

March—April, 1938

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Note on Henry George's Conception of Civilization

Will Lissner

Causerie

Thomas N. Ashton

A Forgotten Hero—Joseph II of Austria

Book Reviews: Prof. Wm. J. Schultz's, "Your Taxes,"
Lundberg's "Sixty Families," Prof. Faulkner's "Political
and Social History," etc.

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING CO., 150 Nassau Street, New York

JAMAICA OFFICE, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 150 Nassau St., New York City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

MARCH—APRIL, 1938

VOL. XXXVIII

No. 2 WHOLE No. 207

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

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

SPAIN: A. Matheu Alonso, Tarragona.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

Hungary: J. J. PIXLER, Ester Utca 9. Budapest.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	35
A FORGOTTEN HERO.....	36
CAUSERIE.....Thomas N. Ashton	37
NOTE ON HENRY GEORGE'S CONCEPTION OF CIVILIZATION.....Will Lissner	40
ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION REPORT.....Antoinette (Kaufmann) Wambough	43
DEATH OF CLARENCE DARROW.....	44
THE PASSING OF FISKE WARREN.....	45
TRIBUTE TO FISKE WARREN.....Emily E. F. Skeel	46
ACTIVITIES OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.....	46
CALIFORNIA NEWS LETTER.....Jackson H. Ralston	47
FABLES.....Joseph Dana Miller	49
THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL.....Frank Chodorov	50
BOOK REVIEWS.....	56
CORRESPONDENCE.....	60
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	62

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

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

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

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

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

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

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXVIII

MARCH—APRIL, 1938

No. 2

Comment and Reflection

THAT the Protective Tariff is on its way out seems as good a guess as any. Discredited as it is by bitter experience, its main contentions refuted in every college and university in the land, it has lost its appeal to the intelligentsia. Its failure in Great Britain to arrest the depression, and a similar experience in the United States, have left an increasing number of minds in doubt.

[T was great fun while it lasted. It was amusing to watch the topsy-turviness of the thing and the mental gyrations of cowardly free traders anxious to satisfy the protection sentiments of their constituents. Take Theodore Roosevelt and James A. Garfield, both members of the British Cobden Free Trade Club, and the fatal admission of James G. Blaine in his work, "Twenty Years in Congress." These men, Jekylls and Hydes in their different fields of activity, presented abundant entertainment in proposals and statements impossible to reconcile.

THE protective theory is a maze of contradictions. Just for a resumé of the recommendations for a protective tariff which we do not hear so much about these days but which it is interesting to reflect were once potent arguments in support of protection. No such jumble of strange doctrine was ever held outside of Bedlam. Some of it is still held. We must not delude ourselves. That an increasing number have been undeceived is true, but the truth has not yet filtered down to the masses who are the last to perceive anything.

THE argument once heard—still heard in fact—ran something like this: I will give you, said the Protectionist to the worker, a system that will raise your wages; to you, the manufacturer, a system that will increase your profits; to you, the consumer, a system that will lower prices." Was there ever such a wonder-working miracle? The manufacturer was to be benefited by legislation that would force him to lower prices and raise wages. The workman was to receive this increase in wages from increased profits. But though protectionists told the people that cheapness was not desirable, nevertheless to the consumer prices were to be reduced.

RATES of wages, we are now coming to perceive, are *not cost of labor*. The cost of labor may be, and usually is, the highest where wages are lowest, and vice versa. Therefore when protectionists speak of the cost of labor, they mean only the rate of wages, which is a different matter. So, too, the cost of production involves these considerations and others besides. We are learning that as a rule importations from Japan made by cheap labor so-called, which constitutes one of the worriments of the makers of American bulbs and gadgets, are not as serviceable as those of our own manufacture.

PERFECT freedom of trade would tend more and more to secure to each worker a larger share of his natural reward. It is not reasonable to suppose that in the open markets of the world, where the whole market was the demand, that the wages of the worker would be lower than in an artificially restricted market. It is folly to imagine that high wage countries, high as wages go, cannot compete with low wage countries. England, that paid the highest wages in Europe, did it for nearly fifty years. As a matter of fact the trend of export is from high wage to low wage countries. It has always been so.

OF course, there is a factor that operates to defeat the rise in wages from whatever source. Land absorbs the gain. *Ultimately*, as Mr. George contended, it absorbs all of it. And observing this, though unconscious of its cause and not perceiving it all clearly, protective tariffs have continued to appeal to the workers. And their teachers being about as ignorant as the masses of economic cause and effect, have not been able to indicate why this is so. And the politicians who are chiefly concerned in retaining office and spending the people's money have encouraged the superstition of protection for their own benefit. They hand out their favors, or what their constituencies regard as favors, in tariff aid to local manufacturers just like they hand out the dole. And both are deadly poison to a nation.

WHEN we have something given to us by government, or think that government can give us anything that they do not take from us, we are in the down grade of civilization, and traveling fast. A few more generations of the dole and democracy will cease to exist. Pro-

tection and the dole are sisters of evil and are deadly poison to the citizen, insidiously lulling to sleep the self-respect of the worker and finally reducing him to the slave mind of the helot.

IT is not solely nor principally differences in wages that determine the course of trade, but, more vitally, differences in natural resources, climate and aptitudes. As an illustration of climate as one of the determining factors it might be pointed out that at one time in England, a condition probably still prevailing, in the town of Oldham was manufactured a certain kind of cotton cloth that could not be duplicated anywhere in the world.

WHETHER due to aptitudes or superior labor efficiency it may be indicated that the greater part of our exports, excluding farm products, is made up of commodities in which labor as an element of cost predominates, such as watches, clocks and machinery, and this is significant too in consideration of our problem. When Mr. Burger, a Swiss watchmaker, delegate to the Centennial Exposition in 1876, after a comparison of Swiss and American watches, stated that the scepter of the watch-making industry had passed from Geneva to America, he definitely stated what had been apparent to American manufacturers for a long time—that to refer again to James G. Blaine, leader of the protectionist force, in the Republican party, that longer hours of labor and greater efficiency, principally perhaps in the greater subdivision of labor—gave America the mastery.

IT cannot *prima facie* be that a theory like protection that contradicts all elements of reason and logic is scientifically correct. Take the "balance of trade" theory of which we hear so much—namely that a country prospers by its excess of exports over imports and that this constitutes what is called "a favorable balance." Here is the *pons asinorum* of the problem that seems to puzzle so many people. Even some "journals of civilization" like the *New York Times*, which is old enough to know better, repeats the absurd chatter. The idea at the back of it in the mass mind is that we are to be paid some time in money for this excess of exports. If we are, some day the "favorable balance" will change to an "unfavorable balance" due to an excess of imports!

BUT of course it all isn't so. Goods are paid for in goods. Trade between peoples is a two-way traffic. If there is a balance, it is settled for in shipments of bullion—goods again. Yet even this amount is so small as to bear no comparison to the bulk of exchanges and is almost entirely negligible. Perhaps more enlightened generations will laugh at the notion that the more goods we send out the richer we are.

IT may be appropriate right here to answer a correspondent who asks us to explain the mechanism of international exchange. It is very simple. It may be described in a few sentences as follows: A merchant in the United States sends goods to a merchant in France. Unless credits have been previously arranged, the shipper takes to a bank the bill of lading, with a draft on the buyer for the amount of the bill. The draft with the bill of lading attached is forwarded to the bank's correspondent in Europe for collection from the buyer. The foreign correspondent, being in possession of the money, places it to the credit of the American bank, which in turn places the proceeds to the credit of the shipper.

A Forgotten Hero

HERE is the place for a tribute to a forgotten hero. And whom should he be, of all persons, a member of the ruling house of Austria, son of Maria Theresa, one of the most reactionary monarchs of Europe, and brother of the intriguing and traitorous Marie Antoinette of France—himself Joseph the Second of Austria.

He was not forgotten in the preparation of the Single Tax Year Book in 1917 and is quoted as follows (see page 328):

"Land which nature has destined to man's sustenance is the only source from which everything comes, and to which everything flows back, and the existence of which constantly remains in spite of all changes. From this unmistakable truth it results that land alone can furnish the wants of the state and that in natural fairness no distinction can be made in this."

Joseph was eccentric, even erratic. That he was entirely sound in his economics cannot be contended. He hated in his secret soul the trappings of royalty. He could hardly be persuaded to treat with common courtesy the members of the royal household, even the members of his own family. The one exception he made was his clever brother Leopold. But to his social inferiors he went out of his way to make himself agreeable. He was particularly gracious to those of "the lower orders."

He developed an early dislike for the church knowing that it supported privilege, for which even in his youth he was gradually cultivating a violent dislike. He read the French physiocrats and the encyclopædists, and he wrote a sharp letter to his sister Marie Antoinette for antagonizing Turgot, Louis's Finance Minister. He told his sister, in language not over-polite, not to bother with what she did not understand. Here is his language: "The intrigues and stupidities which appeal to your vanity make you commit one blunder after another. Why, my dear sister, do you interfere in removing min-

*Most of the material for this article is gathered from "The Revolutionary Emperor" by S. K. Padover, Ph.D., Research Associate of the University of California, 1933.

ers, in exiling some to the country, in helping others to win lawsuits?"

In urging the taxation of the nobility he admitted that their diminished income would reduce the brilliancy of the court, but said, "Who cares for the splendor of the court?"

Of course the nobles resented his sharp criticism, but he told them it was unjust that those who worked should pay the taxes while aristocratic idlers enjoyed all the privileges.

He opened the parks to the public which had hitherto been monopolized by the nobility. The nobles protested against having to rub shoulders with the plebians, and his extraordinary emperor retorted, "If I were to associate with my equals I would have to descend to the vaults of the Capuchin church (where the Hapsburgs are buried) and there spend my days." He made frequent appearances in the public parks which were now the people's parks, but issued a decree that no one should pay any attention to him. He inscribed at the entrance of one of these parks, "This amusement place is dedicated to the people by their well wisher." It can still be read.

Emperor Joseph accomplished much but he sought to achieve a great deal more. He annulled from the statute books the crime of heresy and with it the imposition of torture; he strove to abolish the death penalty; he abolished serfdom; he sought to keep separate church and state; he urged complete religious liberty; he suppressed the censures.

When a lady applied to him protesting against his anti-pension decree he treated her with scant courtesy.

"How can I live on a hundred florins? I demand justice of Your Majesty." "It is precisely because of justice that you will not get that pension. As to your standards, for those you believe you are entitled to, am I to assist you at the expense of the unfortunate poor? Justice demands that I shall not accord to you what would support five or six thrifty families."

"What will become of my daughter? She is without resources."

"She can go to work."

My daughter work? But, Your Majesty."

"Work," snapped the Emperor. "Yes, work. I, too, work."

Joseph sought to establish the Single Tax. All industry was to be free and land to be the sole source of revenue. To get at the values a registrar of real properties had to be made. The nobles objected and in Hungary the army had to be called out.

The measure of course would have resulted in the abolition of the nobility. The nobles called the Emperor the "peasant God," and rose in rebellion.

Three months after this attempt to enforce the edict the Emperor died, and his brother Leopold who succeeded him found it necessary to revoke the decree. And thus came to an end the first nation-wide attempt to secure

the freedom of industry and man's natural right to the earth.

Brave Joseph! He left as his own epitaph the record of his failure and requested that it be engraved on his tomb. This request was disregarded. The people he sought to benefit did not know their friend and so he passed almost unrecognized by his ungrateful subjects.

The war he had tried to carry on in their behalf had been lost, and another great fight for human liberty had come to naught.

Lonely Joseph! Except for his easy going brother Leopold he went his way alone, cherishing his great dream of human enfranchisement. One thought was a comfort to him—the memory of his wife, Isobel, torn from him by death in his early manhood. He never forgot her, and it is as beautiful a love story as was ever told. But there was no other man or woman to share his solitude, with mother, brothers and sister unable to understand him, or openly or secretly hostile.

We have spoken of him as a hero. The designation is richly deserved. For who among the reformers of the world has traveled so desolate a path? Brave Joseph!

Causerie

BY THOMAS N. ASHTON

HONNEUR ET PATRIE

AS between a bad, bold, brazen exploiter and an unctious, psalm-singing statesman who operates behind the cloak of private "legal" title to public site-values, the bestowing of our scintilla of respect goes to the former.

Dick Turpin acted the man he professed to be—a highwayman. Jesse James made no pretense at being an exemplary citizen. Al Capone intended to violate the statutes against rum and rackets and cared not a hoot who knew it.

When a gun-man suddenly looms out of the night and pokes a gat into our ribs we need no scientific treatise to clarify his aims. Pietistical platitudes are a waste of time in his purposeful programme. When the Moham-medan banditti semi-annually swooped down upon the natives, a couple of hundred years ago, the victims knew that taxes were due—that their homes would be burned to the ground if the tax collectors felt the least bit bilious, that their property might be destroyed in sheer cussedness if not taken in tribute—that it was time to take to the tall timbers to save, most precious of all, their very lives.

These poor souls were far more fortunate, in one respect, than we tax victims of this enlightened age—they were not called upon to learn and believe that wrong is right through the media of political economy as taught in our universities, nor needed they learn to be awed by a title-deed filled with to-haves and to-holds and know-alls

and seals and wax—all of which give to the holder thereof the right to exact ground-rent to the full extent of production, if the deed-deviser deems it wise, in return for nothing.

In one respect the aims of the brazen exploiter and of the suave ground-rent collector are identical—both intend to take from the victim a part—mebbe all—of the products of his earnest and honest labors.

In a second respect those Mohammedan victims were twice as fortunate as we—the banditti did *all* the tax collecting at one operation on each occasion, whilst we pay twice—once to the official tax collector and once to the ground-rent collector, on each occasion. Furthermore, the victims of the great Mogul learned the worst in a few moments, but we—Lord help us—are subjected to a prolonged agony, not knowing for weeks or months or mebbe years whether we are in the red of ruin, after each occasion.

The pages of history run rank with tales of the time-tried rapacity of man—the man who stole the food and fields and families of the toiler; with tales of tyranny and starvation in India, of six millions of Indians perishing in hunger en masse; with harrowing details of Chinese mire and misery and poverty where mandarins waxed wealthy and smooth and sleek; with prosaic recitals of Irish famines wherein Irish foods were carted away for exportation “along roads lined with the starving and past trenches into which the dead were piled.”

The crude methods of India's banditti have given way to a more refined, a more cultured, exploitation of laborers—modern methods in which our nation and that of our British forebears assume a statesmanlike atmosphere—streamlined methods whereby billions of dollars and hundreds of millions of pounds periodically are levied in taxation upon illiterate workers to finance wars growing out of man's rapacity for power and plunder—methods pursued to perpetuate the legal right of the few to exploit the many whilst hymns and organs soothingly sound in the distance.

As we visualize the physical and mental tortures which accompanied tax collections in ye olden dayes we can appreciate the difficulty experienced, by charitable readers of today, in controlling a rising feeling of contempt for “a race of people who, stung by such wrongs, have *only occasionally* murdered a landlord.” But what greater contempt arises as we witness nary a landlord taken for even an oratorical castigation by a race of this day's ostensibly cultured, erudite, parliamentarians who are easily buncoed by legal bombast which carefully has confused private and public wealth under the mediocre mark of “real estate”—the whole structure being painstakingly carried on rickety cribbing placed, one log at a time, in the names of commonsense, common-law, statute-law, university economics and legal precedent.

'Tis well nigh impossible to cool our boiling blood as we

read the sordid stories of ancient Hindoos selling the souls for a handful of rice—of emaciated coolies clawing the gutters for roasting rats and pups—of tiny tots toiling in textile sweatshops until death brought an early release. Yet all this—as nauseating as it is—creates less heat in our hardening arteries than does a revelation of the successful span of suave, sanctimonious, noiseless thievery whereby industry—both man, woman and child—today starves human stomachs and stunts human minds because of being busily engaged in bringing home the bacon to beneficent racketeers.

As between a bad, bold, brazen exploiter and an unctious hymn-humming statesman who carefully steers the ship of state away from public site-values into the private pockets of labor, our scintilla of respect still sticks to the guy with the gat.

TELLING POINTS

As we bore our way into the boring schemes, plans and programmes for rescuing humanity from depression recessions—yea, and obsessions—we note that in order to be a la mode to you, the reform genius, should have a programme of so many points. Ten points, twenty points, or so—any substantial number which will lead the reader to suspect that you carefully have analyzed the entire social problem and have boiled it down to an exclusive, fixed and limited, number of essential features.

A one-point reform, like Single Tax, haint enough 'Taint got enough heft. It's too simple. Readers and taxpayers like a lot for their two-bits. Take care, however, that you don't have too many points because a fifty-point programme for social relief, f'rinstance, might cause your readers to suspect that your scheme had got the best of you—had got you down—and that you had finished your monumental proclamation on the floor under your desk buried in a litter of copy-sheets. It is better to stick to a manageable number of points—say a baker's dozen or less.

