."

Of these 133,253 are occupied by renters.

Only 82,679 are owned by those who live in them.

Of those 82,679 owned by their occupants, 49,509 are mortgaged.

There are but 31,506 occupants who own their own homes free of encumbrances—but 14.9 per cent. of the total.

The Advertising Weekly actually boasts about this! It says: "This shows a very high percentage of homes owned, almost twice the percentage of St. Louis."

Poor St. Louis!

It has come to a pretty pass when a business magazine can brag that 14.9 per cent. of the families of a city own their homes free of encumbrance.

If it could brag that the rest of the families live in co-operative homes, free from the grip of the landlord, it would be something to brag about—but the rest of the families are precisely in the grip of the landlord, except those who are in the grip of the mortgagee.

Owned homes are vanishing—and nothing the own-a-home crusade can do will stay the tendency toward the vanishing point—*Toledo Union Leader*.

Despoiling the Sanctuary

THE matter of vanishing rural beauty to make way for "suburban building sites" is not a matter of individual vandalism like the despoiling of roadsides and the Sanctuary. The fault there lies far deeper in the economic basis of our social structure as now constituted. As long as land values, that fruit of the earth which man obtains not by his own labor, but by the gradual growth of the community, therefore by the united labor of all the community, can be diverted as individual profits, into private hands—just so long will villages grow ugly as they grow bigger, and natural beauty be destroyed as the thing that stands between the individual and his profits. The history of every growing or coming community shows how, long before the growth of the community demanded it, natural beauty, fine trees and all the rest of it, have been sacrificed for the speculative values to come, values that belonged to all, but went to the few.

Anywhere we begin to study and love the processes of nature, the beautiful growing things, do we, if we be honest, find ourselves understanding these fundamental economic truths, for no economic reasoning is fundamental if it cannot be linked in some way with nature's laws.—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON in syndicated article, "Bird Notes."

The Farmer and the Tariff

I HEARD nothing of a radical nature from Senator La Follette or his followers during the late campaign. If I understood them aright, they proposed to antidote the evils wrought by one kind of class legislation, by other and futher class legislation.

Such proposals may be drastic and even vicious, but radical they certainly are not, more's the pity. To me they seemed worse than useless. The system of class legislation and special favors is too strongly entrenched in the affections of powerful interests to be upset by anything in the nature of a conflict on interests. Nothing short of a radical public conviction of the foolishness of all class legislation can bring about the desired end of fair play for all.

The last four years have been hard for the farmer and for all business depending on farm prosperity—and what business does not? During those years some two millions of people were forced out of farming and added to our town and city population, many of them losing their all in the shift. And the town and city industries lost just as many possible customers. Who profited? Even the "Money Power" suffered, as the hundreds of failed banks in the West testify.

I see no intelligible reason for this state of affairs other than that all classes are intently engaged in the meanest of pastimes—trying to get the better of one another.

FARMER A POOR SCHEMER

The farmer, though a worker and producer and therefore not fitted to be a schemer, has engaged in the scheming, and got much the worst of it, as might be expected. I doubt if any class really gets the better of it, for human society is so put together that an injury to one often results in injury to all.

It is nearing four years since the Emergency Tariff law was enacted, followed by the Fordney-McCumber law, both putting a tariff on wheat. Last winter the tariff on wheat was increased. All through these years and the ups and downs of the market wheat was heavy. It sagged and sagged. It proved beyond question that the tariff could not put up or keep up the price of an article of which we produce a surplus for export.

Why is a tariff? Wages were always higher in this country than in Europe, even in Colonial times when Britain tried to suppress manufacturing here and to maintain the colonies as a dumping ground for her own mer-

chandise. The first arguments advanced in our Congress for a tariff dwelt on this fact—wages were so high here that men with money could not engage in manufacturing unless the prices of imported goods were brought up to the cost of producing them here. In other words, a tariff was needed for the protection of capital! The cry has changed to the much more popular demand for protection of labor, and the "American standard of living," but the real reason has not changed.

Why should any class seek advantage by class legislation? God is just, and nature hath an alchemy by which such advantage is neutralized and nullified. Special advantage for one is disadvantage for others.

"DOWN WITH SPECIAL PRIVILEGE"

Protection has been misnamed. It is only a senseless obstruction to the commerce and prosperity all the nations might otherwise enjoy. Take the maps of Europe and the United States. Take the trade barriers that rest on the European boundary lines and in imagination set them down on our state lines. What would become of our interstate trade? What would the trade of Europe become with those barriers removed?

—STEPHEN BELL in *The Farm Journal*.

