

March—April, 1931

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Justice and Poverty

Professor T. N. Carver

Reply to Professor Carver

John S. Codman

Land Monopoly in England and America

John Lawrence Monroe

Land and Water in California

George J. Shaffer

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

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

No. 2, WHOLE No. 165

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade, Av. Pal Legislativo 40, Mexico City.

PAGE

COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	35
JUSTICE AND POVERTY.....	Prof. T. N. Carver 38
REPLY TO PROF. CARVER.....	John S. Codman 39
LAND MONOPOLY IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA	
	John Lawrence Monroe 41
LAND AND WATER IN CALIFORNIA....	George J. Shaffer 43
WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH THE WORLD?	
	James R. Brown 46
LECTURE WORK OF ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE.....	47
WORK OF THE SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION	
	Antoinette Kauffman 47
LOUIS JACOBS PASSES ON.....	49
NATIONAL CONVENTION TO MEET IN OCTOBER.....	49
REPORT OF LECTURES OF JAMES R. BROWN.....	52
BOOK NOTICE.....	59
CORRESPONDENCE.....	59
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS....	60

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. XXXI

MARCH—APRIL, 1931

No. 2

Comment and Reflection

SIR ARTHUR KEITH in a recent statement says: "Humanity is passing through a process of selection of a kind it has never passed through before. It is passing through the selective mill which has been set up with the introduction of modern economic standards." And then follows a hiatus, a sense of something missing, a conclusion that does not seem to follow as a perfect sequitur: "A nation has to produce or go under."

VERY noted scientist is Sir Arthur. His words have weight with the scientific world. He is, to do him justice, a man of courage, and whether we accept or reject his conclusions they are entitled to a certain respect. We are speaking now of his scientific speculations, and not of the paragraph quoted, which seems to us more than a trifle vague. For it is not too much to say that every period in the progress of civilization is a passage through a selective mill in which something of the old is laid aside and something of the new is instituted. But we do not clearly get the connotation of that thought and the statement that "a nation has to produce or go under."

IT would be much nearer the truth to say that a nation *must solve the problem of distribution* or go under. It is not production but equality of distribution that makes for survival—a just or approximately just method of distribution. In other words, the strength of a nation lies in the wages of its workers. That such a nation will rank high in the scale of production is true, but this is a consequence and not a cause.

FROM high wages flow all the concomitants of a true civilization: enlightenment, culture, private and civic morality. Production is really an individual problem, save in the socialistic state. Distribution is a social problem. To solve it calls for social action. Production takes care of itself. Where economic laws do not give an undue advantage to one group over another, production will solve its own problems in its own way, automatically. Nothing need be done about it save to leave it alone. Buyer and seller will fix terms between them. In a free competitive market no one will gain an advantage over another, and

where there is equality of distribution natural laws may be depended upon to set a reasonable limit to the love of gain.

IT is easy to pooh-pooh this reasoning, and we hear some one ask if we would remake human nature. We would rather remake society in accordance with a plan where natural laws would allow human nature to develop its highest tendencies and realize its highest aspirations. This can be done by an entirely new concept of the right of property. Some things treated as property must cease to be so regarded. Referring to the charge brought against us by Professor Douglass in his review of Louis Post's "Prophet of San Francisco," in which he accuses us of "monotonous monomania," it is necessary again to reiterate that the basis of a natural society is the ownership by the people of public values and the recognition of the sacredness of private property rights.

CIVILIZATION has never tried this plan. But in the measure that it has approached it, nations have prospered. Slavery, either chattel slavery or economic slavery, has never made a happy or contented nation. As some of these hindrances fell away civilization has leaped forward. It is true that liberty is forever being lost and forever being found again, but it is constantly renewing itself, like the eagle.

LET us discard the question of production for the time being and consider the problem of distribution and what determines it. We shall then get somewhere. We do not need to vault these innumerable barriers that bar mankind from enjoyment of wealth and plenty—nor can we ignore them in our discussion. They must be removed—these title deeds that are fences shutting men out from the great mother earth, the great mother to whom none of her offspring are stepchildren, but all sharers alike in her overflowing bounty. Is this "monotonous monomania" to you, Professor Douglass? You *do* seem to think there is something in it—this you tell us. It is constant repetition that offends the "intellectually fastidious," as you hint, but have patience with us, professor; for our words may be poor enough, but what we would convey is a gospel of vast importance to the world—never more so than now.

PROFESSOR WALTER H. HAMILTON, whose address at a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association stirred Harry Weinberger to action (see January-February LAND AND FREEDOM), stated what we regard as a typical misunderstanding. He said: "Ours is a machine civilization. * * * 'Progress and Poverty' is exactly the kind of book I should expect in an agrarian age, which is just passing, and in a society in which wealth is land. Thus it was taught that the unearned increment was a product of the superiority of fertile over infertile soil."

THERE is no discussion in "Progress and Poverty" of fertile over infertile soil beyond an allusion or two. And there was some machinery at the time the book was written. Though machinery has increased since then, its relation to land remains the same. Land is not wealth now any more than it was then, but it is the source of all wealth and the material on which and from which all wealth is produced. And the land question is not a rural question; its urban importance, where a few choice lots are greater in value than an entire agricultural county, overshadows its rural importance. It might be said that the land question is chiefly an urban question.

HOW then comes the curious notion that "Progress and Poverty" is concerned only or mainly with the land question in its agricultural aspects? Henry George knew little or nothing of farming, so he was not influenced by his surroundings in that way. His life had been spent in cities. And how can any professor, or any one else, speak thus of a work which proposes to take economic rent in taxation when such economic rent manifests itself very slightly in rural communities and preponderantly in cities and towns?

THE entire fabric of civilization was woven out of land; the foundation of all the comforts and grandeur of cities, houses and palaces in which people live, was land. Land—and cabbages! St. Paul's Cathedral and turnips! Why ignore the cathedrals, the great stately blocks of buildings, the great emporiums of trade, the great machines, and think only in terms of cabbages and turnips? Where civilization does most for the people, there the services of government are the greatest, there the land question assumes its most acute form. Did Henry George see this? Why, it was as an explanation of this varied phenomena that the book was written—that was its chief concern, and not the differing values of agricultural land arising from degrees of fertility. The book was not written, as Professor Hamilton says, in the terms of a survey of the economic law in an agrarian society of about 1830, but fifty years later in the terms of a survey of the economic law of 1931, or any year you please, since economic law is the same in 1930 as in 1830.

IT is a persistent fallacy—this iteration and reiteration that land is an increasingly negligible economic factor. In the Washington, D. C., *Daily News* of Feb. 20 there is an

article by Robert P. Scripps, headed "Land Hunger No Longer a Dominant Economic Factor." The writer says that "Great Britain has been in a bad way economically for a longer period than the United States * * * yet the British people have had access on a per capita basis to more free land and undeveloped natural resources than have Americans."

AND as if this clinched the argument, Mr. Scripps passes to the consideration: "It would seem that, failing the unusual, such as rapid population accretions, or a greater disruption of world markets on a large scale, free land and undeveloped natural resources are of small account in our present system of world economics." All this is written with special reference to what the writer calls "the Single Tax plan of Henry George." "The theory was," Mr. Scripps proceeds to explain, "that as long as you find available to the people free or cheap land * * * the individual prosperity of that nation is guaranteed."

ADAM SMITH, writing before we were a confederation, and noting the higher wages prevailing in the colonies as contrasted with wages in Great Britain and the Continent of Europe, with his usual sound judgment assigned the cause to cheap and free land. Land is no longer cheap. There are vast undeveloped natural resources, but these are neither free nor cheap. And it will be news to the people of Great Britain that the land of the British colonies is free—and we suppose it is to her colonies that reference is had. Let the native Briton start to make his home anywhere in the lands of Great Britain's far-flung possessions and he will find every desirable locality pre-empted and held at a stiff price. The landlord has got there before him. And this is true wherever the system of unrestricted private ownership of land prevails.

HAS anything been changed? Has the relation of the factors, Land, Labor and Capital, altered since Henry George, or even since Adam Smith? Unconsciously many modern writers talk as if some new element had been discovered from which wealth is now drawn. Mr. Scripps is not thinking—he is confused by the complexities that he conjures up. And so he keeps right on talking. Now, where does Mr. Scripps live? On land. Where are his newspapers printed? On land, of course. And on land increased enormously as "a dominant economic factor" since Henry George wrote. What does he eat and where with is he clothed? With the products from the land reacted upon by human labor. And from where come the great presses that turn out the printed sheets? Land, land, always land. And always we are confronted with the tribute-taker who draws from all these great enterprises, among which are Mr. Scripps's many newspapers, the share known as economic rent, the price of a still dominant economic factor.

It seems so hard for Mr. Scripps to understand. He says: "The existence of undeveloped lands within the United States today does not relieve our present situation." Of course not. Nor would these undeveloped lands if multiplied a dozen times do anything to relieve it. The fact that they are undeveloped does not help the situation; in reality that is in part the trouble. Nor is this fact cited by Mr. Scripps at all relevant to the situation: "Western states contain millions of acres today purchasable for less than they were twenty years ago." True, doubtless, but what of it? How does that prove that land is no longer "a dominant economic factor"? What is probably asked for these acres is all that they are worth or more, just as twenty years ago the asking price might have been more than they were worth. Many of these acres were subjects of land booms which carried the price asked beyond what they should have been at any time. It is the economic rent that determines the selling price of these acres, and the selling price is based on their earning power. If something has happened to affect the earning power, of course the selling price is less, just as is the case with other millions of acres, rural and urban alike, in the East and West, where the selling prices have mounted higher than they were twenty years ago. So land as an economic factor appears to be very much with us.

VERY difficult it is to be patient and polite. It is Satan who whispers in the ear of St. Anthony in Flaubert's great work: "What after all if the absurd should be true?" But we do not believe it. Correct reasoning from obvious facts still has its value. And we should demand it from those who write for public consumption. We ought to insist on a recognition of cause and effect; we cannot treat fallacy as if it were a pet canary and sings sweetly. Mr. Scripps writes well; he is a newspaper man who knows how to use English. But his reasoning is deplorable. He alleges that the most solid factor in the economic structure, land and its rent, is disappearing, yet he draws large monthly checks for those who produce nothing and from whom he gets nothing but permission to live and print newspapers on the earth—payment for permission to use the economic factor which Mr. Scripps declares is now negligible. It should occur to him that he is paying rather high for a factor that has almost no existence.

Is Saul also among the prophets? President Hoover has seen a light. He looks with disfavor upon those who profit by the increase of land values made by the community. He says so in language that is unmistakable: voices good Henry George doctrine. But hold! It is with reference only to the Indians that he is speaking. He probably still believes that white men should continue to take from other white men the socially created values that attach to land.

BUT at least he is very explicit so far as the Indians are concerned. In his veto of the Choctaw Indian land bill he says: "This case raises a very wide issue whether we are to undertake revision of treaties entered into for acquiring of Indian lands during the last 150 years. The values of such lands have obviously increased, and the undertakings entered into at the time the agreements were made may naturally look small in after years. But the increased values have been the result of the efforts of our citizens in building this nation." This is good doctrine if universally applied. In recent years some of our Indian friends have been enriched by the discovery of oil. Somebody must be after those oil wells!

ARTHUR J. BAILEY, of the People's Church at Olean, N. Y., has a letter in a recent issue of the *Christian Advocate*. It is entitled "Christ's Teaching Applied to Unemployment." He says: "All students of the problem recognize that unemployed labor is largely the result of idle capital." Not *all* students. A few would challenge the contention and are prepared to show that idle labor and idle capital are consequences, not causes. They are therefore able to see that most of the proposed remedies are futile.

AND along with these is Mr. Bailey's own suggestion of a sliding scale of taxation, with the taking over of 50 per cent. of all fortunes of a million dollars or over. He calls this "a safe and sane redistribution of wealth." He reassures the wealthy by telling them that most of the wealth would return to them, though he is rather vague as to the *how* of this. He says, rather naively, that his plan "would work no hardship, as so much wealth is worthless to those who possess it," a statement which to the rich might not be wholly appreciated.

MR. BAILEY is a sincere Christian. He wishes to apply the doctrines of Christ to economics and social conditions. There is only one way: Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's. It consists in recognizing the God-given right of all men to the use of the earth, and the government's right to the collection of those values which are created by the community. It consists in the recognition of the distinction between those matters which are individual and those which are communal. There is no need of a sliding scale of taxation to take the wealth of the rich, and there is no way of determining by such a method just what proportion of the wealth of the rich belongs to the rich. Without intending it Mr. Bailey is advocating measures that are predatory, not Christlike.

THE question really requires more thought than Mr. Bailey has given to it. For if the wealth of the rich is unearned something is at fault with the methods of dis-

tribution. But if such wealth is earned the community has no right to it. We ask our friend to read "Progress and Poverty." There he will find his question answered. The missing wealth of the poor is not to be put back into the pockets of the poor by any such method as he advocates. The leak may be stopped by a radical but simple change in the methods of distribution.

BUT from another quarter comes at last a real remedy for unemployment and the periodical depressions that visit us. The writer of this new solution tells us it is "very different from socialism." Perhaps it is. It appears that we have a lot of "commonwealth," public parks, roadsides, etc. We are told that "all the spare labor in the country (by which we suppose is meant the unemployed) could be used in improving the roadbeds of the United States." We are urged to take (not actually take in the sense of resumption of ownership but take into consideration) the land on both sides of the railway tracks, so conspicuous as we travel in "our" trains. Do not smile at the word "our." Increasingly large numbers of the unemployed could be absorbed in the improvement of "our commonwealth."

THERE is a certain thoroughness in the suggestion. To make all this really effective we are to have a Peace Time Army, just like a Standing Army. There is to be a General Staff, and these officers of the Peace Time Army and these members of the Regular Army are to receive wages and salaries sufficient to draw the talent that is required. When the Peace Time Army expands to take all those out of employment, the payment of those temporarily employed would be the same as that of the enlisted men in the War Time Army, so as not to take out of private employment those normally engaged in industry. When a corporation like the United States Steel Corporation wants ten thousand men, application will be made to the General Staff of the Peace Time Army, who would immediately dispatch those with the requisite qualification.

THE money for all this would be financed from loans backed by the United States. The loans are to run for twenty-five years. It might be unjust, the author of this plan cautiously says, to tax industry, where so much is being done by business men to relieve distress. But how these loans are to be paid except by taxing industry we are not informed. We are cautioned that the Peace Time Army must be kept free from politics! We seem to sense how easy that would be, like taking the liquor and tariff questions out of politics!

WE have for the most part described this proposal in the words of its very eminent originator. If we were to take it seriously, it has some menacing aspects, since it is a suggestion for the establishment of a new

national slavery for the workers. But of course it is no more practical than a Gilbertian burlesque. Nor is it intended for a contemporary satire like the memorable work of Gilbert and Sullivan. It belongs to the Opera Bouffon of Political Economy, a rapidly growing literature of speculative oddities, weird, mysterious and fantastic. And that the name of the originator may not be lost in this casual periodical literature of his time, here is his name—Richard T. Ely; and the article in which the proposal is outlined in all the stark nakedness of its absurdity is the March number of the *Review of Reviews*.

Justice and Poverty

T. N. CARVER, in *Boston Herald*

WHY not try justice? This formula is used rather frequently when plans for the prevention of poverty are being considered. They who use this formula seem to assume that injustice is the sole cause of poverty. This assumption needs looking into.

We need not waste time discussing the possible connection between injustice and such disasters as drought, flood, fire, accident or sickness. Hardships resulting from disaster are not commonly included under poverty. Poverty generally means the inability to secure, in ordinary times and conditions, the means of supplying one's needs. It is only with poverty in this sense that we are here concerned.

Justice, so far as the distribution of wealth is concerned, generally means that each shall share in the products of industry in proportion to his product, to the value of his product, or to the real value of his work. To pay a man what he needs, merely because he needs it, whether he has earned it or not, is not justice but charity. It is given out of the goodness of the giver's heart and not as a return for what is received.

It is obvious that there are many people who are able to get as much as they need. It is also certain that there are many who do not get as much as they earn or than they produce. But are these two groups identical? If they are, then justice would eliminate poverty. If they are not, it would not help the group which is not getting what it needs to give the other group what it earns.