At the close of the World War our dexterous Democrats juggled a plenty-of-points programme onto the international stage and outpointed the Ten Commandments by several. In political campaigns both major parties usually dish out a plenitude of points, although our robed Republicans ordinarily are not as lavish with points as are our daedalian Democrats.

To blurt out the fundamental truth which is the key to social chaos—the failure to collect site-values for public expense—is a one-point programme which cannot politically compete with the 57-point programme of our sovereign State's legislative experts on taxation.

Take the new, Republican, “eight-point” programme of Senator Vandenberg, f'rinstance, as enumerated under four items by a smart reporter: (1) a balanced budget, (2) repeal of surplus profits tax, (3) avoidance of entangling foreign alliances, and (4) a balanced response

bility between Capital and Labor and the Constitution under a new name for the Republican party. Now *there's* a neat number of points, each carefully set apart like the four vegetables on a partitioned-plate at a vegetable dinner, wherein the diced carrots stand apart from the cabbage whilst the peas do not roll into the mashed potatoes. Dishing up a programme in *that* form presents an edible whole which means much to the empty Republican stomachs and to the vacuous digestive tracts of independent, dyspeptic Democrats of advertised Jeffersonianism. Hash, on the other hand, while being a one-point lunch does not begin to offer the epicurean allurements and public exposure of what's-in-this-lunch as does the four-point, blue-plate, partitioned vegetable dinner.

Success in putting over your reform of the taxation muddle lies in offering a fascinating number of points. Surely, there is a number which fascinates you, is there not? *We* have a weakness for fives and sevens, though we don't know why and they've never brought us luck in the nigger pool. It's just a hunch. If we were asked to write an "eight-point," Republican, salvation programme (under four items) we would submit the following:

- (1) A balanced budget arrived at by spending for government costs an amount equal to the revenue derived from a single tax upon the site-values of land.
- (2) Repeal of the surplus profits tax and of all other taxes upon industry.
- (3) Avoidance of entangling foreign alliances by the means of free trade, free speech universally, free men, women and children, economically as well as physically.
- (4) A balanced responsibility between Capital and Labor by preventing owners of natural resources from boosting and pocketing the site-values of land, and by harmonizing the now-contradictory clauses and amendments of the Constitution—all done under the new political party name of Republocrats or Demicans.

Now *there's* an "eight-point" (four item) salvation programme which tells *how* to accomplish the eight points proclaimed by Senator Vandenberg. Congressmen have no difficulty in naming an eight-point, or ten-point, or sixteen-point goal, but they seldom know *how* to reach it. For three centuries our eminent statesmen complacently have been enunciating prolifically-pointed programmes to gape-mouthed captains of industry until the tidal wave of economic chaos has grown to mountainous proportions. Half a century ago Henry George waded through the deluge of verbiage and sorted the wheat from the chaff—filtered the juice from the pulp—took the kernels from the husks—and wrote a one-point programme, Single Tax; a one-point programme which has one point too many to be comprehended by some minds; a one-point programme which is several points too few to satisfy the complicated thoughts of perplexed politicians, erratic economists and straddling statesmen.

A point is position, says the geometrician. The center of a circle is its locus, whilst the circumference is the locus

of all points which are equi-distant from the center of the circle. Statesmen with a flair for many points will be found out on the circumference running around in circles or—if their points are not equi-distant from a common center—running around in ellipses, spirals, trapezoids, polygons, parallelograms or parabolas; all the while professing to be oriented to the common point of common sense.

THE NEGATIVE APPROACH

"Capital does not limit industry, as is erroneously taught. . . .

Capital does not maintain laborers during the progress of their work, as is erroneously taught. . . . Capital does not supply or advance wages, as is erroneously taught. . . . Capital does not supply the materials which labor works up into wealth, as is erroneously taught. . . ."

Thus wrote Henry George in 1879, all of which he painstakingly proved.

You, Mr. Big Businessman, and you, Mr. Little Businessman, may put these five contradictions of five erroneous teachings, into your pipes and smoke 'em. Both of you have had nigh unto three centuries in which to discover correct methods for permanent success for industry—without regard for the length of time similarly at the disposal of your foreign forebears. Both of you have had nigh unto three score years and ten in which to read the long-discovered correct methods for permanent success of your own affairs. Little attention, if any, has been given by your almost entire multitude to the logic (?) of erroneous economic teachings. Little energy, if any, has been expended by you in solving the simple equation which governs your own commercial lives. As long as your individual heads escaped the brick-bats of bankruptcy you all, each and severally, naively plodded your nonchantly selfish ways and let your sinking fellowmen go to economic hell. His plight, your engulfed fellowmen, and the plight of the low-browed multitude—wearily unemployed or busily brawling with Big and Little Business Bosses—these plights, sez you, were none of your business.

Oh, yeah?

What did you care about the error or truth of the teachings of your professors of political economy—what did you care as long as *you* made a profit? "Am I my brother's keeper?" (meaning *no*) sez you to yourself time and again during the last three generations.

Well . . . are you?

You felt certain, did you not, that the rising tide of economic chaos *never* could reach *your* doorstep?

Well . . . did it?

You are charged, both of you, by Bernard M. Baruch with not having done your share toward rectifying the causes of industrial disaster.

Well . . . have you?

"Business hasn't wanted a change," swears witness Baruch. "It hasn't cleaned up its own stables."

Well . . . have you?

Do you want anything except to return to "old times" when *you* were making money and you felt sorry for your bankrupt contemporaries, whilst being somewhat annoyed by the low-browed rabble in its raucous demands for higher wages and shorter work-days?

"If the government will only leave us alone we can restore the old times of prosperity." That's what *you* think. In what manner can you make a success of old notions and efforts—which are based upon erroneous teachings—if you are unhampered by all the busybody Mr. Fixits now toggled out in official togas and governmental gumshoes and horn-rimmed specs?

Has it ever occurred to you, Messrs. Big and Little Businessmen of these United States, that in original thought—in observation and deduction—you are not so hot? In one breath you have asked our paternalistic national government to loan you money—to fix your minimum prices—to rig your markets; in the next breath you have asked the same pater to "leave us alone."

Do you know what you *do* want. The evidence shows that, basically, you do not know. Furthermore, you are too busy grumbling at "cruel Fate" to find out what ails yourselves. You do not know whether you have a headache or a stomachache, or a backache, and your bill of complaint indicates that your thoughts originate anywhere except in your heads.

Your organizer of a National Little Businessmen's Association opines that Big Business and Brain Trusts and individuals all have failed in showing our government the way out of the dilemma, so he and his crowd "might as well have a fling at it." Your leaders of Big Business assert that the governmental programme is "all right—all wrong—right in part—right with modifications—wrong in part." In other words it is all right but it wont work; it wont work any better than your own methods which, based upon erroneous economic teachings, have built up this nation's commerce—during three centuries—to a big let-down.

During three generations the disciples of Henry George—the disciples of taxing site-values and of untaxing industry—politely have proffered to you, positive principles found in true economic thought. These you have ignored.

We hand you, herewith, the negative approach to your problem.

THE power to reason correctly on general subjects is not to be learned in schools, nor does it come with special knowledge. It results from care in separating, from caution in combining, from the habit of asking ourselves the meaning of the words we use and making sure of one step before building another on it—and above all, from loyalty to truth.—HENRY GEORGE.

A Note on Henry George's Conception of Civilization

BY WILL LISSNER

IT is in his contribution to the general theory of civilization that Henry George has established one of his several claims to the appraisal of him by John Dewey: "One of the world's great social philosophers, certainly the greatest which this country has produced," Professor Dewey himself, of course, is among the most important contributors to our modern conception of civilization. In respect of George's conception of the general nature, origin and measurement of progress in civilization, it is most fruitful to ask, how does Dr. Dewey arrive at this evaluation of George as a social philosopher.

To estimate George's contribution, we must understand the idea of civilization dominant in his time. It was assumed then, as Professor James Harvey Robinson has pointed out, "that man was *by nature* endowed with a *mind* and with reason. These distinguished him sharply from the animals, which did wondrous things, it is true but not as a result of reason . . . (but) by instinct." Civilization, which by prejudice was confused with "urbanity," "civility," was contrasted with "rusticity," "barbarity," "savagery." It was a state, or rather stages achieved by evolutionary causation, and its achievements were transmitted by an hereditary process which, it was thought, changed the character and powers of man.

This concept, expounded by Spencer in George's time (Phil. of H. G., p. 524), was challenged by George. George did not play a lone hand in the recasting of the concept of course. Certainly, it appears that the major credit for the initial development of our present theory of civilization should go back to Darwin and E. B. Tylor. The former's "Decent of Man," and the latter's "Primitive Society," both appeared in 1871, eight years before "Progress and Poverty" made its appearance, in the year in which George formulated the essentials of his economic theory in the then little known pamphlet, "Our Land and Land Policy."

But the evidence indicates that too much importance cannot be attributed to George's work in bringing about a thorough renovation of the general idea of human progress and in forcing moral philosophy to take realistic account of social problems. Here again, there are others whose contributions must be noted. In Europe, George shares credit with his contemporary and anticipator, Karl Marx; his partial followers, the Fabians, to followers like Tolstoy; and most of all to his followers Oppenheimer and Muirhead; in America, to a lesser extent, with his contemporaries, Bellamy, and to a greater extent to intellectual allies like Veblen.

The sociologists and moral philosophers were more willing than the economists of the time to discuss the

problems raised by the American economists-philosophers. It was in 1894, while George was still alive, that Benjamin Kidd, the distinguished British sociologist, wrote his widely-read book, "Social Evolution," recording the elements that were operating. Discussing the challenge to the idea of progress George had raised, he writes: "If we look round and endeavor to regard sympathetically, and yet, as far as possible without bias, the remarkable social phenomena of our time in Germany, France, America and England, we shall find in the utterances of those who speak in the name of the masses of the people a meaning which cannot be mistaken." ("Social Evolution," 1895 edition, p. 72.)

Mentioning the major works of George, Marx, the Fabians and Bellamy, he continued: "It is deserving of the most careful study by the student of social phenomena; for it is here, and here only, that he is enabled to see with the eyes, and to think through the minds of those who see and reason for that large class of the population who are confronted with the sterner realities of our civilization."

Going on to consider George's crucial question, whether attempting to maintain political equality in the face of widespread and increasing economic inequality, was not like standing a pyramid upon its apex, Benjamin Kidd concludes from an honest appraisal of the facts then known that "it must leave the impression on the mind of the unprejudiced observer" that "to the great masses of the people, the so-called lower classes, in the advanced civilizations of today, the conditions under which they live and work are still without any rational sanction." That is, that "the lower classes of our population have no sanction from their reason for maintaining existing conditions." This, Kidd thinks, is an "inevitable" conclusion. (Pp. 72-3.)

Moral philosophy became so concerned with these societal problems raised into the consciousness of the masses by George from a tradition that extended back to Plato and the Greeks and Jeremiah and the Biblical Prophets at a new field of philosophy, one concerned with the validity of ideals, one concentrating upon judgments of value, became clearly defined. It took for its name one John Stuart Mill had suggested earlier, among a host, the science that became known as sociology under the influence of Comte. This field, under Mill's name, "social philosophy," has in recent years developed a large literature and is developing a method. And sociology found these problems involving the individual society so fruitful of investigation that it has given to a field of science all its own, the special sociology, Social Problems, one that, together with the related special sociologies, provides the main body of materials with which the student of social philosophy must work.

George was acquainted with the work of Darwin, to some extent, at least, but the first book of "The Science of Political Economy," shows him to have reserved judg-

ment on its importance and it does not appear that he has been considerably influenced by it. (Which saved him, perhaps, from the misinterpretation current in his time.) One suspects that he had more acquaintance with the point of view of Tylor, for we see in this first division of "The Science of Political Economy" that he was aware that even in the society of so-called savages there were vestiges of civilization of a higher degree than one might find in some modern cities.

But he was predisposed by his evangelical background to an acceptance of the view that man was endowed by nature with mind and with reason, and that this distinguished man from the animals, who were guided by instinct. He frequently contrasts the civilized man with the barbarians, the savages.

His philosopher's mind led him to question these views. He perceived that man was, in origin, a wild animal, but he thought he was something more: "an animal plus a human soul." It would lead us far astray to attempt to define and to analyze what George meant by the soul, for he had an open mind on the crucial points of this problem which, to define in his time, would have dated his thought. (He was, we must remember, while an intensely religious man by the broad standards of behavioristic psychology, a freethinker in theology.) It can, however, be said that he thought man was an animal, but a unique kind of animal, one that we could say has a peculiar capacity for development, one with a peculiar capacity for moral perception, that is, appreciation of the values of behavior, and one peculiarly capable of "creating" an environment in accord with his state of general knowledge and his level of moral perception by means of which he can change himself.

His first discovery of importance is the extent to which the activities of man are purely animal activities. He remarks in "The Science of Political Economy" upon these "non-progressive activities": those by which man provides himself with food and shelter, protection from the vagaries of the rest of nature and defense from the other animals, and by which man perpetuates his kind.

But his greatest discovery was in the nature of civilization, which developed from his challenge of the notion of Spencerian evolution. Civilization, according to the modern view, consists of language, religion, beliefs, morals, arts and manifestations of the human mind and reason (Robinson), all of which are newly assimilated by each generation and are not hereditarily transmitted. For this modern theory we are indebted to George.

"Each society, small or great, necessarily weaves for itself a web of knowledge, beliefs, customs, language, tastes, institutions and laws," George writes. ("Progress and Poverty.") "Into this web, woven by each society . . . the individual is received at birth and continues until his death."

The importance of this theory of the "cultural web" can only be indicated here. How much of a contribution

this was to philosophy is best illustrated, perhaps, in Professor Dewey's classical work, "Human Nature and Conduct." Its practical importance is seen in connection with the age-old controversy of environment against heredity; today we find this controversy dominating the thought and policy of empires, with the environmentalists supreme in Soviet Russia, and the hereditarians dominant in National Socialist Germany.

In his exposition of his notion of the cultural web, George proceeds significantly; "This is the matrix in which mind unfolds and from which it takes its stamp." In this brief sentence, George emerges from the limitations of the thought of his time. He may not have been aware that his definition of man defined exactly only civilized man; he may have been unwilling to accept the view that man once had been in an uncivilized state in which he was nothing more than an animal (a view which makes assumptions as equally unfounded in our present state of knowledge as his own); but he did perceive that mind was developed, originated in and was part of the process of civilization itself.

Having seen that civilization is an accumulation, a social and traditional heritage from the development of man's intelligence made possible by an accidental or purposeful combination of physical characteristics, George was able to analyze the phenomenon—progress—whose contrast with a phenomenon of which he had anguishing first-hand experience—poverty—had led him to stray in the fertile field of economic thought. Let us consider what we mean by progress.

If we accept, for example, the evolutionary concept of Spencer or the mechanistic ideologies of more recent thinkers, we must set down human aspirations as visionary, human discontent—itself a powerful force for social change—as futile raving. Social betterment, we must tell ourselves, will come if it is betterment by the inexorable processes of history; we can do nothing but sit back and wait, we can be confident of nothing except that we shall not see improvement in society in our own time.

But if our modern hope of progress is as Robinson defines it—"an indefinite increase of knowledge and its *application* to the improvement of man's estate—then our hope resides in man as an actor; to use the religious phraseology of our modernist debtors of anthropology and mathematical physics, our hope resides in the possibility of man acting as the cooperator with God in the creation of an unfinished world.

George saw that invention, discovery and the increase of knowledge are the stuff of which civilization is made, to borrow Robinson's phrase. He saw that civilization consisted of spiritual things, that is, things of the mind and of reason, language, religion, belief, morals, arts and similar manifestations. He continued further, however, and found the basis for our religion, our morals, our folkways, even our arts, in the material: "much of subjective

desire is in the material," he puts it. (Sc. Pol. Ec., Bk 1.

From this he ascends. Since man's nobler aspiration are found to have their seat in his material needs, he ventures the opinion that only as his material needs are satisfied will he be able to realize these nobler ends. There is no short cut to the direct manipulation of the individual. Human progress, he concludes, consists in the adaptation of the changing social structure to the problems in which man in the course of his development involve himself. The individual insofar as he is a social organism is a product of his environment; in George's thought man's moral and social progress is inevitably conditioned by his economic background. He can develop upward only when and as his economic problems are solved.

This brings us to the problem of the measurement of progress. George locates the law of human progress in the phenomenon of association, of social gregariousness. "Man, the social animal," as Geiger says in paraphrasing George, "is presented only with one way of efficiently solving the problem of non-progressive activity; that is by a continuing and ever-increasing utilization of communal forces . . . the power of social cooperation." It is in this association that we find a measure of progress; its extent, George holds, determines the extent to which men are released for pursuit of the progressive activities in which civilization increases.

George feels that we might measure civilization in power which exists in the extension of man's individual power in society by what we denote as social cooperation and social integration; in wealth, the result of that extension of powers; and in justice and kindness, or, to use a more modern terminology, justice and charity, the aspect of human relations, the relations between man and man. In the latter, in the level of social justice and charity (the latter is not to be confused with benevolence), which is the moral side of civilization, was the aspect he considered the truest sign of general advance. We have but to consider the treatment of the jobless, the need and the underprivileged today, not only in the United States but in all so-called civilized countries, to realize the value of this scale in the measurement of human progress.