Farmers and the Land Problem

THE mortgage debt on the farms of the United States was \$1,726,000,000 in 1910. It is now more than \$4,000,000,000. Other debts owed by the farmers bring the grand total to \$14,000,000,000. The National Grange, ultra-conservative farm organization, is responsible for the figures. Not a very promising showing for the Nation's basic industry.

So far as the mortgage debt is concerned, it is largely due to speculation in land. Agriculture's problems will never be permanently solved until the farmers bravely face the land question and solve it in the interest of the men who live by tilling the soil rather than in the interest of the speculator.

So far as we know, only one farm leader of national prominence ever had the courage to suggest a fundamental remedy. The late George Hampton, for many years director of the Farmers' National Council, was a follower of Henry George and believed the Single Tax would drive out the speculator and relieve the dirt farmer of much of his burden. Hampton preached that doctrine to the day of his death and won many converts.

Of course the mere mention of the Single Tax will cause bankers and politicians to see red, but the farmers will never get anywhere so long as they look to bankers and politicians for guidance. They must organize and study their problems from the grass roots up. If they do that, they will soon discover the evil effects of land speculation.

—*Labor* (Organ of Rail Unions.)

Adam Smith on Taxation

ADAM SMITH, sometimes called the "father of political economy," was a Scotchman. He studied at Glasgow and Oxford. He was professor of moral philosophy in Glasgow university.

He resigned his professorship in 1764 to teach the young duke of Buccleuch and take a two year trip on the continent. While on this trip he stopped at Paris and it was there that he became acquainted with Quesnay and his disciples and was a frequent and welcome visitor at the apartments of Quesnay in the palace of the king.

The work which made Adam Smith the founder of political economy was "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations." He started this investigation after he returned home from his continental trip. Adam Smith had the leisure to do this, being in receipt of a liberal pension from the Duke of Buccleuch.

Henry George contemplated an edition of the *Wealth of Nations*. It is to be regretted that he never entered upon even the preparatory steps of such a task, so far as his posthumous notes reveal. This work would have been of inestimable value, for Adam Smith will be read long after a great deal of the so-called political economy is forgotten.

Smith fell into many errors even when treating of land rent and its varied relation. But there is so much of value in his general discussion of the subject of taxation that we venture to quote the following extracts from the *Wealth of Nations*. They do not greatly differ from the teachings of the present day Single Taxer.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

"The rent of a house may be distinguished into two parts, of which the one may very properly be called the building rent, the other is commonly called the ground rent.

"The building rent is the interest or profit of the capital expended in building the house. In order to put the trade of a builder upon a level with other trades, it is necessary that this rent should be sufficient, first to pay him the same interest which he would have got for his capital if he had lent it upon good security; and, secondly to keep the house in constant repairs, or, what comes to the same thing, to replace within a certain term of years the capital which had been employed in building it. The building rent, or the ordinary profit of building, is, therefore, everywhere regulated by the ordinary interest of money. Where the market rate of interest is four per cent. the rent of a house which, over and above paying the ground rent, affords six or six and a-half per cent. upon the whole expense of building, may perhaps afford a sufficient profit to the builder. Where the market rate of interest is five per cent. it may perhaps require seven or seven and a-half per cent.

"Whatever part of the whole rent of a house is over and above what is sufficient for affording this reasonable profit, naturally goes to the ground rent; and where the owner of the ground and the owner of the building are two different persons, is, in most cases, completely paid to the former. This surplus rent is the price which the inhabitant of the house pays for some real or supposed advantage

of the situation. In country houses, at a distance from any great town, where there is plenty of ground to choose from, the ground rent is scarce anything, or no more than what the ground which the house stands upon would pay if employed in agriculture. In country villas in the neighborhood of some great town it is sometimes a good deal higher, and the peculiar conveniency or beauty of situation is there frequently well paid for. Ground rents are generally highest in the capital, and in those particular parts of it where there happens to be the greatest demand for houses, whatever be the reason for that demand, whether for trade and business, for pleasure and society, or for mere vanity and fashion.

"Let us suppose, for example, that a particular person judges that he can afford for house rent an expense of sixty pounds a year; and let us suppose too that a tax of four shillings in the pound, or of one-fifth, payable by the inhabitant, is laid upon house rent. A house of 60 pounds rent will in this case cost him 72 pounds a year, which is 12 pounds more than he thinks he can afford. He will, therefore, content himself with a worse house, or a house of 50 pounds rent, which with the additional 10 pounds that he must pay for the tax, will make up the sum of 60 pounds a year, the expense which he judges he can afford, and in order to pay the tax he will give up a part of the additional conveniency which he might have had from a house of 10 pounds a year more rent.