Another way of presenting the problem is to point out that there are, on the one hand, many who do not get as much as they need, and that, on the other hand, there are others who get vastly more than they earn or than they produce. When these two groups are thus contrasted, it seems to be implied that if the unearned wealth now going to one group were given to those who actually earn, poverty would disappear. But this, again, assumes that those who actually earned that wealth are the identical ones who are now poor, or who are not getting as much as they need. That is an assumption which ought to be verified before we assert too positively that justice will eliminate poverty. Until that is verified, we should

ow at least a small place for charity and not place our sole reliance on justice.

Justice, of course, we must have at all costs, whether it will eliminate poverty or not. We may find, however, that after we have approximated as closely as possible to justice in the distribution of wealth, there will still be cases of poverty which can only be relieved out of the goodness of our hearts, people whose needs must be supplied whether they can earn anything or not. Charity is a good word and its spirit should be preserved and not be thrown into the incinerator.

Let us be a little more specific and assume, for the sake of argument, that the Single Taxer is right in his contention that the rent of the land is unearned by the landlord. Let us go further and assume that this rent is taxed away, that it is taken by the government in lieu of other taxes, and used to pay all the necessary expenses of government, including schools. That particular form of unearned wealth, as the Single Taxer calls it, would then be taken away from those who formerly received it, and redistributed. Will it find its way to those in need, or will it go, most of it, to those who are already pretty well to do or at least above the poverty line?

Of course, those who now pay taxes will be relieved, but they are not usually the people in need. They will also have more money to spend, and, it may be contended, their increased spending will stimulate business, increase employment, and thus help the poor. But their increased spending will be balanced by decreased spending on the part of the former landlords. It looks like a case of cancellation. We may decide that it is better that those who now pay taxes should spend more money for what they want than that landlords should spend it for what they want. But so far as helping the poor is concerned, it does not seem to make much difference to them which group spends the money.

Let us pursue the matter a step further. Business men are heavy taxpayers on their buildings and equipment. These taxes are a heavy burden. Let us grant that if the taxes were all put on the landlords, it would be a great relief to active business, and that business would therefore expand. This expansion would mean more employment for both labor and capital, and better interest rates, salaries and wages. But would the benefit go chiefly to the poor whose wages are too low to supply their needs, or would it go to those who are already well to do?

It would depend upon other circumstances. If technologists and skilled laborers were scarce, and if unskilled labor from abroad could come to the country in unlimited numbers, it is pretty certain that wages of unskilled labor would not rise. The chief benefit would go to those whose labor was scarce enough to command high wages or salaries. Under such circumstances, it is pretty certain that the Single Tax would not eliminate poverty.

The Single Tax has been selected, not for the purpose of special attack, but merely as one example of the numer-

ous attempts to achieve what various reformers call justice. Whatever else may be said for it, there is no reason for believing that it will eliminate poverty. Precisely the same remark may be made of every other scheme for achieving distributive justice. It cannot be too often repeated that we must have justice, as soon as we discover what it is, whether it will eliminate poverty or not. But if we really want to eliminate poverty we must have something more than justice.

[EDITORIAL-NOTE.—Professor Carver is in the same predicament as Pilate. Instead of asking "What is truth?" the professor asks "What is justice?" and confesses he does not know, though he indicates his belief that we must have it.

It is an ingenious argument. But the fallacies are obvious. The contention that economic rent might just as well go to the landlords, that it makes no difference which group spends it, and that if it went to the workers the total sum spent would be just about the same, and therefore it is only a problem of cancellation, is a perfect gem of reasoning. For if economic rent is not earned by the landlords, if its present recipients are to be classed as receivers of loot, then they are not easily identified as differing from such eminent personages as Robin Hood and Captain Kidd. The reasoning is not ours, it is the professor's, and it is not we but the professor who owes the landlords an apology for the harsh implication.

The argument of the Single Taxer is not based upon the contention that economic rent would be redistributed so as to give more of the same money to the poor to spend. Economic rent would go into the public treasury, not into the pockets of any group. The resultant benefits to the poor, who pay most of the taxes, would be the abolition of all taxation and the freeing of all natural opportunities, which would so raise wages as to give every worker employment, whether his labor be skilled or unskilled. If it would result in an increase of salaries and wages, as Professor Carver in a moment of inadvertence seems to admit, then he need not ask himself whether these benefits would go chiefly to the poor, for it is in wages and salaries that the poor are mainly interested.

Professor Carver crowds a great many errors into a little space; indeed his cute little essay is quite a masterpiece in its way. He is to be congratulated that his arguments are quite new; we do not recall having heard them before, at least not put in the same way, and this is something of an achievement after fifty years of controversy. We think, however, that Mr. John S. Codman in the article that follows has made an effective reply.—EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.]

Reply to Professor Carver

JOHN S. CODMAN, in *Boston Herald*

IN your issue of Feb. 16, Prof. Carver devotes about half an editorial to a discussion of "the Single Tax" and reaches the conclusion that "whatever else may be said about it, there is no reason for believing that it will eliminate poverty."

The theory and programme of Single Tax have been very well and briefly expressed as follows: "The rent of the land belongs to the people; the first duty of government is to collect it and abolish all taxation." If the programme indicated by this pronouncement were carried out, certain very oppressive restrictions on the industry of the country would be removed. These restrictions at all times prevent industry from being as active and as profitable as it should

be, and from time to time they become so burdensome that widespread business depression results. The removal of them would go far toward the elimination of poverty.

The most obvious of these restrictions on industry is the staggering burden of taxation levied upon it by the federal, state and municipal governments. That the business men and wage earners of the country are willing to tolerate this restriction is mainly due to the misconception that revenue for governmental purposes can only be raised by the taxation of industry and that no other source of revenue is available. There is, however, a fund from which our government could secure the necessary revenue, and the securing of revenue from this fund, far from throwing a burden on industry, would actually assist industry to prosper.

The City of New York builds a rapid transit system which enables commuters to make their trips in a fraction of the time in which they could be made previously. The possible residential area for commuters is thereby vastly increased, and as a direct result the demand for land throughout this enlarged area and also in the downtown area is greatly increased and a huge sum is added to the value of land in Greater New York.

The City of Boston decides to build a tunnel from the city proper to East Boston, and no sooner is the plan known to be seriously contemplated than land prices at the terminals start to go up in anticipation of the certainty of increased land value which will arise as the result of the expenditure of taxes collected from the citizens of Boston.

In both of these cases and in countless other cases throughout the United States, in little towns as well as big cities, land values stupendous in aggregate amount have been created and will be created as the result of the presence and activities of the people and the expenditure of the taxes levied upon them. If these values were retained by the people who created them they would form a vast fund which could be used to finance still further improvements and would thus enable industry to be relieved of a great burden of taxation.

But what is actually done in Massachusetts and other states with this great fund of land value which the community collectively has created and in which every citizen from the captain of industry to the day laborer should feel he rightfully owns a share? It is the traditional habit to give it away to certain private individuals who have helped no more than the rest of us in its creation, but who happen to be the possessors of the land the value of which has been enhanced by community activity.

What would be thought of the stockholders of a corporation who would permit the capital they furnish to be invested by the corporation so as to create values and should then proceed to give away those values to private parties?

Furthermore, the failure to collect the fund of land value for community purposes not only necessitates unnecessary taxation of industry, but it creates a restriction on industry

of an even more serious nature than does the unnecessary taxation itself. Land to do business upon is the first requisite of industry, but if the private owners of land are in a position to secure the land values which industry creates, then a motive is established for owning land, not to make use of it, but to gamble on the possibility of increase in its value. It is here that the land speculator steps in to forestall the demand for land for industrial or home purposes, and he either prevents its use or forces industry to pay a price which it can barely afford to pay and live. In times of increasing industrial activity land rentals and prices advance and the increase passes to the land owners who, in trying naturally to get all they can, finally force rentals and prices to such a height that they become an overhead charge so burdensome that industry finally cracks under the strain and panic and depression follow. It is also true that at all times land owners are encouraged to leave land idle or inadequately used. They know that any improvements they may make, whether on building, agricultural benefits or what not, will add to their taxes but having to pay relatively little in taxes if the land is merely held and not used, they feel it may pay to wait until the industry of others enables them to sell out at a profit.

There are then three ways by which the adoption of Single Tax will greatly assist industry. It will secure to the community the rental value of land, which value the community has created. It will, therefore, enable the taxes on industry to be abolished. Finally, and most important, it will prevent the withholding of valuable land from the use of industry.

With these things done, who will dare say that we shall not have gone far, if not all the way, to the elimination of poverty? And if we do not do them, why should we expect not to go from bad to worse?

"Real" Property

OUR "conservative" newspapers really ought to be more careful in the grouping of their business news. On page 8 of the real estate section of the *N. Y. Times* of March 8, 1931, column 4, is the story of a plot of land in Seattle, Wash., purchased for \$1 in 1879, which was recently leased for "a long term" at an aggregate rental of \$60,000,000. In column 5 of the same page is another article carrying the caption, "Realty Taxation Calls Too High," pleading for greater economy in public expenditures.

AS I look toward the future of our civilization I see ahead only two causes that may bring it finally to ruin; one is another European war between great Powers, the other is a general resort to Protection. And in essence these are not two causes, but one.—Professor GILBERT MURRAY.

Land Monopoly in England and America

JOHN LAWRENCE MONROE AT THE HENRY
GEORGE CONGRESS, SAN FRANCISCO,
SEPTEMBER 2, 1930.

IF it is true that the picture Henry George saw in 1879 is not the same as that of today, it is only in that every line in that picture of fifty-one years ago is more deeply etched in our present social and economic life. If there was poverty then, our poverty today is the far graver because it is the more unnecessary. If there was injustice in the private appropriation of community earned wealth in 1879, it is a greater injustice today, for land values have increased many fold. If our system of taxation was inequitable then, it is the more so today, for, while the incidence of taxation has not been changed appreciably, governmental services paid for by taxes have expanded with the growth of the country and the natural desire of the community to share in the progress of an advancing civilization. If thousands were unemployed in the panic shortly preceding the publication of "Progress and Poverty," were not millions unemployed in the recent times of barmecidal prosperity?

Indeed, it would be to misconceive the nature of Henry George's proposal to regard it merely as a simple solution for a simple age. Rather, the relation which he saw between the rise of land monopoly and the persistence of poverty amidst increasing plenty is a relation that may be traced to any country at any period in the course of world events, and by the least skilled student of human affairs.

When and where the people have had free access to the use of land, whether that land be known as the commons as in English history, or as the western frontier in American history, in those times and in those places freedom and independence have marked individual community life.

The period of one hundred and fifty years in English history, from 1700 to 1850, the period known as the Industrial Revolution, witnessed the greatest increase in the productive power of mankind known up to that time. It was the period of the growth of political freedom culminating in the Reform Bill of 1832. Parallel with these two phases of English accomplishment came, ironically, the enclosure of the commons and the loss of the independence of the English laborer.

In the typical English village of 1700, before the enclosures, the homestead was individually owned, but all the land outside of the village, known as the commons, belonged to the community. The village laborer did not depend on his wages alone. He had the use of the commons for pasturing his cow, for gathering his kindling wood and fuel, perhaps a patch of ground for a garden. He was not merely a wage earner, receiving so much money a day or a week for his services in a village shop, but in

part he maintained himself and his family as his own employer on the land.

With the rise of the factory system came the need for workers in the cities and the determination on the part of the industrial leaders to secure them at the lowest possible wages. To do this by any means short of chattel slavery it was necessary to destroy the independence of the village laborer, and to do this it was also necessary to enclose the commons. The industrial leaders therefore openly espoused acts to fence out the village worker from the land which tradition and justice had given him for generations. He was driven to the city factories, for unless he could be forced to leave the village it would have been necessary to attract him with higher wages than he could make in his own town assisted by the commons. Such a measure as this, however, was not in the scheme of the Industrial Revolution as the leaders saw it at that time.

Apologies were not forthcoming. One writer, urging the enclosure of certain commons of a thousand acres or so, complaisantly prophesied that "when the commons are enclosed the laborers will work every day in the year, their children will be put to labor early, and that subordination of the lower ranks of society which in the present time is so much wanted would be thereby considerably secured."

"Having gained the trifling advantages of the commons," complained one, "it unfortunately gives the minds of the workers an improper bias, and inculcates a desire to live without labor, or at least with as little as possible."

A few years later after the enclosures had taken place, it was Arthur Young who was to remind the landlords who were complaining of the *high poor rate*, that "the despised commons had enabled the cottagers to keep a cow, and that this, so far from bringing ruin, had meant all the difference between independence and pauperism. A man," he told them, "will love his country the better even for a pig."

The enclosure of the commons was therefore the successful instrument whereby the steady exodus of the agricultural laborers to the cities was effected. Pay fell off, prices rose. There was suffering among the small farmers left in the country, and as great if not greater suffering among the poor who went to the cities. The moral and physical condition of the workers in both city and country deteriorated.

Poaching and stealing of game on what had previously been the commons now were serious offenses. The Justices of the Peace, being the landlords themselves in most cases, became more interested in the preservation of game than of human life. There is more truth than poetry in an old rhyme to the effect that:

You prosecute the man or woman
Who steals the goose from off the common,
But leave the larger felon loose
Who steals the common from the goose.

With the collapse of the economic position of the laborer

during the last lap of the English enclosures, and with its resultant poverty and misery among the masses, we find "remedies" now being offered from every corner—not in the form of attempts to retrace those steps which had led to social calamity, but as substitutes for those steps, as substitutes for the enclosed commons.

The remedies offered in 1795 in the midst of the enclosures do not differ in spirit from those advocated popularly in many English circles today. Diet reform was one proposal. A "judicious change of diet," thought the upper classes, "would enable the laborer to face the fall of wages with equanimity." Painful complaints soon arose from such eminent men as Pitt—complaints of the "groundless prejudices" that made the poor refuse to eat mixed bread instead of the wheaten bread to which they were accustomed.

One of the most ingenious "remedies" which has come to my attention is discussed with favor in a contemporary English magazine in a "Review of Unemployment Remedies." "It is recognized," says the writer, "that the worst feature of prolonged idleness is the loss of personal quality, the inertia and the despair which make men unfit for re-employment." The aim of the "treatment by work" remedy, as he terms it, is, then, to "take men away from the hopeless districts, provide them with hard outdoor work, physical exercise, and a regular disciplined life to restore their working habits, and finally, after an eight weeks' course, to help them to become absorbed into the industrial life of busy and expanding towns where they will probably find their best chance of employment on road schemes or the like." By a curriculum similar to this eight weeks' course in rock breaking he would create "employment value" in young men!

In advocating unemployment juvenile centers the same writer says that, "Indeed, all parties agree in principle that no boys and girls between 14 and 18 ought to be unprovided" And does he say unprovided with modern schooling, comfortable homes with plenty of lawn, garden space and fresh air, homes with the lifetime inspiration of family life by the hearth? No. He says they should not be unprovided "with some sort of supervision and occupation during their spells of unemployment!"

Such were the substitutes offered in place of the restoration of the commons in England.

FREE LAND IN THE WEST

At the time when the last of the six million acres of English commons was being enclosed, about 1830, the importance of the vast domain of over one billion acres of rich, fertile lands west of the Alleghenies in this country was only beginning to be felt. At the time when the English laborer was losing his last thread of independence the American worker was just beginning to assert his. At the time when the landed-manufacturing interests of England were congratulating themselves upon their successful "subordination of the lower ranks of society," and upon

their keeping down wages, the New England landed-manufacturing interests were futilely attempting to lobby the American government into withholding the land in the West at a price sufficiently prohibitive to prevent the drain of their poorly paid workers from their factory sweatshops to these new lands of hope and promise.

More important than any consideration of the influence of the free land in the West upon the political and social philosophy of the American people was its effect upon their economic status. The American frontier of free land, like the English commons, gave the people a feeling of economic security. Their acres were policies of unemployment insurance, of protection against "hard times," a sure means "to duck the w. k. business cycle pendulum on its low swing."