The further development of George's theory of civilization and of human progress in civilization, which must be set against the background of George's theory of the organization of production and exchange, is important to an understanding of the realism of George's program of social reconstruction, which is another problem. But there is an important consideration that must not be disregarded. Progress, he held, depended upon the association *in equality*.

Here we find George the realist, bringing into the concrete arena of measurable social phenomena the aspirations of a long line of utopian thinkers to whom the world is indebted for progressive motivation, even if it cannot thank them for performance. As in association *in equality*

he found the law of the rise of civilization, in association in *inequality* he saw its inevitable fall. Many lesser thinkers have returned to this discovery of George's of late. But they overlook, what George analyzed with the keen insight peculiar to his genius, the economic imperatives through which this law operates.

Acting on the suggestions of Adam Smith and Macaulay, George examines the idea of "pecuniary interests" and finds them to be special interests become rooted in the structure of society and thus, in the first book of "The Science of Political Economy, we find an extensive development of this theory of "vested interests," the first formulation of the old, vague idea of "vested rights." So valuable was this analysis, this formulation (anticipated but not defined in "Progress and Poverty" and other of George's earlier writings) that Thorstein Veblen was able to apply it to a vast range of industrial phenomena and, in, by it, his claim to recognition. ("The Vested Interests and the State of the Industrial Arts, 1919.")

George began his inquiry into society impelled by the curious phenomena produced by the monopolization of agricultural land. His insight into civilization broadened that concern from agricultural land to all natural opportunity. Social progress, he concluded, demands the socialization or the abolition of all special privilege, all monopoly exactions. It is in this perception of what Peligman called "the disturbing but fruitful concept of privilege," that George's approach to the socialization of rent "soars beyond the categories of economics," as Geiger points out, "into the very dimension of the rise and fall of civilization."

Dorothy Thompson Speaks Out

HENRY GEORGE was a great man. He is the only economist I ever read with whom I could find no fault. He was the only economic philosopher of capitalism. If the capitalists had paid any attention to him they would not be in the mess they are today."

DOROTHY THOMPSON.

Miss Thompson in a letter to Mrs. deMille gives us permission to quote. Also acknowledging receipt of a copy of "Progress and Poverty," she says she will review "some time soon."

THOSE who make private property of the gift of God pretend in vain to be innocent. For in thus retaining the substance of the poor they are the murderers of those who die every day for the want of it.

POPE GREGORY, THE GREAT.

EQUAL: The Earth therefore and all things therein are the general property of all mankind, exclusive of all other beings, from the immediate gift of the Creator.

BLACKSTONE.

Robert Schalkenbach Foundation Report

IN returning to the work at the Foundation I see everywhere signs of progress. Miss Peterson, who has been acting secretary during my two years leave of absence, has done a monumental work in handling the demand for books, in planning new activities, and in carrying out exacting assignments along lines not heretofore followed. We feel that in having her at the helm the Foundation has been fortunate, and it is contemplated that she will continue to direct a large share of the Foundation affairs.

Ten thousand "Progress and Poverty," two thousand "Protection or Free Trade," and one thousand "Science of Political Economy" are being printed this month. The Henry George School is taking one half the amount of each title and the balance will be distributed in channels developed by the Foundation's activities.

Further, the Trustees of the Foundation have completed an interesting arrangement by way of experiment, with Random House, Modern Library Series, whereby five thousand copies of "Progress and Poverty" printed from electroplates jointly owned, are now on the market ready for distribution through the Random House facilities.

The Book-of-the-Month Club have chosen this Random House edition for a listing among the books to be given free to subscribers, and "Progress and Poverty" will henceforth appear in each Book of the Month Club bulletin.

"The Science of Political Economy" will be the first American edition to be published since the old Doubleday McClure version and of course those versions, in double volume, that appeared in various "sets." It will match "Progress and Poverty," and its 542 pages will be obtainable for the usual standard price of \$1.

Besides the preparation of the new printings, and concern with the details of appearance, design, etc., it is the duty of the office to promote new methods of placing the books in the hands of the public. Miss Peterson reported in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM the sending of a letter, describing "Progress and Poverty," to accountants. Ten thousand accountants received the five-day trial offer for the book, and 330 have sent for it. Each mail brings additional orders. We find members of the same firm telling each other about "Progress and Poverty" and sending for extra copies. The Librarian of Ernst and Ernst, one of the foremost accounting firms in the country, has placed the book in the company library.

Through the series of advertisements appearing in *Fortune*, *American Mercury*, *Atlantic Monthly*, and *Harpers*, a certain number of Henry George's books have been placed, and we note that the demand springs from professional men, authors, editors, bank presidents, and many college professors who have sent for the books through the use of these media. For the information of those in the cause

who wish to conduct advertising programmes in their own vicinity, we may say that while it is helpful to bring the story and news of Henry George's books before the public, judged by results, mailed material is far in advance of magazine advertising as a means of getting books off the shelves and into the hands of many readers.

From a friend in Texas we received a letter asking for information as to how to put the Single Tax into operation in his town. This gentleman has a strong enough voice in the city government to do effective campaigning, provided we can prove to him that sound measures can be drafted into the laws of his city. Technical material has been supplied.

More numerous than some people imagine, are the letters that come to the Foundation asking for special material, and information along practical lines. Such letters are answered with great care, and a supply of reference material is kept on hand.

Speaking engagements and the arrangements therefore are taken care of through our office. If leaders in cities and towns near New York feel the need of interesting local civic bodies, we have several men of ability who are prepared to make addresses. Mr. Lancaster Greene, whose activities are well known to LAND AND FREEDOM readers, is taking on an assignment of this kind for us in Boston.

Friends who entertained Professor A. Matheu Alonzo of the National College at Tarragona, Spain, during his visit to this country in 1934, will be interested to know that he needs fifty copies of "Progress and Poverty" in French, for the instruction of his class. The French publishers inform us that they can supply fifty copies (paper covers), for \$26, plus carriage. Because of our large commitments for new editions referred to in the first part of this report, we find our Book Fund depleted. If therefore one or two persons could come forward with a donation toward this specific task of putting "Progress and Poverty" into the hands of the youth of Spain, it would be most helpful at this time.

ANTOINETTE (KAUFMANN) WAMBOUGH,
Executive Secretary.

Death of Clarence Darrow

CLARENCE DARROW, humanitarian extraordinary, once said of Henry George:

"Henry George was a master of English; one of the greatest that ever used a pen. He was one of the real prophets of the world; one of the seers of the world. His was a wonderful mind; he saw a question from every side; his philosophy appealed to every school. Henry George wrote a profound book, the first book on political economy that people may read; the first and perhaps the last that was readable to plain ordinary men."

No finer tribute could be paid. The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in preparing its little booklet "An

Appreciation of Henry George" by John Dewey, included in the latter pages, a series of comments by famous men. The Darrow remarks above quoted appear there.

The writer remembers particularly the request of our then president, the late Charles O'Connor Hennessy, to gather as many statements as possible made by famous men and women concerning the life or work of Henry George. Several days of research at the Main Library, Manhattan, were required, and in poring over the many sources of information I remember vividly the magazine article by Darrow in a 1913 issue of "Everyman." His succinct appraisal was part of a speech delivered by him at a Henry George Anniversary Dinner of the Single Tax Club in Chicago.

Interesting reference to this phase of Darrow's career is made in the N. Y. *World-Telegram* obituary, March 14, 1938:

"Soon after coming to Chicago, Darrow attended a lecture by Henry George and in the discussion after the speech he got up and delivered such a forceful analysis as to capture the audience. His talk impressed John P. Altgeld, then a Judge and later Governor of Illinois, who invited Darrow to become his law partner, and who was to exercise a great influence on his thought and career."

Students of Single Tax history will remember that Altgeld strove mightily for the Single Tax in his State, and that he was one of the many faithful, public-spirited followers of Henry George who came to realize the full import of George's concluding admonition in "Progress and Poverty",—

"The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be die for it. This is the power of Truth."

It is seldom accident that the paths of men cross. The altruism that actuated George to write these words, the humanitarian instincts that drove Darrow during a long life to do battle with the ignorance and apathy of the mob and the political martyrdom that Altgeld suffered himself to undergo are part and parcel of the great plan that links the lives and deeds of forward-looking men.

ANTOINETTE WAMBOUGH, Executive Secretary,
Robert Schalkenbach Foundation.

PROPERTY in land differs in its origin from property in any commodity produced by human labor. The product of labor naturally belongs to the laborer who produced it. . . . But the same argument does not apply to land, which is not the produce of labor, but is the gift of the Creator to the world to mankind. Every argument used to give an ethical foundation for the exclusive right of property in land has a latent fallacy.

JUSTICE LONGFIELD.

The Passing of Fiske Warren

FISKE WARREN, founder of a dozen Single Tax colonies, "enclaves" as they are called, and an attendant at nearly all the Henry George Congresses which have met from year to year under the auspices of the Henry George Foundation, was born at Waltham, Mass., in 1862. He graduated from Harvard in 1884 and later studied law at Oxford, England.

He was a fighter for Philippine independence in 1899 and was intimately associated with the Filipino leaders, knowing many of them personally. He was proud of the title bestowed upon him, "Champion of the Unpopular."

His particular service to the Single Tax cause was the founding of the "enclaves" by which he hoped to demonstrate the advantages of paying all communal expenses out of land values while exempting all improvements from taxation. He founded the enclaves at Tahanto, and Ayer, Mass, Halidon at Westbrook, Maine and Sant Jordi in the Republic of Andorra. He also founded the Georgian Trust Fund for the promotion of the Georgeist cause.

Mr. Warren was prominent socially and was a member of many clubs. He was national amateur court tennis champion in 1893.

His friendship with Erskine Childers is an interesting incident in his career. Fiske Warren and Erskine Childers married sisters, daughters of Dr. Hamilton Osgood of Boston. Childers was a veteran of the Boer War and the author of a novel warning against Germany. He became interested in the Irish fight for independence and used his yacht to convey guns to the Irish rebels. He was taken and died wearing the green before a firing squad.

In an interesting sketch of Fiske Warren life the *Boston Globe* in its issue of Feb. 6 says:

Both men operated on the principle that the highest patriotism is to prevent your own country from dominating a small nation. Both were "lone wolves"; Warren resigned from the Anti-Imperialistic League so as not to embarrass it, before campaigning for Philippine Independence on the spot at Manila. Childers separated himself from his English friends to carry on the fight in Ireland. Both men appeared to have failed in their objectives, but in both cases these seem to be approaching achievement.

The Philippines have become a Commonwealth and are on their way to independence. A British Prime Minister recently had a friendly discussion at London with President Eamonn de Valera regarding the details of Ireland's newer, more independent status in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Those who remember the quiet, soft-spoken man that was Fiske Warren will have some difficulty in visualizing him for what he was, a heroic fighter, willing to take up any cause that appealed to him. In this he was like his friend Childers. It is difficult to feature him as the

daring advocate of a cause that aroused the utmost bitterness.

As illustrative of the intensity of the bitterness aroused by the controversy over Philippine independence we may mention the address delivered by the Rev. Dr. Rossiter before a gathering of American veterans at Manila, at which the Reverend gentleman said, that if William Howard Taft, then Governor General of the Philippines, would give the word they would duck Fiske Warren in the Pagis River. It never happened, but Mr. Warren later carried on a newspaper controversy with William Howard Taft while that gentleman was Governor General and Secretary of War.

It was not until 1909 that Mr. Warren read "Progress and Poverty." It was an indication of his venturesome character—always the "lone wolf" as the *Globe* has called him—that in place of cooperating with existing activities he sought to establish through Single Tax colonies the principles which he had eagerly espoused. And it must be said that these "enclaves" have been measurably successful. While colony experiments have come and gone the Single Tax "enclaves" have continued to flourish. They are not sufficient in their scope to produce any great economic effects, but they may be said to be working examples not without their value as partial demonstrations.

When the history of the movement is completed the name of Fiske Warren will occupy a high and prominent place in its annals. He was a brave soldier in the war for human freedom.

A Tribute to Fiske Warren

THE sudden passing of Fiske Warren in Boston was a shock and sorrow to his many friends. He was in the full tide of his usual even and athletic health; he walked, he bicycled, and he even ran over hill and dale with ease and zest of a youth up to the moment when an aural operation intervened.

A childhood of delicate health had robbed him of the heritage of open-air activity enjoyed by most American boys. This he battled with and conquered, becoming one of the earliest national champions in tennis. Later his crusade, almost single-handed and at risk of life and limb, to stem imperialistic trends by a long trip through the Philippine Islands made vivid and picturesque history, known to but few.

Travel, faithfulness to his business activities (in an inherited paper-making concern of high repute), study in delving deep into the scholarship of the early English language, a felicitous marriage to a most rare and understanding mate (who, with their three children, shares his aims and purposes to introduce Single Tax), rounded out a distinguished career, though withal a most modest one, of amazing energy, concentration and earnestness.

Practicing the most rigid self-denial in all luxuries or even comforts (he habitually traveled to Europe by third-class), no harsh misunderstandings, no tacit social ostracism on the part of others who did not understand his high ideals, ever turned him by one jot or tittle from his path.

To Georgeism—chiefly as exemplified in several successful enclaves which he either founded or in which he shared management—he gave unremittingly of himself and his substance with a single-minded devotion rarely found.

So, over and above the swift yet enduring pangs of grief that must be felt by many in every walk of life, scattered over several continents, to whom he endeared himself by his sincerity, his roguish humor, his Spartan simplicity, his human-ness, his tolerance, his courage and his integrity in the largest implications of the word, his admirers and friends must learn to merge their sense of loss in the larger realization that though the world is literally the poorer for his going, it is infinitely richer by his efforts and his spirit.—EMILY E. F. SKEEL.

Activities of The Manhattan Single Tax Club

PRESIDENT INGERSOLL has had unusual activity in public speaking engagements in the last few weeks:

The Lions Club at White Plains, in conjunction with Radio Station WFAS of that city, had Mr. Ingersoll on March 3; and Mr. Frank A. Seitz arranged for the address on the air, and also each question and answer. As the latter consumed nearly three hours, this programme was very interesting. It might be promoted in each place having a radio station. (See separate report on this event.)

The Lions Club of Fall River, Mass.

The Kiwanis Club of Fall River, Mass.

Dr. F. M. Padelford has arranged for these two service clubs to hear Mr. Ingersoll at a union luncheon meeting on April 20. His subject will be "The Cause and Cure of Depression, Unemployment and Poverty."

The Rotary Club of Bridgeton, N. J.

This club will have Mr. Ingersoll as its guest speaker on June 9. His subject: "The Cause and Cure of Depression, Unemployment and Poverty."

The Rotary Club of Haddonfield, N. J.

This club arranged with Mr. Ingersoll to be its guest speaker in April, but has not decided as between which Thursday.

Mr. Ingersoll is giving special study to his appeal to business men and in connection with broadcasting of current events.

THE PUBLIC SERVICE FORUM

A number of forums have given special opportunity to Mr. Ingersoll as Director and Chairman to introduce economics. This station, having 5000 watts power, enjoys a coverage of the whole East as evidenced by com-

munications from as far as Minneapolis, Miami and Nova Scotia.

Mr. Ingersoll's weekly broadcasting schedule:

Mon., WCNW, 2:30 P. M.; WWRL, 11:15 P. M.; Tues., WFAS, 10:30 P. M. (White Plains); Wed., WCNW, 3:45 P. M.; Thur., WLTH, 8:15 P. M.; Fri., WPEN, 9:45 P. M. (Phila.); WDAS, 12:45 P. M. (Phila.); WSNJ, 2:45 P. M. (Bridgeton); WTNJ, 7:45 P. M. (Trenton); Sat., WOV, 3:15 P. M.; WWRL, 11:15 P. M.; Sun., WBIL, 8:15 P. M. The Public Service Forum, (C. H. I., Director.)

1400 to 1500 k. c. except WBIL, 1100 k. c. 5000 watts. WOV, 1100 k. c. 5000 watts.

REPORT ON PRES. CHAS. H. INGERSOLL'S ADDRESS TO THE LIONS CLUB OF WHITE PLAINS

This report is deemed important in view of the following comment made by Frank A. Seitz, Manager of Radio Station WFAS at White Plains. Seitz arranged this meeting and serviced it with not only the speaker's microphone, but shifted another receiver to each diner as he asked questions, thus getting the whole proceeding.

"I can only repeat what I told you after the meeting—that I have never yet seen the members of the Lions Club give up the greater part of their afternoon for a speaker! Since a great many of them are interested in real estate in Westchester County, your subject was particularly appropriate."

This report is important as an example of radio technique which should be extended, and as indicating a well-balanced talk to business men, as evidenced by the fact that practically everyone of these sixty Lions members asked one or more questions, and stayed away from their business three hours to get the answers.

The high points of Mr. Ingersoll's talk were as follows (his subject being "Single Tax—the only remedy for depression," suggested by the club President): He explained that while the Single Tax was descriptive, it tended to narrow a great moral and business philosophy. The first democracy, and greatest producer of wealth, should not be "at the cross-roads." Our troubles are economic though involving morals, spirituality, and philosophy. Business men should stick to the tangible, financial and temporal.

There are two schools only, approaching the breakdown from the economic viewpoint—the individualist democrat of the Jefferson and George type, and the Marxian collectivist philosophy (or fallacy). These two opposite schools very significantly agree: (1) that our prime trouble is poverty itself; (2) that it is caused by exploitation; (3) that it is curable; and by stopping the exploitation; (4) that the approach is economic; and (5) that socialization is the remedy. This takes them together to the half-way point, because the individualist would socialize all social values which comprise about half of our "national wealth."

This is very important because these two schools and the followers of them, make up the vast majority of all the people; and if they can come together on the only point of difference, we will be practically out of our trouble. This point is: "who or what is the exploiter?" As you know, collectivists would destroy our private system of business, capital and wealth—by socializing it. The individualist would correct the errors of that system and insist on absolute integrity of it. So, instead of the absolute agreement of the two schools, as up to the 50-50 point, they are as absolute in their disagreement from thence on, because this difference involves not only our business and profit system, but our democracy, and civilization as we now understand it.

Now, we come to the answer: the Single Tax is the only alternative to (a) this Marxian, leading to chaos, or (b) our present system, which

call monopolism, and which we know has broken down. The Single Tax, therefore, aims to draw a clearcut line between business, big and little, which you represent, and monopoly, which is now in control of at least half our wealth, but only favors—as their major interest—perhaps 3 per cent of the population.

This monopoly, while having limitless ramifications, such as the administration at Washington is tangled up in, has only three principle divisions in its basic element, comprising the 200 billion of value as estimated. Most familiar to us are utilities; the next are natural resources; these combined make probably half the total; the rest site values in cities.

Monopoly, therefore, should be first considered as basic monopoly; in a sense, monopoly of the earth itself. It yields what is commonly known as "unearned increment" and in the form of economic rent. As such, this is a purely social creation, meaning that it is a creation of the whole people and their activities, especially their governmental activities.

This rent amounts to something like fifteen billions; and you may think it a coincidence that our tax budgets, local, state and federal, are about the same amount. But your business sense should make it clear that in a general way, our expenditures for government reflect these increments or rents—in fact, one creates the other.

Now, is there anything more obvious to a business man than that this great stream of social "profits" should be used to liquidate the equally great costs of government, that go directly to create these same surplus earnings of our collective estate? Is there anything more obvious to every business common or horse sense, than that no individual should be permitted to touch any of this social revenue?

Do any of you business men allow the earnings of your business to run away from it, and then go and beg, borrow, or steal (our government does all of these) to pay the expenses and obligations of your business? Do any of you, having partnership interests or owning stock in corporations outside your own, give any less care to collecting and conserving these profits, then to your individual activity?

The analogy is perfect; consider yourself as one of 130,000,000 people; for every dollar you make individually in wages, salaries, profits, there is another dollar made by you, but as a citizen of your community, state, and nation; and without any of your interference, that dollar is "deposited" in the form of these social or land values rents. The only way of "withdrawal" of this deposit so far found, through this device called the "Single Tax," but which really is collection of rent."

Through this process, everyone of the 130,000,000 would get his share of the 200,000,000 of social value which actually earns 15 billions of income called rent. So this is the answer: merge these 1001 taxes that now rest on the consumer, doubling his living costs, and thereby cutting in half his purchasing power, slowing down factories and creating millions of unemployed; merge these taxes that destroy industry into a Single Tax which will destroy monopoly.

I don't think I need to say any more.

WHAT we should do unto others as we would have them do to us—that we should respect the right of others as scrupulously as we would have our own rights respected, is not a mere counsel of perfection to individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform social institutions and national policy if we would secure the blessings of abundance and peace.—HENRY GEORGE.

THE great difference between the democratic theory of equality and the Communistic theory is that democracy aims at equality of opportunity whereas Communism aims at equal rewards.—WALTER LIPPMANN.

California News Letter

ALTHOUGH it seems to be little realized in the rest of the country there is going on in California—with every sign of increasing severity—a fight for the restoration of the rights of the people to free opportunity to live and produce, which has been without equal in an electoral way for the past sixty or many more years. I shall not rehearse its earlier history and endeavor to confine myself to the occurrences since last reporting to LAND AND FREEDOM.

We are engaged in an effort to present through the initiative a constitutional amendment which will at once abolish the sales tax in California and at the end of nine years all taxation on improvements and tangible personal property. To obtain a place on the ballot it is necessary to secure the signatures of a little more than 186,000 registered voters, whose qualifications have to be passed upon by the registrars of voters of the several counties. To this day the reports to the Secretary of State cover around 171,000 names, leaving us so far about 15,000 names short. These would have been procured several weeks ago but for two circumstances—the weather and the opposition of the real estate boards and the chamber of commerce. As the world knows, the California weather this winter has been what is locally called "unusual," as for instance, of the first 19 days of March, 16 were rainy. This, continued virtually for two months, has made work by canvassers very difficult and slow.

Entirely without precedent has been the work of the organizations of which I speak. Never before has there been a continuous and persistent effort to prevent a measure from being initiated. This time our canvassers have been spied upon in entering and leaving the offices of those having in charge the solicitation of names, have been followed in their work through the cities, signers have been told falsities as to the effect of their action in signing and urged to have their names withdrawn. Further, the canvassers have been threatened with loss of other occupation unless they abandoned our work, and there seems ample reason to believe that lists they had obtained have sometimes been bought from them.

Frantic full column warnings have been published as advertisements in the papers, usually of the following tenor: "Voters, Beware! Read before you sign. Initiative petitions now being circulated in this county (the solicitors may so soon seek your signature) are in support of The Single Tax Masquerading as a Sales Tax Repeal Act. This vicious proposal is an exorbitant land tax—a tax on your home, your rent, your farm, your business. Why Tax Yourself? California Association Against Single Tax. Denunciations and withdrawal slips have been circulated broadcast.

Despite all of the foregoing we are steadily and surely approaching the position on the ballot for the coming election we are seeking.

In addition to the acts above referred to, the courts have been twice asked to forbid the certification by the registrars of voters of San Francisco and Alameda counties of our lists to the Secretary of State. In each instance the court has refused to so act, and the reports have gone forward. Probably no further action in this regard will be taken, and we know as well as may be that any further like attempt would fail.

Why this determined fight to prevent the people from voting? One can only regard it as the outcome of a certain fear of the result. While chanting loudly that it is too bad that the repose of the people should be disturbed when they have six times overwhelmingly rejected the Single Tax they seem pallid with fear lest the history of the past would not be that of the future. For instance, in a circular letter addressed by a committee of the San Jose chamber of commerce to follow members through Santa Clara county, calling for individual contributions of \$50, the committee says:

"This is one of the most dangerous and misleading measurers ever presented to voters. Its innocent looking phrases, repealing sales taxes and exempting homes and improvements, appeal to the immediate self-interest of great masses of people. Wording of the measure gives no warning that the old Single Tax panacea of taxing land out of private ownership is the real objective. . . . Appeal to voters will be to repeal the Sales Tax and to exempt their homes or personal property from taxation. Anyone can understand that. That is why our fight is going to be so difficult. . . . The very foundations of our state and local governments are in jeopardy. The threat is real. . . . We find it will take many thousands of dollars to do the work."

The sincerest and best help we are receiving is from the labor organizations. The American Federation of Labor has in convention five times endorsed the plan. Only last week at Santa Barbara the Executive Council of the State A. F. of L. instructed its officers to throw their whole weight into the fight. The best part of this is that the officers and council know perfectly well the importance to labor of the proposition and are determined that the rank and file shall as well understand the situation. In addition the State Railway Brotherhoods are endorsing the amendment and there is no reason to doubt that the C. I. O. will be of the same mind. These constitute a potential force of probably not less than 400,000 voters.

Those who should be our friends and supporters throughout the Union are strangely silent, while the few of us, with Labor's assistance, are carrying on a gigantic fight with very strong chances of success. As you have seen our opponents attest this by their actions and utterances.

I remarked a few days ago to a friend that the forces we are contending with were so strong and their resources so vast that it seemed like the old fight of David against Goliath. "Yes," he replied, "but you remember what happened to Goliath."—JACKSON H. RALSTON.

The Natural Law of Rent

LAND is sometimes classified into marginal, super-marginal and submarginal. These terms are self-defining when it is understood that marginal land is such as will produce common wages; that is, a common or average living, and nothing more, to the occupant, upon the application of the average amount of labor and capital.

Ricardo's Law of Rent may be stated thus: Rent is the excess value or product of any land above the poorest grade of land in common use, or marginal land. It may be illustrated as follows:

If marginal land will produce 25 bushels of corn per acre with the average application of labor and capital, its product constitutes common wages only. It has no rental value.

If other land will produce 50 bushels of corn per acre with the same application of labor and capital, the excess 25 bushels, constitutes ground rent, and is attributable to the quality or location of the land itself, rather than to the labor and capital employed. The excess is a gift of nature. It belongs equally to all men; and since it cannot be apportioned, it belongs to society.

As between landlord and tenant, this excess, or ground rent, is taken by the landlord, since the tenant is entitled only to common or average wages.

Super-marginal land will yield not only wages (and interest) on the labor and capital applied, but ground rent in addition, which is the share taken by the landlord and for which he makes no return. It is a monopoly income; and gives such land commercial value.

It is this that makes land so desirable an investment for those who want an income without effort. Such income is at the expense of the public.

Ricardo's Law of Rent is a natural law. It cannot be outmoded, as some say, nor repealed. As well try to repeal the law of gravitation.

Ground rent cannot be added to the price of corn, for the excess corn is itself the ground rent, and has cost nothing. The price of corn is fixed by the cost of producing it on marginal land.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

I ASK in behalf of the poor nothing whatever that properly belongs to the rich. Instead of weakening and confusing the idea of property, I would surround it with stronger sanctions. Instead of lessening the incentive to the production of wealth, I would make it more powerful by making the reward more certain.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS, BY HENRY GEORGE.

I AM a Single Taxer! The Single Tax would be the means of bringing about the sanitary reforms which I so much desire.

Surgeon-General WILLIAM C. GORGAS, U. S. Army.

Fables

COMPENSATION

There had been a battle. Death was everywhere. Under cannon lay dead and dying. The ground was red with the blood of men. The defeated commander, dusty, begrimed and sad beyond words, a fugitive from the field, crept on his hands and knees through underbrush toward the outskirts of the village. Suddenly he paused; the sound of a soft voice broke on his ear, and he peered through the bushes. A little child sat weaving a garland of grass and wild flowers by a running brook.

"Be not afraid, dear child," he said, as she started at his approach, but resumed her seat, reassured by his kindly eye; "I have lost my empire."

"How sorry I am," said the little one, timidly. "But you may have my garland."

WORSHIP OF IMAGES

"Go," said the Emperor to his courier, "and direct that all those who hold beliefs at variance with the state be thrown into prison. And, by the way, stop at the Treasury Department on your way out and instruct my Chancellor of the Exchequer that the new issue of coins be stamped with the image of Liberty that we may please the populace."

PRAYER

A monk in his cell prayed long and earnestly that God would watch over His children on that night of tempestuous storm; that those who were hungry might be fed, and those who were shelterless might be housed. All night long he prayed, his bare knees on the sharp stones, the wind outside blowing a fierce hurricane.

A wanderer came and knocked at the monk's cell, knocked till he was weary, till his strength gave way and he fell prone at the threshold. In the morning he was dead. Thus the monk found him. How could he have heard faint knocking who prayed so long and loudly through those hours of the night?

STATECRAFT

The king of one country was angry with the king of another. "Let the people fight it out," said they, and went home to read reports from the field.

When the war was over the conquered king owed many millions to the victorious one.

"Let the survivors pay it," said they, as they shook hands amicably; and neither blushed.

HE LIKED THAT, TOO

"Did you listen to the speech of Senator Milani in which he dwelt upon the strength and dignity of labor as the creator of all wealth?"

"Yes," responded the king, "I liked that."

"And did you listen later to his great speech on the need of a protective tariff to maintain the wages of labor?"

"Yes," said the sovereign, "I liked that, too."

THE UNWELCOME GUEST

Down the broad thoroughfares of the city go many travelers, rich and poor. That beautiful building you see there is where its legislators meet; opposite in their temple, of worship. Around the corner is the chamber of commerce. All three receive guests today—Pride, Envy, Ambition, Selfishness, Talent, Genius, all are welcome at its three courts—its legislative hall, its temple of worship, its chamber of commerce.

But see where comes a plainly appalled, sturdy, bright bright-eyed visitant. He knocks and presents his card; the city fathers show him the door; he goes to the church but the pastor meets him coming in and says he must leave him at the church portals—such has always been his custom. The unwelcome guest goes sadly around to the chamber of commerce. The same men are now here who refused him admittance at the city hall and the temple of worship. They greet him cordially, explaining to him that he is always welcome at their councils, but that he must under no consideration present himself while they are making laws or when they are at their devotions. They explain to him gently but firmly that he is good enough in his place but on no account must he visit the city hall or chamber of commerce or temple of worship. This has been their habit with him ever since they knew him.

The name of the unwelcome guest is Common Sense.

SUGARED LIES

"Take it," said Nature, the great Mother Nurse, to the man crying like a baby. "It will do you good."

"But it is so bitter," whined the Man.

"The truth is always bitter," said the Great Nurse.

"I won't take it," said the Man, and went out and swallowed so many sugared lies that he sickened and died.

Then the Great Nurse gathered his head tenderly into her lap and smoothed the hair back from the forehead of the dead Man.

"Always the same silly child," she said.

A LOVER OF FREEDOM

"You may roam freely over all parts of my dominion," said the King. "All the miles and miles of land are for your feet, but there is one square mile of sequestered territory where you may not go."

"Why?" asked the subject in rebellion, "may I not tread feet upon this particular square mile?"

"It is a mere fancy. I have estimated that forty thousand square miles were sufficient for you."

"It is a spacious prison, but a prison nevertheless," said the subject. "I must have my freedom."

"You can take what I give you or die," said the King.

"I would rather die than lose my liberty," said this consistent lover of freedom, and cheerfully allowed himself to be beheaded.

BOTH RIGHT

"I have watched the hour hand of that clock for a full minute and it hasn't moved," said the pessimist. And then he fell asleep and slept for twelve hours. He woke, and his friend the optimist hailed him joyously.

"The hand has moved all around the dial," he cried.

"You lie," said the pessimist, "it is in precisely the same position as it was when I fell asleep."

JOSEPH DANA MILLER

The Henry George School

WHAT WILL 1938 BRING TO US

DURING the year 1937 enrollments in the classes of the Henry George School of Social Science totalled 5,587. Two hundred and eighty-four classes were reported. In addition to this class enrollment, 2,475 registered for the correspondence course, which was first offered to the public in March, 1937. The total number of both class and correspondence course enrollments was 8,062. This figure for 1937 speaks well for the past year, when it is considered that the grand total for the five years since this educational campaign started in 1933 is 15,043.

This result for the year was to be expected. The development of techniques for teaching, organizing classes and training instructors, plus the increased financial assistance given the School, made possible this achievement. The year 1937 was the culmination of many plans and experiments, plus the development of a co-ordinated working organization.

During this year several steps were taken to improve upon our curriculum so as to increase the effectiveness of our teaching. A course on International Trade, based upon "Protection or Free Trade," was added, and now a Teachers Manual and classroom question papers are available for those desiring to teach this course. The school recommends that this course, as well as others that are being developed, be offered only to those students who have completed the course in fundamental economics. Since no records of advanced classes are kept, we cannot report on the number that have been held, or the number of students who took this course. But, the orders for manuals indicates that approximately one hundred classes in International Trade have been conducted.

The need for more teachers has made necessary classes for a more intensive study of "Progress and Poverty." Such Teachers Training classes are being conducted con-

tinuously at the headquarters school, and based upon the experience gained, the School has issued a suggested outline for these classes. A number of cities are now training teachers along these lines, which augurs much for the continued growth of the school movement.

Considerable work was done during 1937 in developing a manual for the Science of Political Economy. At this writing four classes, with a total enrollment of over one hundred students—who have previously taken the fundamental course and the course in International Trade—are in operation in New York. The manual, prepared by Mr. H. L. T. Tideman of Chicago, is being tested in these classes, and during this summer a perfected instrument will be published, so that such classes can be conducted throughout the country.

While we are on the subject of manuals, it might be of interest to note that "Social Problems" is now being studied for this purpose. Also, the "Philosophy of Henry George," by Dr. George Raymond Geiger, and "Economic Basis of Tax Reform," by Dr. Harry Gunnison Brown. If space is available courses based on both these books will be offered to graduates of the fundamental course, at the headquarters school, this fall. The aim is to make available for instructors the orderly study of a number of works which will enhance their knowledge and thus improve their teaching.

Perhaps the most comforting achievement of 1937 is the granting to the School by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York of its absolute charter. Since the founding of the School we had been operating on a temporary charter. This recognition of the School as an educational institution is a great help in attracting students. It also imposes on us an obligation—to avoid any semblance of propagandist purpose or political method. This, of course, is the method of the School, to teach the philosophy of Henry George in an unbiased and objective manner. This method avoids the antagonism which is aroused by the avowed propagandist, keeps the students' mind open during the course, and gains his confidence. But, the difficulty is with the students themselves who, after acquiring this knowledge, are imbued with the desire of "doing something." It is necessary to direct their enthusiasm along educational lines, and to caution them of the danger to the School of any attempt to inject this philosophy prematurely into the political arena.

The most gratifying result of the School movement is the constantly increasing number of new Georgeists who are engaging in this work. The army of volunteer teachers is an inspiration to all old-timers. In their hands is the future of the School.—F. C.

THE land therefore of every country is the common property of the people of that country.

THE BISHOP OF MEATH, IRELAND.

Commencement Meeting of the New York School

ON Monday evening, March 28, occurred the Commencement Exercises of the New York School at the Engineering Club in 39th Street, and about 700 were gathered. It was the most gratifying meeting of Henry George disciples ever held in this city.

Among the speakers were Harry Weinberger, Norman B. Fowles, Mrs. Emily E. F. Skeel, William J. Schiefflin, and Victor A. Rule. William S. O'Connor, teacher at the Henry George School, acted as chairman. In addition there were short addresses from the following graduates of the School: David Hyder, Paul Peach, G. Gustav Weiner, A. C. Matteson, W. B. Thomson and Mac V. Ilds.

At the conclusion there were dances, and refreshments were served by the young ladies of the School.

Graduation Exercises at Plainfield, N. J.

THE graduation exercises of the Plainfield, N. J. group were held on March 17 at the Jewish Community Centre and were unique. They opened with the singing of "America Beautiful" by the audience to the accompaniment of piano.

Edwin Ross, Jr., of the Walter Hampden Players delivered "The Central Truth," from "Progress and Poverty." Each student before receiving his certificate from Miss Melba Youngman was called upon by Mr. Burger, the moderator, to answer a few questions indicating his familiarity with the Georgian Philosophy. Behind the speakers on the platform were displayed eight banners which Mr. Burger had salvaged from a parade of the unemployed in New York City exactly a month earlier.

Students were called upon to comment on the signs bearing inscriptions such as "Down with Capitalism," "Tax the Sixty Families," "We Want More Relief."

In contrast, there was shown a sign bearing this quotation from George. "Social Reform is not to be Secured by Noise and Shouting, By Complaints and Denunciation, By the Formation of Parties, Or the Making of Revolutions; but By the Awakening of Thought and the Progress of Ideas. Until there be correct thought, there Cannot be Right Action, and when there is correct thought, right action will follow."

Short addresses were delivered by Mr. Clifford Kendal, Miss Helen D. Denbigh, Mr. Henry J. Foley, and Mr. Harry B. Maurer.

Also the local newspapers carried notices inviting prospective students to the exercises so that new classes might be formed.

School Notes

THE Henry George School news is so abundant that we find room only for a brief mention of the many incidents occurring. C. C. Steele, an instructor at headquarters, addressed a dinner recently at the Prospect Park Y. M. C. A. This was preparatory to the opening of a class at the "Y" on March 23. Fifty were present at this dinner. . . . Mr. R. Joseph Manfrini spoke before the Senior Society of the Brooklyn Presbyterian Church using Henry George's address in Edinburgh on Political Economy as the basis of his talk. . . . The advanced course in the principles of international trade was opened at Omaha, Neb., by Arthur Falvey the instructor, and closed on March 21. The Spring term began in April 1. W. F. Baxter, dean of the Georgeist movement in Omaha, was honored recently at the formal dedication of the new Henry George Library at Omaha. The Library was launched with a gift of Henry George books together with a file of LAND AND FREEDOM. . . . At Indianapolis, Ind., George J. Lindeman, instructor of the Henry George School in that city, presented certificates of graduation to eighteen students recently. Mr. C. B. Hanger and Connor D. Ross addressed the gathering. . . . Mrs. Bue Bjorner reports that in Copenhagen and vicinity more than six hundred students graduated from the Henry George School. . . . The Chicago Chapter of the Henry George Fellowship held a very successful card party recently, the proceeds from which go to the maintenance fund. . . . The extension class of the Henry George School at Winstead, Conn., closed March 21 after a very successful season. Joseph R. Carroll, of Norfolk, Conn., was the instructor. . . . A class has been started at Hudson, N. Y., with Willis A. Snyder of that city as instructor.

Freedom the Panacea for Poverty

TO me, as well as many others, the lessening of poverty and the raising of wages, which the George idea promises, was an unwarrantable prophecy, and in my letter of sympathy to Mr. George I said, "I do not believe that your plan is the panacea for poverty." "Nor I," he replied, "but I am sure freedom is." Since then my faith has grown and is growing in the efficacy of this measure. It is the handmaid of freedom.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, 2nd, in speech.
Chicago, September 3, 1891.

WHAT we propose is not the disturbing of any man on his holding or title, but by abolishing all taxes on industry or its products, to leave to the producer the full fruits of his exertion.—HENRY GEORGE.

Our Lop-Sided Taxation

LOUIS WALLIS in *The Financial World*

UNDERNEATH all of our industrial and business life is a crooked, lop-sided method of taxation which poisons our economic system.

The situation is best explained by a concrete example: Two pieces of land, equally valuable, lie side by side. An enterprising capitalist buys and improves one of these lots, erecting upon it a business block, or a factory, or a residence; and he thus employs labor in producing wealth. But a heavy load of taxation is instantly imposed upon the improvement; while, at the same time, a much lighter proportional tax continues to be levied upon the adjoining vacant land. Familiar as these facts are, they nevertheless imply a great, unrecognized economic tragedy which the general public has not yet glimpsed.

TAXATION TRAGEDY

Here is the tragedy in a nut-shell: There is a heavy penalty upon the production of wealth and the employment of labor; while all the time there is an actual, effective premium upon holding the ground idle, so that encouragement is constantly given to speculation in the most essential necessity of life (since every human being must occupy ground or space before he can do anything else).

Ground rent is the meter measure of unearned land value due to the presence of population which constantly needs to occupy and use physical space. And yet this unearned space-value, arising from the mass-pressure of society, is taxed very lightly in comparison with the burdensome taxes on the value of improvements and merchandise created by labor and capital.

The more we consider lop-sided taxation, the more grotesque and weird are the shapes that it assumes. Thus, before you can be productive and employ labor by putting up an apartment building, or a business block, or a factory, or a home, you must begin by paying a high purchase price for the location, or by contracting to pay a heavy annual ground rent for the simple reason that some speculator who is doing nothing with the land, and who employs no labor on it, has been taxed so lightly that he is able to hold the ground vacant until somebody who wants to be productive and employ labor is willing to pay the speculator a high price for the opportunity. And then, after the building has been erected by human labor, in cooperation with capital, the labor value in the structure is taxed far more heavily in proportion than the ground rental value of the location is taxed.

Ground rent and taxation have now reached a point in the United States where both capital and labor are increasingly blockaded to such a degree that neither the building industry nor any other productive work can go on profitably. Millions of our people are inadequately housed. But so long as lop-sided taxation is practised,

no remedy for the great and growing problem of the slums will be possible. Capital is piling up in the bank and labor is idle or can obtain work only at insufficient wages.

Crooked taxes were put into force by the landed aristocracy of Great Britain and Europe when America was being settled by our colonial forefathers. There was a great difficulty at first, when taxes were low and there was a big western frontier of cheap land. But today the weight of taxation is enormous; and all vacant land (especially in and around our great centers of population) is held at prices and rentals which, together with heavy taxes, make industry a losing game.

To remedy the difficulty, the big city of Sydney, Australia, with a million inhabitants, has abolished all municipal taxes on business blocks, factories and homes, and is taxing the ground rent which land monopolists have been collecting for private account. There is also a heavy tax on speculative held vacant land; so that more land is thrown into the active market at lower prices.

BRITISH RESOLUTIONS

Observing the good effect of land value taxation, with exemption of improvements, as carried out in Australia, the London County Council, together with two hundred and thirty other city councils throughout England, Scotland, and Wales, has recently passed, by overwhelmingly majorities, resolutions asking Parliament for authority to reduce the fiscal burdens on improvements, merchandise, etc., and increase the taxation upon ground rents. It also asks that property now collected for private account, and also the taxes upon vacant sites in order to throw more land into the market at lower prices.

This problem will have to be taken up by the American people at once—not at some distant time in the future, and so the readers of *The Financial World* can help the country by bringing their minds to bear upon economic problems from a new point of approach. The city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, has already begun to separate the value of improvements from land values for purposes of local taxation, and to shift the tax burden slowly over from buildings to the value of improved and vacant land. The importance of this plan is becoming clear to land manufacturers in that city, and must in time be evident to all business men.

AS the sun is the lord of life, as well as of light; as its beams not merely pierce the clouds, but supply all growth, supply all motion, and call forth from what would otherwise be a cold and inert mass all the infinite diversities of being and beauty, so is liberty to mankind. It is not for an abstraction that men have toiled and died; that in every age the witnesses of Liberty have stood forth, and the martyrs of Liberty have suffered.

HENRY GEORGE

Canadian Lands

HERE appears in the April number of *Nature Magazine* the following advertisement:

CANADA LANDS SEIZED AND SOLD FOR TAXES

- \$27 buys small island
- \$67 buys 50 acres, travelled road
- \$108 buys 20 acres lake front
- \$171 buys half mile river front
- \$256 buys 67 acres lake front

(Here follows descriptive matter, suggestions, etc., including news at this is the 21st Annual List just issued in a twenty-page booklet containing the above and many other choice properties.)

There is nothing to indicate whether a government agency or private individuals are handling these properties since the advertisement is signed Tax Sales Service with a Toronto address, but I do not fear fraud since the *Nature Magazine* is a highly respectable publication.

Among the suggestions as to the use of such properties, such as fishing and hunting camps and summer cottage sites, there appears this:

"Now is the time to invest in Canada's minerals, forests and farms." Canada has been suffering from the depression just as we have and doubt there are many on relief there just as there are here. We are led to ask why the former owners could not manage to pay the taxes on these lands and so hold on to the investment that we are asked to consider. Surely it would seem as if 50 acres of land on a travelled road would enable a man to make a living and pay his taxes, even if they were as high as \$67 a year. When we know that lands are not sold for one year's delinquency in taxes, nor for two, but more likely for five years' non-payment, and that the tax sale price includes back taxes with interest and costs we can see that the taxes must have been very low, perhaps \$5.00 per year or ten cents an acre. Surely anyone so lacking in ambition as to neglect the opportunities presented by ownership of 50 acres of land, probably with forest and minerals, is deserving of no pity and should be removed from the guardianship of so large a tract of what is really the property of all men.

Such a proposition as that a living could not be made on such a piece of land as any one of the above properties, and with enough to care to take care of taxes and provide for the future, is untenable. And those in charge of the tax sales know the possibilities and so advise purchasers to "invest in Canada's minerals, forests and farms." There is but one logical conclusion in regard to the former owners. They did not live on the lands. In fact they did not buy them for that purpose. They probably live in the centers of industry far removed from these properties. Probably they have never seen them, having seen a similar advertisement in the past they bought "to get" in Canada's resources, which means that they invested in the right to charge those who would use Canada's resources to supply men's wants the highest price possible. But those who would delve to the earth for copper, iron, and other valuable and useful ores, who would convert forests into lumber and wood pulp, or coax food crops from the soil of virgin countries, are not looking to pay the highest prices, especially since the price paid for permission to use the land is in addition to the labor and capital that must be expended in production. And they shop around for the cheapest price for the best land available. This means that only those well fixed financially can afford to keep paying taxes year after year on land that provides no revenue for only such can afford to wait until finally some one is compelled by circumstances to meet their demands. Thus little by little with a few hard earned dollars buy land only to lose it later because of inability to afford the luxury of throwing money or wealth away which is just what they do when they pay taxes on unproductive land.—JOHN LUXTON

Questing for News

STROLLING around town in quest of real news, I happened into the meeting of the Citizen's Housing Council at the Town Club, called for the purpose of discussing proposed amendments to the State Constitutional Convention.

The suggestions were that the state have the power to make loans and grants to housing authorities and guarantee their bonds.

Local government empowered to aid as well as to make loans to housing authorities with exemption of self-liquidating projects from constitutional debt limitation.

To permit the acquisition of large areas of land for housing purposes, and to provide for excess condemnation. Another suggestion was to exclude from valuation of condemned property increments in value due to a reclamation programme.

William J. Schieffelin, chairman of the Citizen's Union, and one of the most prominent men in New York City, the first speaker, said, "if you want to know how to solve the housing problem, read 'Progress and Poverty.'" There was very slight applause, only three hands were clapped, and then he followed it up by saying that the book was written by Henry George in 1879 and was just as true as if it were written today.

He read a letter which was sent to Mayor La Guardia, signed T. J. McHenry, who outlined for his Honor a method by which low cost housing could be provided. Mr. Schieffelin said, "here is an illustration that Mayor La Guardia stands with Henry George." Someone, however, said that Mr. George is dead and the Mayor favored the proposals of the conference that the Constitution be amended to permit the city to provide low cost housing, and assessments made up by those citizens who could be forced to pay the difference through a sales tax, an occupancy tax, and any sort of nuisance taxes that the public will stand for. The difference between La Guardia and George lies in the fact that George was an economist and not an opportunist.—STROLLING REPORTER.

Miscellany

FREEDOM OF ACCESS TO NATURAL OPPORTUNITIES

Do not the facts here set out indicate that there is no need for colonies for any of the European countries or Japan? Each country has ample natural resources to supply its own needs directly from its own soil or by exchanging its products for those of other countries. They do not really need foreign land and the amount of benefit their entire peoples would get in trade, through the mere fact of their owning colonies, is negligible. In every one of those countries, as well as in the Have countries, the home market could be developed enormously, if the people were set free to work for themselves without having to pay heavy rents to their land monopolists.

No one of the Have or Have-not countries has as yet shown any sign of willingness to tackle its own internal problem of land monopoly.

zation, but each seems willing to risk plunging the world into another war rather than to do so.

F. A. W. LUCAS in an article Solving the Colonial Problem in *Christian Science Monitor*.

THE MORE ABUNDANT LIFE

Once upon a time there was a farmer who sold two hens and with the proceeds bought two shirts. So the farmer had two shirts and the city man had two hens. Then along came a theorist who told the farmer he should get more money for his hens by making them scarcer. He must kill one of his hens and bury it, or at least he must not raise so many and then he would get more income.

The theorists then went to the city and told the working man that he must work fewer hours so he could get more money. That, of course, caused all manufactured products to cost more. So after a while the farmer brought only one hen to market and he got as much money for his one hen as he had previously got for two. He felt fine. He then went to buy some shirts, but found that shirts also had doubled in price, so he got only one shirt. Then he didn't feel so fine. Now the farmer has one shirt and the city man has one hen where, before the days of modern theorizing, the farmer could have had two shirts and the city man two hens. This theory is called "The More Abundant Life."—*American Agriculturist*.

JOHN LUXTON REPLIES TO LOUIS H. BROWN

Louis H. Brown, President of the Johns-Manville Corporation, in a recent address before the National Advertisers, said: "After all it is our own fault if three-fourths of the teachers in our schools and colleges have never been inside a factory. It is our own fault if all they know about business and industry is what they have read in books—in Karl Marx or Henry George."

John Luxton, a high school teacher as well as a teacher in the Henry George School, protested against the coupling of the names of Henry George and Karl Marx, and Mr. Brown explained it was not his intention to indicate that Henry George and Karl Marx were alike in any way. "In the case of Henry George," he said, "I believe in his philosophy. I think if put into effect it would succeed and he gives a period of fifty years to make it effective."

To this letter John Luxton again replies and the letter is so good that we reproduce it here:

I am glad to know that you had no intention of linking Henry George and Karl Marx as to likeness of ideas but I am afraid that your address does not make this clear. The impracticality of the Marxian philosophy seems to be common ground for us to meet upon. It is impractical because it is not founded upon justice to all but aims at getting for the worker what it claims the capitalist class has now, an unfair advantage.

Having met more or less with teachers for the last thirty years in my capacity of instructor in our city schools, I know for a fact that the ignorance of a large part of an educated class in regard to the teachings of Henry George is profound. Also, as a teacher of the philosophy of Henry George I have met many persons other than teachers, who have refused to open their minds to a just appraisal of Henry George's proposal because they could not dissociate the ideas of property in the products of industry and property in land. To such people the Georgeist is synonymous with Marxist. So you see not everyone recognizes the philosophies of George and Marx as being diametrically opposite.

I agree with you as to the time needed for the successful application of George's philosophy, and am very glad to know that you are a believer. But I am still unaware of any passage in any of George's works where anything appears that can be construed into an exposition of business. I believe that was a slip, without any intention. It doesn't matter now that you have stated your case. I do not agree with you as to the philosophy of Henry George being a theory, or based upon a theory. As business is a practical development of human beings over the ages so is George's philosophy, with this difference: business begins as human beings recognize the need for exchange following upon division of labor, and has been continuous, growing and developing to the present day: the way proposed by Henry George for the attainment of universal justice was the natural way of living as men gathered together in communities and trade

began, but as the one continued and progressed the latter fell in disrepute and finally, was abandoned over a large part of the world. Why, and how, are of no moment in this letter. It is enough to know that in the German forests liberty and democracy flourished under this natural way of life and the Angles and Saxons carried it to England. Returning legionnaires from the Roman armies introduced Germany to the Roman system of land tenure and the Normans modified the English system with Feudalism. In Ireland under the natural system a Golden Age, marked by no unemployment, no poverty, no concentration of wealth, and by great advances in the arts and sciences, lasted for a thousand years until destroyed by the English Courts under Henry VIII. In Mongolia the natural system exists today and their refusal to give allegiance to the Republic of China was due to the Chinese attempt to consider each chief of a nomad tribe the actual owner of the land used by the tribe in defiance of custom held by the nomads before the time of Ghengis Khan. As Germany before the fall of Rome, see Green's History of the English People, for Ireland, see Henry W. Foley's articles in the *Gaelic American*, and in regard to Mongolia see "the Crime of being a Nomad" in *Asia*, Oct., 1934, or thereabouts.

I thank you again and hope that we have both overestimated the period of fifty years, if only that the small homeowner may profit by his saving in taxation on articles produced by labor and capital so that he may be able to insulate his house from cellar to roof and enjoy all the benefits of air conditioning, winter and summer, with all the other things he would like to have now but doesn't dare to hope for.

LET NATURE TAKE ITS COURSE

There is an old saying—"when doctors disagree who shall decide?" In such a case this writer would suggest, let nature take its course and avoid all artificial remedies. Is it not probable that nature knows as much about economics as it does about creating and sustaining life in both the vegetable and animal world, as it would be preposterous to assume, that, as in all the sciences there are natural laws which must be observed, there are no natural laws or science of economics and mankind is doomed to unending chaos in the field of economics?

JOHN T. GIDDINGS in the Providence, R. I. *Evening Bulletin*.

TRIBUTE TO FISKE WARREN

Fiske Warren was never a robust man and as a boy suffered from a spinal disorder which physicians believed would destine him to be invalid for the balance of his life. However they did not reckon with the spirit of the boy and his determination to live and to be well. He gave his physicians much more than the average cooperation. He studied his limitations and lived within them. By not wasting his strength and through living a highly temperate and abstemious life he was able to accomplish far more than do many of average capabilities.

Mr. Warren's influence was international, but wherever he went found strong ties of personal friendship. In Fairhope he is honored for his valiant fight for our great cause and he is held in deep affection by all who were close to him and felt the nobility of his character.

Fairhope Courier.

CONDITIONS IN SPAIN

A story told by the Madrid correspondent of the *Times* throws light on the condition of things in Spain which led to the Revolutionary conditions which General Franco is apparently trying to re-establish. A sick and penniless widow, just admitted to the Madrid Asylum for poor working women, is the only daughter of the 13th Duke of Osuna. The 12th Duke, her father's cousin and predecessor, "used to boast that he could drive from either the Portuguese or the French frontier to Madrid without having to leave his own land."

Monthly Bulletin of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values.

ONE AS FOOLISH AS THE OTHER

When we come to consider the matter in the calm light of reason it seems more than strange that there are people, even those who should know better, who hold the utterly absurd notion that results other than starvation are to be attained by abstaining from partaking

of food. Still, ridiculous as it is, the notion is no more absurd than that held by a majority of the members of congress that prosperity and the welfare of the nation can be promoted by stopping the production of wealth. However, it must be said in favor of the members of congress that it is not of record that one of them ever refrained from tuffing his thick hide with good, nourishing food whenever the opportunity offered. Foolish as they are, the congressional gentlemen never become so bereft of reason as to refuse to eat.

Cause and Effect, FOLEY, Alabama.

THE PROBLEM IS VITAL, SAYS BARON'S

The question which Mr. Wallis, not without justice, calls burning that of land taxation. For more than a century many economists, notably Henry George, have pointed to the paradox which exists between heavy taxation on productive industry while unimproved land is left relatively lightly taxed. Mr. Wallis brings these views up to date; his original contribution is that he points out how now, at all times, when business is already under a crushing tax load, this problem has become vital. Caught between the double burden of taxation and high ground rents, business should demand relief and insist on a shift of a greater part of the tax load to non-productive property.—*Baron's National Financial Weekly*, March 14.

THE MAGNA CARTA FOR FREE TRADE

Reading recently Hallam's "Europe during the Middle Ages," noticed that Magna Carta (1215 A. D.) guaranteed freedom of commerce to alien merchants (see page 437). How many people who refer to Magna Carta are aware of this fact? Certainly our Protectionists know nothing about it, or if they do, consider it expedient to hush up, their being so behind those times.

A. T. in *Progress*, Melbourne, Aus.

Washington Letter

THE December 7th meeting of the Women's Single Tax Club of Washington, was held at the home of Mr. George A. Warren, took the form of a debate between Mr. Walter N. Campbell and the host. Mrs. Helene H. McEvoy, president of the club presided.

Mr. Campbell made an unusually good argument for the Single Tax and outlined the present situation in a general way and specifically the federal methods of taxing practically everything but land values, and at the same time calling for increased employment and lower prices.

Mr. Warren's argument was not in opposition to the Single Tax but to the tactics of Single Taxers. He stated that he considered the Single Tax the greatest needed reform before the world, and that in a lifetime he had never known its philosophy to be proved unsound. His contention was that the Single Taxers, in advocating the Single Tax to the exclusion of all other fiscal reforms, alienated the sympathies of millions who would favor it as one reform among many, all but the easiest. The heart of the Single Tax case, he said, is that society is entitled to and should appropriate values it alone creates—the "unearned increment." "But all around are other unearned increments which the Single Taxer either ignores or dismisses with the statement that these are all finally reflected in land values. The average person observing that the fortunes of the very rich, or the main portion of such fortunes, are much more often represented in bonds and other securities than real estate, and no more earned in one case than the other, feels no great enthusiasm for a tax levied only upon land values, leaving scot free a multitude of other unearned increments."

The session of March 7 was held in the large, attractive Sun Parlor of the Washington Hotel, secured for our use by our host and hostess for the evening, Representative and Mrs. Charles R. Eckert.

After some interesting routine business the president introduced Honorable Charles R. Eckert of Pennsylvania, who expressed his

satisfaction that so many were interested in coming to hear a subject which members of Congress were glad to run away from just now. The Single Tax, he believed, was keeping the campfires of freedom burning. Human society is a natural development and government an artificial one. Thomas Jefferson once declared that government best which governed least. The only two laws laid down by a legendary king were to injure no one and then do as one pleased. If democracies are to endure, they must be built upon eternal principles of justice. Many inspiring quotations were given from Jefferson, Lincoln, Paine, Altgeld and others, which are as applicable to our present-day conditions as when first uttered by these fundamental democrats.

The next speaker, Honorable Knute Hill of Washington, commenting jokingly upon certain members of Congress, expressed the opinion that the Biblical account of creation erred in saying man's rib had been taken to construct woman—it was his backbone! The Declaration of Independence he compared to the spirit of democracy, while the Constitution was its body. The right of the people to change their form of government is the essential principle of democracy, yet men have been imprisoned for quoting from the former document the statement that when governments become subversive of the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, it was man's duty to alter or abolish them. The two most important parts of the Constitution are the preamble and the amendments. The President and the New Deal have been trying to enact into law the means whereby the objects enumerated in the preamble may be realized. But under the present rules and regulations, we are accomplishing but little, since measures which a committee chairman dislikes, may be prevented from being brought before the House; and even after passing both Houses of Congress and being signed by the President, a law may be thrown into the waste basket by the Supreme Court—and we call this democracy! The speaker declared it was his purpose to get some rules changed so that the people could at least get legislation. Referring to the present tax bill which is before Congress for consideration, and which contains 319 pages, he said he wished it were as short and simple and as good as the Single Tax. With the right kind of production and distribution, we could raise three times as much as we do and still not have too much. There will be three great names in American history: Thomas Jefferson, who gave us political liberty through the Declaration of Independence; Abraham Lincoln, who gave human liberty to the black man; and the third name should be that of the man who should give this country economic freedom.

Honorable Robert Crosser of Ohio, considered the subject of economics more along philosophical lines, declaring that the real method of acquiring knowledge was originally by intuition and that by cultivation of that faculty the human race will make progress. What is needed is to teach people to think. Henry George taught the law of justice, which the speaker understood to be the action of infinite mind, the only real substance there is. Mr. Crosser disapproved of students taking the side they did not believe, in a debate just for practice. Many people, he declared, are well trained and well schooled without being well educated, and know a lot that isn't so. Our business is to awaken people to the true philosophy of government, not touched by such measures as protective tariffs, sound money, new deals, etc.

The last speaker, Honorable Herbert S. Bigelow, announced that he was going to introduce a Single Tax measure in the House the following day, and he wanted to practice on his hearers that evening and see how much of a Single Tax argument he could make in five minutes, at the end of which time he wanted to be called down.

At the end of a five-minute talk on the subject, time was called on the speaker, and then, in response to a request from the audience, he related the story of the two men on an island, one of whom did the working and the other, the owning. Then a shipwreck cast a third man, a preacher, on the island, and he asked and was granted permission to build a church, but when he touched upon the labor problem, he was promptly fired from his position by the owner of the

island, whereupon the preacher suggested to the workingman that they exercise their right as a majority to decide the question and to bring about justice on the island. But the workingman refused to listen and still stuck with the owner. If it is true that the only sin is ignorance, what a lot of sinners there must be in Congress, Mr. Bigelow remarked.

Following the speeches, the members offered an informal vote of thanks to their host and hostess and the speakers, for the most enjoyable meeting of the season.—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

BOOK REVIEWS

A CONFUSED PROFESSOR

"Your Taxes." By William J. Shultz. 12mo., clo. 280 pp. Doubleday, Doran and Co., Garden City, Long Island, N. Y.

Prof. William J. Shultz has given us some interesting facts in this volume of nearly three hundred pages. But most of these facts are well known. He tells us that fifteen billion dollars are contributed to the "greatest spending agency on earth," and he lists the various kinds of taxes of which this almost inconceivable sum is composed. He is more concerned with the amount and variety of these taxes than with fundamental principles in the light of which the problems he summons for review must be considered. Why we act that way does not seem to concern him.

He rolls around his tongue these items like sweet morsels. We look in vain for any conclusions from the facts—any fixed conclusions based on laws or principles. It is all Gradgrind stuff.

We wonder whether such books that teach nothing, are not concerned about principles, do not discriminate between what are legitimate sources of taxation and seek merely to astound the imagination by a parade of figures are worth while. If there is any semblance of constructive suggestions it jumps out at us from one of the pages in which the author advises us to join a taxpayer's association. But these taxpayers have no more fundamental knowledge of the subject than the author himself. How shall this help to solve the problem when these tax associations know as little as the professor? Prof. Schultz does attempt to discriminate between taxes on land (why does he not say land values?) and taxes on houses, but even here he is confused. He says, "A government could levy a tax on land so heavy that it practically confiscated all land rent and the landlords could not pass one cent of it on to the tenants."

As a matter of fact it is the user of land who pays the rent. He pays all of it whether taxed or not. The landlord cannot charge his tenant anything additional by reason of the tax. He is already getting all he can.

On page 29 he says: "Some one desperate to find a home, offers your landlord a slightly higher rent than you have been paying, and to keep your house you have to meet his figure. All over the city rents begin to rise . . ."

It will be news to the student of taxation that a rise in rents follows any such course. Rent arises from social activities and increase in production. The author cannot make up his mind whether taxes destroy or check the growth of capital, though it would seem clear enough that any diminution of capital in production would have that effect.

Nor does the Professor seem to have made up his mind whether the government has the right to tax anything in any way it pleases. There does not appear to be any moral principle involved anywhere.

The Professor only states a principle to abandon it the next minute. He dismisses the "benefit theory" of taxation. He thinks the "ability" theory was "formulated by scholars." He says it "bears the stamp of 'greater intellectual refinement' [*sic*] and an engaging tenuous vagueness." He says there is no reason in support of either proposition, still keeping up the merry-go-round, putting up tenpins to knock them down. We wonder now if Prof. Shultz is just amusing

himself, or is what we have called him, "a confused professor." Or is his case one of ethical shortcoming as appears in the difficulty he experiences in accepting the concept of "justice in taxation." And because economists have come to no conclusion he will come to none and advises his readers to accept none. There is something more than confusion here—a moral myopia.

After making what looks like a defense of free trade he veers again in the chapter entitled "Revolution by Taxation." There is little of value in the chapter and much that is inconclusive and will read as well backward as forward.

After giving it as his opinion that high taxation has never destroyed any business, he says, "Several chain stores in Louisiana have already closed some of their branches," again veering his position in order to make his confusion constant and consistent.

Prof. Shultz thinks the disparity in incomes is corrected by our tax system, evidently thinking that a tax on higher incomes or on large aggregations of wealth is a remedy for the inequality in distribution still keeping to his confused theorizing and facing fundamental facts with calm complacency.

We are amused where some readers will be shocked at the following "When a new income tax proposal is before your Congress or your State legislature throw your weight . . . make your contribution to a lobby fund and fight—fair and foul—against the opposing lobbies. This is the first instance we recall of any professor advocating "*foul*" means to escape taxation. Is it any wonder that in the absence of any moral principle to guide him in the collection of revenue, this open and very candid suggestion of foul means is not only condoned but explicitly recommended.

And what shall be said of this: "While a stupidly drawn, inherently iniquitous measure it will gain popular acceptance if its administration is wise and efficient." That is to say, if an iniquitous measure is wisely administered it is not so bad and may be borne with equanimity. This is the inescapable assumption.

It would probably be a waste of time to point out to Prof. Shultz that the problems that trouble him are to be solved by discriminating between what is public and what is private property. He gives no hint of this and hence his confusion.

On page 177 we are arrested by a sentence. He is speaking of inheritance taxation, but it will apply quite as aptly to all the problems he treats of, and it is this: "There is no answer to the question—except those dictated by your preconceptions and prejudices."

On page 212 he says: "I am not concerned with lightening the tax burden on property owners or preventing the burden from becoming heavier."

What then is he attempting to do? Again he says (he is speaking of property taxation): "No one seems to have any solution for the problem."

It becomes, therefore, increasingly difficult to explain why he wrote the book.—J. D. M.

A USEFUL BOOK

"American Political and Social History." By Prof. Harold Underwood Faulkner of Smith College. 8vo. 772 pp. Croft's American History Series. F. S. Croft and Co., New York City.

Here is a work we can commend without qualification. It is a great panorama of the birth and progress of a nation that is unfolded, and with excellent effect.

The author maintains the democratic outlook from the start of the narrative, which begins with our colonial history and is brought down to the World War and the Roosevelt New Deal. Always it is sure-footed, as when he says, tracing the early history of our trade "Of all civilizing influences none is more potent than commerce. Or when seeking for an explanation of the growth of Great Britain and her success in her colonial enterprises, he says, "Not the lead of the advantages of England was that the development of nationalisms

the growth in strength of her national government were not accompanied, as in France and Spain, by the loss of popular representative agencies."

The book is history, not theory, so we are prepared for a recital of facts and only incidentally for controversial points. The reader accompanies the author on the migrations which resulted in the establishment of flourishing communities in the New World. But he says it is to be observed—and the author never loses sight of it—the governing impulse was the quest for greater freedom.

We catch revealing glimpses of the leaders of these empire builders, and read many familiar and unfamiliar names. William Penn stands out for his magnificent toleration, for unlike some of these early leaders among the colonists he demanded the same freedom for others that he claimed for himself and his followers. The like-minded Roger Williams comes in for a word of commendation.

It does not appear to Prof. Faulkner that the "great cavalier exodus" to Virginia, stressed by John Fiske, ever took place, and he says that the emigration to Virginia as elsewhere came from the middle classes of society.

With keen insight our author points out that vagrancy, theft and homicide were infrequent in colonial times and says, "the population is too sparse, the people too dependent upon one another, and the economic opportunities too great (the italics are ours) to foster this sort of crime."

He touches on the industrial panics of the nineteenth century and says they were due primarily to over-expansion in the development of transportation facilities, and the mania for canal building which commenced in the early twenties and reached its climax in the later thirties and with which had gone a corresponding speculation in land, which meant an inevitable economic collapse." (Again the italics are ours.) The panic of 1837 Prof. Faulkner calls "America's first major economic depression."

He quotes Prof. Turner as follows: "Up to our own day, American history has been to a large degree the history of the colonization of the Great West. The existence of an area of free land, its continuous session, and the advance of American settlement westward, explains American development."

On page 254 Prof. Faulkner says once more: "Although panics have been chiefly due to over-expansion in transportation facilities and over-speculation in public lands, other factors, particularly the inflation in currency and banking, have contributed." We may point out that these are secondary and proximate causes, and are greatly intensified by the primary cause. Without further recommendation we select Professor Faulkner to write a much needed work "The Cause of Panics."

He refers to the panic of 1857 as due to the same cause. The reader will remember that there was a speedy recovery from this panic.

On page 669, speaking of the land boom preceding the depression which we are now living, Prof. Faulkner says, "Every panic has been characterized by large scale land speculation."

Inevitably followed, we may add, by recurring collapse.

When Prof. Faulkner gets down to the New Deal he has some interesting things to say. He keeps his judicial pose, but he does say on page 687: "No part of the New Deal programme aroused more criticism than that pertaining to agriculture. The destruction and hoarding of food stuffs at a time when millions lacked sufficient food were difficult to justify."

Reverting to the purely political aspects of our history treated in this well considered work, it is well to remember that the birth of the nation was fraught with the conflict of different theories. The powers of the president were a subject of controversy, and Prof. Faulkner quotes an historian who says (and our author seems to endorse the statement): "An attempt to define the powers of the presidency as Roosevelt has defined it would have been considered in tyranny in 1788." This period and the bitter conflicts in Washington's official family are recited with intelligence and discernment.

It is impossible to review so large and fine a book within the limits permitted us. So we shall content ourselves with saying that the work is a task superlatively well done.

Henry George is mentioned four times and quoted rather significantly in one part of the work. There is a fine tribute to Jefferson on page 162, and there is a splendid bibliography included as an appendix.—J. D. M.

A SCANDAL SHEET OCTAVO

"America's Sixty Families." By Ferdinand Lundberg. 8vo. 544 pp. Price, \$3.75. The Vanguard Press, New York City.

Here is a book which Mr. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, started off to a good sale in a somewhat inflammatory and flamboyant public speech.

If we refer to this work as "a scandal sheet" it is because we are irresistably impelled to this designation. For these families are selected as "terrible examples," as if there were some moral obliquity in the accumulation of great fortunes, and that even the marriages among these families are determined with a view to the consolidation of these great accumulations.

It is perfectly natural that alliances should occur almost exclusively within the groups where men and women commingle. It is conceivable that these unions should be the result of attraction and affection without regard to any other consideration. It is preposterous to think that love between the sexes among these sixty families vary much more than in other and more moderately endowed social groups. And it is even permissible to think that there is as great a number of happy marriages among these sixty families as may be found elsewhere.

It is true that a considerable portion of these family fortunes have been fused by marriages, and Mr. Lundberg gives many pages to the recounting of these unions. But again we ask, what of it? The economic set up is not changed. Rent still flows to the privileged class whether they are few or many; the ownership or control of natural resources remains in the hands of the same monopolistic powers over capital investments. Labor goes to work only on the permission of these owners of the natural resources. Their powers reside in the ownership of the sources of supply, not in marriages, incorporations, or combinations in themselves.

Whether the number of those who control the wealth of the country be six, sixty or six hundred is of no importance whatever. The important thing is the ownership and control of the natural resources. "I believe it cannot be gainsaid," says Mr. Ickes, "that about one-half of the wealth of the country is in corporate form and over one-half of it is under the dominion of two hundred corporations."

These figures are loose enough, but we shall probably make no great mistake in accepting them. But whether they are in corporate form, or individually owned or controlled, makes not the slightest difference. It makes no difference if the individuals who control natural resources are able to add Inc. after their names. There are many corporations in the country which find difficulty in paying their office rent.

Such talk is plain demagoguery, no less so because it is quite unconscious, springing from a gross ignorance of the laws of wealth distribution. The reception accorded the work is significant of the same general ignorance. The *Nation*, which obstinately refuses to recognize the situation, reviews Mr. Lundberg's "Sixty Families" under the title, "Wealth Against Society." Here is unconscious confusion, for how can wealth be inimical to the best interests of society?

It is not of course. *The power of wealth is a borrowed power.* It derives any influence it has for evil, not in its accumulations, but in its control of natural monopolies. If it is able to acquire the control of educational institutions, newspapers or venal editors, to carry on an effective propaganda, it is desirable that we seek for more funda-

mental springs of domination. Again we must repeat that the power of wealth is a borrowed power. Why will not Mr. Lundberg see this? Why will he say: "More and more it is becoming plain that the major political and social problem of today centers about the taxation of great wealth."

Some day a book will be written subjecting to a real analysis the great fortunes that have grown up in America, separating their parts as a chemist might. The writer will take some great fortune and dissect it into its various parts, placing on one side what is derived from natural resources, tariffs, patents, etc., direct and indirect control of natural monopolies, and the remainder due to superintendence or managing ability. His readers will be surprised at what little remains of these great fortunes. It will be clear that what remains is an earned fortune and belongs to the individual or individuals who made it. *It will be all wages.* A parade of great fortunes such as Mr. Lundberg has given us, while ignoring everything that is fundamental, will not help us any.

The writing of such a book will not be easy. It will demand the possession of special faculties and above all an understanding of the laws of political economy which determine the rise of great fortunes.

At present there is no one we can think of able to write such a book. As long as we are obsessed by phantoms of the real, our reasoning, ignoring as we do the fundamental relations of man to the land, we shall be the prey of shallow sensation-mongers who now have the field all to themselves.

This work of Mr. Lundberg is well written. It will be read with interest by young lady typewriters and stenographers and by Mr. Ickes and Walter Winchell. But it doesn't contribute one iota to the knowledge of how these fortunes were amassed, what they consist of, or what shall be done about it, if anything.

We have said that Mr. Lundberg's remedy is to tax them. But they are already heavily taxed. And the question arises if their power is an evil one why are not these evils pointed out? We should know how they got it and just how the getting of it hurts others. If you should confiscate everything that is possessed by them, will not other families take as much more as these sixty families take, institutions remaining as they are and the distribution of wealth being unchanged?

It is an amazing factual history, frankly an attack on the rich, whom the author calls a "psychopathic" class.

These great fortunes and their vulgar display are interesting but as we have said not important. They flow to the recipients and are accepted as a matter of course. But anyway, it is doubtful if any appreciable number understand it. That they fight for the retention of their privilege is natural enough, but they do so with the convictions that these privileges are *rights*. They are as ignorant of the principles of political economy as the men who write text-books about it, or as Mr. Ickes himself is.

It is for the reasons set forth that books like "America's Sixty Families" are not particularly useful in the economic scene however well written, and that it is well written we concede. The evil of books of this character is that they add fuel to the class struggle without the slightest reference to a reasoned solution, or to the fundamental principles that underlie the problem. Gustavus Myers' "History of Great American Fortunes," in the first hundred pages of which he traces the real genesis of great accumulations, has done a much better job, in a more dignified way, and with a somewhat firmer grasp upon economic principles.

Our quarrel is not with the facts as set forth by Mr. Lundberg. These we accept as substantially correct, though terribly colored with indefensible implications. It is a picture of American plutocracy that is impelling. The parade of the names of those possessed of great wealth, a sort of

"Moses and Aaron,

Paul Jones, and old Charon,"

is not especially illuminating. But it will just carry Mr. Ickes away with it. It has.—J. D. M.

FROM A NEW ANGLE

"Taxation Turmoil." By W. R. B. Willcox. Small 12mo. 99 pages. Price fifty cents. Eugene, Oregon.

The reader can the more readily get the drift of Mr. Willcox's argument by the following quotation from page 60:

"The constant reiteration of rent as payment for the use of land and the evils which result from the failure of government to collect the rent, has led many people to regard the correction of social and economic ills, fundamentally, as a land question. Much has been written in support of this view. It lies at the root of the social and communist insistence upon the governmental ownership of land. Even when socialists do not go so far as that, it convinces many of them of the necessity for governmental *control* of land. All of these ideas lead to the theory of a planned economy as essential to the establishment of a classless social order and presupposes some form of collectivism."

This is deplorable if true. But there *is* a Land Question, a Rent Question, and a Tax Question, and the solution is all contained in the remedy Mr. George proposes. We do not believe that those who advocate the taking of economic rent for public purposes as a solution of the land question are in the least danger of being led into any form of collectivism.

Of course the public collection of the economic rent can be defended with little reference to land, and if Mr. Willcox, or any one else, wishes to do that we say, "God speed him." This question is so large a one that it can be approached from many angles, and if one is not enamored of his own subtleties, as we fear is often the case, there is no objection to a different approach to the goal which Mr. George frankly admits was his destination.

We are even willing to believe that a presentation of the remedy from the angle taken by Mr. Willcox will appeal perhaps more readily to a certain order of minds. But it is only a partial statement and leaves something further to be said—much more indeed.

Of course Mr. Willcox has made out a good case. We agree with most of it, save for the part we have just quoted. That we can make it a more convincing argument as a rent question than as a land question may well be doubted. But a number of doors swing open, and it is indicative of the universality of the problem that there is room for several kinds of orthodoxy, perhaps several kinds of heresy, as well. A great truth has many doors. When Mr. Willcox says, "It is not the private possession of land that is wrong but the private possession of rent," he is both orthodox and correct.

We cannot better conclude this inadequate review of an able work than by giving the following from page 135:

"If faced with evidence of popular knowledge of the actuality, beneficence of the natural function of rent, and of the insidious malignancy of all taxation—what counsel of individual justice, of social efficiency, or legal efficacy, or of morals, ethics or religion, could be brought to oppose the recovery of all of the rent for all of the people and the abolishment of all taxation?"—J. D. M.

LACKS A GUIDING PRINCIPLE

"The Folklore of Capitalism" by Therman W. Arnold. Yale University Press.

If one takes up this book, as the writer of this review did, with the idea that he is to be treated to a sort of Machavellian exposure of how the modern world is run, he will not be disappointed. As the author says, the book is an application to a broader field, the field of business and of economics, of the same point of view represented in an earlier book, "The Symbols of Government." The book may be called a treatise on the text. "The children of darkness are visible in their generation than the children of light," but is it too entering, too fascinating, to be called a treatise. A sample of his writing is useful in making up one's mind whether to buy the book or not.

"We have seen that the growth of great organizations in America has occurred in the face of a religion which officially was dedicated to the preservation of the economic independence of individuals. In such a situation it was inevitable that a ceremony should be evolved which

conciled current mental pictures of what men thought society ought to be with reality. . . . Granted an insistent social demand which opposes a deeply felt ideal, and a conflict of this kind between two institutions—one respectable and moral, exemplifying the ideal, and the other *sub rosa* and now respectable, filling the practical need,—as inevitable as the reaction of a man sitting on a hot stove. Without a grasp of this principle it is impossible to understand the anti-trust laws *should* or *should not* have been passed. People sit up all night writing books to contradict each other on whether the anti-trust laws have done any 'good.' They become blind to the fact that they were part of the total cultural situation which tolerated great organizations in the face of a deeply felt ideal that there was a rise to 'bigness.' Corporations (before the era of public relations counsel) were pictured as fat, greedy men preying upon the poor. Therefore there had to be a crusade against them. That crusade resulted in the anti-trust laws."

Vast knowledge of the subject of modern business, "big business," displayed by Mr. Arnold. There are many indications that his knowledge of the subject exceeds his understanding of it, and that he finds his way about in its mazes much as the ancient mariners and their way about the sea—by guess and by gods, without the compass of a guiding principle.

He quotes Edward Bellamy, the Brookings Institute, Stuart Chase, Justice Cardozo, John L. Lewis, Karl Marx, *The New Republic*, Henry Ford, Felix Frankfurter, Chief Justice Hughes, Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt, the Book of Mormon, William Randolph Hearst and other authorities, but of Henry George he seems not to have heard, for he does not even mention him. Perhaps he realized that the writings of Henry George belong not in the realm of "Folklore."

Yet he finds his way about in the labyrinth with rare skill and has produced a most interesting as well as useful book. Also, he has been appointed as Assistant Attorney General of the United States in enforcing these anti-trust laws.—STEPHEN BELL.

PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

We are pleased to note a pamphlet of 12 pages and cover containing an address delivered before the City Club of Cleveland, Ohio, by Peter Witt, on Lincoln, the Man of Sorrow, and broadcast over a nationwide hook-up.

It is published by the William Feather Company and is an excellent account of the life of the great emancipator. It is characterized by the sequence which for years has been made familiar to us by this orator of our movement. In a short address Mr. Witt summarizes the life of Lincoln and conveys to the reader an indelible impression of a great man.

A friendly letter to Peter Witt from President Roosevelt is printed on the first page of the pamphlet.

"Canada's Economic Maladies, Their Cause and Cure," is a large booklet of 36 pages and cover in impressive form, submitted to the Royal Commission on Dominion Provincial Relations by the Single Tax Association of Canada.

It is not only in outward form that this imposing document is arresting. The argument for the taxation of economic rent is reinforced by examples of the bad effects of the present tax system which interferes with production, and holds back the development of communities. It is supported by statements of authorities and accounts of partial successes in land value taxation in the Western Provinces of Canada and in other parts of the world.

It is brightened by epigrammatic statements such as appears on page 14 as follows:

"It is possible by unjust and foolish taxation to destroy all industry and it is also possible by just and sane taxation to destroy monopoly, reduce the cost of living, and at the same time to create such a demand for labor as to make unemployment a matter for myth and legend."

The main credit for the writing of this remarkable Brief goes to E. J. Farmer, but collaborating with him were Alan C. Thompson, Robert T. Owens, J. H. L. Paterson, President of the Single Tax

Association of Canada, C. R. Bagwell, council for the Association, and Dorothy E. Coate.

Copies of this perhaps history-making document may be had for twenty-five cents each by application to Alan C. Thompson, 71 Bloor Street, East, Toronto, Ontario.

"How to Balance Budgets," by George Dana Linn, a pamphlet of 16 pages, not priced, is one of the most interesting and timely documents to come to our desk. Not only is the Georgeist method clearly outlined but the historical perspective is emphasized.

We give a few of the titles of subjects treated as follows: The Land Problem; the Dole; The Dawn of Nuisance Taxes; No More West; Origin of Title Deeds. Added to these are a number of paragraphs giving present conditions in various countries, also brief treatment of such present day problems as Sit Down Strikes; the Pittsburgh Plan; Panics, and necessary state constitutional amendments. In advocating the Georgeist solution our author warns against the cry of "confiscation" by opponents, and from the historical viewpoint briefly reviewed, he says, "It is restoration we are demanding, not confiscation."

"The New Earth" is a pamphlet of 16 pages written by Robert C. Bryant. It is a convincing explanation of the Georgeist viewpoint, one of an increasing number that aim to give the Single Tax philosophy concisely and clearly. We consider this pamphlet well worth while despite one or two inaccuracies, such as the use of the words "land nationalism," which the Georgeist philosophy does not contemplate. Copies of this pamphlet may be had of LAND AND FREEDOM or from Robert C. Bryant, 6200 Franklin Avenue, Hollywood, California. Write for terms.

An interesting pamphlet that has come to our desk is "Toward a Saner America," comprising 99 pages and cover, and published by Philip Rubin, Welsh Road, Willow Grove, Pa.

Mr. Rubin finds the solution of present-day problems in governmental agencies and activities. In the field of adult education he seems to think it the duty of government to establish a higher cultural standard through the agency of the radio.

Mr. Rubin, without being an advocate of socialism, is socialistic in trend, though he says very frankly that Russia, Italy and Germany have failed to improve the lot of the worker through governmental agency and control.

He looks for the slow process of education to eradicate what he calls "the competitive and acquisitive from the human heart"—surely an end to be averted rather than sought for.

There is high praise for Henry George whose teachings Mr. Rubin does not seem wholly to understand. There are wise reflections on protective tariffs and protection in general. We would remind him that "transportation and electric power" connote a land problem, a fact which Mr. Rubin does not seem entirely to comprehend.

Our author has written a thoughtful work in these 100 pages, and it would be an ungracious task to indicate much that seems to us unsound. We may at least be thankful to know that he has come much nearer to the truth than those who clothed in professorial pretence shut their minds wholly to the philosophy of freedom. There are serious flaws in Mr. Rubin's economic philosophy, but the defenses with which he has surrounded them are not impregnable to reasoned assault.—J. D. M.

TO love one's neighbour as one's self is not a mere pious sentiment. It is every whit as much a law of life as fresh air is to the body.—SIR WILFRED GRENFELL.

ENSLAVE the liberty of but one human being and the liberties of the world are put in peril.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

Correspondence

NATURAL-LAW CONTROL OF INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. Quinby's "Fundamentals of Interest" (Jan.-Feb.) properly condemns any effort to control interest. The law of supply and demand must do it naturally, regardless of futile beliefs, and all Single Taxers agree that any man-made laws about it must be worse than useless.

But they also agree that rent-yield from land investments (about one-half of all) is unnatural, and that it will be *cut off* by Single Tax: That this result is certain; and that when this field is cut off *only business investments will remain*.

(1) Is it honest or sensible to ignore *these certain results* of Single Tax?

Whether or not universal prosperity will increase "savings for safety" it is certain that users of capital will not have to compete for it *against the land-owning lure*. (Does any Single Taxer question the truth of Mr. Thompson's statement,—just above Mr. Quinby's article,—that "so long as wealth can purchase land that will yield a revenue just so long will man refuse to loan wealth without demanding a similar return?"

(2) Is not *the direct effect* of present rent yield on yields generally, obvious and important enough to call for honest recognition by Single Taxers?

Everybody knows that nature furnishes special help in the producing of pigs, wheat, honey, etc. - Nearly everybody knows that these are unlimitedly producible just as machine products are; and that their lowered prices similarly benefit all consumers—not the owners in particular.

(3) Must Single Taxers discredit their cause as well as their own intelligence and honesty, by not knowing or not admitting this *natural general distribution* of these gifts of nature?

Unless we honestly answer these questions we hurt our cause as well as our own repute.

Reading, Pa. WALTER G. STEWART.

MR. QUINBY REPLIES TO THE FOREGOING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

If, properly, I interpret the comments of Mr. W. G. Stewart, it appears to me that I had covered the essential points of his kindly "criticism" in my article under discussion. Yet, he is entitled at least to some elucidation of what I said, in the event that my statements were not sufficiently clear.

In all research based upon scientific principles, there should be a clear and definite understanding in the use of terms. Henry George was always definite in making this truth paramount. It seems to me that never could there be any reason for differences of opinion with respect to any truth, if they who expound it used the same language. For instance, would not a universal language go far to promote universal peace?

Mr. Stewart says we agree "that rent-yield from land investments (about one-half of all) is unnatural." Is he not here falling into the error of some "professors of economics" of confusing rent and interest? If he means "rent" as including payment for the use of land and the improvements upon it, he is. If he uses the term "rent" in the same sense as did Henry George, that is, payment for the use of land alone (unimproved), then I do not comprehend his meaning "about one-half." One hundred per cent of it is "unnatural," if by the latter term he means that it is unnatural for any individual to appropriate it to his personal advantage. But rent *is*—when we understand it as compensation for the use of land. It is not "unnatural," but strictly natural viewed from the standpoint of natural law. It arises solely and naturally from the demand of mankind for the use of land,

from which not one individual of us may escape, so long as we ming with our fellows. It will do this despite the fact of whether it "owned" by one or by many. That fact forms the sole basis for claim that "The rent of land belongs to the people." If the fact is true, our claim is just—having its foundation in natural justice. "Rent" which is paid for the use of both land and improvements two-fold, which obliges one discussing the scientific principle of it to distinguish between compensation for the land or site itself and the improvements upon it. That for the land properly is rent. The part for improvements is interest or wages. If the improvements have been made through the employment of labor of others, the return (yield) is interest. If it is for improvements performed by the "owner" himself, it is wages.

(Parenthetically, who of us has not heard the shallow socialist statement, "Socialism includes the government ownership of land. As if that fact would alter or annihilate the natural law of rent. Land and its value are two different things. One is a natural "product" of the soil. The other is truly the product of human association and social action. The individual necessity of toil and enterprise. If only F. D. R. could grasp this simple truth, it would save him from some of the blunders of his methods.)

Quoting Mr. Thompson's article, Mr. Stewart asks if the followers of Henry George will dispute the statement "so long as wealth can be purchased land that will yield a revenue, just so long will man refuse to loan wealth without demanding a similar return." Of course not, but does that imply the converse? Does it mean that after government appropriates rent, men will lend "wealth" "without demanding a similar return?" Perhaps it might be so, but that will be when men work without wages and lend without interest.

As a general rule men do not lend "wealth"—except as wealth may be estimated as capital. They do not lend wealth at all in making a loan of money, for the simple reason that money is not wealth, but merely a representative of wealth. No sane person borrows money simply for the sake of having it. He converts it at once into wealth in the form of food, clothing or shelter, or into capital for some business enterprise. The reason for the fact that wages and interest rise and fall together is that both are essential to the production of wealth. It is not wealth that earns interest, but capital. Neither labor nor capital can be employed without the aid of the other. Demand for one involves demand for the other. Wages compensate labor. Interest compensates capital.

Regarding question No. 2, I agree that rent does and always will affect the returns (yield) of products generally. For regardless of what power collects it, it must come out of the production of wealth and only they who produce the wealth will pay it. But the difference between the social appropriation of rent and its private collection, as now, is, that what is paid will go as recompense for the services which government, as representative or agent of the social compact, shall render, instead of into private coffers of persons living upon the sweat and blood of mankind. And that would be "social difference!"

With reference to the natural increase in raising "pigs, wheat, honey, etc.," there is indeed a "special help" on the part of nature. That is, the natural laws of growth or increase do aid labor, but let us not forget that it is labor alone which is the beneficiary (or should be, in this "special help." In domestic affairs, the calf does not develop into a cow, except through the toil of man, nor does the juice of grapes become wine except through the same means employed in various ways. To the laborer, in these as in all cases, belongs the fruit of the toil.

Los Angeles, California.

LAURIE J. QUINBY

SLAVERY OR FREEDOM

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

As you probably know, I have been interested in Single Tax for more than thirty years, and feel like perhaps many others that

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

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

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

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

Troito, Michigan.

HENRY C. L. FORLER.

A CHANCE FOR WIDE SPREAD PROPAGANDA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

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

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

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

BOLTON HALL.

A SUGGESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

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

Wichita, Kansas.

HENRY WARE ALLEN.

A PLEA FOR TOLERATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Marathon, Iowa.

T. J. KELLEY, M. D.

THE GOSPEL OF PLENTY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

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

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

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

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

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

Plenty is our heritage from our great prophet and leader. If we declare it confidently and exultantly we can justify both our declaration and our confidence by showing how the social mechanism that he devised—the recovery of rent—will distribute plenty on a plenty scale and so will abolish poverty and establish economic equity—for practical purposes, economic equality:—"Who should crouch where all were freemen? Who oppress where all were peers?"

Ottawa, Canada.

A. C. CAMPBELL.

APPROVES OUR EDITORIAL

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your editorial in issue just received pleased me very much. For several years my own expressed opinion that the rapid decadence of the present so-called civilization was apparent in the grotesque, not to say "rotten," productions in painting, drawing, sculpture, music and literature has received no response and scarcely even polite attention.

Art is crude, infantile and offensive to the eye, music a mere din and offense to the ear, and books so poorly and clumsily written that good material for an interesting story is so prosy as to be tiresome and almost unreadable.

I hope you are right as to "the questioning spirit of the young." My observation has noted either absolute indifference or interest only in the superficial nonsense and jargon of Marxism.

How can Broadus Mitchell express such appreciation of Henry George as he has in the article in your current issue and then speak over the radio such nonsense as "we must have production for use and not for profit" to solve our economic problems. The answer of course is probably the necessity of holding a job and the fact that probably Johns Hopkins, as is true of Harvard, Columbia and many of the Western State Universities, gets a large income from ground rents.

Boston, Mass.

EDMUND J. BURKE.

A CORRECTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Walter Fairchild's article on interest in your January-February edition is very clear and conclusive, except:—

He states that "interest, however, is not a return for borrowed capital, but is the return for the use of capital."

I have rewritten this, and W. F. approves, to read "Interest is not a return for borrowing (capital) but is a return in the using of capital." N. Y. City.

F. C. MAGUIRE.

NEWS, NOTES AND PERSONALS

R. R. STOKES, labor candidate for Parliament in the 1938 By-Elections from Ipswich, England, is triumphantly elected, reversing a conservative majority of several thousand for the opposition. In his manifesto he says: "I believe a gradual abolition of the private monopoly of natural resources through the taxation of land values is the most potent remedy for the evil distribution which is the cause of poverty and distress. Land values are the creation of the community and arise out of its presence. The landowner contributes nothing by his ownership as distinct from his management." Mr. Stokes served during the World War in the Royal Field artillery and was awarded the Croix de Guerre. He concludes his manifesto by saying, "I look forward to a state of society in which everyone can live in economic security and war shall cease to exist, and where freedom and justice are secure for all men."

MRS. ROSWELL SKEEL, JR., writes: "I am more and more pleased with the *Freeman* which is certainly a good supplement to your dignified and more universal sheet."

We are pleased to announce that *The New Commonwealth* of New Zealand has resumed publication. It will be sponsored by the Commonwealth Party of New Zealand and is published at Hohair Street Matamata, New Zealand. The number before us is full of good things and is Number One, Volume One, of the new series that succeeds the former *Commonwealth* of Wellington. Success to it!

"MILK RIVER Thrives Under Single Tax" is the title of an article in the *Herald* of Lethbridge, Alberta. It states that relief cost shows a decline over the previous year as well as a satisfactory bank balance from year to year.

WILLIAM B. VERNAM, long active as a Single Taxer in Brooklyn, is dead at eighty-one. Some years ago Mr. Vernam was president of the Brooklyn Single Tax Club. He was a man of varied talents. He painted many portraits in oil of prominent business men and his younger years were active in amateur theatricals. He was born in England and came to America at the age of seventeen. He is survived by his sons, Harold D. and Gilbert S. Vernam; a daughter, Mrs. Margaret O'Connell, and a brother, Sanford J. Vernam, Trenton, N. J.

A BILL has been introduced into the Massachusetts' legislature providing for an excise tax on certain vacant lands. Most of the proposals take a wrong direction, as this one does, but they are significant as straws in the wind.

ANDREW FURSUETH, head of the Seamen's Union, who for many years championed the cause of "those who go down to the sea in ships," died recently in Washington after a long career of usefulness. He is said to have been a believer in the philosophy of Henry George and was known all over the world.

The Square Deal, Single Tax organ of Canada, published in Toronto, shows Canada waking up. The Jan.-Feb. number contains much interesting news. Printed in this number is an address by John Anderson of Montreal in which he calls Henry George "the greatest Christian since St. Paul."

A VERY favorable review of Louis Wallis' "Burning Questions: Making Your Living in a Monopolized World," appears in the *West Street Journal* of Feb. 4.

"LAND AND FREEDOM does not deteriorate with the years," writes John B. McGauran of Denver, Colorado.

W. L. CROSMAN of Revere, Mass., quotes Lincoln and his views on the land question from Robert H. Browne's "Abraham Lincoln: the Men of His Time," in the *Boston Traveler* of Feb. 12.

THE Sales Tax Absurd is the title of a well written letter in Gloucester, Mass., *Times*, from the pen of James B. Ellery.

AN article from *The Medical Times* by Dr. Arnold Jacobson, editor, on Francis Quesnay, leader of the physiocrats, has been printed in leaflet form for distribution and may be had of Dr. Jacobson, Nassau Street, New York City.

THE Commencement Dinner of the Middletown, N. Y. High School was held on the evening of Feb. 14. Mr. Closter, instructor of the school, acted as toastmaster and a number of graduates spoke. Mr. Frank Chodorov, director of the School, addressed the gathering and presented certificates to the graduates. Sixty persons attended.

ILBERT M. TUCKER, author of "The Road to Prosperity," and a member of the faculty at the New York Henry George School, addressed students of the Sarah Lawrence College at Bronxville, N. Y., on 17.

HE *Roman Forum*, published by Frederick W. Roman in Los Angeles, in its issue of March reprints Henry George's "Ode to Liberty," prefaces it with an appropriate introduction.

HE *Universal Engineer*, published at 150 Nassau Street, is an imitative organ of the engineering trade, and gives in the March issue 11 page contributed by John H. Allen under the heading, "Lincoln and the Slaves. Let us Free the Land."

HE *Financial World* of this city with forty thousand circulation is a friendly review of Louis Wallis' "Burning Question."

R. A. C. CAMPBELL of Ottawa, writes Stephen Bell: "I have finished reading your 'Rebel, Priest, and Prophet,' and I write once to thank you for writing it. I was an outsider and non-participant, but breathlessly interested follower of the McGlynnroversy. I did not understand it. Now your book reminds me he points that I had misunderstood in thought. The effect of book is to give me that."

GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY is dead at the advanced age of eighty. He was generally regarded as a Single Taxer, but will be chiefly known as a philanthropist. He retired from the banking business 1906 at the age of fifty-four. He was a life long Democrat and a friend of Governor Alfred E. Smith, whose candidacy for the presidency he espoused. Just how much of Henry George's philosophy had absorbed seems doubtful. To the movement he gave very little in comparison to his great gifts in other directions. He was a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM and made occasional small contributions to its up-keep. Despite the fact that he was a banker he dealt with Irving Fisher's fluctuating dollar and government ownership of railroads, and defended the capital gains tax. He was a remarkably handsome man. *The New York Times* said of him editorially: "A phrase which he once used of another is most fittingly applied to him; 'his is the glory of high citizenship.' And such was his Olympian appearance that Phidias would have chosen him to carve Zeus."

At a short but well considered speech Congressman Herbert Bigelow, introducing his land tax amendment to the new tax bill, said: "Mr. Chairman, the greatest Democrat in Ohio in a hundred years introduced in this house 44 years ago the same proposal I am introducing today. This was my good friend Mr. Tom L. Johnson. At that time he got six votes. Last year I introduced it and got 26 votes. Mr. Chairman, I shall call for a division on this amendment. I may have the happiness of getting 27 votes anyway this afternoon." On division there were 32 ayes to 45 noes. So Congressman Bigelow got five more votes than he asked for.

R. G. M. FOWLDS, son of the late Sir George Fowlds, writes us suggesting that there is a field for some student to write a thesis on the decline and fall of civilizations in the past in the light of Henry George's philosophy. Also he suggests a summary of the influence of land systems, coupled with tariff restrictions, which are admitted by many authorities as the cause of the depression of 1929. We present the proposal of Mr. Fowlds for the consideration of our readers.

A. C. J. LAVERY of Aberdeen, South Dakota, writes us a letter which is crowded out of this issue, in which he says: "The way to

abate our tax muddle is to begin by abating taxes." He favors the action for organization taken at the Detroit convention of the Henry George Congress. He believes the taxes on railroads are the most vicious and thinks that here the abatement process should begin. He is opposed to the formation of a political party.

DOROTHY THOMPSON is "getting warm," as the children say in their games. She writes in the *Herald Tribune*

"Join the Survivors Organization, Mr. President. All we want you to do is to get together the smartest experts on taxes that you know—and you won't find them all in the Treasury Department—and tell them to work out a tax system that takes the taxes off productive land and puts them on idle land, that takes the taxes off pay rolls. Just keep one thing in mind; that we want to put idle men and idle capital to work and that the way to do that is to make it to the advantage of people to put them to work, and not to their disadvantage. . . . And if we guarantee to put five million men to work you won't need so many taxes."

MRS. W. O. BLASE, whose husband passed away at Youngstown, Ohio, on December 16, will carry on her husband's business, in which we wish her all possible success.

HENRY C. LIPPINCOTT, veteran Single Taxer of Philadelphia for many years, passed away on December 8. He became interested in the movement by reading "Progress and Poverty" and was among the first to rally to the call for volunteers in the Delaware campaign of 1895-6. He was ninety-three years old.

CLARENCE DARROW is dead after a long and useful life. With an almost unbroken record of acquittals in criminal cases his career as a trial lawyer was unique. He will pass into history as the Great Defender. Where his sympathies were enlisted he served without charge. He was certainly the greatest criminal lawyer of his time. It was our privilege to introduce him as a speaker at one of the Henry George Congresses in Chicago, on which occasion Peter Witt paid him a high compliment. In another column will be found an eloquent tribute to the great advocate from Mrs. Antoinette Wambough, executive secretary of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation.

MR. HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM discussed the housing problem at the Town Hall and his picture appeared in the *Herald-Tribune*. Mr. Buttenheim never misses an opportunity to raise his voice in defense of our principles.

CORNELIUS W. KIEVIT of Passaic, N. J., is dead. He was born in Illinois and was for a number of years a newspaper executive. He was an active Single Taxer and for a time was president of the Passaic Single Tax Club. He developed a facility for public speaking from platform and cart tail. He was a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM almost from the beginning and at the New York meeting of the Henry George Congress we had the opportunity of cementing a friendship begun by correspondence that has endured for many years. He was known as "Single Tax Kievit" and gloried in the nickname. The *Passaic Herald-News* in its issue of March 16 gave a four column biographical sketch to the life and services of Passaic's distinguished citizen. He was in his eighty-third year.

WILLIAM R. WHITELAW of Toronto writes: "The article by Prof. Broadus Mitchell of the Johns Hopkins University, in your Jan.-Feb. issue, is a winner and conclusively shows the terrible discouragements which that great man 'Henry George' had to combat from both press and pulpit in his earnest endeavor to solve both your and my economic problems. He was a brave man and a fearless fighter for the truth."