"If the tax indeed was very high, the greater part of people would endeavor to evade it as much as they could, by contenting themselves with smaller houses, and by turning the greater part of their expense into some other channel.

"Ground rents are a still more proper subject of taxation than the rent of houses. A tax upon ground rents would not raise the rents of houses. It would fall altogether upon the owner of the ground rent, who acts always as a monopolist, and exacts the greatest rent which can be got for the use of his ground. More or less can be got for it according as the competitors happen to be richer or poorer, or can afford to gratify their fancy for a particular spot of ground at a greater or smaller expense. In every country the greatest number of rich competitors is in the capital, and it is there accordingly that the highest ground rents are always to be found.

"Both ground rents and the ordinary rent of land are a species of revenue which the owner, in many cases, enjoys without any care or attention of his own. Though a part of this revenue should be taken from him in order to defray the expenses of the State, no discouragement will thereby be given to any sort of industry. The annual produce of the land and labor of the society, the real wealth and revenue of the great body of the people, might be the same after such a tax as before. Ground rents, and the ordinary rent of land, are therefore perhaps, the species of revenue which can best bear to have a peculiar tax imposed upon them.

"Though in many different countries of Europe, taxes have been imposed upon the rent of houses, I do not know of any in which ground rents have been considered a separate subject of taxation. The contrivers of taxes have probably, found some difficulty in ascertaining what part of the rent ought to be considered as ground rent and what part ought to be considered as building rent. It should not, however, seem very difficult to distinguish those two parts of the rent from one another.

"In Great Britain, the rent of houses is supposed to be taxed in the same proportion as the rent of land, by what is called the annual land-tax.

"The first tax of this kind was hearth-money; or a tax of two shillings upon every hearth. In order to ascertain how many hearths were in the house, it was necessary that the tax-gatherer should enter every room in it. These visits rendered the tax odious. Soon after the Revolution, therefore, it was abolished as a badge of slavery.

"The next tax of this kind was a tax of two shillings upon every dwelling-house inhabited. A house with ten windows to pay four shillings more; a house with 20 windows and upwards to pay eight shillings. This tax was afterwards so far altered, that houses with twenty windows and with less than thirty, were ordered to pay ten shillings, and those with thirty windows and upwards to pay twenty shillings. The number of windows can, in most cases, be counted from the outside, and, in all cases, without entering every room in the house. The visit of the tax-gatherer, therefore, was less offensive in this tax than in the hearth-money.

"This tax was afterwards repealed, and in the room of it was established the window-tax, which has undergone too several alterations and augmentations. The window-tax, as it stands at present (January, 1775), over and above the duty of three shillings upon every house in England, and of one shilling upon every house in Scotland, lays a duty upon every window, which, in England, augments gradually from twopence, the lowest rate, upon houses with not more than seven windows, to two shillings, the highest rate, upon houses with twenty-five windows and upwards.

"The principal objection to all such taxes is their inequality, an inequality of the worst kind, as they must frequently fall much heavier upon the poor than upon the rich. A house of ten pounds rent in a country town may sometimes have more windows than a house of five hundred pounds rent in London; and though the inhabitants of the former is likely to be a much poorer man than that of the latter, yet so far as his contribution is regulated by the window-tax he must contribute more to the support of the State."

Getting Rich Without Working

TWELVE hundred per cent. in five years on a single real estate investment is regarded by B. V. Johnson, secretary-treasurer of the Walter Gehrke company, 215 Majestic building, as about the best return he has heard of in Detroit or elsewhere.

Johnson reports a client of the firm who bought a corner lot in 1919 through the company at John R. street and East Lincoln, paying \$12 a front foot. Saturday he was offered and refused \$150 a front foot for this property, standing just as it did when he purchased it.

"This represents a profit of more than 240 per cent. a year during the time the man has held the property," said Johnson. "This is not unusual in Detroit, either. We just happened to have this instance brought to our attention. Scores of realtors could report hundreds of cases, yes thousands, where real estate investments in and around Detroit had paid profits of anywhere from 50 to 200 per cent. a year."—Detroit paper.

Why Are Rents High?

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE is rightly reluctant to have the government interfere with business as it is usually done; but he has let it be known that he is of the opinion that Congress will have to do something about rents in Washington. In the first place, the high rents have to be paid by government employes out of their salaries. Inasmuch as the employes have to live, the government must pay them salaries high enough for them to live upon; hence, high rents must in the end call for higher salaries from the government.