The wind of democracy that blew so strongly from the West as to bring shudders of political agony to the perpetuators of the established order in the East, was also to bring chills to their pocketbooks. At the same time that even the older states in New England and the South were calling constitutional conventions and liberalizing their constitutions, the labor population of the cities began to assert its power and the determination to a share in government.

The Eastern industrial magnates always feared the results of an unregulated advance of the frontier and tried to check and guide it. In the "Great Debate of 1830" it was reasoned by the congressmen from the East that "if the federal government continued to invite all classes to purchase the Western land at prices meant merely to cover the actual expenses of the government in making the preparation for settlement, not only those with capital but also the better part of the laboring classes would be constantly drawn away from the East and her industrial system greatly embarrassed." What was the use of a protective tariff which shut out competition, they whined, if wages were to be perpetually kept at a maximum by this drain of population toward the West?

Are not the motives here expressed for withholding the free land in the West exactly the same as were the motives for the enclosure of the commons: to maintain a large landless labor market in the industrial centers where competition would be keen enough to keep down wages?

While free land won in this early skirmish for democracy no provision was made to keep the free land free, that wage might be kept "perpetually at a maximum," as some of the Easterners needlessly had feared they would be. For, in so short a time as sixty years after the Great Debate of 1830 the vast domain of a billion acres of opportunity was almost completely appropriated by a comparative small proportion of the people, who, as the country developed and the need for land increased, were to demand that the new settlers and future generations "relinquish more and more of their earnings for the permission to earn at all."

Just as the enclosure of the commons meant the loss of the economic independence of the English people, the

gradual private appropriation of the land and natural resources of the United States has meant the loss of that economic satisfaction that marked the earlier periods of America's industrial and social growth. The effects of land monopoly in this country have been somewhat mitigated by the great increase of productive power, by the large free area, and by the partial taxation of land values which has tended to make it unprofitable to hold land out of use.

While these factors have cushioned the impact of an otherwise crushing land monopoly, yet page after page in current literature is devoted to a consideration of the concentration of economic and social power in the hands of the few, of privilege in politics, of low wages and unemployment, and of all the accompaniments of a maladjusted economic system based on land monopoly. These pages are evidence of a myriad of attempts, many of them sincere, to find substitutes for the former safeguard of democracy and individual independence: the disappeared free lands. All are based on the assumption that unemployment, in the words of Stuart Chase, is the "nemesis of American business," that unemployment is in the natural course of events and there is no real solution to the question.

There are many inarticulate pleadings of men for land which may be heard if we but listen. That there is still that desire to seek independence on the land has been shown in the recent depression when farm land companies of Michigan, for instance, have reported an increased demand for cheaper lands. In one of the provinces of Western Canada, where an area of free land has been just opened to settlement, the line of men waiting to get grants, I am told, looked like a line of men getting jobs. And that is just what they were doing, for these men knew that a piece of land was the equivalent of a job.

It is significant to observe, further, that in those countries which have most recently had free land, the proportion of the population that is unemployed is less. Popular though conservative estimates of the unemployed during the past year reveal one in thirty unemployed in England, where access to free land ended between 1830 and 1850; only one in forty in the United States, where the frontier of productive free land disappeared in 1890; while in Canada only one in one hundred—where there is still some considerable free land available.

If the monopoly of land could in so short a time as a few generations give rise to poverty and unemployment and their attendant and existing evils, we may well ask if a freeing of the land would not give rise to the opposite and desired state of society which we all seek? Our problem is simply one of projecting upon the highly developed health-producing civilization which we know today the freedom of opportunity that existed during the period of free land.

Henry George, in his very greatness of mind and powers of analysis, presented a simple method by which this can be accomplished—by which, in effect, the commons can

be restored to the English people, the frontier to American life.

By diverting to the public treasury the annual value of the land, the Single Tax would serve, year in and year out, to free the land by removing any privilege in mere possession of title to land, and by removing the opportunity which that privilege now gives to exploit others. There would be no incentive for holding land out of use for a rise in value, since that value as it arose would be taken for community purposes. While the annual value of the land would increase as the presence of society made it more productive, no part of this increased value would go to individuals as such, nor give them advantage over others without land. Use would then be the basis of possession of land as it was under the common field system in England, and as it was in the early settlement of our frontier.

I believe we may agree with Woodrow Wilson that every social institution must abide by the issue of two questions, logically distinct but practically inseparable: "Is it expedient? Is it just? Let these questions once seriously take hold of public thought in any case," he said, "which may be made to seem simple and devoid of all confusing elements, and the issue cannot long remain in doubt."

The Single Tax, the freeing of the land, the freeing of men, as proposed by Henry George, is such an issue.

Land and Water in California

PERHAPS nothing in the public economy of California is more striking to the Eastern student of public affairs who has some of the Georgian slant to his philosophy, than its different methods of approach toward municipal and public improvements, and as well toward public utilities.

As to the initiation and conduct of public improvements there is little material difference from the Eastern method excepting that the property owner is not considered to the same extent as in the East in the initial steps. It is, however, in the assessment and collection for the cost of municipal and public improvements of a widespread character to which I wish to direct attention.

The Eastern student has been accustomed to the legal practice of municipalities paying for improvements of a general nature (sewerage systems, tunnels, etc.) out of the public treasury, very frequently financed by bond issues, which are a charge on the municipality as a whole. That the cost of any improvement affecting the welfare and serving the needs of a wide area such as a general sewerage system or a tunnel, whether abutting thereon directly or not, might be assessed against all the territory conceivably benefited thereby is wholly foreign to him.

True, there were some feeble attempts in some of the Eastern states many years ago, before public wealth and revenues had grown so great, to spread the cost of improving great highways by assessments against the area generally benefited, whether abutting or not. But when the courts held such assessments "unconstitutional" no further

attempts were made on roads or streets. A like attempt on general sewerage systems met with a like result.

From the East, having gravely discussed need of constitutional amendments to enable the cost of such general improvements to be spread over the entire area benefited rather than merely against the abutting frontage, an observer coming to California finds the "district benefit" assessment plan in full operation; and if at all interested, begins to look for authority therefor in the State Constitution, and he is somewhat staggered to find no reference to it at all.

When he first comes to Los Angeles he is amazed at the great number of concrete boulevards paralleling each other but a few blocks apart, and naturally the question arises as to how they are paid for. Knowing that current revenues could not be sufficient, he wonders if the city's bonding power limit has not been reached. Finally he learns that the cost of building boulevards and drainage systems is assessed solely on the real estate (not including improvements) in the general area presumably benefited thereby, and that the cost is not passed on through bond issues to become a burden on all kinds of property, including buildings and personality, which by no stretch of the imagination could be benefited.

COSTS NOT "PASSED ON"

When he comes to San Francisco he learns that the Twin Peaks Tunnel, costing more than \$4,000,000, was built, as I am advised, without practically any expense to the general public. Here again the cost was paid through the "district benefit" assessment plan—that is to say, the city ordinance authorizing the building of the tunnels prescribed a large area surrounding the Twin Peaks (describing it by metes and bounds) which it decreed should be assessed with the cost of the improvement. I am told that the assessments on the property at the ocean end were rather heavy when compared to the values prior to the improvement, but that improvement increased the original value many times. And where formerly were almost inaccessible waste lands we now have a very important and beautiful residential section.

Coming as I do from an Eastern city in a State where the courts have forbidden "district benefit" assessments as unconstitutional, the contrast in progress of public improvements has been strongly impressed on my mind. In my native State a large part of the county wherein was a great city was cut off from the city for the lack of a tunnel through a great hill, to bore through which was less difficult than through the Twin Peaks, and which would have opened up an enormously greater and more valuable area.

For more than fifty years such a tunnel had been agitated, and had it been possible to charge the cost thereof on that part of the county to be benefited, whether by the "district benefit" assessment plan or by bond issue, such cost could have been retired within a comparatively small

number of years through taxes arising from increased valuations alone. Lacking the power to pay the cost other than through bonds voted by the county at large, and that part of the county having a minority of voters, that district suffered a handicap in its development for more than half a century and the people of the city suffered from an unnecessary congestion—a nice word for "slums."

IRRIGATION

One of our beloved California philosophers never loses an opportunity to warn us that our Southern California civilization can expect to survive only if we conserve and develop its water supply; says that unless we do we will perish as did Babylon and Nineveh in their desert environment.

Should the State continue its water development as in the past, doubtless many of the youth of today will live to see a practically continuous city from Santa Barbara to the Mexican border. Much, if not a majority, of the irrigation works of California are publicly or collectively owned by quasi-municipal corporations called "irrigation districts."

Here again the Georgist rejoices when he reads in the California Code, under this head, that in assessing the irrigation districts to pay for the cost of construction and maintenance of such works, "IMPROVEMENTS ON LANDS OR TOWN LOTS WITHIN SUCH DISTRICT SHALL BE EXEMPT FROM TAXATION FOR ANY PURPOSES MENTIONED IN THIS ACT. * *

The term 'improvements' as used in this section include trees, vines, alfalfa, all growing crops and all buildings and structures of whatever class or description erected or being erected upon said land or city or town lots."

AS TO PUBLIC UTILITIES

To Henry George, public ownership of public utilities was an essential part of public welfare.

Due doubtless in part to the rapid influx of population in the North in the early days, and latterly in the southern part of the State, and doubtless in part to great arid areas, Californians have almost perforce acted collectively in the solution of their many problems. Much of the time, it is true, they have seemed to delight in presenting their money-making utilities to private capital and in keeping the other kind for the dear people. Especially is this latter true respect to the utilities requiring the long, expensive purchase with no prospect of quick return, such as the Hetch-Hetch water project in San Francisco and the Owens Valley aqueduct in Los Angeles. However, it is in the doing of these that the people have learned their power. This is peculiarly true of Los Angeles, as it seems to me.

Los Angeles, almost forced, as I have said, and led by far-sighted public spirited men, now owns its own harbor and the lands surrounding it, which are leased at the economic rental value and not sold. It supplies all the water and more than two-thirds of the electric current

consumed in the city, generated partly by its own water system and in part purchased.

Inspired largely, I believe, by the Boulder Dam project, it is now formulating a programme for electrical development astounding in proportions and far reaching in its economic consequences to the people of Southern California, if not to the entire country. May I say here that there is no question in my mind that the greatest enemies of California's welfare in the Boulder Dam project are California's representatives in the executive branch of the government at Washington.

That there may be no misunderstanding, let me say at the outset that all figures given are, of course, based upon arbitrary assumptions as to increase of population; an assumed continued cost of production as at present; a continued increase of consumption as maintained for some years past; also as to power received under the Boulder Dam contract, with its contingent factors of surplus power from Arizona and Nevada and from unconsumed secondary power from the metropolitan water district as well as divers other elements. However, the figures given are based upon present conditions, together with the best data obtainable and conscientious engineering studies. In other words, as expressed by one engineer, they constitute an "educated guess."

LOS ANGELES WATER ALONE

It is proposed that by the expenditure of less than \$200,000,000 Los Angeles will have completed by 1940 an aqueduct connected with the Boulder Dam three hundred miles distant, together with power transmission lines, three great pumping plants, each costing nearly \$6,000,000; reservoirs, etc., capable of delivering to the city 1,200 cubic feet of water per second (almost three times the city's present requirements), for the city's needs and irrigation along the line.

Other than interest charges amounting to about 2 mills taxation over the construction and low earning period of twenty years from 1930 to 1950, at which time tax payments cease, the entire cost would be paid by the revenues of the aqueduct derived from the sale of most of the water to the city consumers, beginning in 1940 at the highest rate, 7 cents per hundred cubic feet wholesale, and after 1950 the price systematically reduced year by year until 1980, and thereafter the price only 2 cents per hundred cubic feet wholesale. This Boulder Dam aqueduct is the only project herein mentioned which contemplates any taxation whatever.

At the end of the government Boulder Dam fifty-year contract period the city will have its aqueduct water system complete and fully maintained without a penny of debt and an accumulated surplus of \$128,346,000, applicable to rate reduction or to further extension and improvements if desired.

LOS ANGELES POWER AND LIGHT

Today Los Angeles consumes 1,100,000,000 kilowatt

hours of electric current a year, of which the City's Bureau of Power and Light delivers to its customers 765,000,000 kilowatt hours. The remainder, some 320,000,000 kilowatt hours, is delivered by a private corporation, the Los Angeles Gas and Electric Company. The city buys from the Southern California Edison the current which the city does not generate itself. The city current is generated mostly from the power plants located on the aqueduct, which pump the water from Owens Valley, more than two hundred miles away.

The existing system has a bonded indebtedness of \$40,000,000, which will be completely retired by 1976. By 1990 it will have a plant representing \$410,500,000 accumulated invested capital, clear of all debt, in addition to the \$70,000,000 capital investment now existing. And it will have an accumulated surplus of more than \$415,000,000 applicable to rate reduction if so desired.

(Note: The 1990 date is used, that being the end of the government Boulder Dam contract.)

The introduction of the Boulder Dam current purchased from the government at 1.63 mills per kilowatt as proposed, to begin in 1940, will modify the existing system by adding some \$28,000,000 of bonded indebtedness, which will be retired by 1979, and will give the city in 1990 a plant clear of all debt, representing an accumulated capital investment of more than \$438,000,000 and an accumulated surplus of more than \$637,000,000 applicable to reduction in rates; or a clear gain of more than \$222,000,000 on a capital investment of \$28,000,000.

No nation can survive half slave, half free, nor can any city continue to prosper in freedom with a large part of its people subject to private utilities, with their never-ending debt systems, their excessive rates and, worse still, their corrupting influence on official and professional life. The City of Los Angeles therefore proposes to acquire the Los Angeles Gas and Electric System, which supplies about 40 per cent. of the city's electric service. Such acquisition would require from the city a bonded indebtedness of some \$53,000,000, which, together with all other city power indebtedness, would be retired by 1970 out of the revenues of the city's power system. No figures given contemplate any taxation. By 1990 this would give the city a plant clear of debt, representing an accumulated capital investment of \$744,000,000 and an accumulated surplus of \$1,651,740,000 available for rate reduction, a clear gain to the city of more than \$1,014,558,000 over the fifty-year period, or an average of more than \$20,000,000 a year.

OWN STEAM

Once having acquired control of the entire distribution of the city's electric service (other than street railway), the next step is to generate in its own steam plants all the current not generated in its water-power plants. This can be done at a cost of 4.8 mills per kilowatt as against

7.6 mills per kilowatt now being paid by the city to the Southern California Edison.

This installation of its own steam plants would require bonded indebtedness of some \$62,800,000, which, together with all other city power indebtedness, would be retired by 1970 out of the revenue of the city's power system alone.

This would give Los Angeles at the end of the Boulder Dam contract in 1990 a plant clear of all indebtedness, representing an accumulated capital investment of \$903,000,000, in addition to the present \$70,000,000 capital investment, and an accumulated surplus of \$2,215,000,000 available for rate reduction, a clear gain to the city of \$1,577,801,000, which, spread over the fifty-year period, means an average annual saving of more than \$31,556,000 to the city's consumers.

Verily, a kingdom well worth fighting for, buying elections for and, if need be, corrupting the government at Washington.

I trust I have not wearied your readers with too great a volume of figures. If, however I have aroused your interest in the gravity of the struggle for control of great economic welfare of our people I have accomplished my purpose.

GEORGE J. SHAFFER.

What Is the Matter With the World?

IN view of the hard times now upon us, the vast amount of suffering that the people are enduring, the question must come to serious-minded people, What is the matter? What has broken down? Has nature failed us? Have her processes gone askew? Must something be realigned, or an entirely new order established to avoid, in the future, tragic days like these?

Production is a very simple matter, nothing complex or intricate about it, and distribution is just as simple. What are the factors of production? Are they not land, labor and capital, and are not the avenues of distribution rent, wages and interest?

There seems to be plenty of land, for look whichever way you will there is no shrinkage in the size of Mother Earth, and the forces of nature work as they have always worked, with marvelous regularity and surety. When you study the land situation a little, you are amazed at the amount of land provided for the maintenance of land animals, namely men. We could put the whole population of the earth in the State of Texas and there would be not ten to the acre.