It is astonishing that he does not see the very just and simple remedy which stares every observer in the face. Rents are high in Washington because houses are scarce in proportion to the population. Houses are scarce because vacant lots are plenty. There are plenty of vacant lots to house a population of ten times that of the District of Columbia—if they were not vacant. The remedy for the rent crisis is more vacant houses and fewer vacant lots.

The president and his secretary of the treasury have said so much about tax-exemption that one would expect one of them to hit upon the real remedy. They complain that money is "driven" into investment in tax-exempt securities so that business which must borrow on ordinary notes and bonds cannot get money it needs on the proper terms.

They might apply this principle to the housing shortage. The remedy is to make houses tax-exempt and to tax vacant lots more heavily. Then money would rush—or be "driven"—into house-building and out of vacant lot holding. Rents would fall. Vacant lots would decrease; vacant houses would increase. And it would not be necessary for the government to bother about any new rent law. Natural law would operate in the right direction.—HERBERT QUICK (Syndictaed.)

Why Fine the Virtuous

LEGISLATORS, taking advantage of the anguish usually attending pecuniary loss, have created an elaborate system of penalties in the form of money exactions imposed upon violators of the law. Unfortunately, having thus found it convenient to obtain money simply by taking it, and failing to discriminate between the social nuisance and the social enemy on the one hand and the social benefactor on the other, these same legislators have created another elaborate system of penalties imposed upon the best citizens for such activities as building homes and factories, engaging in business, and employing their fellow citizens. With this difference: If a man gets drunk and disorderly, he is fined once; if he builds a house, he is fined (taxed) every year, unless he repents and tears down the house.

One reason why criminals and the most useful citizens are all dealt with by the same method is that our lawmakers don't know what else to do, being all at sea on the subject of taxation, and having no fundamentals or guiding principles, except, like the bandit, to get where the getting is good. Another reason is that we have never outlived the traditions of a time when governments acknowledged no ethical obligations, and followed no ideals save irresponsible brute force.

As legislators have never yet discovered that the state (the community) has a form of property and income peculiarly and legitimately its own, they naturally conclude that the state, like the beggar and the robber, must live off everybody else's income—the incomes of private citizens and corporations—and that the repressing and damaging consequences are unavoidable.

Land is a continuity and a perpetuity, and acquires primarily an annual value (a continuous flow) which economists have termed "economic rent" or ground rent. Because efficient use is promoted by private title and possession, and because the state has permitted the greater part of economic rent to accrue in private hands and become capitalized in the selling price of land, we have become accustomed to regarding land as private property. But no form of property, especially landed property, is absolute and unqualified. For the landowner to assume the right to appropriate economic rent is to assume a lordship over his fellow citizens that makes a mockery of our boasted democratic equality. The right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" is a sham if the equal right to the use of the earth is denied, and the assertion of a superior right in favor of a few tends to destroy social stability by arraying the disinherited against the entire fabric of government.

It is true that in building the bridge we have destroyed \$4,000,000 of ratables, but the Jersey half of the value of the bridge (say \$15,000,000) which we have gained will all go into land values, as there is nowhere else for it to go. Our leading citizens are already industriously selling the bridge, and they will continue to sell it with other community-made land values until the community takes its own. Meanwhile we graft on paperhangers and barbers.

But occupation tax strikes everybody in the face whose presence and activities are of any value to the community. Such a tax has a plutocratic tendency, because it favors the strong as against the weak. It plays into the hands of men who have made their pile and established their business on a firm foundation, for in a measure it shields such men, who themselves are well able to pay the tax, from the potential competition of the little fellows who are struggling to gain a foothold and who need every dollar and more. This tax is built on the idea that the fellow on the top rung of the ladder should kick everybody off between him and the ground. It is a small-calibre legislation, favored alike by councilmanic and by commission

governments, and illustrates the depths to which we have been brought by a crooked and bankrupt philosophy of taxation.—HENRY FORD in Camden, (N.J.) *Daily Courier*.

Taxation of Economic Rent

TODAY I got \$10,000 I didn't earn. So others will have to earn \$10,000 they will not get.