In view of the plenitude of land and the scarcity of human beings, it seems as though the cheapest thing on earth should be land, there is so much of it and so few of us. If there were as many idle Packard cars as there are idle lots in New York City, the tramps on the Bowery would be able to drive a limousine to breakfast.

There is plenty of labor, goodness knows, for the streets

are filled with idle men, the roads with tramps, and everywhere the cry of unemployment rises to high heaven.

There certainly is no dearth of capital, the rate of interest is going down, and owners of capital are just as busy looking for employment for their capital as laborers are looking for employment for their hands.

As there is plenty of capital, plenty of labor and apparently plenty of land, and all wealth is produced by these factors, what is the matter? Why has production ceased to the alarming extent that it has of late?

The cause of the trouble is that while there is natural plenty of land, there is an artificial scarcity of land, for wherever you go the selling price is so high that even in Arizona if you want to buy enough land to bury a snail you pay a king's ransom. On this Manhattan Island ours there is land that can be sold for \$40,000,000 an acre and an acre is not a great estate, it is only a little piece of ground about 200x204, and remember there is no production cost in it. Today, however, it has a selling price that is simply staggering, for this selling price of \$40,000,000 means that labor and capital would have to pay, in 5 per cent. money market such as ours is, at least \$2,000,000 a year for the privilege of using this bit of material that nature made and for which nature makes no charge.

Now we are trampling right on the heels of the cause of hard times, the frightfully high price that labor and capital must pay for the use of that material without which there is no production of wealth, for notwithstanding the great increase in the productivity of labor and capital in the day, there is a limit to what labor and capital can pay for the privilege of using a piece of the earth.

Combined with the very high price of land, another evil overwhelms production, and that is the heavy burden of taxes borne by industry in a hundred different ways. All taxes upon industry increase the cost of production and limit the amount of labor and capital that can be used in production.

Taxes that fall upon production increase the cost of living and they have been so burdensome of late that they tremendously limit the purchasing power of the people's dollar.

Between the upper and the nether millstones, the high price of land and the high cost of labor products, production is brought to a standstill, not through any fault of nature but through lack of wisdom on the part of man. This lack of wisdom is shown in our stupid way of handling the taxing power. We could adjust taxation in such a way that it would keep the selling price of land down, keep the gate of opportunity open and lower the cost of everything made by man, thus creating a natural relationship between the value of the opportunity to produce wealth and the value of the things that labor and capital produce.

The only and scientific way of doing this is to collect for public use the values that society creates and leave untaxed, unburdened and unhampered all those values that represent the things that men make.

JAMES R. BROWN

Lecture Work of Anna George de Mille

YOU have asked me to tell you of my recent lecturing experiences in the colleges.

They are not only encouraging but inspiring.

I went into the thing with fear and trembling—quite scared, in fact, of the scholastic atmosphere; but it proved so pleasant that I am happy in it.

I have only been at work a few weeks. I had become almost desperate over the unemployment situation. It seemed to me that we Single Taxers should be shouting from the housetops, and yet we are apparently doing little to make the great masses of groping, fumbling humans see the way out of this evil economic muddle. I felt as though I'd have to climb on an apple box and shriek to the multitude our solution of this problem. Instead, I offered my services to the Schalkenbach Foundation, and accordingly Mr. Walter Fairchild and Miss Antoinette Kaufmann arranged with Prof. Broadus Mitchell, of Johns Hopkins; Professors S. C. Mitchell and H. H. Seay, of the University of Richmond, and Prof. A. G. Taylor, of the College of William and Mary, for me to talk to their classes in economics.

The following week at Columbia University I spoke to the classes of Dr. George S. Mitchell and Dr. A. F. Cutler.

Later I went back to Baltimore, where, under the auspices of the Dean, Dr. Elinor Pancoast, I talked to her groups; following next day at Rutgers, where I was sponsored by Dr. Thos. W. Holland. I am booked by Prof. Raymond C. Moley to speak on March 31st, at Barnard, to some ninety-five students.

I lecture for at least fifty minutes and sometimes as long as an hour and a quarter. I give straight, unadulterated Single Tax. If they ask it, I give a brief biographical sketch of Henry George, but always I give his message first, for that is as he would have it.

Everywhere I have been the professors have been more than courteous; they have been graciously hospitable, usually doing the honors of their campus. Their interest in my subject is intensely gratifying to me. And the students, too, seem interested. Out of the nearly six hundred I have talked to—as far as I could perceive (and having been a mother for some years I possess a roving and far-seeing eye)—only one youth consistently drew pictures in his note book and only one smirked and squirmed, and only two went to sleep. Rather a fine record when one considers how weary the poor children must get, being, as the old lady said, “teached and torched” all day long!

The most complimentary audience of all was the one at the University of Richmond. My lecture was held at the noon hour and the attendance was not compulsory, yet so many students crowded into the big room that seats gave out, boys perched on window sills and stood along

the sides of the long walls, and some twenty in the corridor, where no supervising, professorial glance could reach them, stood through my hour's talk. They could so easily have cut and run. I do not know whether to attribute this attention on their part to Southern chivalry or to a real interest in our cause. I prefer to think the latter.

Certainly it is gratifying to know that the young idea is “getting on the job,” and I am more than ever enthused over the prize essay contest scheme. It costs \$200 to hold a contest in a college, and it means that from twenty to perhaps more than a hundred students, as the case may be, are actively striving to understand this philosophy and economic reform of ours—*striving to understand it well enough to write about it*. I wish I knew some way of enthusing Single Taxers to donate funds to the Annie C. George Prize Essay Fund—to help in this great work. Certainly doubters would see the far-reaching effect of it if they had but a little of my recent experience with the college student.

Certainly they would feel, as I now do, more optimistic concerning the future of these our United States.

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE.

The Work of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

SOMETIMES extracts from correspondence express more clearly than long recitals of “activities” just what progress is being made in gaining the attention of newcomers and reviving the interest of old-time friends in the life and writings of Henry George.

The following are brief extracts from a few of the many letters that pass daily across our desk. Each letter is given careful attention, assortments of literature are made up to suit the individual circumstances, and the interest aroused is fostered by appropriate “follow-ups” from time to time:

Severance Union Medical College, Korea:—“Gentlemen: I have noticed in a recent number of the *Literary Digest* that you are handling Henry George's books. I have probably the best collection in Korea of the works of Henry George and other Single Taxers, and am doing everything I can to propagate these ideas.

“At present I have a group of Korean doctors who meet weekly to study English, and this would be a good opportunity to combine the teaching of English and the dissemination of land value philosophy.”

Marietta Johnson, Fairhope:—“The ‘Social Problems’ have come, and our senior class, numbering about twenty pupils, began reading the book last week. The students are all seventeen or eighteen years of age, and I am having the time of my life reading ‘Social Problems’ with them. I am delighted to have the opportunity because I am anxious that all of our graduates shall have as full an under-

standing as possible, when they leave our school, of the theory on which this town is founded."

Mexico City:—"Please send me some literature on the most important subject of the Single Tax, as I am much interested in that question and desire to have all that you can send me in order to translate same and have it published in some of our papers, as the time is getting ripe for that work."

J. D. E., Hampden Sydney College, Virginia:—"Your letter of the 14th with enclosures has been read with interest. I am forwarding to my son the little circular on 'Causes of Business Depression.' He is now taking Economics at the University of Virginia. I am glad to know there is a decided revival of interest in the teachings of Henry George. It is high time."

E. T. B., Clinton, Iowa:—"Your booklets duly received. The writer first heard of Henry George years ago when a small boy from his father, who had one of the early paper bound copies of 'Progress and Poverty,' and who told about the dramatic campaign of Mr. George for Mayor in New York City. Later on at various times in the university I heard of the Single Tax and other subjects closely connected with Mr. George, but heretofore have not read his books or his life. I enclose check, for which please send the following books published by your Foundation. * * * I find time, aside from the practice of law, to teach two classes of persons engaged in banking in legal courses. They have had five years or more banking experience, and they are a fine, intelligent group of persons. If you care to forward me any copies of the small booklets on Henry George I would be glad to distribute them to these people and would gladly urge that they read them and learn about Henry George."

Dr. Carlo Pagni, editor *Industria Lombarda*, Milan, Italy:—"I have pleasure in informing you that a complete review of 'Progress and Poverty' will be published in the *Giornale degli Economisti*, the foremost Italian economic review. I will welcome 'The Life of Henry George' as well as other publications of yours and will announce them in my paper and in other reviews."

Professor Wm. T. Beadles, Illinois Wesleyan University:—"Yes, indeed, I am deeply interested in the work of your Foundation and have been for several years. Your publication 'Significant Paragraphs' is to my mind an admirable contribution. Each year it forms part of the required reading for all students in my principles of economics classes."

J. P., De Land, Florida:—"This is to let you know that the 'Life of Henry George,' copy of the 'Libertarian' and various pamphlets were received today. Please accept my sincere appreciation of both the books and the information, and you may be sure that the books will be placed in the Stetson University Library after they have served their purpose."

"I am scheduled to give several lectures on the life and works of Henry George to our political economy class."

Secretary for Col. Arthur Woods, Chairman President's Emergency Committee for Unemployment:—"Colonel Woods has asked me to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of February 4th, and to express to you his appreciation of your offer to send him the unabridged 'Progress and Poverty' by Henry George, which he would be glad to have. The copy of 'Significant Paragraphs,' ordered, was received today."

During the past year we have had an interesting number of requests for information about the life and work of Henry George from students who are assigned the subject in their economic courses.

Since last November some 650 books have been sold to schools and colleges for classroom use, indicating an increasing receptivity on the part of the professors and instructors for the books of Henry George.

About 100 high school teachers and superintendents of schools have ordered the book "Significant Paragraphs" as well as other books available from the Foundation, and it is likely that, having had this first contact with the ideas of Henry George, they will continue to be interested and may possibly spread in their respective communities a knowledge of his writings.

ANTOINETTE KAUFMANN, Secretary.

Brazil Takes a Step Forward

THE following cablegram has just been received at the Manhattan Single Tax Club headquarters:

"Provisional government of Sao Paulo, Brazil, has established taxation 2 per cent. on land value for state and capital. Congratulations.—Confederacion Georgista Argentina; President, Doctor Besio Moreno; Secretario, Juan B. Bellagamba."

On this decree the *New York Times* of March 8 comments as follows:

"Joao Alberto, President of the State of Sao Paulo, Brazil, this week signed a decree removing the State exports tax and substituting a land and property tax as the State source of income. His decree relieves the coffee growers of the State of a financial burden and distributes taxes more evenly. Coffee growers and the press are lauding the decree as an important step forward."

IN a little while all nations will have tariff walls, and then they can all get rich by charging themselves too much.

—*Everett Herald*.

BUDDING Political Economist: "Dad, what's the difference between a scientific and an unscientific tariff?"

Protected Manufacturer: "Well, my boy, you see a scientific tariff is a tariff which enables me to charge more for my goods than they are worth; an unscientific tariff is one which enables the other fellow to charge more for his goods than they are worth."

—Sidney, Australia, *Standard*.

Louis Jacobs Passes On

THE death of Louis P. Jacobs at Palm Springs, California, where he had gone in search of health after an illness of several months, is a serious loss to the English movement as well as to his many friends the world over. He was accompanied by his son on his trip to the Coast and appeared to be much benefited by the change. But he suffered a relapse and passed away March 8, suddenly, at the age of 67. His body was cremated and the ashes are now on the way to England. He is survived by his widow and five children, now living at home, England.

Mr. Jacobs first became acquainted with the philosophy of Henry George through Max Hirsch, a close friend of his, through whom he met our great philosopher. He read "Progress and Poverty" in the early part of this century, hereafter devoting all his spare time to spreading the Gospel.

After his retirement as managing director of the British American Tobacco Company (located in Australia), Mr. Jacobs moved to London, becoming actively interested in the cause. A few years ago he established a fund to organize the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, which is making rapid strides in the printing and circulating of the writings of Henry George.

Mr. Jacobs was much interested in Judaic as well as international economic problems; is the author of "Social Justice and the Jew;" was active in the Fourth International Conference held at Edinburgh in 1929 sponsored by the International Union for the Taxation of Land Values and Free Trade.

We had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Jacobs on two occasions during his visits to this country. An outstanding feature of his personality was a gentle dignity. His devotion to the cause he had espoused found expression in generous gifts to agencies organized to carry on the work. He had many correspondents among his co-religionists and fellow Single Taxers in Great Britain and the United States, and he had friends everywhere who will long cherish the memory of his fine and modest spirit and hopeful example.

Charles O'Connor Hennessy, President of the Schalkenbach Foundation, has sent the following cable to John Paul concerning our departed friend:

"The passing of Louis Jacobs was a saddening shock to me, as it must have been to many in widely scattered communities throughout the world who enjoyed the rich privilege of his personal friendship, or shared his devoted and unselfish labors for better human relationships. My own sorrow is made more poignant by recent personal association with him. The last message in his handwriting, received but a few weeks ago, was cheery and hopeful of returning health.

"A noble representative of a great race, Louis Jacobs

was a truly good and kindly man; a brother and lover of all human kind and hater of all injustice.

"A believer in mankind's regeneration, he gave freely of himself and his substance that dreams of a higher and happier humanity might be made into reality. His example as well as his good deeds must some day bear fruit abundantly.

"Upon you and your associates with whom we believe he had peculiarly intimate and affectionate relations, we know a great blow has fallen. But we feel that he would wish you to rally, close up your ranks again, and go forward in the great fight that seems to await the Henry George men and women of your country. On behalf of many friends, I beg to convey to the stricken family a respectful assurance of the sympathy and condolence of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation and the followers of Henry George in the United States."

National Conference to Meet October 12th-14th

THE dates of October 12th-14th have now been definitely fixed for the Sixth Annual Henry George Congress. While it has always been customary heretofore to hold the Congress some time in the month of September, it has been suggested that October is an ideal month for a convention in Baltimore on account of the delightful weather conditions that then prevail, whereas the summer heat ordinarily continues well into the month of September. The convention will open on Columbus Day, which, being a legal holiday, though not one so much given over to recreation, may enable a goodly number to absent themselves from their places of business with less sacrifice.

Charles G. Baldwin, President of the Maryland Tax Reform Association, has been appointed Chairman of the Convention Committee and is cooperating heartily in plans for a successful convention which is expected to attract larger numbers from the Eastern section than any previous convention held under the auspices of the Henry George Foundation. The fact that last year's convention was held on the Pacific Coast prevented many active workers in the East from participating, and after a lapse of two years since the Pittsburgh convention, it is natural to anticipate an especially keen interest in the gathering at Baltimore this fall. The Congress, however, being a national affair, is in no sense intended exclusively for the East, and now that Georgists on the Pacific Coast as well as in the great Middle West have come in closer contact with the Foundation and have participated in one or more sessions of the Henry George Congress, it is hoped that the Baltimore convention will be more truly representative of the various sections than any of its predecessors.

Secretary Williams of the Henry George Foundation recently visited Baltimore to look over the situation there and confer with Single Taxers in that vicinity, and met

with a very cordial welcome. Maryland is one of the few states in the Union which has throughout a period of many years maintained an active state association for the advancement of land value taxation, and important forward steps have been achieved in Maryland from time to time under the early leadership of Jackson H. Ralston, and also in more recent times under the guiding hand of his worthy successors in the movement. For many years, Charles J. Ogle has been actively engaged as Secretary of the Association and has kept a close watch upon all matters of legislation of interest to Single Taxers. All of the officers of the Maryland Tax Reform Association, including Samuel Danziger, its Assistant Secretary, are prepared to exert their best efforts with a view to making the Congress a highly profitable as well as an enjoyable occasion.

The Lord Baltimore Hotel, the city's finest convention hotel, erected two years ago, has been secured as the official headquarters of the Henry George Congress. As an added inducement for all delegates to make the Lord Baltimore their home during the convention sessions, special rates have been given the Henry George Foundation, which are as reasonable as those offered by any modern hotel in the city.

While programme-making and other convention details are not being allowed to engross the attention of the Foundation officers thus early, assurances have already been received of the participation of a number of prominent speakers and a programme of a high order this year is a reasonable certainty.