Twelve years ago in the village of Clawson, Michigan, a corner lot sold for \$2,500. Then Ford workers and others settled around that corner, increasing its land value. Eight years ago I bought that corner for \$8,500 and moved an old building onto it. This I rented to a druggist, who has paid the expense of my holding that corner ever since. Then still others moved there, increasing its land value still more. Today I sold that corner to the druggist for \$20,000. That lot, as a lot, is not worth a dollar more than when I bought it, but the people who live around that lot give it its value. I sold that druggist the people, not the lot. The man I bought it from profited \$6,000, and my rake-off was \$10,000. So that druggist has \$16,000 invested that we got, and he will have to charge it up on things he sells. Ford thought the druggists were overcharging, so he put in a stock of drugs to sell his workmen. He does not see what increasing land values are doing to his workers. If tomorrow it should be announced that Ford were again to increase the wages of his men, land values would jump up still more and take it away from them. Ford cannot see the joke.

The lot I sold is about 34 miles out of Detroit. Now look at the increased land values in Detroit. Say they are only one billion dollars. This means that employed capital and labor in Detroit will have to earn at least one million a week that it will not get. Increased land values are paid for in interest and higher rents and charged up whether you buy prunes, cough syrup or get a tooth pulled.

Manufacturers associations and labor organizations are still cave men. They want to take something away from one another and as yet haven't one bit of economic sense. They are so near-sighted they do not realize that increasing land values are getting a big part of their earnings.

Single Tax would untax improvements created by employed capital and labor, and instead tax vacant lots the same as lots in use. It would not tax improvements on a lot but would base its value on the number of people around that lot. That is called location value, and would make holding idle lots unprofitable and throw them on the market. If we were operating under Single Tax, that druggist could probably have bought that corner for \$2,000 instead of \$20,000 and workers could buy a lot for \$50 instead of \$1,500. Increased land values not only increase the price of lots, but the cost is added to everything we buy.

Today it takes at least \$7,000 to buy a humble home and furnishings. What chance is there for young people of marriageable age? We can build a church on every

corner, but unless we elders learn to look through the eyes of youth and recognize their predicament churches and all will go to the devil.

We older folks have yet to learn that it takes backbone to be religious and face sin in its den. We claim to believe that God made man in His image. Yet birds have the privilege of building a nest in any place not in use, while man has to pay tribute to land speculators. Let's stop whining. Is it not sacrilegious for intelligent men and women to pray, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven," and then not know what our present system of taxation is doing to us? We might as well pray for ice cream sodas in hell.

—GERRIT J. JOHNSON in *Detroit News*.

A Vision Of The World To Be

IF we can picture men and women the world over actuated by the desire to make all others happy, acting towards all others as if they really were their brothers and sisters and as interested in their welfare as their own, we can have the picture of a perfect world, perfectly free, which such a perfect religion brings to men. It would involve a perfect equality of opportunity for every man, woman and child in the world. It would enable every soul born on earth to realize the ideal life which is his birthright from his Creator. It would take away the old idea of charity, or alms-giving and its consequent humiliation, and substitute that justice which the Lord demands of every one of us. True charity, or sincere love to the neighbor, would take the place of mere piety in religion. Religion would thereby become the reign of heavenly law and transform the earth into heaven. REV. WALTER B. MURRAY in *New Church Messenger*.

WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE was deficient in humor and despised science. A friend induced him to visit a laboratory, in which a really great and useful man was engaged. He exhibited a new contrivance to Gladstone, who, however, did not attempt to conceal the fact that he was bored. "What good is it?" asked the premier of Great Britain. "Well," replied the scientist, "if I succeed, as I hope, it will give you something new to tax." There was a twinkle in the scientist's eye, the friend laughed, but Gladstone saw nothing funny in it.

THAT costly and utterly useless department at Washington, over which Mr. Hoover presides, is trying to induce manufacturers to simplify and standardize their output, so that everything one uses, from a teaspoon to a baby carriage, would be exactly like those used by others. No variety at all! It is claimed that hundreds of millions could be saved. Then comes that blunt, rude writer of syndicate articles, Herbert Quick, and asks Herbert Hoover, "Saved for whom?" We imagine that the official Herbert and the writer Herbert never could get along together.

Labor's Land Policy

THE New Zealand Labor Party is to be congratulated on being the only important party in the Dominion with a land policy that is worthy of the name. The Liberal Party, instead of following the lead given by the Hon. George Fowlds in 1911, stopped still, and has been marking time. It will never regain its vigour unless, and until, it comes out boldly with a policy of "the land for the people."

This league, while differing with the Labor Party, recognizes that that party proposes to make a genuine effort to free the land and give equal rights to natural opportunity to all citizens. Its aims are largely influenced by the teaching of Henry George, indeed without him it is doubtful whether they or anyone else, would have yet heard of the "unimproved value" of land.

We note with pleasure the Labor policy as regards National Endowment lands, the need for an up-to-date valuation of all the land of the Dominion, their appreciation of the evil of speculation, their recognition of the private mortgage system as ownership disguised, and their general policy of tenure based on occupancy and use.

While paying this tribute to the Labor Party we would like, in a friendly way, to point out where they depart from, or fail to appreciate some of the fundamentals of the question.

In the first place the payment of compensation by the State denies "the right of the people to the land" since if this right exists at all it cannot be equitably bought. For the State to buy out the owners is merely to change a rent charge for an interest charge, except that it secures future increments. Even if the Government of the country were to issue bonds for the purchase price of land and afterwards redeem them, the community would still not be free of the interest charge since the money which redeemed the bonds would be reinvested (possibly in State securities, but in any case invested) and earning interest, thus enabling ex-landlords, their heirs and assigns for ever, to possess an income for which no service is or has been rendered.

Where population and land values were stationary, no goodwill would result. Another point is that the Labor policy is powerless to secure future values for the people unless the land is acquired by the State. If increment values accrue to the owner, by selling, they also accrue to him by occupancy. Land—other things equal—confers just the same privileges and advantages upon a man who continues to be the owner-occupier, as the money he would obtain upon sale at any time would secure him. He obtains all the advantages of community created values, all increases in values, by occupancy and use without selling.

Finally, we doubt whether the people of the Dominion would consent to such an extension of bureaucratic control involved in wholesale purchase or resumption. The rights of the people to the land can be fully conserved by

taking the annual rent. The State would then have the kernel and the landowners the shell.—*The Liberator* Auckland, New Zealand.

From An Argentine Socialist

IF Alberdi (our great Argentine economist) in his "Economic and Revenue System," did not declare himself a partisan of the Single Tax which according to Professor Colmeiro, in a phrase quoted by Alberdi, is in political economy somewhat similar to the squaring of a circle in geometry, he was in a measure justified by the economic situation of the country at the time when he wrote the splendid work to which we have referred. At that time, the land did not have the value which it has now and could not consequently produce rent sufficient to support the whole taxation system. Today, circumstances have changed by virtue of the increase in land values, and it may be affirmed that a tax upon these values would have no repercussion, since, as the economist Henry George has shown, the direct tax is the only one which has any influence on the amount of the income, and not the tax on increment values or the Single Tax, because these operate on real estate in the same way as a mortgage. That is to say, they would never fall upon the consumer, nor upon the wealth producer, but only upon the purchaser of the real estate or the speculator.—From a speech by Senator Iberlucea, Socialist member of the Argentine Senate.

A Ballad Of The Briny Deep

Quoth the shark to the whale, "Let's be Lords of the sea—
Methinks 'tis a capital notion;
We have only to make up our minds and agree
To get a big rent from the ocean.
We will claim it as ours, from Equator to Pole
(As the big men on earth claim the land);
Every fish that can swim shall first pay us toll—
By jingo, our life will be grand!"
So the whale started off to rent out the North Zone,
The Shark for the Mediterranean;
And he tied up the ocean, and leased off alone
The sea, from Gibraltar to Canaan.
Ho! Ho! laughed the shark, in his ravenous glee,
As the whale spouted high in his joy!
"Daddy Neptune's a fool, sir, to you and to me,
Now, we'll gorge on the masses, my boy!"
Then old Neptune arose, and he cried in loud wrath,
"How dare they thus treat my domain?"
And he shouted these words, from the South to the North,
Till the echo rang loudly again:
"Know once and for ever, ye fish of the sea,
From the whale to the minnow so small,
That none shall oppress, for the ocean is free;
The sea was created for all!"

Commonweal, London, England.

A Distribution Factor Worth Investigating

THE highly important task undertaken by the United States Chamber of Commerce, with the cooperation of Secretary Hoover, to conduct a systematic nation-wide investigation of the reasons for the excessively high cost of distributing commodities, will accomplish little more than all its predecessors in the investigation field unless it goes into the fundamentals of the problem. That there are too many persons in the line between the farmer or manufacturer and the ultimate consumer, each of whom takes some toll for his more or less valuable services, has long been well recognized. There has, however been an inclination to avoid discussion of certain underlying facts, either from lack of knowledge as to their relation to the problem, or from an indisposition to criticize what is regarded as the firmly established order of things.

In the course of the forthcoming inquiry, it should be possible fearlessly to examine into all the various items that add to distribution costs, and to recommend the adoption of such changes as would seem equitable and desirable. One of the factors entering into distribution costs is that of rents of warehouses, storage buildings and retail shops. Whether what is termed "economic rent" enters into the price of goods is an academic question that is not of much importance in this connection. What is important is the question of how far the charges of the various "middlemen" are affected by the rentals they must pay for the buildings in which they transact business, and whether it is possible by the wiser direction of taxation to decrease the burden of rent that now is carried.