Lecture Tour of Percy R. Williams

DURING March, Percy R. Williams, Secretary of the Henry George Foundation, made an extended tour through Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland and New Jersey. One of the largest and most interesting meetings was that of the Northeast Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, which is displaying a keen interest in land value taxation and improved methods of real estate assessment, a matter in which the great city of Philadelphia has been lagging sadly behind. Mr. Williams's address to this organization was one of a series of three recently carried out, Lawson Purdy, former President of the Tax Commission of New York City, being the first speaker in the series. The meeting received considerable publicity, and the discussion following the address indicated a keen and friendly interest in the lessons to be learned from Pittsburgh's policy of concentrating the principal burden of taxation upon the land values rather than upon improvements or personal property.

In Wilmington, Delaware, where Frank T. Stirlith is pushing vigorously forward with a promising legislative campaign, Mr. Williams addressed the Real Estate Board, and the realtors in that community displayed such a deep

and friendly interest that the discussion period lasted fully an hour. The same evening the speaker addressed a radio audience over Station WDEL on "Taxation and Prosperity." In New Jersey, the organization operating under the name of Industrial Tax Relief, Inc., had arranged evening meetings in Elizabeth, Paterson and Newark. Charles H. Ingersoll, President of the New Jersey organization, presided at each of these meetings, which were attended by representative audiences consisting largely of business and professional men, and public officials, though organized labor was represented at the Elizabeth meeting by a prominent spokesman who is working consistently and actively to promote the idea of land value taxation among labor groups in that state. Alfred N. Chandler, the active executive officer of Industrial Tax Relief, Inc., who has been carrying on a valiant fight and doing very efficient work for more than fifteen years, spoke at each of the three meetings and was ably supported by James F. Morton at the Paterson meeting, by John F. Allen at Newark, and by L. R. Bonta at Elizabeth.

The New Jersey workers are striving very earnestly to secure the enactment of a measure drafted by Attorney George L. Record, of Jersey City, which would permit an taxing district within the state to completely exempt improvements and personal property and place the entire local tax burden upon land values. The bill, presented at the present session of the Legislature, provides that when this option is exercised the process of shifting shall be accomplished by gradual steps within five years. The New Jersey leaders have made very effective use of Pittsburgh's successful experience with land value taxation and at each of these meetings Mr. Williams told the story of the Pittsburgh plan and explained how this unique and somewhat radical idea had steadily grown in the esteem of the business element as well as maintaining consistent the whole-hearted support of public officials, newspaper editors, civic clubs and labor organizations and the unit building and loan associations representing, the large organized body of home owners.

In Philadelphia, Mr. Williams attended an informal Single Tax dinner at the Venture Cafe, at which he reported concerning activities and plans of the Henry George Foundation. Among others participating actively in the discussion at this meeting were Frank Stephens, of Ardmore, Delaware, and Harold Sudell, Robert C. Macauley, and Francis I. duPont of Philadelphia. A brief visit to Washington was also made for purpose of conference with prominent Single Taxers there, including Harry W. Oliver and Will Atkinson. In New York City he conferred with Joseph Dana Miller, Frederick C. Leubuscher and Edward Polak concerning various phases of the work in which they were particularly interested. Mr. Polak is giving earnest study to the question of the feasibility of erecting in the near future a Henry George Memorial Building, either in New York City or in Washington, the seat of the national government, and will be glad to have any practical suggestions.

gestions that might be helpful in working out this undertaking on a sound business basis.

Prominent public officials of Pittsburgh have recently been enlisted for special lecture service, marking another forward step. Hon. Wm. Y. English, now Chairman of the Finance Committee of Pittsburgh City Council, addressed the Wilmington Chamber of Commerce and paid a glowing tribute to the Pittsburgh tax plan. During April Chief Assessor Thomas C. McMahon, of Pittsburgh, will speak in Cumberland, Md., before a meeting of the City Council of that city, which is showing a very keen interest in the Pittsburgh idea. Both Councilman English and Assessor McMahon take pride in the fact that they were among the earliest advocates of the graded tax plan, as co-workers with former Mayor William A. Magee, its chief official sponsor. Mr. English has been a member of the City Council during the entire period of seventeen years that the graded tax plan has been in effect, while Mr. McMahon is now serving his third term as Chief Assessor and his fifth term as a member of the Board of Assessors.

Letter Carriers, Attention!

THE following letters from M. J. Finnan and Edward J. Gainor, respectively secretary and president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, are of interest. This association, affiliated with the A. F. of L., has more than 50,000 members. We commend what these officials have to say to the letter carriers of the country:

"I appreciate very much your courtesy in enclosing the pamphlet by Henry George on 'The Causes of Business Depression.' The philosophy regarding business depression enunciated by George is well worth heeding by the economists of the present day, many of whom express their views as to the causes of the present depression. The greater portion of them seem to be running around in a circle. The present depression will pass on as have preceding depressions, but the unfortunate part is that the poor, who are least able to bear the burden, are the sufferers."
—M. J. FINNAN."

"In reference to Henry George's philosophy regarding the inflation of land values as a moving cause for business depression, I feel that while this is not the entire answer, it is charged to the hilt with merit. Moreover, it is a phenomenon, apparently inseparable from these business collapses. No one can address himself to their correction without an understanding of the Single Tax point of view. I esteem you for your firmness in the faith."

—EDWARD J. GAINOR."

Wendel Wealth and Poverty

THE following editorial which appeared in the *New York World-Telegram*, one of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, is especially commended to Robert P. Scripps, whose special article, "Land Hunger No Longer a Domi-

nant Factor," is treated on another page in Comment and Reflection.

"Buy land; never sell." That was the Wendel motto. Piece by piece, plot by plot the acres multiplied—always in the richest area, among the most fabulously increasing land values in the whole Western Hemisphere. And so the millions grew. Tenants might improve the property if they would. But not the Wendels. Theirs but to hold fast—grim, inactive, unyielding—while the great city, year after year, pushed ahead with its own vast developments, piling million after million upon the value of Wendel land, though no Wendel lifted a finger. Shades of Henry George! What ammunition for the Single Taxers in their war on unearned increment!

"And so the millions grew. Narrowed lives, starved lives, cruel clamps upon normal human loves and ambitions in the old Wendel mansion. Iron domination of a brother's will until one sister after another submitted, escaped or died. But always the mounting millions. And at last nothing left but a lonely old woman in the battered house on one of Fifth Avenue's busiest corners, with her old-fashioned stable and her \$1,000,000 dog-run, living as one of the city's curiosities until death took her.

"Will the millions, spread out among other lives, let loose at last some of the human comfort and happiness that seems to have meant so little in the Wendel calculations? Will Providence, in its mysterious ways, work out some compensation?"

Baldwin's Budding "Difficulty"

"THE first step that we shall have to take when we come in will be, as quickly as legislation can effect it, an emergency tariff on manufactured goods. One of my difficulties, one of the difficulties of any leader of our party, is to interpret this to very different parts of England."

We should say so! Joseph Chamberlain encountered that same "difficulty" when he advocated a tax on imported leather amid the applause of the tanners of Bermondsey; and had to explain that away before the boot manufacturers of Northampton. But the attempt, if repeated, should develop some expert liars!

—Commonweal, London, England.

The Moon Will Fall Down

THIS is the latest piece of information from Sir J. Jeans. One day, he says, the moon will crash into the earth. Millions of fragments will then surround the globe like Saturn's. It will be moonlight all night.

If any of those fragments should come within reach of earth, some landlord's grasp will close over them, and up will go the price of moonlight!

—Commonweal, London, England.

Report of Lectures of James R. Brown

FROM FEBRUARY 1 TO MARCH 10

THIS interesting report of the lecture work of James R. Brown during the period indicated is an inspiring record of the increasing hospitality to the Message everywhere manifested, but nowhere so signally exhibited as in the many meetings addressed by our lecturer:

Feb. 1—Baltimore, Md.; open forum meeting at 3 P. M. in theatre; 500 present. The title of lecture was "The City Beautiful." This subject held the interest of the people from start to finish. At the end an old man got up in the front row, held up his hands in pleading fashion, and said, "Mister, where can I learn more about this City Beautiful?" "The City Beautiful" was an outline and word picture of what the Single Tax would do in removing ugliness, physical, mental and spiritual, that so predominates in our modern city. It was touching the way this man acted; he was so earnest, as though it were a city of his dreamland and this was the nearest he ever came to it. After the meeting was over a large amount of literature, books and tracts was sold at the door, much to the encouragement of our good Single Taxers.

Baltimore, Md.; Cosmopolitan Community Church (colored), 8 P. M. Here was a splendid audience of earnest souls, about 500 in number, presided over by an earnest and cultured man by the name of Frederick Douglass. They were attentive, appreciative, and one thing I enjoyed very much was the singing by their very capable and well-trained choir.

Feb. 2—Baltimore, Md.; Robert Beach School for Girls, 8:30 A. M. A bright, attractive group of about fifty girls. I have spoken regularly for a number of years at this school and I enjoy my visits there. The members of the faculty are kind and interested.

Towson, Md.; State Normal College, 11:30 A. M. This college has been presided over for a number of years by a talented lady, Miss Lida Lee Tall. I spoke to the assembly, numbering 600, and the faculty was in attendance. The point we tried to press home to the embryonic teachers was that when they get to schools and wish a salary increase—a proper and a natural thing—they are met by the Mayor and praised and flattered and told that they work hard and get little money and they ought to have more money, but the Mayor will tell them "We have no money." Then it is up to them to point out that the selling price of land is that part of social service value largely created by our educational system, that is uncollected by taxation, capitalized; and the City of Baltimore has at least \$30,000,000 a year of uncollected social service values, and to collect a part of this for school purposes would be but giving back to the schools a part of the value the schools create.

Baltimore, Md.; City Council, 4 P. M.; a gathering of about fifty. This session lasted an hour. We feel it was profitable; attention could not have been better nor interest keener, and we were treated with utmost kindness and courtesy, following by a hearty invitation to come again and go on with the argument.

Baltimore, Md.; radio talk over Station WCBM, 7 P. M. The title of this talk was "Man's Greatest Blunder." Briefly, we tried to point out that the assuming that private property is the measure of public service is a most disastrous blunder.

Feb. 3—Baltimore, Md.; Strayer-Bryant and Stratton Business College, 11:40 A. M. This address was delivered to the law students, some ninety students present. Very enjoyable and we believe very profitable. This is one of the places we visit regularly in our tours of Maryland.

Baltimore, Md.; Johns Hopkins University, class of Prof. Broadus Mitchell, 8 P. M. until 9:30. About 100 students of a very earnest type. This is another of our regular calling places.

Feb. 4—Catonsville, Md.; High School at 9 A. M.; 500 students.

Dr. Pullen, principal of the High School, has a great interest in our philosophy and is always anxious for the students to learn more of this important subject.

Annapolis, Md.; A Senate committee of the Legislature, appointed to look up new sources of revenue. We had very little time on this occasion, but think we made good use of it by pointing out a source of revenue that most of the legislators had never thought of, utterly ignorant of the fact that this source is the natural source of public revenue. Quite an interest was stirred up in our proposition, evidenced by the reception of letters from members of the committee who had their interest awakened.

Feb. 5—Washington, D. C.; Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service, Class in Economics, from 10 to 11 A. M.; some sixty present. Friendly and receptive in the department presided over by Dean Notz.

Feb. 6—Washington, D. C.; Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service; a group of about thirty seminar students. This session lasted two hours, from 5 to 7 P. M. It was interesting because in this group there were representatives from almost all over the world, who were then on the point of leaving for their respective countries, including China, Japan, Germany, South America, Canada and other places.

Feb. 11—Taunton, Mass.; Kiwanis Club; some fifty-three present; subject, "Hard Times: the Cause and Cure." We had the pleasure of having for our guest at this meeting two of our good fellows from Fall River, Doctors Padelford and McCann. It was a most enjoyable meeting.

East Weymouth, Mass.; Men's Club of the Davis Bates Clapp Memorial Association, 6:30 P. M. This was a banquet; fifty-five splendid men sat down. The topic was, "Foolish Things That Wise Men Do." A very satisfactory meeting.

Feb. 15—Whitford Lodge, Pa.; open forum, 4:30 P. M. Our good friend John W. Herring was in town, and he drove me in his car for this engagement. Whitford Lodge is the home of county welfare work of Chester County, Pa., and is just a few miles outside the City of West Chester. Mr. Herring is director. The audience, about thirty in number, was made up of neighborhood folks interested in county welfare work. This group, while small, was interested and influential. We had the pleasure of the company of our friends R. Louis Lloyd and Harold Sudell.

Whitford Lodge; 6 P. M. There was a dinner, attended by some twenty-five people of the same type as at the 4:30 meeting, and all were much interested.

Feb. 16—West Chester, Pa.; Teachers College. Class in economics at 8 A. M.; class in economics at 9 A. M. Fifty students in each class. Whitford Lodge; 6 P. M.; another dinner group of twenty.

Feb. 17—Rochester, Pa.; Senior High School and faculty, 8:40 A. M. Mr. Denton M. Albright, superintendent of schools of that city, arranged this meeting.

Rochester, Pa., Mr. Albright called together all the school teachers at 4 P. M., fifty-nine in number, and I addressed them on the Single Tax.

Rochester, Pa.; Rotary Club, 6 P. M.; fifty-eight in attendance. All of these meetings were presided over by Mr. Albright. I first met Mr. Albright in 1925 when he was the principal of the High School in Kittanning, Pa., and I spoke there to the Rotary Club, the Kiwanis Club and at the High School. In 1926 he accepted the superintendency of the schools in Rochester. He is interested in our proposition and an intelligent worker for it. It was, of course, a pleasure to renew his acquaintance.

Feb. 18—Cincinnati, O.; University of Cincinnati, 9:30 A. M. students in economics; fifty in attendance. Dean William W. Hewett under whose direction I spoke last year at the same university, presided.

Cincinnati, O.; Lions' Club, at noon; a splendid group of alert citizens, eighty in number. At this meeting we had the pleasure of the

company of John J. Gordon, an ardent Single Taxer, more than eighty years of age, whom I had last met thirty-four years ago. He came to this Lions' Club meeting and wanted to know if he could hear the speaker. They, of course, treated him kindly, gave him a seat and refused to let him pay for his dinner, and after the dinner he came up and spoke to me. He was very much astonished when I called him by name. I invited him to come also to the Rotary Club meeting, and they, too, were very kind to him; met him at the door and gave him a seat at the speakers' table and entertained him royally.

Feb. 19—Cincinnati, O.; Rotary Club, at noon; 300 in attendance. We had the pleasure at this dinner of the company of our good friends Fenton Lawson, John J. Gordon, E. G. Merrell and E. F. Alexander, of the City Solicitor's office.

Feb. 20—Evanston, Ill.; Northwestern University; an interesting class in the School of Commerce; about fifty present.

Chicago, Ill.; Liberal Club at Chicago University, 4:30 P. M. A group of about fifteen but interesting.

Chicago, Ill.; Single Tax Club at 6:30 same evening; dinner, with seventy-four present. It was a pleasure to meet with our good Single Tax friends of Chicago. There were some present not Single Taxers, and that gave me an excuse for explaining what is meant by the Single Tax, and at the same time took occasion to talk about the Single Tax movement to Single Taxers.

Feb. 22—Chicago, Ill.; radio talk for the Federation of Labor, 3:30 P. M.

Feb. 23—Peoria, Ill.; Advertising and Selling Club at noon; a fine group of interested men, some fifty-five in number.

Bloomington, Ill.; Wesleyan University, 7 P. M.; student body, about 200 present.

Feb. 24—Bloomington, Ill.; Wesleyan University. Class in the Economics Department, 8 A. M., forty present; class in the Economics Department, 9 A. M., sixty present; general assembly, 10 o'clock, 500 students.

Bloomington, Ill.; Young Men's Club, 12:15 same day. A civic luncheon club; a nice group of live men, eighty-five in number.

Bloomington, Ill.; Tau Kappa Epsilon Fraternity of Wesleyan University; dinner at 7 P. M.

The lectures at Bloomington were arranged for by Prof. William T. Beadles, of the Department of Economics of Wesleyan University, with the assistance of the Dean. Prof. Beadles got in touch with us through our good friend Prof. Taylor of the College of William and Mary.

Feb. 25—St. Louis, Mo.; Scottish Rites Club at noon; 145 men.

Feb. 26—St. Louis, Mo.; Washington University, 9 A. M., for Prof. Joseph M. Klamon's class. Prof. Klamon is an ardent, outspoken Single Taxer, whom I first met at William and Mary, and a man of great capacity of mind and heart. Forty-two present in this class.

St. Louis, Mo.; Rotary Club, at noon; 425 at a luncheon; splendid meeting from every angle.

St. Louis, Mo.; Y. M. H. A. and Junior Chamber of Commerce, 3 P. M.; 100 present. Very satisfactory meeting.

Feb. 27—St. Louis, Mo.; Washington University, 11 A. M.; Prof. Klamon's class, 120 students.

St. Louis, Mo.; Single Tax League of Missouri in the Public Library, 1 P. M.; a small group of earnest thinkers.

Feb. 28—St. Louis, Mo.; Washington University; another of Prof. Klamon's classes, 11:30 A. M.; sixty present.

March 2—St. Louis, Mo.; Washington University; group of classes; 80 students, 8 A. M.

St. Louis, Mo.; Teachers College, 11 A. M.; class in economics, 200 students.

St. Louis, Mo.; Teachers College, 12 noon; class in economics, 200 students.

St. Louis, Mo.; Washington University, 7:45 P. M.; a research group of members of the faculty; subject of discussion, "Taxation and Character." This was a very pleasant evening.

March 3—Lebanon, Ill.; McKendree College, 9:30 A. M.; Dr. Harmon, president; 400 students; a most delightful occasion.

St. Louis, Mo.; City Club at noon; 100 present.

St. Louis, Mo.; Ethical Culture Society dinner, 6:30; 130 guests and a most agreeable, profitable evening.

March 4—Alton, Ill.; Rotary Club at noon. This group of eighty-five men was everything that could be asked for—intelligent, open-minded and tremendously interested.

March 5—South Bend, Ind.; Kiwanis Club, noon; an exceedingly pleasant time, with a hearty invitation to return soon; eighty present.

March 6—Evanston, Ill.; Lions' Club, noon; twenty-five present. This meeting was arranged by our good friend John Lawrence Monroe, of Chicago.

Chicago, Ill.; Single Tax dinner; thirty present. Very pleasant, very profitable.

March 8—Chicago, Ill.; radio talk, 6 P. M. The radio talks were arranged for by our friend George M. Strachan, of Chicago. I am certain that when the undertakers put the lid on the coffin when George takes his long journey, the last thing they will hear from George will be, "Are you a Single Taxer?"

March 9—Urbana, O.; Urbana University; the Rev. Franklin H. Blackmer, president; a small but growing university; class in economics at 12:20.

Urbana, O.; open meeting at the university, to which citizens were invited. It was a pleasure to meet with the members of the faculty, and particularly with Dr. Blackmer, the president, a sincere and cultured scholar. Our friend Fenton Lawson, of Cincinnati, is treasurer of this university.

March 10—Reading, Pa.; Rotary Club, noon. This was a remarkable meeting; 120 gentlemen present and could not possibly have been more interested or better satisfied with the story of our doctrine.

Note.—Everywhere I spoke the door is left wide open with hearty invitations to return when possible. There were sixty addresses, and during this period, excluding the radio audiences, auditors numbered 7,621.

Our friends in St. Louis were greatly pleased with the work there. They have taken on a new lease of life and are enthusiastic in making arrangements for a return visit.

I am especially indebted to our friend Erwin Kauffman of St. Louis and Prof. Joseph M. Klamon for the many hearings arranged, the very great kindness shown and assistance rendered while in St. Louis. Mr. Kauffman could not have been kinder nor of greater assistance; he drove me to every engagement and we are deeply indebted to him. It was also a great pleasure to meet with other good folks of St. Louis and other cities.

So far this year I have delivered eighty lectures—that is, from Dec. 1 to March 10—with an attendance of 10,688 by actual count, aside from radio talks. The future is loaded with opportunities which it is hoped can be taken care of, with the assistance of our members and contributors.

The reaction to Mr. Brown's addresses can best be indicated by excerpts from letters as follows:

Mr. James R. Brown of New York last Tuesday addressed the students of our school on the subject of tax reform, for the second time within a year. We have asked him to speak before our student body again, when he is next in the city, believing that what he has to say is a matter of first importance to every present or prospective taxpayer.

Aside from the importance of the message he brings, Mr. Brown is a delightful and dynamic speaker, and we have learned to look forward to his visits here with keen interest and pleasure.

McHENRY MITCHELL,

Feb. 5, 1931. Strayer-Bryant and Stratton College, Baltimore, Md.

Let me express to you once more the cordial appreciation by all your audiences, both morning and evening groups, of your splendid lec-

tures, and to thank you personally for your kindness in coming and speaking here. The personal touch you gave to your lectures made them especially helpful and valuable to us all.

WILLIAM F. NOTZ, Dean,
School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Feb. 9, 1931.

The Assembly Committee of Catonsville High School wishes to thank you very much for the talk you so kindly gave them on Feb. 4.

The pupils enjoyed it very much and hope you will come again next year.

MARY E. ROWLAND,
Feb. 10, 1931. Catonsville High School, Catonsville, Md.

I want to repeat my expression of unalloyed satisfaction and delight at the way you brought home to all present the essentials of Single Tax teachings, with real enjoyment of it by your hearers and obvious personal friendliness, all within the limited time permitted by their luncheon rules. I fully understand now why you so generally have invitations to return. Please accept the enclosed contribution towards your work as an indication of my appreciation of it.

Reading, Pa., March 14, 1931. W. H. STEWART.

As chairman of the programme committee I wish to thank you for the splendid talk you gave our club Wednesday, Feb. 11.

That is the second time they have had the pleasure of hearing you, and are asking for more.

J. ALBERT BRIEN,
Taunton, Mass., Feb. 16, 1931. Kiwanis Club of Taunton.

I can't begin to tell you how deeply we folks here at Illinois Wesleyan University appreciated and enjoyed your talks during your recent visit to our campus. Your apt illustrations of the gross and stupid blunders of our present tax system were certainly effective in causing our students (and faculty members too) to think more on the subject of taxation than they have ever done before.

Believe me you will always find the welcome sign hung out for you at Illinois Wesleyan, and it is my hope that you will not wait too long before returning.

Indeed, it was a great personal delight to have those several chats we had together while you were here, and I want you to know that my best wishes go with you in the great work which you are doing. You know how to put your subject "across" to college students and business men; such talks as yours are bound to be effective, if for no other reason than because they do not leave the audience wondering what it is "all about."

WILLIAM T. BEADLES,
Bloomington, Ill., Feb. 25, 1931. Illinois Wesleyan University.

It was a good meeting, about 125 prominent Masons attended. Message well received—instructive and entertaining.

AUSTIN W. BIGGS,
St. Louis, Mo., March 4, 1931. President Scottish Rite Club.

Mr. Herman H. Smith, programme chairman of the Advertising and Selling Club of Peoria, reports that everyone at their meeting "enjoyed his talk immensely."

I want to add my thanks to theirs for your interest and cooperation in giving them such a worthwhile meeting.

H. A. HOLBY,
Club Contact Department, Advertising and Selling Club.
Peoria, Ill., March 6, 1931.

I want to assure you that we certainly enjoyed Mr. Brown's address and truly hope it will be possible for him to be with us again. I heard any number of comments from the boys on his talk, and I know everyone enjoyed it to the utmost.

I am attaching a newspaper clipping of a write-up that appeared in one of the local newspapers on the day following Mr. Brown's visit

to Peoria, and I want to say that the comments made herein express our reactions also.

HERMAN H. SMITH,
Peoria, Ill., March 21, 1931. Peoria Advertising and Selling Club.

I can hardly tell you how greatly I enjoyed Mr. Brown's visit and what a great impression he made upon the students. When will it be possible for him to come this way again? Early in next fall's term at the latest we would like to have him come to the university again.

Permit me to express my thanks for the five packages of literature which letter indicates are on the way. I will place it all on reserve and more than 150 students will cover it thoroughly. I don't know how we can ever repay the great obligation we are under for the noble work Mr. Brown is doing.

JOSEPH M. KLAMON,
Washington University, School of Business and Public Administration.
St. Louis, Mo., March 31, 1931.

The talk of Mr. James R. Brown before our club on Feb. 8 was much more than a prosaic presentation of what by many may be considered something entirely in the abstract—the subject of taxation.

To take such an important subject, which requires profound study, and present it in the humorous, interesting and educational method used by Mr. Brown was indeed a rare treat. In addition to this enjoyment, the purpose was realized, and that was impressing upon us the foolhardy method now employed in connection with taxes and the necessity for better regulation and methods respecting this question.

When Mr. Brown comes this way again we shall be delighted in having him on one of our programmes.

WILLIAM BEISER,
Chairman Programme Committee, Lions' Club of Cincinnati.
Cincinnati, O., March 10, 1931.

Other letters from which extracts may be made have been received at the office of LAND AND FREEDOM. Charles J. Ogle wrote:

We brought our friend James R. Brown here last week to address a number of groups, most of whom had heard him before and wanted him back. Brown is without doubt the greatest salesman our movement has at the present time, and if the Schalkenbach Foundation could only discover (and finance) a number of other speakers with anything like his effective presentation of the subject, our cause would go ahead by leaps and bounds.

Mr. Charles Lischer, of St. Louis, writes to the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM as follows:

I thought you would be interested to learn that Mr. James Roger Brown's recent visit to St. Louis provoked an interest in the Single Tax unequalled by any other visiting lecturer during our forty years of agitation.

Erwin Kauffman, a live wire in St. Louis, expresses his enthusiasm as follows:

For the amount of money necessary Mr. Brown creates a far greater understanding and interest than any other single agency and in the most influential sections of our society. Surely, the students, faculty and members of active civic clubs, are the most vital and worthwhile people to be reached in considering the future of the Single Tax movement. Mr. Brown does not attempt to teach the whole vast subject of economics, but uses such concrete, humorous examples that none can fail to realize the importance of the subject.

THE continuance of prosperity depends upon an equitable distribution of it.—GEORGE E. ROBERTS, Vice-President National City Bank.

Coming Dinner to Alfred Bishop Mason

ON May 6, 1931, the Manhattan Single Tax Club will give a complimentary dinner to Alfred Bishop Mason, vice president of that club since 1914, at the National Vaudeville Artists' Club, 227 West 46th Street, New York City, at 6:30 P. M.

Mr. Mason has been a resident of Florence, Italy, for some ten years, and advantage is taken of his visit here to his old home to pay respect to our friend and ardent, earnest fellow Single Taxer.

While Mr. Mason is well advanced in years—born 1851—his spirit is young, his mind extremely active. Of late he has been busy with his pen. In 1919 he produced "Tom Strong, Lincoln's Scout;" in 1929, "A Duchess and Her Daughter;" 1930, "Walpole's England." He is the translator and editor of Von Holst's Constitutional History of United States, published in 1876, and many other books.

Reserve your tickets early. Phone Columbus 5-4993, or send to Manhattan Single Tax Club, 1860 Broadway, New York, N. Y. Tickets are \$3 each.

A Single Tax Crusader

THE late W. A. Douglas was a man with a cause. To this cause he subordinated all else. He devoted his life to the preaching of a doctrine in a city where the doctrine was never popular. The doctrine was Single Tax and the city was Toronto.

Mr. Douglas wished to have municipal tax revenues derived wholly from the land. He resented, as every homeowner must sometimes resent, the penalizing of those who improve the land by placing buildings upon it. He could not see justice in a law which says that a new veranda or an added wing shall mean higher assessment and higher taxation. He felt that a far better plan would be to penalize those who hold land unused or inadequately used in the hope of an ultimate profit. He was a man of intellect as well as the spirit of the crusader and he urged these views upon the public with cogency and energy at every opportunity on the platform, through the columns of the Single Tax paper, *The Square Deal*, and through the columns of the daily press. He did not mind being called a crank, for he was conscious that he had logic to support his view.

He was a man who wished to be a benefactor to his fellows. He felt that he had a boon for them, and he was willing to devote his life to explaining the opportunity for public betterment which he believed Single Tax afforded. He lived to see one partial adoption of the principle in Toronto. Houses assessed at \$4,000 and under are, in this city, taxed upon only a portion of their assessment, and in the case of the smaller houses on only half their assessment. But when a vote of the people was taken

some years ago upon a further extension of this principle so as to remove a portion of the levy from buildings in general, the decision was adverse. Mr. Douglass was not discouraged, and never ceased to promote the cause which had become so dear to his heart.

Toronto is the poorer for his passing; the world needs more men like him. It is from such minds—from such devotion to a cause—that great reforms have sprung.

Toronto Daily Star, March 19, 1931.

Words of Professor Dewey

AT a meeting called by the League for Independent Political Action at the Hotel Woodstock in this city a few weeks ago, Prof. Dewey said: "I am not wedded to any form of words and I should like to read to you the platform presented to me in a letter from an influential lawyer in California. 'The purpose,' he writes is the abolition of privilege, the unjust economic advantage by possession of which a small group controls our natural resources, industry and credit, prevents equal opportunity of development for all, and thus dictates the conditions under which we live. To remedy this we advocate:

"(1) Public Control of natural resources by taxation of all land values (including land containing coal, oil, natural gas, commercial timber and water power) in order to prevent monopoly and speculation, to aid industry and to force idle lands into use.

"(2) Public Ownership, as rapidly as may be practicable, by nation, state and municipality, of transportation, communication, water power and public utilities which are in their nature complete monopolies.

"(3) Resumption by the National Government of its constitutional power to issue money and control credit.

"(4) Equal Rights, economic, legal and political, for all citizens and ALL CIVIL RIGHTS, including free speech, free press and peaceable assembly, as guaranteed by the Constitution.

"So far the letter. If a fifth plank were added dealing with economic matters, a policy which would bring peace and friendliness into our international relations, I think the main outlines for the foundation of a new party are fairly if briefly before you.

"Even if a new party were in power, it would take time to bring the needed economic changes into social effect. To bring about a social change is something much wider than political action. It requires changes in education, in the social responsibilities of the churches, and a multitude of other things, including changes in the attitude of men in responsible places in industry. But there is an immediate and central issue which is of a definitely political nature. Before desired legislative, administrative and judicial changes can be brought about, control of government must be redeemed from the special interests which have usurped it and restored to the people."

Profits of Faith and Courage!

MR. R. W. THORP of Charleston, So. Carolina, who is a well-known and practised writer, in a letter to our good friend A. H. Jenkins, of this city, writes as follows:

I have always hammered away at the things which Henry George despised and wrote about, and this sometimes makes powerful enemies. However, the real causes of these deplorable social diseases, i. e., the pyramiding of land values, had never entered my train of thought before I read "Progress and Poverty," so I was really as far away from a solution of the problems as the most ignorant.

"Many are called, but few are chosen," and this spiritual law will hold good with the readers of this book—though many read it, how many will read it intelligently enough to understand it? Many people go to the theatre and laugh at tragedy, thinking it comedy, and vice versa; such is the limitation of the human brain.

A coincidence occurred while I was reading this book which, while very common, struck me forcibly and made me laugh. You will recall my writing and telling you about one John Newman of Seattle, an old Alaskan gold-hunter, whose life I wrote up in a series of articles? A few days ago Newman sent me a lot of material, clippings from papers, etc. In one of the latter I saw where his wife had a notice. It seems that twenty years ago she bought a small piece of land in Seattle for \$2,000. A few weeks ago she sold it to the Washington Athletic Club for \$267,000. This is a nice profit, but the part that got me is that Newman, who is great on having "monuments" erected, got permission from the club to put a copper plate with an inscription on it, at the entrance of the fine new building they were putting on the newly acquired site. The inscription reads: "*To the Memory of Hannah Newman, who, with courage and with faith in our city's growth, held this land for twenty years, etc.*" I don't imagine it took a great deal of courage, and perhaps little faith, to hold this land for a rise in value. Most men toil for a lifetime without accumulating one-twentieth of the sum Mrs. Newman received for sitting down and watching the city build in toward her holdings. I noted yesterday in the local paper that one of our state legislators (from Charleston) is the author of a bill now pressing "to remove all taxes from real estate."