Visitors to New York City at any time during the past forty years have seen in the heart of the city's business district two blocks, bounded by Thirty-Eighth and Fortieth streets and Seventh Avenue and Broadway, vacant except for some old two-story "taxpayers." These valuable lots have been held out of use awaiting the coming of some owner of capital who would pay the high rental demanded for this fortunately located property. Quite recently the southwest corner of the Thirty-Eighth Street block was leased for an aggregate rental of \$12,000,000 for a term of sixty-three years. This means that in addition to a fair return on the \$3,500,000 which the building to be erected on the lot cost, and heavy city taxes, there must come out of the building's earnings an annual payment of nearly \$200,000 for the privilege to Capital of employing Labor to create a great, useful building. It might be interesting to Secretary Hoover to find out where this \$200,000 comes from each year, and what the lot owner gives in return for it.—*Christian Science Monitor*.

WHEREVER land is used, whether by the owner or renter, and it has a value, there is *actual rent*.

—HENRY GEORGE.

EVEN the captains of industry, who, to the world of a decade or two ago, represented all that was great and noble, no longer are so universally admired and emulated. We have begun, at last, to realize that no special talent, aside from greed, is necessary to make vast sums from cornering natural resources which a growing nation must have; in short, that circumstances, more than outstanding genius, built up most of our great fortunes, and that even today some of our great financiers and industrialists are Babbitts under the skin.

Public Affairs for September

WHEN any radical measure of reform is proposed, the reformer must be prepared to meet, not only the opposition of those whose selfish interests have been disturbed, but the opposition of good people who have been made uncomfortable by his revelation of unwelcome truth.

SAMUEL MCCORD CROTHERS.

BOOK NOTICE

We have received from Mr. Patrick Kelliher, of Chicago, a reprint in pamphlet form of Bishop Nulty's famous Letter on the Land Question to the Clergy and Laity of his Diocese. It is a neatly printed pamphlet of fifty pages, with cover design of Gaelic lettering and tracery.

In a preface Mr. Kelliher says:

"We turn again to the pages of this book; the result is that we are more convinced than before that here is the remedy; that in this book justice is given, and that the provisions of Divine Providence, in wisdom and design for the benefit of mankind, had obviously been guiding the hand that wrote these pages."

It has occurred to us that if this book could be circulated in Ireland it might have the effect of drawing attention to the crying need of reform in the land system of that country. Mr. Kelliher is to be congratulated on a valuable bit of work.—J. D. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE BEST SINGLE TAX PAPER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I do not know whether I have renewed my subscription or not, but am taking no chances of missing a single copy of the best Single Tax paper published.

Marathon, Iowa.

FLOYD L. WAITE.

FROM A CANADIAN FRIEND

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish I could send a thousand dollars for your Sustention Fund.

Ottawa, Canada.

F. GRIERSON.

CANNOT CONNECT FACTS THAT EXPLAIN OTHERS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Enclosed find five dollars for LAND AND FREEDOM. We must not let that go down whatever else does.

Strange how excellent writers in the best magazines betray their innocence of the fundamental law relating to man's use of the land when they write on various problems of our civilization. Sometimes I think they purposely dodge it. However it is more likely that it is an unfortunate instance of man's general disability to think two things at the same time, or to connect two facts that explain each other.

Glendale, Calif.

LONA INGHAM ROBINSON

FROM A DEVOTED WORKER IN THE CAUSE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Before the old year closes I wish to send in my usual small donation to LAND AND FREEDOM for 1925, wishing the amount were ten times as large, so that my appreciation of your valuable work for the cause might attract hundreds of new subscribers now in ignorance of the importance of this valuable publication.

New York City.

CHARLOTTE O. SCHETTER.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

THE death of Mr. I. H. Duran is announced from Joplin, Missouri. Mr. Duran was seventy-one years old and was formerly a resident of New York. He was for many years a Single Taxer and subscriber to this paper.

THE death of Henry W. McFarlane, of Los Angeles, Calif., is chronicled in the papers of that city. He was a Single Taxer affiliated with the Los Angeles League.

THE Henry George Club of Melbourne, has acquired by purchase a piece of land with an old building on it. The Club transformed the building, letting the two rooms on the street and converting the upper story into a room for the League. It is on a small but not unimportant street. At the suggestion of Mr. Powell, an active member of the League, the name has been officially changed from Latrobe Parade to George Parade.

THE *Toronto Globe* of Dec. 16, prints a picture of our old friend, W. A. Douglass, under the caption, "Veteran Single Taxer Still in Harness."

A MAJOR-GENEALSHIP has been conferred on General Pendleton, now stationed at Coronado, Calif.

A FEW friends honored John Filmer on his 88th birthday by a gathering at the home of Mrs. Cebelia L'Hommiedieu in Brooklyn. Present were a number of well known Single Taxers long associated with Mr. Filmer in work for the cause. Age has in no wise diminished the activity of his mind which is as keen as we recall it twenty years ago.

WE have received the report of the Maryland Tax Reform Association of which Alfred S. Niles is president. Mr. Niles succeeds Mr. J. H. Ralston in this office since the latter's departure for California. The Report contains a record of the year's activities.

MIDDLETOWN, N. Y., has an official who has refused an advance of salary. This *rara avis* is Zophar K. Greene and he is a good Single Taxer and subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM. His action, extraordinary among public officials, has been the occasion of a widely circulated news item.

A GRACEFUL holiday greeting has reached us from Dr. Marion Mills Miller in the shape of a neatly printed translation of a poem from Theocritus who is a favorite of Dr. Miller's among the Greek poets. Dr. Miller's rendering of the poem is marked by his usual mastery of technique, and we imagine that he has reproduced the spirit of the original.

HENRY L. PECKHAM, a contributor to this issue, was born in 1865 on a New England farm, was educated in the public schools of Newport, Rhode Island, and graduated from the United States Naval Academy in 1889. Many years ago he read the works of Henry George, and his greatest interest in life has been the correct solution

of those problems treated by the great master of economics. He is in the navy department and has served his country in various capacities for 37 years.

WE are indebted to *The New Leader* for a very fair statement of the Single Tax with a useful bibliography. The article is by Harry W. Laidler, Ph.D. We are wondering, however, what kind of a Single Taxer is the one quoted by Mr. Laidler:

"I favor," said one prominent Single Taxer, a while ago, "not only the Single Tax, but the public ownership of natural monopolies, of municipal utilities, of the credit systems, of the great trusts, and, if these changes don't correct present economic injustices, a complete socialization of industry."

ALTHOUGH the Single Tax resolution introduced at the recent meeting of the National Grange at Atlantic City received scant consideration, the following resolution was adopted: "We demand that undeveloped land shall submit to regular taxation." The trouble with the Grange appears to be that they do not know what the Single Taxer proposes to tax.

F. H. MONROE, of the Henry George Lecture Association, 538 South Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill., has published a new edition of 100,000 of John Z. White's pamphlet on Taxation for general distribution. Another pamphlet by George H. Duncan will also soon be published. Mr. White's health will not permit him to make extended lecture tours and in the future his work will be confined to Chicago and vicinity.

THE Library Association of Portland, Oregon, is in need of copy of SINGLE TAX REVIEW for July-August 1923. Maybe some of our readers can get into communication with the library.

HON. GEORGE H. DUNCAN, member of the New Hampshire Legislature and minority leader, will make a transcontinental tour for the Henry George Lecture Association of Chicago. He will proceed west via Cleveland, Chicago, Omaha, Denver, Salt Lake City, Spokane, Seattle, then east via Los Angeles, San Diego, New Orleans, Memphis, Atlanta, Washington, D. C., New York and Boston.

WE note the name of Judson Grenell as one of the contributors to the *Dearborn Independent*. The article is entitled Back Door Glimpses of the Vatican. Readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will recall Mr. Grenell as the author of an excellent Single Tax pamphlet once widely circulated.

THE powerful Scripps league of newspapers is often useful; sometimes amusing. In one column, it will denounce government in the bitterest and most sweeping terms, for its extravagance, inefficiency and corruption; in the next column will be an article calling upon Congress to undertake the delicate job of limiting, regulating or prohibiting the labor of all under 18 years of age, or demanding that a new bureau be added to the 98 we now have to regulate railroads. Is not that funny?

A STATE that uses a hundred or more sources of revenue, based on conflicting theories, is not likely to do anything well. Common sense calls for abolishing many of its functions, rather than the creation of new ones.

ARDEN is entering its 25th year without a public debt, except a balance of \$400 on the original land mortgage, which will be paid off the coming fiscal year beginning the 25th of March. For 25 years, Arden has collected the ground rents, through Trustees, out of which fund it paid the real estate taxes, maintained roads, made a yearly payment on the original land mortgage, and refunded to leaseholders their automobile and business taxes.