On Barren Ground

WHAT you have to say in your article in *The New Freeman* of January 7 on "The Laborer and His Hire" prompts me to tell of an experience I had recently. I attended a luncheon of the League for Industrial Democracy, and afterward the question, "Can Industry Be Civilized?" was discussed by several able speakers, who, while they were all desirous of bettering industrial conditions, differed widely in their viewpoints. But while they severely criticized existing conditions, they had very little to offer in the way of improvement, and most of that little lay in the direction of governmental restrictions of and interference with industry, most of which, to my thinking,

would make matters worse rather than better. The last speaker, a labor leader whose work had been among the soft-coal miners, was especially pessimistic. He said I didn't know what was the matter with industry or how to remedy it, and after many talks with the mine owners he was convinced that while they were well-meaning and desirous of better things, they were just as ignorant as I was of the real cause of the trouble and how it was to be cured. He ended by saying that he had about reached the conclusion that nothing less than a war between capital and labor and the smashing of the whole system would help matters.

One of the speakers had touched on the land question but even he did not press the righting of this wrong as our primary need. So at the close, I very briefly pointed out that the basic wrong of our civilization lay in its denial of the equal rights of all men to the use of the earth; that unemployment and poverty and misery were the inevitable results of this denial; and that until we had righted this wrong and put all men on an absolute equality as regards natural resources it was impossible to tell what further steps were needed, if indeed any further steps would be needed.

There was an audience of from 100 to 200 persons, a presumably interested in bettering living conditions. But my brief remarks were received in dead silence. Evidently the remedy I offered did not appeal to them in the least. One of the previous speakers had told the story of a pious slaver whose ship, with a full cargo of slaves, was near sunk in a terrific storm. In his diary the slaver told how he had thanked God for His merciful kindness in delivering him from the storm. The speaker commented on the fact that this God-fearing man was totally blind to the iniquity of his business, and made the point that we have progressed a lot since that day. Thinking things over afterwards, I doubted this. For here was an intelligent audience apparently blind to a social crime as clearly wrong as chattel slavery itself and much more far-reaching. If they saw any wrong in the system, evidently they thought of very little moment; and as for considering the abolition of land monopoly as a cure for our industrial evils—it was like Elisha's "dip-seven-times-in-Jordan" cure for Naaman's leprosy, too absurdly simple to be even thought of.

So after my experience I fear that your well-meant advice to the labor leaders, ably as you have expressed it, will but prove to be good seed sown on barren ground. If the labor leaders of the day are, alas! "blind leaders of the blind."

—HAROLD SUDELL, in Letter to *The New Freeman*.

THE equal right of all men to the use of land is as clear as their equal right to breathe the air—it is a right proclaimed by the fact of their existence. For we can not suppose that some men have a right to be in this world and others no right.—HENRY GEORGE.

The Elder Pulitzer and the Single Tax

IT is reported to LAND AND FREEDOM on excellent authority that the elder Joseph Pulitzer, founder of the *New York World*, said: "I do not care to read anything more about the Single Tax, nor any more of the writings of Henry George. I am almost committed to it." He evidently feared that if too strongly convinced he would be forced by such conviction to make the *World* a Single Tax paper. It is only a matter of conjecture what the effect would have been on the progress of the movement with New York's leading Democratic paper fighting for the cause of Henry George over a period of forty years!

Is Private Property in Land the Cause of Our Ills?

WE read with special interest Mr. Bell's article in *Commerce and Finance* last week on "Sizing Up the Business Depression." After reciting the various diagnoses of our economic depression, none of which he finds wholly adequate, Mr. Bell ends on a pertinent note of interrogation:

"Out of the distress of 1930 the world has learned that unemployment is a social problem of the very first magnitude, like unto the fabled riddle of the Sphinx, which not to answer was to be destroyed. It must be solved, and solved right, however a false conservatism may oppose. Why this eternal conflict between conservatism and radicalism, anyhow? One demands the preservation of what is good, the other calls for the elimination of what is bad. It is false conservatism that resists, thus arousing a false radicalism that would overturn the whole structure in order to build anew.

"What is the evil principle in our civilization that periodically paralyzes business and deprives millions of men of their natural right to earn a living?"

In speaking of an evil principle in our civilization that deprives millions of men of their natural right to earn a living, Mr. Bell, it is safe to say, is shooting at the ancient institution of private property in land. To reduce to private ownership the natural resources of nature, permitting their utilization only on coming to terms with those whom the law determines to be their owners, is depriving men of a natural right—that is, a right which would exist did not the law take it from them. It is indeed interesting to consider how far the institution of private property in land has been a factor in inducing the economic paralysis that came so terribly upon the world.

If the accepted economic theory of rent be correct, the owners of land and natural resources are able from the normal return to labor and capital secured on the rented land to appropriate as rent the amount by which such re-

turn exceeds the normal return to labor and capital on the best land that can be had for nothing. Of such land there is practically none, so that the share left to labor and capital is what they are willing to accept rather than go out of business, or perish.

It is difficult to translate this formula into terms of actual measured economic factors. In the large cities it would be interesting to measure the actual return received for the use of land in its purely economic sense. Such figures are usually or often available, as the custom prevails of assessing separately land and its improvements. The tribute levied in the form of rent must be enormous.

The question naturally arises of what would in fact be the ultimate destination of this vast component of the return to industrial effort were its diversion in the form of rent intercepted. It seems to us that one element, and a grave one, in the economic depression must have been the overweighted production of certain kinds of commodities, emphasized, where mass production largely prevails, by the difficulty in adapting to other ends the equipment and organization made and developed exclusively for a highly specialized output. In this particular maladjustment the factor of economic rent would not seem to represent a chief component of the returns to manufacturing.

It is somewhat surprising that more attention is not paid to the part played by economic rent in distorting the just apportionment of the returns that should go to labor and capital.

In its broad social and ethical aspects it is hard to justify private property in land. Is the present depression a fresh illustration of its bad working?

—MCCREADY SYKES, in *Commerce and Finance*.

Cause and Effect

HAS this so-called depression not existed a sufficient length of time to consider its cause, if any?

All sorts of reasons, excuses and palliatives have been advanced, of which overproduction seems to be the most exploited, based on what is conceived as supply and demand.

Strange it does not occur to one seeking for true cause and effect to simplify the matter by realizing that both supply as well as demand are practically unlimited, supply consisting of our earth's resources, the abundance of which we boast and demand as our human needs and desires, consisting of necessities and luxuries. Of course this definition is too simple for our expert economists to contemplate; it implies no statistical elaboration, historical data, or prognostication anent the future, merely contemplates the Here and Now.

We repeatedly boast that we have been beneficently endowed with the greatest natural resources of any country on earth. Admitting this theory, the logical question in sequence is, Who is in possession, and why of this natural

supply created without effort or knowledge on our part and ostensibly intended for all who are willing to use their intelligence and muscular power in supplying their needs?

Accepting these indisputable fundamentals it is easy to discover that our trouble lies in a proper and equitable distribution of our natural supply. Let it be understood that in essence men do not furnish work to other men. Nature furnishes work to all men who cooperate in supplying their individual needs.

A system of monopoly of the Creator's gift to all of his children is ethically out of line with true Cause and Effect.

F. J. EDDY, in *Miami (Florida) News*.

No Other Plan Can Avail

STUDENTS will not forget Henry George and his proposed solution of our economic problems through the Single Tax, whereby he sought to give society the benefit of its and nature's creation—land values. Nature made the land, and society as a whole, not the individual, gives land its value, says the Single Taxer. And every now and then one of them talks out in meeting. Here is the way a Townmeeter, C. F. Hunt, puts it:

1. Human misery is caused by lack of labor products, called wealth.

2. All life depends upon air, light, water and land. The first three are free to use, but land, being subject to enclosure, was appropriated by "divine right" feudal lords, who still hold it, in fact.

3. Wealth is produced only by labor on land. Access to land depends on the consent of the land "lords," still so called.

4. The Constitution of California contains the following:

Art. XVII, Sec 2: "The holding of large tracts of land, uncultivated and unimproved, is against the public interest, and should be discouraged."

Emerson said in 1841, in "Nature Addresses": "While another man has no land, your title to yours, my title to mine, is at once vitiated."

Thomas Paine (about 1800): "Land is the free gift of the Creator in common to the human race."

Same: "Every proprietor of land owes to the community a ground rent."

5. As water is the remedy for thirst, so land, the source of ALL wealth, in the ONLY remedy for poverty.

6. Land has no intrinsic value; if it had, a cubic yard of dirt under the Loew Building would bring a thousand times the price of a similar mass from Mount Hollywood; but both are equal in value. The value of titles is only the value of location; the advantages due to population.

7. Access to land would not draw all people to the land. As many as at present would work up raw materials—secondary occupations; but all would go on land in preference to starvation.

8. Realtors boast of the fabulous profits made from

selling land, not one cent of which was caused by owners or brokers.

No plan other than one providing easier access to land can avail.

Hollywood (Calif.) News.

Economics From Chase Bank

THE following from the Economic Bulletin of March 23, issued by the Chase National Bank of New York is much nearer the truth than the usual writings coming from such institutions. Allowing for a few slips such as that land is scarce in China, the writer is knocking at the door which, if he pursues his inquiries further, will open to him.

"There are those who fear the lowering of the tariffs because they believe that the American standard of life is dependent upon the tariffs, and particularly because they believe that high tariffs make high wages. This doctrine has very little standing among economists. Wages do not depend upon tariffs, and standards of life do not depend upon tariffs. Wages depend upon the productivity of labor per man, and the productivity of labor per man depends, other things equal, upon the abundance or scarcity of the land and capital with which labor works. The country which has a comparative abundance of land and capital and a comparative scarcity of labor will have high wages, as is true of the United States. In a country like China, where men are abundant, capital scarce, and land scarce, land rents will be very high, interest rates will be very high, and wage rates will be very low, tariffs or no tariffs. American labor is high, in comparison with European labor, because land and capital are relatively abundant with us and men relatively scarce, whereas in Europe land and capital are relatively scarce and labor relatively abundant."

"Snug" Sum From Snug Harbor

AN old sea captain, R. R. Randall, dying in 1800, left a large farm in New York City to be used for a Snug Harbor for old sailors.

His heirs fought the bequest for thirty years, but in 1831 the Supreme Court upheld it.

In 1800 its rental value was \$4,000 a year; in 1830 \$40,000; today, \$4,000,000 a year.

This \$4,000,000 a year rent for a very small part of the land of New York City is not being earned by the man who died 130 years ago.

It is being earned today by labor and capital, and when \$4,000,000 a year is taken from labor and capital for mere permission to use a small piece of land, both wages and interest are cut down just that much.

—WILL ATKINSON, in *Washington Star*

OUR "crime waves" are but the counterpart of those selfish mentalities who keep the "common consent" keyed to and focused upon false standards, and whose practices are robbed in "respectability."

C. A. MC LEMORE in *Hollywood (Calif.) News*.

We Shall Understand

WHEN we see the social structure as it really is and how it works we will see why the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. We will understand why labor stands idle and capital wastes, with no productive returns. Hard times come from the unnatural state that is keeping man from the land, his birthright. This is the fundamental wrong that can only be righted by taking the land values we all make for all.—E. H. Boeck, in *Journal of Electrical Workers*.

NO MAN, I think, ever saw a herd of buffalo, of which a few were fat and the great majority lean. No man ever saw a flock of birds, of which two or three were swimming in grease and the others all skin and bone. Nor in the savage life is there anything like the poverty that festers in our civilization. In a rude state of society there are seasons of want, seasons when people starve; but they are seasons when the earth has refused to yield her increase, when the rain has not fallen from the heavens, or when the land has been swept by some foe—not when there is plenty; and yet the peculiar characteristic of this modern poverty of ours is that it is deepest where wealth most abounds.—HENRY GEORGE, in "The Crime of Poverty."

MANY welfare workers doubt whether any effort will make a dent in the slum problem as long as every improvement in living conditions adds to the ground rent that must be paid for the use of the land.

Every large-scale housing relief plan, here or elsewhere, has come against this landlord barrier before it got very far, and there is no record of the barrier being broken.

—Labor, Washington, D. C.

THE history of mankind shows that monopoly of the soil has been the most fruitful source of wars and bloodshed—of oppression and cruelty, of poverty and misery, of debauchery and crime—than all other causes, and they are legion.—Congressman JOSEPH CABLE, of Ohio, 1852.

THE logic of Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" and its literary style have been so insistent that it has been studied closely by economists of note in every country on the globe. Its argument has never been answered."

—ELBERT HUBBARD

A Great Soul

IT is always a disadvantage to consider a man's work apart from his character, but alas, when both are spread before us how often our idols are found with feet of clay, or we perceive a dual personality—a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr Hyde. How frequently material or intellectual success reveals some unbalance of mind or some defect of

soul and makes us wonder how lives and theories can be so unrelated.

The great man whose memory we honor tonight exhibited none of this frailty—in him precept and practice went hand and hand. He was neither fake nor politician. He sought no favor. He accepted no bribe. He made no alliance with any power except the power of truth. As we follow the course of his hard life—made harder still by the doctrines he taught—we see the great truths of nature he unveiled mould into a character that as nearly approaches that of the great Master of men as our imagination may portray.

—From address by Wm. L. J. Thompson, Sydney, N.S. Wales.

BOOK NOTICE

ANOTHER WORK ON THE GEORGIST PHILOSOPHY*

In this little volume of 111 pages our author, who has evidently given much thought to our economic system (so called), gives a well-reasoned discussion of the Single Tax philosophy, particularly the effect of permitting private individuals to appropriate publicly created land values.

His arguments are, in the main, sound, even if hard to follow, owing to the involved language in which they are couched. Much is compressed into a few words.

The book will be of value principally to those who are already well acquainted with the fundamentals of the Georgian philosophy. To others, the waters of thought will be too deep.

Although the author shows his familiarity with the Henry George principles, and ought to know better, he insists that four factors enter into production and distribution. In fact, he writes (page 44): "But in the final distribution there enters still a fifth factor * * * this is the government's power of taxation."

How can he excuse such a statement?

B. W. B.

*"Radicalia." By S. Tideman, Fisk, Mo. Price \$1.50.

CORRESPONDENCE

FREE SOIL AND TREMONT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Personally I can see no advantage to lining up with any party that has not the elements of the economic rent for the people as their slogan. The existing parties are not performing a man's job, and any party that falls short of the above conception is doomed to failure. The slogan at the birth of the Republican Party was "free speech, free press, free soil and Fremont," and I have always maintained that when Lincoln was assassinated the Republican Party was likewise assassinated.

Milwaukee, Wis.

CORNELIUS LEENHOUTS.

AN ABSURD STATEMENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

For many years I have enjoyed the possession of an edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Recently I have contemplated the purchase of the new 14th edition. In deciding on the merits of a work of this kind I naturally wanted to know what was said on a subject with which I feel I am quite familiar, and so chose the Single Tax.

The greater part of the information I found to be fairly accurate, but the closing sentence reads as follows: "It was thus implied (by Single Taxers) that the yield of the Single Tax would be sufficient to meet the expenses of the government. This might easily be so in an agricultural community, but in Great Britain, in 1928, the entire rent

of the land in town and country would not defray more than a small fraction—perhaps one-eighth—of the expenses of the central and local government."

Could a more amazing statement be made? Those who are at all familiar with the subject know that the rental value of the land of England, as of the United States, is probably twenty per cent. greater than the expenses of government.

With this evidence of the Britannica's unreliability I lost all interest in it as a source of accurate information.

Lansing, Mich.

RAY ROBSON.

[EDITORIAL NOTE.—The above letter was sent to the American editor of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Mr. F. H. Hooper, and Mr. Robson received the following reply:

"I am in receipt of your favor with reference to the article Single Tax in the new edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. I am taking up the matter at once with the author of the article with a view of making any change that may be necessary."

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

ON February 2, Herman Reel, of Milwaukee, addressed the class of engineers of the Marquette University on the Single Tax.

A LENGTHY article on the Single Tax appears in the *Federation News*, of Chicago, February 14, by Walter E. Peterson.

POINTING out that the automobile owner pays taxes three times, the editor of the Sherman, Texas, *Democrat* condemns the proposed increase in the gasoline tax under the heading, "Single Tax in the Gasoline Levy," and uses the name of Henry George.

THE Minden, Louisiana, *Herald* quotes from J. F. Colbert, under the heading "Local Man Writes Tax Article for a New York Magazine," the magazine being LAND AND FREEDOM.

"A RENAISSANCE of the Single Tax movement is one of the possible outcomes of the interruption of prosperity in this country, and the tour of Henry George's daughter, who lectured Wednesday to the Johns Hopkins students on her father's theory, may be instrumental in giving it impetus," writes the *Baltimore News* of February 26.

W. LUDWELL BALDWIN, chairman of the State Real Estate Board of Virginia, according to the Norfolk *Ledger-Dispatch*, is reported to have said: "The Single Tax idea has been advocated and there are many followers of the Henry George system, but we still pursue the same method that we installed when we were an agricultural instead of an industrial nation."

THE *World Tomorrow*, for March, contains an article by Norman Thomas on "Socialism: The Way Out." He says: "The main dependence of socialism in its transition state will be a tax taking over the rental value of land and a heavy graded tax on incomes and inheritances." We wish Mr. Thomas had treated more in detail of the effects of the first recommendation, which would make the second unnecessary.

THE *Franklin News*, the monthly bulletin of the Franklin Institute for Home Building and Savings, has as a contributor to its columns one who signs himself "Uncle Ben." He quotes David Gibson, who, commenting on a recent convention of scientists in Cleveland, says: "What the world would like to know just now is where to get a job and how to pay its bills." Uncle Ben says: "Outside of the writings of Henry George I don't know where any evidence of scientific thinking on this vital problem is to be found."

CHAS. G. MERRILL, of Cincinnati, Ohio, writes: "I was pleased to read in LAND AND FREEDOM of the good work that Mr. Brown is doing and that he will be here at the Rotary Club on February 19. I am glad that he has this appointment for while I was a member of the Rotary Club I tried several years to get him a date, but was never able to put it through. I congratulate whoever succeeded in making this appointment, but perhaps it was due to Mr. Brown's success with other Rotary Clubs in other cities."

IT is known to readers of LAND AND FREEDOM that U. S. Senator Burton E. Wheeler inserted in the Congressional Record the outline of "Protection or Free Trade," and that the same office was performed for "Progress and Poverty" by Senator Nye. Both of these outlines were made by Will Atkinson and either one will be franked for mailing to separate addresses and delivered in envelopes in lots of one thousand or more at the rate of \$5 for a thousand, or at one cent a copy in smaller lots. Enormous numbers of these have been sent out all over the world. Further particulars may be had of the All American Reciprocity League, Capon Springs, W. Va.

THE death of Edwin C. Walker, of this city, founder in 1890 of the Sunrise Club, is a real loss to the cause of free discussion and liberal thought. For years Mr. Walker presided over the Sunrise dinners. These dinners were given up to discussion of moot questions. They were often of great interest, though it may be said that there was too great a preponderance of sex questions. But other subjects, literary, social, scientific, political, economic, were not neglected, and the philosophy of Henry George had frequent hearings. "Ed" Walker, as he was known to his intimates, presided with rare tact and great firmness. It was known that he was a Single Taxer, but at all times he was an impartial chairman, holding the scales with even handed justice over friend and opponent alike. Whatever the question, under discussion he had no opinions, seeking only the fullest expression for every man or woman who would speak his thought, whether conservative or libertarian. Few men in this city have done so much in a very practical way for the advancement of knowledge and intellectual freedom as Edwin C. Walker.

BORN in 1840 and dying on February 12 of this year, Mrs. Ellen Garrison, widow of William Lloyd Garrison and mother of our William Lloyd Garrison and Frank W. Garrison, had attained a great age. Her mother and her sister, the famous Lucretia Mott, were workers in great causes and were two of the four signers to the call for the first Woman's Rights convention held at Seneca Falls, N. Y., in 1848. For a number of years Mrs. Garrison's life had been spent in retirement. Beside the two sons mentioned there is another, Chas. Garrison, of Cambridge and two daughters, Agnes and Eleanor Garrison. Single Taxers whose memories go back to the beginnings of the movement will remember the singular charm of William Lloyd Garrison's reading of his speeches the only man we ever knew who could read as acceptably as great orators speak. This was due to a curious felicity of expression and unique powers of elocution.

ING. PAVLOS GIANNELIA, Wien IV (Vienna 4), Rainergasse 18, Austria, is in need of numbers 141 and 148 of LAND AND FREEDOM to complete his files. Can any of our readers supply his need?

MAJOR GENERAL J. H. PENDLETON, who would have been one of the members of the court to try Major General Smedley D. Butler for his recent indiscretion of speech had the latter been brought to trial, is a Single Taxer, and was long a subscriber to this paper.

CYRIL ASQUITH, son of the late Lord Oxford and Asquith, has a series of articles in the *News-Chronicle*, of London, England, on "Free

ade in the Light of Modern Conditions." These are wholly admirable and we wish we had space to quote more fully. In one place Mr. Asch says:

Is there anything in all this mass of propaganda which should persuade a reasonable man that the system of free imports is at the heart of our troubles, and should be abandoned?

And as a specific illustration he says very forcibly:

If, on the other hand, a tariff is needed to enable, and does enable, a domestic manufacturer to run his plant to full capacity, why were the U. S. iron and steel trades in the second week of December running to 38 per cent. of theirs?

An advertisement of "Progress and Poverty" appears in Jan. 9th issue of *Radio Times*, of London, England, with a circulation of one million.

CHARLES B. ROGERS, of Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin, in a recent communication to the editor of this paper, says: "It is rather pitiful to a Single Taxer to read the speeches, editorials and magazine articles on the present depression written by people who are blindly groping in the dark seeking a cause for it and not finding it, and whose eyes might easily be opened."

JAMES B. ELLERY, since 1912 a resident of Erie, Pa., whose Single Tax letters have been published widely by the press of the country, is to remove to Annisquam Station, Gloucester, Mass., on April 1st. Mr. Ellery was recently visited with a bereavement in the death of his father, Benjamin Franklin Ellery, who became a Single Taxer because his son was interested. He not only accepted and understood the Single Tax but has contributed to the movement financially. He was a member of the city government in which he made a creditable record. We know that the son will continue those useful Single Tax activities in which for so many years he has been engaged. His father, who died January 1st, was born in 1852, and had lived all his life in Gloucester.

A TWO-COLUMN review of "The Prophet of San Francisco," not usually, appears in the book supplement of the *New York Times* of today, Feb. 1st.

In our review of the valuable little work by W. L. Sinton, "Spiritualism and Economics," we neglected to give the address of Mr. Sinton, who is both author and publisher of the book. The address is 2951 Washington Street, San Francisco, California, and the price of the brochure is 75 cents.

THE *Los Angeles Times* says editorially: "The entire burden of holding and maintaining should not be placed upon motorists, since they do not receive all the benefits." It might be profitable for the Times to consider a class of persons who get most of the benefits.

THE *Ingram Institute News* of Feb. 6 contains a biographical sketch of F. F. Ingram, reprinted from the *San Diego Sun* and written by G. Bray. Mr. Ingram is founder of the Institute of Social Science in San Diego, which was the subject of a descriptive article in Jan. issue of LAND AND FREEDOM from the pen of Chester C. Platt.

It is announced that in the planning of the new city of Boulder, Nevada, the government will hold title to all the lots and issue leases to persons who wish to establish business houses or places of residence.

REV. ADOLPH ROEDER is dead at 74. He was long a prominent figure in Swedenborgian circles and was pastor of the New Church in East Orange, N. J., until his retirement last year. He was president of the

New Jersey State Civic Federation, and the author of a number of books. Like so many Swedenborgians he was said to be a disciple of Henry George.

ROBERT E. URELL, of Mansfield, Pa., has addressed a letter to Dr. S. Parkes Cadman and Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, beginning: "Do you not believe that the laying of all taxes on land values, or economic rent, as taught by Henry George, will bring about the economic and social benefits claimed for it by the author of 'Progress and Poverty'?" Then followed a short but effective statement of our principles. Both gentlemen courteously acknowledged the receipt of the letter, but gave no further sign.

The Palisadian, Palisade, N. J. has an excellent column letter on the doctrine of Henry George from the pen of Mark M. Dintenfuss. *The Palisadian* is friendly to our principles.

Terre et Liberte, Single Tax organ of France, in a recent issue presents a translation from LAND AND FREEDOM of M. J. Stewart's article, "Another View of the Snowden Budget."

J. F. COLBERT, of Minden, Louisiana, has retired as member of the Louisiana Tax Commission.

THE *Daily Province*, of Vancouver, B. C., one of the leading papers of that city, in an editorial urges, or seems to urge, for the writer wabbles a bit and appears to be not quite certain, that vacant lots should be exempt, or but lightly taxed, because vacant lots do not require public service, need no police or fire protection, and have no children to send to school. The argument is a familiar one. But it should be pointed out to the editor that vacant lots profit in increased selling price by all such public service. Is it fair that the man who builds should pay, while vacant lots which go up in selling price, bear no taxes and reap all the benefit? For houses do not increase in value because of government service. Land is the only thing that does increase by reason of such services. We hope the *Daily Province* will do a little more thinking on the subject.

RAY ROBSON, of Lansing, Michigan, is not idle in the cause of economic freedom, as witness his letter in another column to the publishers of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Besides this he has found time to address a letter to the editors of the *New Republic*, in which he makes lengthy quotation from the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM which animadverted strongly on the policy of the *New Republic*. Mr. Robson is conducting a christian economic Class every Wednesday evening in the Central Temple House at Lansing. Mr. Robson writes: "May I add that in giving a talk recently in a rural community I found that the farmers are not now, if they ever were, prejudiced against the Single Tax on the ground that it is a tax on land, when the matter is made clear to them. More than a hundred were present and listened with close attention. At the close of the talk they questioned and discussed for nearly an hour, were apparently satisfied with my answers. Desperation has made them open minded and ready for the truth. Ah, if only greater numbers could be reached!"

THE *Pittsburgh Bulletin* of Jan. 22, 1931, contains an interesting and very flattering biographical sketch of Cornelius D. Scully of that city with portrait. It states: "He is an ardent believer in the Single Tax and has a certain hearty laugh touched off by a fine sense of humor."

THE Lorain, Ohio, *Journal* says: "Henry George held that the remedy for preventing poverty was simple and easy of application, avoiding the ugliness of violence and revolution and by orderly means

readjusting the economic processes so that prosperity for all would be the consequence. This was a large order; but we have only to read his exposition to realize that we are in the presence of one of the world's most considerable economists; one whose clearness of vision is matched by the power and convincingness of his demonstration; one, in short, who cannot easily be put aside."

MENTIONING Henry George in its "Looking Backward" column the *Buffalo County Journal*, of Alma, Wisconsin, says: "Many thinking men today believe that Henry George came nearer to answering the great riddle than any other man."

THE Sylacauga, Alabama, *News* says: "As time goes on we are inclined to think Henry George's idea will grow more popular. It is hard to believe that land, air and water were not intended by our Maker to be free."

At the Sunrise Club dinner on February 16, Harry Weinberger, lawyer, playwright and Single Taxer, lectured on "The Way Out of Economic Depression."

O. WERNER, of San Diego, California, writes: "Was pleased to see the name of Luke North mentioned again. He deserves more than oblivion from Single Taxers. His record has not been equalled since his death."

It is announced by the Associated Press that Adolph Damaschke, of Berlin, has been nominated by a group of Parliamentarians for the Nobel peace prize. Mr. Damaschke is called in these dispatches the founder of the Single Tax movement in Germany.

LOUIS MANN's death, which occurred recently, recalls the fact that this veteran of the stage, who possessed sterling qualities as an actor, was a Henry George man for many years. When the editor of this paper ran for President of the Board of Aldermen of this city on the Single Tax ticket, Louis Mann wrote a letter pledging his support. In this connection it is also interesting to recall that quite a number of actors who have passed away were disciples of Henry George—James A. Herne, James K. Hackett, Milton Sills and others.

"THE way to meet Bolshevism is to make it unnecessary and not tempting. Henry George showed the way," writes J. C. Kipp in the *Hollywood Daily Citizen*.

THE Saskatchewan Section (27,000 strong) of the United Farmers of Canada has declared in its convention held in Saskatoon for social ownership of all land, and cooperative production. The convention asked that no more lands be alienated, that no more homesteads be granted or farm lands sold, but that instead leases be issued for long term periods.

JOHN M. MOORE and Foxhall A. Parker appear as signers to a Single Tax letter in the *Public Ledger*. Mr. Moore, on his recent visit to Scotland, read an original poem at a Masonic gathering of the Robert Burns Lodge and was elected an honorary member of the lodge, an honor rarely accorded to foreign visitors.

AN interesting letter from F. C. Leubuscher in the *New York Sun* of recent date tells of Robert G. Ingersoll's abiding faith in an unseen power. Mr. Leubuscher and Ingersoll were close friends.

"THE City That Hath Foundations" is a poem in blank verse of high quality by Lewis H. Clark, of Sodus, N. Y., advertised on another page.

MRS. MARY WARE DENNETT sends us a bulletin issued by a theatre

ticket agency uptown in New York with a picture of Fanny Brice, well-known vaudeville performer, on the cover. Mrs. Dennett says that Single Tax thinking bobs up in odd places. She intercepted on its way to the waste basket because the following caught her eye.

With factories idle, *land idle*, billions in the bank and millions of men out of work, don't you think the "smart" people ought to be able to bring it together and solve our problems? * * *

Did you ever stop to consider that a savage with hardly any tools always was able to support himself and family while some of you, though you work hard, and science has increased the productivity of man thousands of times, you cannot make a living? * * *

Don't think if it hurts your head.

GEORGE L. RUSBY has issued a fourth edition of his admirable little pamphlet, "Smaller Profits, Reduced Salaries and Lower Wages."

WE acknowledge receipt of a six-page pamphlet entitled "High Land Values," reprinted from "Tax Relief for Real Estate," by Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown.

A. FREELAND, of Seattle, Washington, long known to the friends of the movement, has addressed a letter to Julius Rosenwald on the cause of business depression.

It is announced that Lincoln Steffens's autobiography will appear some time early in April.

"THE spirit of Henry George lives again in his daughter," says the *Baltimore Sun* in a report of her recent lecture before the students of the economics class at Johns Hopkins.

AN interesting communication from Emil Knips, of Fairhope, Alabama, says: "We have a splendid paper in the *Fairhope Courier* and are doubly blessed when we draw LAND AND FREEDOM from the mail box. We want to echo this praise of the *Courier*; we scan every line of it. It is well edited and Brother Gaston knows how to put his opinions and information in interesting shape. We urge all those who are not subscribers to the paper to send for it. Mr. Knips tells us that the Fairhope Economics Study Club recently addressed a communication to S. M. Dinkins, of Selma, Alabama, wishing him a speedy recovery from the illness that still confines him to his home.

IN the *Extension Magazine* for March S. A. Baldus, author of "The New Capitalism," has an article which, while ignoring fundamentals, does say: "If the Capitalistic Entrepreneur System wants to save itself from destruction or annihilation its present beneficiaries must do some hard thinking in the next few years."

MR. L. D. BECKWITH, of Stockton, California, editor and publisher of the *Forum*, announces that he will shortly begin the publication of a Single Tax weekly paper called the *No Taxes*.

BARNEY HAUGHEY, of Denver, Colorado, cannot remain idle long. He has started a movement for a free bus amendment to the city charter, the cost to be defrayed by a tax on the land values of the city. Full particulars of the proposal will be mailed in due course to Single Taxers throughout the country.

At a recent meeting in this city U. S. Senator Copeland spoke on the business depression. At the conclusion of his address Mr. Van Vleet asked for the floor, which was granted him. Our friend made a five minute speech, asking how Dr. Copeland could hope for any improvement in economic conditions when billions of land value made by the people were absorbed by the few. Senator Copeland replied: