

September—October, 1938

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

The Henry George Congress at Toronto

Benjamin W. Burger

A World Survey of Our Progress

Margaret E. Bateman at Toronto

Land Campaign in New Jersey

Alfred N. Chandler

Schalkenbach Foundation

Antoinette Wambough at Toronto

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXVIII

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1938

No. 5

Comment and Reflection

WITHOUT regard to the natural order, or any reference to natural laws, among which economic laws are included, we may elect to try the Great Iniquity, by which term Tolstoy has characterized the denial of man's equal right to the use of the earth, by the moral law. It is the everlasting credit of Henry George as it is of Oscar Geiger, now linked inseparably with his great Mentor as the interpreter of our philosophy, that both these men stressed the need for the observance of the moral law in society. From this teaching the Henry George School under its eminent director, Frank Chodorov, will not depart.

THE identity of the moral law with the natural law is taken for granted. Society cannot do things that are forbidden to the individual. Society cannot transgress the right of property any more than the individual can, and expect to escape the penalty. It is preposterous to assume that there is one law for society and another for the individual. Its sanctions are as binding on both. No amount of tergiversation or excursions into the realm of metaphysics can obscure this truth. To abandon it is to sacrifice the mainstay of our argument. After all emphasis is laid upon the natural laws, the ethical imperative calls aloud for recognition.

THIS concept, an inseparable part of our philosophy, dates from no special period, now to be laid aside, and a so-called scientific interpretation substituted. "The School of 1897"—why this date?—is the School of Henry George and Oscar Geiger, and now of the rapidly growing institution founded by the latter. But it is unfortunate, besides being a trifle ridiculous, that a controversy should have arisen over this point. At a time when there is a more wide-spread knowledge of our philosophy than at any time since "Progress and Poverty" was written; and which still remains the invulnerable citadel of our teaching.

THE land is Mine and shall not be sold forever," and similar injunctions were the teachings of the School of 620 B. C., or thereabouts. It does not differ materially from the School of 1897 started by the followers of Henry

George on or before that date. Its teachings contain the moral injunctions for society of which this seems to be the supreme command. It comes to us from the highest authority that can be cited. It is a moral injunction of tremendous solemnity. Of this Henry George and Oscar Geiger were supremely conscious. It was an inseparable part of their preachment. The moral law in society and the natural law were one and the same.

WHAT consideration other than this did Tolstoy have in mind when he referred to "The Great Iniquity?" He was thinking of the moral law of which this was the supreme violation. What do we mean when we say a thing is wrong or wrung from the right? What do we have in mind when we say of some social arrangement or the law of man that it is wrong? Do we not at once conceive of some violation of an ethical principle. Is not this man's first reaction when we say it is not just. "Justice the end, Taxation the Means," was George's title to one of his most important lectures. It is mere juggling with words to protest that that what we propose is only the abolition of all taxation. We will, nevertheless, do what we set out to do through the machinery of taxation, the instrument with which the people are most familiar and which they are not likely to misunderstand. Mr. George has given us reasons for discarding other means, and these show him to have been a statesman as well as an economist.

A Supplementary Word

IT is in no spirit of controversy that we again consider our old friend, the moral law, as related to economic law, which was touched upon in a recent issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

We are wont to consider the marked contrast between law and what is known as the common law, and the statutes. Basically law was recognized in early concepts as natural law only. All other so-called law was considered as man-made, viz., enactments or recorded precedents or customs. Law carried its own penalty if violated. All else required a specific penalty and human enforcement. Blackstone affirmed this in his chapter on the nature of law in his Commentaries, Vol. I, Chs., 2 and 3. Concerning the relation of law to human enactments we quote as follows: "This law of nature being coeval with mankind, and

dictated by God Himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority mediately or immediately from this original." We further quote from the same volume: "No human laws should be suffered to contradict the laws of nature." "On the contrary, if any human law should allow or enjoin to so contradict a law of nature we are bound to transgress that human law or else we must offend both the natural and the divine." In ignorance of the economic law has not society offended both? But here is the source of sovereignty expressed in man through his compliance with law, natural law. Ignorance is no excuse; the penalty is inevitable.

It requires only slight elevation of thought to realize that in considering law as natural law we are dealing with invisible and invariable principle. It is incessant and eternal and without dimension; its invariable effects only, are registered through our physical senses. From these effects we learn by trial and error, by stumbling, falling down stairs, burnt fingers or electric shock. Thereafter we recognize law but we can neither analyze or define it. In so recognizing and in obeying law we register a good effect and so consider it as positive and its violation an evil effect and negative.

As Georgeists we state a positive philosophy, an idea, technically, a natural law, an eternal principle. It was its violation as perceived by bad effects that led George and his predecessors to its discovery. Reasoning therefrom the law was sought out and found. It was the principle of equal rights, the invisible moral law itself, and then its application expressed as equal rights to the source of all external things, land. Tested, it was found good, not evil, and true, not false. Its truth is worked out to mathematical exactness and to that extent fulfils the requirements of science. Tested by its violations the automatic visible results are always poverty, distress, misery and crime and all that flows from these things. Given invariable evil effects of the violation of the economic law and that law itself, the essence of goodness and truth, wherein does it fail to coincide with the moral law. Let any Georgeist discover if he can the slightest violation of the moral law in the philosophy of Henry George, let him find any intrusion of evil or falsity in the principle which George enunciated. Humanity in its ignorance has failed to obey the unchangeable economic moral law. The four horsemen still ride.

C. H. KENDAL.

INDUSTRY being the result of employment, there can be no productive employment where there is no industry, a fact the last session of congress failed to recognize when seeking to curb industry at every turn.

Cause and Effect, Foley, Ala.

Report of The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation at the Toronto Conference

SEPTEMBER 8, 1938

ANTOINETTE WAMBOUGH

I AM glad to be able to speak before so many good friends of both Canada and the United States, whom I feel I know well through long years of pleasant correspondence.

To the newcomers and strangers I am grateful of an opportunity to bring news of the purposes and aims of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, and to show how that organization cooperates and coordinates with other branches of our movement.

The trustees of the Foundation send their heartiest greetings to this Conference and their good wishes for the success of any plans that may be here worked out for land value taxation and the Henry George movement in Canada and the United States.

In particular do the trustees desire to thank Mr. Perc Williams and Mr. Owens, for the elaborate book display that they have sponsored, and the opportunity they have afforded to have the work of the Foundation brought before the Conference.

My husband in reading this speech said, "Why don't you throw in a joke or two?" When preparing to talk I don't think any of us feel very much in joking mood and so I didn't respond to his suggestion very warmly but something happened as we crossed the border that might be considered as a tepid little joke!

The customs officials asked us various questions, and all went well until they said, "Why are you coming to Canada?" I replied, "To attend the Single Tax Convention." They looked very severe. I gathered that they thought it was a convention of single people, and as we were married, they wondered why we were attending. At 4:30 a. m., we gave them a brief talk upon the Single Tax, the life and work of Henry George, and the aims of this Conference. At last satisfied that everything was all right, they admitted us to Canada.

If the work of the Tax Relief Association, the Henry George School of Social Science, and the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation can continue on the ever increasing front that they are now proceeding upon such ignorance and such feeble witticisms as we are all familiar with with regard to the name "Single Tax," will disappear, and instead, we can hope for a real understanding of our aims and ideals.

Now you will all want to know just how the Foundation is at present furthering the principles of Henry George. But before I go into this discussion, I should like to take a few minutes to outline the history and character

the Foundation for the benefit of newcomers to the movement.

Way back in 1884, a young hardworking printer read a book, and he was fired by it, as millions of others have been, ever since that book's appearance. The boy was Robert Schalkenbach; the book, "Progress and Poverty." This boy had had a hard life in the silk mills at the age of twelve, had been an apprentice printer later, and finally became the owner of a great printing plant in New York City. At the time of his death he was president of the New York Typothetae, an association of employing printers.

This man wanted to do something very tangible and definite for the cause that Henry George had made so plain. He knew that "Progress and Poverty" was the starting point for nearly all constructive activity and so, through the influence of a beloved friend, a Canadian, by the way—Jim Brown by name, he decided to leave his modest fortune to twenty-one trustees who would form a Foundation expressly to keep Henry George's books in print. Especially "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade?" were to be produced and widely circulated.

In November, 1924, Robert Schalkenbach died, and his estate was divided; one-half to his family, one-half to the Foundation.

The amount has been stated extravagantly to be \$400,000. That is far from the truth. It has been about \$225,000, and through certain legal complications stands now at about \$140,000—an extremely modest fund, when funds such as the Russell Sage and Rockefeller funds are brought into comparison. The Foundation does all of its work upon the income from this trust, and runs a very active office, provides for the printing of the books, and undertakes national distribution thereof.

It is the thought of the trustees that in following this policy a steady light will be kept burning, and that at all times, in all climes, Henry George's books—the impetus from which other action springs, will be available for a great number of years.

If we realize that in 1926 George's books were practically out of print and unavailable except at very high prices in book stores, the work of the Foundation becomes more significant—and when we say that through its efforts 100,000 books and nearly three-quarters of a million pamphlets and another half million of advertising pieces have been printed and distributed, it can be seen that the Foundation is indeed serving the ends that Robert Schalkenbach envisioned.

In 1926 one of the first acts of the trustees was to find the 25th Anniversary Edition of "Progress and Poverty," that was being printed at \$1.75 and \$2.00 a copy by Doubleday Doran, and arrange for a new printing—a dollar edition—which was for the most part given to leading libraries throughout the United States.

The second major move was to obtain from Dr. John Dewey an Appreciation of Henry George, and the services of Professor Harry Gunnison Brown in condensing "Progress and Poverty," for what we might call "tabloid use." The resulting book, "Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty," with its collection of expressions of opinions from leading economists as to the utility and desirability of land-value taxation, forced the Foundation to run into four editions, totaling 16,500 copies, all of which were sold to schools, colleges, and the general public, and to some extent to already active Single Taxers.

This popular book was published in Braille for the blind, and sent as a gift of the Foundation to 100 libraries for the blind in 1927 and 1928.

Then, as the so-called prosperous era drew to a close, and people could not deny signs of impending unemployment, we felt the need for a new, well edited, unabridged "Progress and Poverty." In 1929, the Foundation stood the expense of new plates—obtained the most painstaking kind of editorial work, done by Arthur C. Pleydell, well known for his ever loyal devotion to the cause,—and launched its first printing under its own imprint—calling this new edition the Fiftieth Anniversary Edition of "Progress and Poverty".

Since 1929, 45,317 of these books have been printed, and, if the recent Modern Library Series is included (for the Foundation has just finished loaning its plates to this company, in order to produce a Random House, Modern Library version)—we find a total of 50,317 unabridged "Progress and Poverty" released directly because of this Foundation's work.

The Vanguard Press was also assisted in the issuing of 4,000 abridgements of "Progress and Poverty"—edited by our honored chairman, Mrs. deMille, and the late Louis F. Post.

Abridgements, tabloid version, and unabridged work sponsored therefore, total 73,337, and the balance of 26,663 books represent the other Henry George titles such as "Science of Political Economy," "Social Problems," "Protection or Free Trade?" and several thousand titles of books closely allied to Georgeist principles.

All of these books were printed in bright new editions for this generation to read, even as the Fels Fund printed George's books for the early 1900's to read! All books written by Henry George were priced at the modest price of \$1.00, and the Foundation has prepaid postage in order to further accommodate purchasers and bring the books within reach of all.

I have heard it said often of late—"Well, the reason you are distributing books is because of the activities of the Henry George School." It is undoubtedly true that the School with its splendid technique, and splendid teaching methods, has been responsible for the use of many books, 25,000 of that 100,000 to be exact.

But I should like to explain that since the very beginning of the Foundation's existence, it has been able to create channels of interest in the general public as well as in Single Tax centers, that have resulted in an average yearly distribution of about 5,000 to 6,000 books.

This work goes on steadily, even when School and Extension classes use the book in great numbers,—and it is of these methods whereby the Foundation obtains the permanent interest of an entirely different portion of the general public each year, that I would like to speak for the next few minutes.

We found that merely printing the books was of course not enough. To obtain readers, in addition to the methods evolved by the School, certain vigorous promotion campaigns had to be waged each year, and the following media were therefore concentrated upon:

1. Advertising in newspapers and magazines.
2. Advertising by direct mail.
3. Obtaining wide bookstore distribution by making friendly contacts and obtaining orders on a large scale from bookdealers and jobbers.
4. By publicity.
5. By asking Single Taxers to cooperate in the distribution of books and pamphlets.
6. By planning exhibits.
7. By running prize essay contests in the schools and colleges in the early years of the Foundation's existence.
8. By seeing to it that our books were used as required reading in schools and colleges.

ADVERTISING. A constant stream of newcomers to the movement is obtained by the use of what we call "spot" ads. They are not very big; we place them only in magazines that have proven drawing power, but the steady correspondence engendered among people who are new to the teachings of Henry George, and the resultant inclusion of them in Georgeist work is one of the most important features of the Foundation's programme.

DIRECT-MAIL ADVERTISING. Each month some new group, some new list of several thousand names is selected. Test mailings are made introducing to these people news of the books and general knowledge of Henry George and the movement. Judging from the results obtained on smaller mailings, the way is shown to swing into larger mailings. Among the groups reached in this way are the accountants, school superintendents, all associations whose membership is interested in government, economics, and the social sciences. Thousands have been added to the Schalkenbach lists, and other thousands have later taken up active School work because of their initial contact with Foundation mailings.

BOOKSTORES. When the Foundation started printing George's writings it had no bookstore contacts. Each year several letters have gone out to dealers, until gradually thousands of dealers know where they can get the George

books, and other thousands are able to stock the books. One of the most important recent additions to the long list of dealers who carry "Progress and Poverty" is the Concord Book Shop in the Paramount Building, 43d Street and Broadway. In the busy seasons this shop moves on an average of 25 copies every two weeks. Outlets are procured from the large jobbing houses, so that whether a library or an individual contacts the dealers or the supply houses, our books are instantly available.

The cost of books to dealers is kept very low, practically on a subsidy basis, in order to foster the display and sale of George's chief works. The extension courses of the School, and the colleges are likewise given books in quantities at extremely low rates to encourage wide distribution and use.

PUBLICITY. Since inception, the Foundation has noted articles in magazines and newspapers written in favorable vein, which could be used, if reproduced, for direct propaganda. Such articles have been reproduced by the thousands and distributed. Among notable publicity events are the following—all reproduced in huge quantities and given tremendous circulation:

1. Two editorials in *Liberty*, written by Mr. MacFadden, but with the aid of Mr. Charles Ingersoll, one of our directors, and also our late president, Mr. Charles O'Connor Hennessy.
2. An article on "Progress and Poverty," entitled "Three Capital Ratios," written by Mr. Roy Foulke of Dun and Bradstreet, after he had called, in answer to one of our advertisements, at our office, and had obtained a copy of "Progress and Poverty."

An interesting experiment with the *Financial World* resulted in the publication throughout the summer of extremely favorable reviews for "The Science of Political Economy," "Progress and Poverty," and "Protection or Free Trade?" (this latest appearing in the September 7, 1938 issue.) Through such reviews many orders for the books have been received, new contacts made and some have written enthusiastically for the Correspondence Course offered by the Henry George School and with which every newcomer is automatically acquainted when he receives Schalkenbach literature.

Since November, 1937, more than 500 people have enrolled in the Correspondence Course of the School because of the Schalkenbach activities.

The cooperation that Single Taxers give at Christmas time and in the spring by the purchase of books and pamphlets to be given to strangers, is also a tremendous help in forwarding knowledge of the movement and of Henry George's ideas. The Foundation owes a deep debt of gratitude to the many who faithfully continue little private missionary activities of their own that yield the most interesting kind of fruit. We cannot always inform people when and how their particular friend began to enter into the work, or began to buy more books, or do

more things for the cause—but we can assure those who have given books in times past, that this happens very often. We know because we keep an index card of everyone who receives these gift books.

FOREIGN CONTACTS. The Foundation had a large foreign correspondence. It endeavors to maintain an international acquaintance, and it has always rendered an international book service. It supplies people in out-of-the-way parts of the world, and keeps them advised through its mailings of what is new in books and activities.

EXHIBITS. Every so often there comes an opportunity to arrange an exhibit, or to cooperate with a Book Fair or an Exposition, or the work some large publisher is doing, in displaying books and pamphlets. These opportunities are seized, and the resulting publicity and interest stimulated is valuable.

WORK IN THE SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. Twice a year professors and teachers receive letters from the Foundation telling them of the new books and pamphlets that can be used in history, economics and social science courses. The work that Mr. Walter Fairchild, a trustee, accomplished in 1931 and 1932 has been of greatest value in establishing the books in the assigned reading courses in leading colleges throughout the nation. A letter from a student explains how well integrated with the general economics course is this material from the Foundation:

"I am a student at Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. It was just last fall that I carried on a course in Taxation under Professor E. H. Hahne. The requirement in this course was to compile our class notes and reading assignments into one. This bulk was to be bound into a book in order to receive credit for the course. Reading assignment sheets were handed out, and upon one of them there appeared "H. G. Brown, Significant Paragraphs from Progress and Poverty," from Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 11 Park Place, New York. Cloth, 90 pages, 50 cents."

From our file of 2,000 university professors who are in touch with our offerings, evidence often comes to us long after the initial service is rendered by the supply of books or pamphlets, that they are indeed using our material each semester. Regularly 60 copies go to Princeton, University of Illinois, and many other colleges receive quantities of the unabridged "Progress and Poverty" for class work. After a recent mailing of a general letter seeking to increase the use of George's books in the courses, we received the following typical response:

"I have noticed that you published at very reasonable rates some years ago, various works of Henry George. I am going to give a course here next year in which we will make a fairly detailed study of this thinker. Is there any such thing from your press as the collected works of Henry George?"

In conclusion may I say that all this emphasis upon the books is for two purposes:

1. To carry out the express wishes of our Founder.
2. To keep Henry George's message before the world, with the hope that from the books and the reading thereof, some day a great forward political "push" can be made that will bring forth land value taxation in both Canada and the United States.

We believe that in making the books readily accessible we are truly the Foundation upon which others can build a firm structure for the future security and economic welfare of mankind.

ANTOINETTE WAMBOUGH,
Executive Secretary,
Robert Schalkenbach Foundation,
11 Park Place, New York.

A World Survey

ADDRESS BY MISS MARGARET E. BATEMAN AT
THE HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS IN
TORONTO, CANADA, SEPTEMBER 8, 1938

WHEN your committee invited me to speak to this assembly, they suggested that my subject be "A World Survey." I should never have had the courage to choose such an imposing topic myself! I was glad to find, however, in preparing this survey that there were many sources from which I could obtain authentic information, and that there are numerous publications advocating land value taxation and the Henry George philosophy in various parts of the world. I should like to mention especially:

Land and Liberty, published in London, England.
LAND AND FREEDOM, published in New York.
The Freeman, published in New York.
Democracy, published in New York.
No Taxes, published in California.
The Square Deal, published in Toronto, Canada.
Progress, published in Melbourne, Australia.
The Standard, published in Sydney, Australia.
The Liberator, published in Western Australia.
The People's Advocate, published in South Australia.
The New Commonwealth of New Zealand, published in Auckland, N. Z.
The Free People, published in Johannesburg, South Africa.

Many other publications are devoted to the same cause, but those mentioned are published in English, and I found their articles very excellent indeed. The publicity afforded through these papers is extending the Henry George philosophy to large numbers of people throughout the world.

May I say, that in spite of my hesitancy to deal with such an all-inclusive subject, "A World Survey," seems

to me to be particularly appropriate to this Henry George Congress, because if there ever was a man whose sympathies and viewpoint were world-wide, that man was Henry George! One cannot read or study his work, without a realization of his world-outlook, his desire to make a contribution, not only to one nation, race or creed, but to mankind.

Another reason that I find this world outlook (or "World Survey") particularly interesting, is that when my friends asked me to explain what this Henry George Movement or Philosophy really means, my first impulse is to remind them that this world or planet we call the earth is a spinning ball on which we travel some 68,000 miles per hour (and can still admire Mr. Hughes for his average of 250!) and that inhabiting this earth there are a fairly small number of human beings (probably less than two billions), but they are entirely dependent upon the earth for food, clothing and shelter, no matter on what part of it they live, and regardless of their color, race, creed, speech or customs.

The resources of this earth are so remarkable that with the aid of science these few human beings are now able to produce far more than the necessities of life. They can have luxuries as well. Our needs can be lavishly provided for, if only mankind has freedom of access to the earth.

It is only a step then to the problem of why millions of people cannot procure everything they need, and why they are so shut out from the resources of the earth that they cannot feed or cloth themselves, but must depend upon the charity of others or starve to death.

We are then face to face with the question raised by Henry George, the question of progress and poverty—of poverty in the midst of plenty!

Let us look around the earth today. Our material progress has been amazing. The radio flashes news around the earth in a matter of minutes. An aeroplane dashes around the globe in four-and-a-half days. Human beings seem to have conquered the sea and the air, and yet they have not conquered unemployment—poverty—strikes—and wars. We know that whatever may be the cause, happiness, peace and plenty are utterly impossible of attainment by the majority of the two billion human beings inhabiting this earth.

We believe that Henry George opened the way to a correction of this state of world affairs. We also believe that the monopoly of the natural resources of this earth, and the unnatural trade barriers, are fundamentally responsible for the present world economic situation. As a writer in one of the Henry George publications recently put it, "We know that private ownership of a single acre of land gives to the title-holder the power to say who may come on this acre, how long he may stay there, what he may do while there, as well as how much of his production he must part with for the permission

to be there and work. It is obvious that if one man owned all the earth, he would have the power to regulate the lives of all the rest of humanity."

If we may look backward for a moment, I should like to quote and emphasize a passage from a speech by the late Sir George Fowlds of New Zealand. It seems to throw much light on the danger of the present world land monopoly. Sir George said: "It is estimated that when Persia perished, 1 per cent of the people owned all the land; Egypt went down when 2 per cent owned 97 per cent of all the wealth; Babylon died when 2 per cent owned all the wealth and Rome expired when 1,800 men possessed all the then known world." What do we find in the Twentieth Century A.D.?

GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. Graham Peace in his book, "The Great Robbery," published in 1933, shows that when the last survey was made, some 40,000 people in Great Britain (one-tenth of 1 per cent) owned nearly three-quarters of the country. The remaining one-quarter was held by about 2 per cent while the remainder of the people (some 44 million) owned no land whatever.

In Scotland, 96.4 per cent of the people owned no land. It was held by 3.6 per cent of the population.

In Ireland, the same survey showed that 1.4 per cent of the population owned all the land (some 20 million acres), while about five million people held not a single inch of land that they could call their own.

Mr. Peace further states: "Small wonder that between May, 1851 and December, 1920, no less than 4,338,199 natives—the real owners of Irish soil—emigrated for permanent residence abroad. The great majority went to America—and increased the rental value of that country for the landlords there."

May I recall again the figures?—Scotland, 3.6 per cent owning the land; Ireland, 1.4 per cent; Great Britain, 2 per cent; and then go back to Egypt, 2 per cent; Persia, 1 per cent; Rome, 2 per cent. These figures have a very startling significance.

Those who hold titles to land in Great Britain seem to have been quite successful in escaping taxation on their holdings. Land that is held out of use, even today, is exempt from taxation. (And yet there is a tax of 10 cents a pound on tea!) In London and many other cities buildings are also exempt from taxation if they are not producing a revenue. Is it any wonder that industry and business, food and clothing, gasoline and tea and almost all commodities are taxed so heavily that people are finding it almost impossible to carry the load?

I am sure that many of you are familiar with the history of the large estates in Great Britain and how they were acquired. This year, the Marquess of Bute sold his estates, said to be valued at £40,000,000, and which

included half the City of Cardiff—some 20,000 houses, 1,000 shops, several theatres, a huge steel works and numerous factories. The estates are said to cover 117,000 acres and from his coal royalties alone, the Marquess' income amounted to £109,277 or over half a million dollars a year! In testifying before the Coal Commission, the Marquess said that the property had been granted to his ancestor in 1547-1550. One of the commissioners pointed out that King Edward VI died at the age of fifteen, and that this "ancestor" who was one of the guardians of the King, had in effect granted himself enormous areas of land which were at the time in possession of the Crown.

One of the leading newspapers commented on the sale of these estates as follows: "While every Welshman sings 'Land of My Fathers,' a Scots Marquess, with a long and doubtful pedigree, sells half their proudest city to an English syndicate which expects to find the enterprise a good investment. A good investment it will be but not for Wales!"

I should like to say here that we are not condemning landlords as individuals. Landlords are not any more responsible in this matter than are other members of society. The private appropriation of rent and the monopoly of the earth's resources is not an individual wrong, it is a social wrong.

Last year a bill was passed, providing for £66,000,000 to be paid to owners of titles to the coal mines of Great Britain. One Member of Parliament pointed out that in the last ten years, royalty owners, or those holding title to properties, had received over £50,000,000; and the mine operators, £19,000,000. This man said that he himself had worked in the mines for 22 years, and during that period had faced great dangers, run great risks, and was sometimes brought home brutally injured. He drew during that whole period, less than £2,000. (This would average about \$450 a year—less than \$40 a month.) He pointed out that the mine operators furnished capital and labor, the coal miner used his labor in the production of coal, and the landlord, who did nothing, was awarded this huge sum for ceasing to rob the people! (I wonder if the people realize that they themselves must pay this £66,000,000, and so the robbery does not cease—but is continued!)

In Scotland, twenty-five landowners claim to own one-third of all the land of their country. It was said that in one glen from the inhabitants of which Wolfe in the 18th century raised a whole regiment of fighting men for Quebec, there is now only one family—that of a game-keeper. Is it any wonder that there is unemployment in Great Britain or anywhere else, when men are shut out from the earth, the source of all wealth?

In fairness to these landowners, I want to say that some of them (or at least one of them) is apparently unselfish and foresighted enough to see the injustice of the land

system, and to make an effort to correct it. I was told by an Englishman just a few weeks ago, that a Scottish laird who owns some thirty or forty thousand acres, had the courage to broadcast a speech the other day, in which he told his listeners that he was definitely in favor of land value taxation, as he realized that the large estates in Scotland must be released again to the people.

There is really much hope that Great Britain will before long institute a better system. The question of land value taxation is again becoming a very live one, and among other organizations and schools throughout the country where the Henry George philosophy is being taught, the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values and various Leagues in England and Scotland, are doing good work. A recently elected Member of the House of Commons, Mr. R. R. Stokes, is adding weight to the movement, and has recently organized among the members of the Labor Party in the House of Commons, a committee to extend the campaign for the taxation of land values, and to promote the policy through all the available Parliamentary channels. The very excellent journal, *Land and Liberty* of London, is constantly urging the taxation of land values, and at the present time the London County Council as well as some 230 municipalities have petitioned Parliament for the right to tax land value for the public revenue.

A man who is following the progress of the Henry George Movement in Great Britain said to me the other day, "I believe you will see the application of this system in England before any other place." (I have been betting on California, but I may have to change my mind!)

An Englishman who was in Montreal recently told me that I could definitely state at this Congress that if the next Government in Great Britain is in any sense a "Leftist" one (provided their platform is not too radically extreme), there is certain to be some measure of land value taxation put into effect. He went on to say that this will be due to the persistent and untiring efforts of Henry Georgeists in Great Britain.

GERMANY

In our "World Survey," let us turn now from Great Britain to Germany. In 1933 about 400 people owned an average of 13,000 acres each. One million owned only 6½ acres each. Mr. Hitler has repeatedly stated that the land of Germany must be released for use, but at present it would seem that nothing of a really constructive nature is being done. In fact legislation has recently been adopted to prevent the free sale and purchase of land holdings. This law will restrict the number of owners of land.

ITALY

Italy is in about the same position as Germany. More than two-thirds of all the land is owned by less than 4

per cent of the land owners. There has been an extension of "share-cropping" and an enormous growth in rural unemployment. Peasant ownership of the land has been decreasing during the last ten years.

For the year 1935 official Roman statistics show that about one-half of 1 per cent of the landowners possess 47 per cent of all the cultivated land—some 12,000 men possess almost as much as the remaining 2,465,922 put together. And this situation exists in a country where there are some 350 people per square mile—a total of 43,000,000 people, with about 40,000,000 owing no land whatever!

HUNGARY

In Hungary, in spite of so-called "Land Reform" in 1920, 30.3 per cent of all cultivated land consists of estates of more than 1,400 acres, owned by about 1,200 proprietors. The biggest of these is the Esterhazy Estate, its area of 223,287 acres including not less than 159 villages.

In contrast to these figures, there are 1,500,000 small holdings up to five acres, totalling 11.9 per cent of the cultivated area owned by 864,403 people and 1,250,349 farm hands (including their families, in all, about 3,000,000 people) or one-third of the population, own no land whatever.

POLAND

And now, we turn to Poland. Of Poland's 34,000,000 people, 70 per cent are peasants. These unfortunate people live, or rather exist, in appalling conditions. Their poverty is incredible.

On the other hand, one Polish aristocrat has an estate of 100,000 acres, and it takes him three weeks to travel around his property on a tour of inspection. Another noble owns 340,000 acres.

When we think of these tremendous estates, and the great need of the people for land, we know that Poland, too, needs the philosophy of Henry George.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

A land reform administration was appointed to function until 1936, when it was absorbed by the Department of Agriculture, having completed its work of rendering small farms more important in the National economy. Between 1921 and 1930 this administration had increased the number of small farm owners (5 to 25 acres) by 12 per cent. The 25 to 125 acre farm owners had increased 8 per cent, and the number of owners of 200 to 1,250 acres had increased by 69 persons, but their total acreage was reduced by 775,000 acres or 27 per cent.

RUSSIA

We hear a good deal about progress in Russia. The citizens of Russia are now guaranteed freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly and meetings,

freedom of street processions and demonstrations; women have equal rights with men, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot. These are all provided by the Constitution. Whether in practice these high principles will be maintained, time will prove, but since the Constitution was written there have been more executions, more political imprisonments, more dismissals and degradation of officials in Soviet Russia, than in any country in the world.

The new Constitution is in certain respects a challenge to our so-called Democratic form of government, and although as in British law the land is declared to be the property of the State, there is apparently in Russia no systematic assessment and just collection of the community-crated land rent for revenue. Free trade has not been instituted, and our own principles of taxation are in full swing.

Prior to 1930 small peasant farming predominated in Russian agricultural economy. By 1936, however, more than 18 million peasant households or 89 per cent were combined into 250,000 collective farms. In 1928 collective and state farms accounted for 3 per cent of farm acreage. By 1935 they included over 90 per cent.

SPAIN

And now we come to Spain. Before the recent invasion 1 per cent of the people owned 51.5 per cent of the land 14 per cent of the people owned 33.2 per cent of the land 20 per cent of the people owned 11.1 per cent of the land 25 per cent (85 per cent of the people 2.2 per cent of the land).

40 per cent of the people owned none of the land.

One writer says: "Three million agricultural workers toiling for absentee landlords worked from 12 to 16 hours a day for miserably low wages. More than half of the country was owned by big landlords numbering scarcely 50,000 in a land of 24,000,000 people—9,600,000 people (40 per cent) had no land, and a total of 15,600,000 (64 per cent) owned only 2.2 per cent."

The *London Evening Standard* recently said: "There will be no peace in Spain until the land problem has been satisfactorily solved."

Last summer I met a young woman whose family had lost everything in Spain (some of them their lives), and we talked about the Henry George philosophy. She had never heard of it before, but she said to me: "If only we had had that system, my country would not be in the position it is today."

The Henry George Movement was progressing well in Spain before the present war—George's works were translated into Spanish and a splendid monthly paper was published—but the effort was too late. We can only hope that other countries will take warning!

JAPAN AND CHINA

From Spain we look towards Japan and China.

A system of survey and valuation of land was in progress in China in 1936, but for centuries this country has been held by a comparatively few landowners. The *Voice of China*, a journal devoted to the support of ground rent revenue and the abolition of taxation, stated in July 1937, that a committee had been at work for four years and had produced a policy for socializing the economic rent and the abolition of taxation. Some 1,200 delegates were to have met at Nanking last September. The Japanese invasion frustrated this, and the first building destroyed was the publication headquarters of the *Voice of China*, but if I know anything of Henry Georgeists, I am sure that some of these 1,200 people will revive the programme when the war is over.

In regard to Japan a recent article states, "It is claimed that Japan must have foreign outlets for its people. Actually, the density of population in Japan is little more than half that of Belgium and only half that of England. But the Japan Year Book, 1936, shows that one-half the arable land in Japan (7½ million acres) is owned by 1,000,000 people or about 1½ per cent of the total population, while some 33,000,000 get their living on rented agricultural land. Of these, 22,000,000 are trying to exist on approximately one acre per household. Not only must they pay a high rent for that small area, but they are also heavily taxed. It is this that causes the poverty and all the so-called over-crowding or over-population. The cure for these evils and the lack of markets for the Japanese people lies in remedying that situation."

The other day I talked with a woman who has spent the last twenty-five years in Japan. She is a social worker, and she said this: "We used to think that Japan needed more colonies—that she had more people than could be supported on that small area of the earth. Then for a time we thought it was a matter of birth control—the population was growing too rapidly; but lately most of us have decided that the real trouble in Japan is economic—and when we see whole families trying to exist on an acre of land upon which they must pay rent and taxes, we have felt that this awful war may be a blessing in disguise, because it will so increase the taxes that the people cannot submit, but will take steps to obtain more land for themselves, not in China, but in their own country!"

Someone said, "More can be made out of man by owning the land he lives on, than by owning the man." Think of twenty-two million people, twice the population of Canada—living on one acre of land per family, and paying rent and taxes on that.

In January, 1938, there was an average indebtedness of \$290 on every farm in Japan.

SOUTH AFRICA

The picture in South Africa is somewhat brighter. At the present time, Johannesburg, the largest city,

levies the whole of its local taxes on land values alone. Pretoria, the Capital, takes all but a small part of its revenue from the same source. In the City of Durban, the rate on buildings and improvements is half that on land values.

A newspaper item in the *Montreal Star*, in February of this year, stated that in 1937, ten million dollars worth of new buildings were erected in Durban, with the rush to build still continuing into 1938. It was pointed out in one of our classes, that as Montreal has about seven times the population of Durban, if we were under the same system which encourages building and improvements, we should have a seventy million dollar programme of building this year—and needless to say—no unemployment.

Mr. F. A. W. Lucas of Johannesburg is an ardent advocate of the Henry George philosophy, and his paper, *The Free People*, celebrated its first birthday in June, this year. There seems to be no question that the movement for land value taxation is making progress in South Africa.

In noting the conditions in:

NORTHERN NIGERIA (West Africa)

We Canadians are rather proud of the fact that the man who succeeded in instituting what the *London Times* described as "the most far-seeing measure of conservative statesmanship West African has ever known," was the Canadian-born High Commissioner, Sir Percu Girard. (I think we should have kept him here in Canada.) This gentleman recommended "a declaration in favor of the nationalization of the lands of the Protectorate." This was incorporated with native laws—that the land is the property of the people—held in trust for them by the chiefs, who have not the power of alienation.

This policy was adopted by the Colonial office, and the natives were secured in the possession of their land, the Government imposing land rents, which are the equivalent of taxes.

One of the newspapers stated that, "The exclusion of the European land speculator and the denial of the right to buy and sell land, and of freehold tenure, was held by the authorities to be essential for the moral and material welfare of the inhabitants." I wonder why other British High Commissioners, or Statesmen, fail to deal with the land question in this way?

Shall we go across now to—

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

From this part of the world, I was interested in the following report: "Throughout all Queensland, all New South Wales (including Sydney) 14 Victorian Municipalities, parts of South Australia and West Australia, also a great part of New Zealand including Wellington,

they have adopted municipally this reformed system of raising their revenue (that is, Land Value Taxation). All improvements on the land are therefore free from taxation, and so building can go on unrestricted.

The report further states, "In every case the system was adopted without friction except from land speculators, and so just and beneficial is it in practice, that all attempts to revert to the old system of rating improvements have been overwhelmingly defeated by the votes of the ratepayers."

Louis Wallis, in his recent book, "Burning Question," refers to the progress of land value taxation in Australia, and states, "The new method has not been put into exclusive use on a National scale, but it has been employed far enough to prove that it functions effectively, and that the principle is sound." Forty-three per cent of New Zealand's municipalities which include 57 per cent of the population, raise all their revenues from land value.

And now across the Atlantic to—

SOUTH AMERICA

Some progress in land value taxation has been made in Brazil, where although the rate is very moderate in amount, a number of states have adopted some measure of the policy. There is a strong public support for the Land Value Policy in the Capital City of Rio de Janeiro, where a systematic valuation of land has been made in all areas.

In Argentina definite progress has been made in the Province of Cordoba, and Cordoba City introduced a land value rate of taxation in 1927. A number of towns in the northern part of the country have also adopted this policy.

In his book, "Latin America," published in 1936, Stephen Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education has this to say: "Estates of from 100,000 acres to 500,000 acres exist today in some of the Latin American countries. The owners of many of these estates spend most of their time in the capital or in Europe, many of them visiting their estates only at intervals. The more progressive statesmen look forward to their break-up as a result of increasing taxation and advanced legislation."

In North America, may we look for a moment at—

MEXICO

An article written by the Reverend John O'Brien, Chaplain of the Catholic Students, University of Illinois, gives us some very pointed truths about the situation in Mexico. It says: "Mexico, too, has an important lesson and warning for us in America. At the beginning of the 19th century the wealth of the church was truly enormous. Such an eminent Catholic historian as Aleman states that the church then owned more than half of all the land in Mexico, while her holdings in urban property

and in money, was tremendous. She was the chief money-lending agency of the age. Meanwhile, the natives were living in abject poverty, working as peons for a few pennies a day. The National Revolutionary Party now in control of the government makes its appeal to the workers, promising to secure for them a living wage and a fair division of the land among the natives.

Let it be remembered that as late as 1910, 2 per cent of the population owned 70 per cent of the land, while in the State of Morelos, 2 per cent owned 98 per cent of the land.

The facts of history, past and present, give added emphasis to the words of Pius XI, as to the only effective method of combating Communism, namely, by correcting the gross inequalities of distribution of the goods of life."

And now to speak of our own countries—

THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

The United States has one-twentieth of the land area of this planet. Canada has another one-twentieth—that together, one-tenth of the land area of the world is in these two countries.

Up to the present, we have adopted the land tenure systems of the European countries and Great Britain. No such thing as unemployment was known here as long as the frontiers reasonably accessible to markets were still open, but we have reached the time now where we must either find a way in which our vacant lands and natural resources can be made available for use, or continue to make the same mistakes that other countries have made, following their course, towards wars, poverty, and national decay.

In a current publication, I found this comment which I think describes the situation rather well: "When the Pilgrim Fathers landed in America in 1620, they didn't have to run around looking for a boss. They found jobs for themselves with a few simple tools, on the free land, which the Lord their God had provided for that very purpose. There is plenty of land left, and all our unemployed could do the same today, were it not for the fact that the land speculators had got in ahead of them." As an instance of this, we have only to look at Manhattan Island, where less than 1 per cent own 95 per cent of the land.

In a recent issue of LAND AND FREEDOM it is stated that, "in the United States three-quarters of the farmers do not own their own farms. The farms are mortgaged, or the farmers are tenants. Among the one-quarter 'owning' are millionaires and poor farmers on land below the normal rent line." I came across in a Minneapolis newspaper a few months ago, a table showing that between 1880 and 1935, the number of farm owners in the United States had increased 33 per cent while the number of tenants increased 300 per cent.

I know that you will hear in detail at this Congress reports of the various activities for the advancement of the Henry George philosophy, and the introduction of a larger measure of Land Value Taxation in the United States and Canada.

Let us keep in mind that if we could institute a just and equitable system of Land Value Taxation in these two countries which make up one-tenth of the land area of the world, we could prove that there is a sane and satisfactory solution to the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty!

DENMARK

May I complete this "World Tour" with just a word about Denmark? (I am sure my friends are wondering how I have restrained myself so long!) This country had practically the same history of landlords and large estates that we find in Great Britain. The people have known feudalism in its worst sense; they have been through wars, unemployment, discouragement and wretched poverty, but apparently some of their noblemen were wise enough to see that their country could not survive under the old system of land ownership. They realized that if the privileges they themselves held were continued their little country was doomed, and be it said to their honor, they were the first to urge the King and the government to institute land reforms, which meant breaking up the large estates and releasing the natural resources of the country to the people.

This year there was celebrated in Copenhagen, the 150th anniversary of the emancipation of the peasants, through the abolition of the feudal system. During those 150 years the country has taken slow and gradual steps toward a better social system, and I can best sum up their progress in the words of their former Minister of Home Affairs, an ardent Henry Georgeist, who in 1926 said this: "From social freedom arose in Denmark, political freedom; and out of that will grow one day, for society, the economic liberty under which free and independent citizens will enjoy the full fruits of their labor, while the community will receive what it creates."

The Henry George philosophy has been taught in Denmark through the folk schools, and at one of these schools last summer I heard the principal, during a lecture to the class, state that the ideas of Henry George had influenced Denmark more than any country in the world. At the present time there is a large measure of land value taxation in effect, with a gradual reduction in the taxation of buildings and improvements.

I have not time to tell you more than a small fraction of the things I should like to mention about this country. Land Value Taxation has completely eliminated the slum problem in Copenhagen. People are building homes in suburbs where they can have a little garden, and there is no tax on the buildings up to 10,000 kroner, or about

\$2,500. A small home can be built for \$3,000, so the taxes are very low.

The general state of happiness and well-being among the people is very noticeable. They know how to cooperate with one another—they know that when the government spends money it doesn't come from Santa Claus, but they themselves must pay it. Their educational system is such that there is absolutely no illiteracy in the whole country—85 per cent of the farm homes are electrified—there are paved roads all over the country (with a little special narrow strip for bicycles). Practically every home has a good library; there is a radio to every six or seven persons—a motor car to every thirty—(I should say a bicycle for every one)—a telephone to every ten persons, and there is absolutely no poverty (as we know poverty) in all of Denmark.

At a meeting in Montreal last winter, I was speaking of these things, and when I had finished, an old Danish gentleman in the audience said to me, "I am so glad to hear all these things about my country. I left Denmark fifty-three years ago (1884) and at that time thousands of people were leaving because they couldn't find work. The unemployment and poverty were terrible." He went on to say: "At that time there were only a million and a half people in Denmark, and now with three and a half millions, everyone can make a living." I said, "Do you remember the large estates there?"—and he replied—"Oh yes, indeed. The country was all in big estates at that time." To me, this was just another proof of what a better land system giving the people access to the earth has accomplished. Instead of large estates, 65 per cent of the farms are now less than 37 acres—32 per cent are between 37 and 150, while only 2 per cent are over 150 acres. Only 5 per cent of the farms are held by tenants. (In the United States, 75 per cent do not own their own farms.)

I know that many of the Henry Georgeists in Denmark feel that there is still so much to be accomplished that they cannot be satisfied with what has been done, but I can assure you that much has been done, and the country (or the people) have benefitted from it.

A man in Copenhagen said to me last summer, "So many people come over here from America to study our cooperatives, but do not forget that if it had not been for our land reforms the cooperatives would never have come into being."

I know of no greater inspiration than a believer in the Henry George philosophy could possibly have, than a visit to Denmark to observe at first hand, the results of their land reforms, and of land value taxation. True, they have only gone part of the way, but compared with most other countries, they have gone a long, long way.

There is a little book called "Democracy in Denmark," which can be bought for only 25 cents (it is published in

Washington, D. C.), and which gives an excellent outline of the progress this country has made.

CONCLUSION

And so, as we look around the world today, we find many encouraging happenings, and also many discouragements, but we remember the warning and also the assurance of Henry George—"The truth which I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance—but it will find friends—Will it eventually prevail? Ultimately—Yes."

It is good to know that in Denmark, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Nigeria, South America, the United States and Canada, as well as some other parts of the world, definite progress is being made, and there are people who are willing to sacrifice something that this great truth may ultimately prevail.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the many people who, in spite of discouragements and disappointments, have kept the light of this great truth before them, and handed it on to others.

It is evident that there is much to be done before the natural resources of this planet will once more be available in justice and equity to all human beings who inhabit the earth, but the achievements of many people who are working towards this end in various countries, are an inspiration to us all, because as Henry George said:

"We are surer that we see a star, when we know—that others also see it."

The California Campaign

IMPORTANT events have happened in California since I made the last report. Our opponents pursued the tactics they followed two years ago. After we had had certified to the Secretary of State more than sufficient names to place us on the ballot, two separate agencies caused suits to be brought in the Supreme Court to have us excluded. In a general way the suits were alike. They alleged that the Attorney General's summary of one hundred words failed adequately to state the "chief purpose and points" of our amendment as constitutionally required. This objection was much like that of two years ago except that then we were charged with the similar duty to be performed within a limit of twenty words.

After full argument the court held that the Attorney-General's title was sufficient, and now there is no earthly power that can prevent the people from voting on the amendment. Thus ends a protracted struggle, and the contest before the people formally begins.

Needless to say—except as a matter of suggestion for help—that we are to all intents and purposes without money. We were compelled to raise more than \$20,000 to get on the ballot—that is, for the circulation of petitions and incidentals—and our pocketbooks are exhausted. We must have your help to the last penny.

Meanwhile the discussion in the State is proceeding rapidly. Against us the campaign is largely being managed by the Chamber of Commerce, which doesn't realize that it is fighting to maintain shackles upon commerce when resisting the amendment. It has secured the powerful aid of the Parent-Teachers Association, on the specious pretense that if the sales tax is abolished the revenues for the schools will be endangered. Of course this is not so, but in the opinion of our opponents and using a simile of an earlier day "it is a good-enough Morgan till after the election."

Home owners are being assured, contrary to the fact, that if the

amendment is adopted, taxes on homes will be so high that they will be forfeited to the State.

In one breath and with a sober face the voters are told that the amendment means that rents will be advanced to stupendous heights and that all lands will be taken over by the State. And with many the absurdity is not perceived.

The dailies are now blossoming out with three-column advertisements a quarter column in length telling the public that the State wide Council against the Single Tax wants "you to know why we oppose the Single Tax proposition No. 20 on the November ballot and why we believe you, too, will want to vote no. It will not raise the funds to keep our schools open, provide aid for the needy or for the aged. Chaos in business, agriculture and government will result. No argument, only this statement, purporting apparently to have the support of a number of business organizations fighting against the real interests of business.

But there is another side. Having the support of the AFL we are justified in expecting in this instance the equal support of the CIO. These two bodies must number not less than 400,000 voters favorably inclined toward us. A number of the business men, notwithstanding the action of their organizations, take the same view. Ferrell from Los Angeles writes me that he has more calls for speakers than he can fill. In San Francisco the situation tends in the same direction.

We cannot doubt the educational importance of our work. A slight illustration is that the morning's mail brings me requests from representatives of two high schools for information that they can use in support of what they term "Single Tax."

We are preparing for the circulation generally of two documents introduced in the last Congress by Senator Shipstead and Representative Eckert, and directly bearing upon our campaign. These promise to be effective.

One of the most important civic organizations in San Francisco is the Commonwealth Club, numbering about 4,000 business and professional men. Tomorrow night is set for the discussion of the amendment before it. I shall lead for the affirmative and Chester H. Rowell, probably the most widely-known man in the State in a public way will represent the negative. It will be interesting, I am confident.

This is the last appeal I can make through your columns before election. There is little to be added to what I have said before. I trust the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM do not appreciate the importance of the California issue upon the history of the movement and the tremendous significance that will attach to success, rest assured that the people of California do. For all assistance so far rendered, many thanks. But we want to be still more grateful.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

AND whoever will look may see that though our civilization is apparently advancing with greater rapidity than ever, the same cause which turned Roman progress into retrogression is operating now.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

MR. ROOSEVELT would abolish the poll taxes that still are levied in some of the states, and we agree with him. If Mr. Roosevelt can think of any other tax he would abolish, we will agree with him on that, too.

Kansas City Times.

INCOMPETENT officials seem to regard the government as only a tax collecting agency, designed solely for the purpose of taxing the life out of every line of industry and human activity.—*Cause and Effect*, Foley, Ala.

Thirteenth Annual Henry George Congress

TORONTO, CANADA, SEPTEMBER 7, 8 AND 9

THE Henry George Congress has come and gone, and it is now our pleasant task to report it for the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM.

While the attendance was not large (only 78 registered delegates), it was fairly representative of the movement. Twenty-seven delegates represented Canada; fifty-one came from the United States.

Beside the outstanding officers of our host, The Single Tax Association of Canada, there were among the Canadian delegates, Arthur W. Roebuck, member of the Ontario Legislature, formerly Attorney-General for the Province of Ontario, and a member of the Ontario Hydro Electric Power Company for Ontario; W. C. Good, President of the Cooperative Union of Canada, and former member of Parliament; John Anderson of Montreal, former Vice-President of Standard Brands, Ltd.; Herbert B. Cowan, a delegate from the Canadian Chamber of Agriculture to the Empire Producers Conference held last March in Sidney, Australia; and Prof. S. B. McCready of Toronto, of the Ontario College of Education.

Among the more prominent representatives from the United States were Percy R. Williams, Chief Assessor of the Dept. of Assessors, City of Pittsburgh; Harold R. Battenheim, Editor of *The American City*; Joseph Dana Miller, Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM; Gilbert M. Tucker, author and writer, and A. Laurence Smith, President, Tax Relief Association, Inc.

The Henry George School of Social Science was represented by three of its six trustees (Mrs. deMille, Joseph Dana Miller and Lancaster Greene), besides its lusty director, Frank Chodorov, and its field director, John Lawrence Monroe.

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation was represented by its Executive Secretary, Mrs. John H. Wambough.

Chas. H. Ingersoll, President of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, also attended.

Two trustees of the Ingram Fund attended, George R. Averill and F. Gordon Pickell.

Miss Bateman's address, "A World's Survey," unquestionably received the most popular response (it is published in full in this issue of LAND AND FREEDOM).

Mr. Battenheim's paper, "Why Handicap Housing by Unwise Taxation?", to be published in the *Yale Law Journal*, in the opinion of this chronicler, at least, was the most meaty.

The Convention was the most successful from still another angle. There was no display of acrimony or hard feelings between the delegates. They expressed

themselves earnestly and sincerely, and the discussions were constructive.

The sessions were late in getting under way, and our only suggestion would be that hereafter we make a more determined effort to begin proceedings at the appointed hour.

It was a stroke of genius on the part of Lt. Col. Rule, at the outset of the Convention, to ask each delegate to rise in turn, announce clearly his name and address, and *in one minute*, explain how he became interested in the movement. The responses were intensely revealing.

The story of Donald MacDonald, an engineer who has roamed around the world on various frontiers from Mexico to Alaska, was especially absorbing.

"I took a course at the University of Arizona in 1905," he said. "I had observed that speculative rent defeats the ultimate purposes of my profession, whose object is to make it easier for men to create wealth. Speculative land values, instead, converted instruments of production into instruments of exploitation, and so distorted engineering projects as to defeat their ultimate purposes.

"I was disturbed to think that my efforts as an engineer were being frustrated. I put this all up to the Professor of Economics at the University and learned of the existence of economic rent.

"I became a whirling dervish and decided to reform the world. I started a Single Tax movement in Everett, Washington in 1912, but failed."

We cannot too earnestly thank our Canadian co-workers for their great efforts to make the Convention the success it was. Quietly but effectively, they exerted themselves to the utmost. At the conclusion of the Thursday afternoon session, under the direction of Mr. Thompson, they provided a free automobile tour of the city. Saturday afternoon, at the conclusion of the Convention, the City of Toronto provided a boat for us to inspect the surrounding waterways.

Toronto has only one morning and two afternoon papers, and the reports of our meetings, while friendly, were not comprehensive. In this field, as well as in the field of radio broadcasting, our movement must bestir itself.

This was the 13th Congress held under the auspices of the Henry George Foundation of America and the first to be held outside of the United States. All who attended were amply repaid for their time and effort. The value of these annual assemblies becomes increasingly apparent year by year. No other organization regularly and systematically provides for annual meetings of the workers in our common cause.

As Mr. Williams, the efficient Executive Secretary of the Foundation has written in an article entitled, "Are Conventions Worth While?" (*LAND AND FREEDOM*), Jan.-Feb., 1935, pp. 25-26), these Congresses are of value "insofar as they serve to educate their participants to develop a greater degree of agreement and cooperation, inspire a new zeal, bring about an improvement in methods of technique, and expand activities which will advance the movement, which they seek to represent and express." . . . "The Henry George Congress was conceived as a means of providing, if nothing more, an open forum of free speech where all of those interested in the philosophy and programme of Henry George, might meet as opportunity affords itself, for earnest discussion and exchange of ideas in the faith that such free discussion would tend to bring about better understanding and a greater degree of united action."

DETAILED REPORT

WEDNESDAY MORNING, SEPT. 7

Mr. Patterson, President of the Single Tax Association of Canada, in a short felicitous address, opened the proceedings. Mr. Howell, on behalf of the City of Toronto, responded. Mr. Williams announced that the President of the Henry George Foundation was absent owing to a critical illness. Subsequently, resolutions were adopted expressing hope for his speedy recovery as well as the recovery of Walter R. Demmler.

Mr. Williams reported that Henry George's birthplace in Philadelphia, had been acquired free of mortgage, and the next step was to rehabilitate the property. Mr. Burger was added to the committee consisting of Mayor Scully of Pittsburgh, and Mr. Fee, to interest the City of Philadelphia in acquiring the home and surrounding property as a shrine.

A telegram was read from Noah D. Alper of San Francisco, advising that the California courts had finally decided that the Ralston amendment must be submitted to the voters of California at the ensuing election.

Mrs. deMille made an earnest plea for contributions and received about \$200 cash in addition to pledges.

A congratulatory letter was read from Mr. Madsen of *Land and Liberty*.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

Mr. Tucker read his paper, "Why Have A National Programme?". "We Single Taxers," he said, "are almost too individualistic and must learn to pull together with a greater will, and to integrate our forces." . . . "I think we are agreed that the first step is education, but we must not interpret that word too narrowly. It is fortunate that we have in education—indeed in the whole field of our activities—a veritable Abou ben Adhem which leads all the rest—the Henry George School."

Mrs. deMille spoke on "Working Together For Success."

WEDNESDAY EVENING

Benjamin W. Burger of New York City, spoke on "What to Emphasize In Teaching The Georgeist Philosophy." There are five points, he said, which we must make clear to beginners:—

"First, it seems to me, we must convincingly show that we live on the earth; . . . and that man, in his physical aspects, at least, is a land animal.

Secondly, we must establish that all human beings have an equal right to live on this earth.

The third point, a corollary, flows from the two points I have just discussed. The earth cannot be owned any more than air or sunshine, or the flowing rivers, or the mighty mountains, because it was not produced by human beings.

The fourth point, that rent is a differential which measures the desirability of different locations, presents a problem in inductive reasoning in the Science of Political Economy.

The fifth point, in my opinion the most difficult for beginners to comprehend, follows. Applying rent to our common needs and abolishing taxation, *in effect*, we establish the equal right of every human being to live.

When, and only when, we have convincingly proved each and every one of these five points, have we established our case."

THURSDAY MORNING, SEPT. 8

This morning is remembered for a most comprehensive report entitled, "A World Survey," delivered by Miss Bateman of Montreal. Miss Bateman delivered her paper in effective fashion. She pointed out that in England, three-quarters of all the land is owned by one-tenth of the population, and that in Ireland, one-quarter of the population own every acre. "The private appropriation of rent and the monopoly of this earth's resources, is not an individual wrong, it is an institutional wrong," she said.

When she had concluded, Mrs. McEvoy, on behalf of the Washington, D. C. Single Tax Women's Club, ordered 500 copies of *LAND AND FREEDOM* containing Miss Bateman's address.

The second address of this morning was delivered by Mr. Bутtenheim. While not yet a Georgeist, since he advocates income and inheritance taxes along with the collection of our land rent, Mr. Bутtenheim is making progress toward our philosophy. He promised to mail reprints of his paper to all registered delegates after its publication in the *Yale Law Journal*.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON

This session was given over to the Henry George Schools. It was presided over by Mrs. deMille in her wistful manner.

Frank Chodorov, director, gave one hour's detailed

account of the work of the School; its problems, hopes and ambitions.

He was followed by Lancaster Greene, who also patiently answered all questions.

John Lawrence Monroe, the energetic field director, reported for the Extension Classes in the United States, and Mr. Farmer explained the problems confronting similar classes in Canada.

The afternoon's session closed with Mrs. Wambough's report on behalf of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. As usual, she acquitted herself ably.

The display of books, pamphlets and circulars which she staged was most illuminating.

THURSDAY EVENING

Mr. Campbell of Ottawa, spoke on "The Canadian Taxation Situation." He explained how the tariff, the income tax, and other taxes had affected his country.

Mr. A. Laurence Smith of Detroit, made his report. He reminded his listeners that at the Detroit Congress in 1937, a committee had been appointed to plan a national programme of action. This committee, Mr. Smith stated, had met in New York and organized the Tax Relief Association, Inc.

It decided to concentrate its activities in the State of Michigan. That state was selected because (1) it presents both a manufacturing and agricultural problem:

- (2) Its problems affect similar interests in other states.
- (3) The population is not concentrated in a small area.
- (4) Its total population is not so large that it cannot be reached at a reasonable expense.

Mr. Burger reminded the delegates that similar efforts to concentrate on one state had been made as far back as 1895, when Delaware was selected as the point of attack. Later, similar arguments were used to concentrate our activities on campaigns in Oregon, Missouri, California, and other states.

"In California, we polled 260,000 votes in the Luke North Campaign," he said.

"Why not devote our efforts and give our money to organizations already in existence, instead of repeating the mistakes of the past."

However, the delegates overwhelmingly voted to accept Mr. Smith's report.

The report of Mr. Otto Cullman, Treasurer of the Committee of Organization and Action, showed that between December 10, 1937 and August 31, 1938, he had received from the Ingram Trust the sum of \$2,500 and from other sources, \$803.64.

The disbursements had been:

Salary, Executive Secretary	\$1,550.00
Stenographer	666.00
Rent and light	226.63
Printing	274.23

Equipment	172.50
Postage	145.00
Miscellaneous disbursements	254.80

Total	\$3,289.16
-------	------------

FRIDAY MORNING, SEPT. 9

Dr. Mark Millikin spoke on "The Value of Political Contacts." "Extraneous subjects are anathema to Single Taxers according to my observations, but if they expect to make political contacts with men of power, they will have to be proficient advocates of all libertarian measures." . . . "Single Taxers should learn that to effectuate their plans, they must cease working for them alone."

Mr. Chas. H. Ingersoll of New York, then delivered a most interesting address. He reminded his listeners that during the great economic depression of the past few years, many land owners had failed to pay taxes, and that the public authorities now were in the position to redeem this land for the community.

He quoted from two letters he had received from J. Rupert Mason of San Francisco. "Over half the land in one state has paid no taxes at all in over ten years."

In one California county, containing the finest red wood forests in the whole world, over 70 per cent of the land is held by six lumber concerns who have paid no taxes for many years. Over \$700,000 is now past due from holders of these lands."

FRIDAY AFTERNOON

Mr. Thompson in a few well-chosen words, indicated that of the many approaches to the tax problem, the moral approach is one of the most effective.

"The moral sense is higher and truer than the intellectual sense; the moral faculties do more certainly revolt against iniquity than the intellectual faculties against absurdities," he quoted, from Henry George's reply to the Duke of Argyll.

Appropriate resolutions were passed on the deaths of William F. Baxter of Omaha, George W. Schilling and Clarence Darrow of Chicago, and Fiske Warren of Harvard, Mass.

The City of Toronto and our Canadian co-workers also, were recipients of votes of thanks for their many acts of kindness.

THE BANQUET

Mr. Patterson presided in his usual gracious and kindly manner. In a few well-chosen words, he introduced Mr. Peter Witt, who delivered a masterly address.

Then, following a violin solo, the Honorable Arthur W. Roebuck, member of the Ontario Legislature, delivered an address entitled, "Orderly Progress." It was a great treat for the American delegates to listen to the beautiful diction of this polished Canadian orator.

Short addresses were made from the floor, and at 11 P. M., the gathering broke up with the singing of "Auld Lang Syne."—B. W. B.

Attendance at the Henry George Congress

CANADIAN DELEGATES

The Province of Alberta: I. F. Goode.

The Province of Quebec: John Anderson, Miss Margaret E. Bateman, Mrs. L. Boudler, Miss Strethel Walton.

The Province of Ontario: Mrs. Wesley E. Barker, A. C. Campbell, Miss Dorothy E. Coate, Mrs. G. M. Coulthard, Herbert B. Cowan, Ernest J. Farmer, Stanley Floyd, A. Herridge, Miss Florence MacDonald, Louisa B. MacDonald, A. I. MacKay, J. A. Martin, S. B. McCready, J. O. McCorquodale, Miss M. Ollerhead, Herbert T. Owens, J. H. L. Patterson, Arthur W. Roebuck, Miss Janet Scott, Miss Margaret Scott, A. C. Thompson, L. B. Walling. Total, 27.

AMERICAN DELEGATES

Alaska: Donald MacDonald.

District of Columbia: Mrs. Helena Mitchell McEvoy.

Illinois: Otto Cullman, Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Ewing, Miss Dorothy M. Olcott, George C. Olcott, Lt. Col. Victor A. Rule, E. Schentke, George M. Strachan.

Iowa: Mathew Cowden.

Louisiana: Mr. and Mrs. G. B. Cooley.

Massachusetts: W. L. Crosman.

Michigan: George R. Averill, F. Gordon Pickell, A. Laurence Smith.

Missouri: Mr. and Mrs. C. Fuller.

Nebraska: Harold W. Becker.

New York: Benjamin W. Burger, Harold S. Buttenheim, Frank Chodorov, Mr. and Mrs. Louis H. Clark, Clyde Dart, Mrs. Anna George deMille, Lancaster M. Greene, Ross C. Holley, Charles H. Ingersoll, C. A. Lingham, Sidney Manster, Joseph Dana Miller, John Lawrence Monroe, William W. Newcomb, Harvey H. Newcomb, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Hiram Newman, William S. O'Connor, Mr. and Mrs. John H. Wambough, Gilbert M. Tucker, Miss Margery Warriner.

Ohio: Peter Witt, Dr. Mark Millikin.

Pennsylvania: Francis J. Fee, C. V. Horne, Capt. Lester A. Jenks, Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Smith, Percy R. Williams.

Total 51.

In addition, the following attended the Banquet, although not registered as delegates:

Thomas Bengough, Mrs. Francis J. Fee, Miss Jeffrey, Frank Johnston, Charles Kerr, Mr. and Mrs. Longstaff, Mrs. Arthur W. Roebuck, Arthur Seale, Miss Daisy Seale, Dr. W. M. Sivers, Miss D. M. Smellie, Miss Edith Thompson, Dr. and Mrs. F. W. Wilkinson, W. R. Williams.

Total 16.

Convention Notes

"WHAT are you coming to Canada for?" "How long do you expect to stay?" asked the Customs officials at Niagara Falls after inspecting our baggage. When we replied that we were to speak at the Congress they countered, "Are you going to be paid?" Had we answered "Yes," we would have been turned back since we would have been deemed a contract laborer supplanting a "Canuck" from a job. Such is Protection, fifty-two years after Henry George exposed its fallacies.

TORONTO, the Convention City, has a population of 850,000. It is situated on the Northern Shore of Lake Ontario, midway, by rail, between New York and Chicago, and has the tallest office building in the British Empire (475 feet in height). The Royal York Hotel, our meeting place, has 1,200 rooms, and is the largest hotel in the British Empire.

How will Frank Chodorov and Lancaster Greene explain their absence from the Convention Floor on Thursday evening when Messrs. A. Laurence Smith, Lt. Col. Victor A. Rule and Ben. Burger were shooting off the fireworks?

NEVER before at a Henry George Congress were assembled, under one roof, so many Single Taxers of Scotch ancestry.

MR. A. C. CAMPBELL of Ottawa, over eighty years young, is a dead ringer for the late Lord Bryce. In features, stature, and speaking voice he reminds one of the famous British author and diplomat. His mind is as keen, his intellect as brilliant, as that great scholar's. He told how his father gave him "The Condition of Labor" to read, and how, later, he interviewed George.

TORONTO resembles any large American city. It has its Childs Restaurants, General Motors Corporation, Shredded Wheat Company, and many other American firms. We even observed in the business section, this sign on an abandoned bank building, "For Sale, \$100,000. Assessed \$193,750." It reminded us of our own depressed real estate markets.

ONE of the outstanding personalities of the Convention, Donald McDonald, traveled 5,000 miles from Fairbanks, Alaska. No taxes are paid by Alaskan landlords outside of the cities, he said. American consumers of Alaskan fish support the government.

IF Peter Witt had not referred to his seventy years at the Banquet, no one would have guessed his age. Georgeists make excellent insurance risks.

MR. EWING of Chicago, presided at the annual meeting of the Trustees and Charter Members of the Henry George Foundation held at luncheon on Wednesday. Among other things, it was voted to hold the next Congress in New York City between Wednesday, August 30 and Monday, September 4, 1939. (Labor Day.) Special exercises will be held Saturday, September 2, 1939, the 100th Anniversary of Henry George's birth.

How many speakers, Col. Rule, *almost* took more than one minute to relate how they joined the movement?

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL left Toronto 7:30 A. M. Saturday. He drove 550 miles to New York City, stopping only long enough to view Niagara Falls and to deliver Mrs. deMille at Merriewold Park. Arriving in Manhattan twenty hours later he was ready for his Sunday

evening broadcast over station WBIL. All this at seventy-three years.

We missed Mr. Hardinge of Chicago, Abe Waldauer and Rabbi Aronson of Memphis, Carl D. Smith of Pittsburgh, Mrs. Skeel, Harry Weinberger and the genial Miss Schetter of New York.

HERE is a complete list of the Henry George Congresses:

YEAR	CITY
1926.....	Philadelphia
1927.....	New York
1928.....	Chicago
1929.....	Pittsburgh
1930.....	San Francisco
1931.....	Baltimore
1932.....	Memphis
1933.....	Chicago
1934.....	Chicago
1935.....	New York
1936.....	Cincinnati
1937.....	Detroit
1938.....	Toronto

Farewell,—Co-workers of Canada,

Good bye, lovely land of the maple leaf.

We hope that the impulse to advance and pride of achievement which you will carry away from the 1939 Convention will be as vivid as those which you generated in us.—B. W. B.

The Editor Comments

THESE annual gatherings of the Henry George Congress serve one important purpose if no other. They enable us to meet face to face with those who have been working in collaboration in the interchange of views and ideas. They furnish inspiration for the year to come. They enable us to understand one another better. They cement lasting friendships. Therefore our thanks are due to Secretary Williams for his earnest work in sponsoring these Congresses with the equally valuable cooperation of President Evans and other officers of the Henry George Foundation.

WE differ from some of our friends in their curious opposition to organization. Whether the Tax Relief Association now started on its career has the most desirable set-up, or whether the name is the best that might have been selected, we can afford to disregard for the moment and await results. It is at least up to us to cast no stone in its path. It is patent disloyalty not to wish it all possible success. Organization of some kind we must have and will have despite our predilections. It is a reflection on our ability for team work that we are without some form of national organization.

WHAT a pleasure it was to meet our Canadian friends with whom we have corresponded these many years. And some of the people from our home-land like Crosman of Revere, Mass., and Donald MacDonald of Alaska, Lingham of Lockport, the indefatigable and efficient Clayton J. Ewing of Chicago, and Mrs. Ewing, whose sense of humor enabled her to enjoy some of the proceedings which may have been lost on the others.

WE were delighted to meet Mrs. Christine Ross Barker, mentally alert as ever. How well we remember those brilliant shafts of wit which in the old days she carried in her quiver. Her jests were scintillating but even her victims were amused, for these were rarely ill-natured. Nevertheless we feared her!

At the banquet two great speeches were made by Peter Witt and

A. W. Roebuck, the latter a member of the Ontario Legislature. Never in the years we have been connected with the movement have we been privileged to listen to two greater speeches. One could not help being thrilled by them. Oratory has not yet lost its great masters.

THE Henry George School was well represented at the Congress with Frank Chodorov the director and three of the trustees, Mrs. Anna George deMille and Messrs. Greene and Miller. Messrs. Madster and O'Connor appeared unofficially for the New York teachers and Captain Jenks and Mr. Fee represented Philadelphia. Miss Bateman of Montreal in her able paper on the progress of the movement made a signal contribution to the proceedings. As a graduate of the School Miss Bateman is a witness to the value of its teaching methods. Through the kindness of Mrs. McAvoy five hundred copies of this issue are to be circulated among the members of the House of Representatives and Senators and others, or mailed as Mrs. McAvoy directs.

MRS. MCAVOY contributed some fireworks to the Convention. She always does. She is a very useful member of any convention and we are sure that her criticisms were taken in good part. We are disposed to think they were needed. Just now Mrs. McAvoy is engaged in the preparation of a concordance to "Progress and Poverty," a work which our friend Arthur C. Pleydell, once had in contemplation. We wish Mrs. McAvoy all the success in the unselfish work she has undertaken.

MANY churches nowadays have bulletin boards outside the edifice with biblical and other quotations on display. An interesting coincidence should be reported. During the week of the conference a Toronto church had one of these "wayside pulpit" bulletins which read: "We must conform to the Golden Rule if we could secure the abundance of peace.—Henry George. "It may interest Torontonians to know that this was displayed by the First Unitarian Church on Jarvis near Dundas street in that city.—J. D. M.

And the Fruits Thereof

A READING PLAY IN ONE ACT

BY NORMA COOLEY

Characters:

The Recording Angel

Steven Braswell — a Baptist Minister

Thomas Barcklay — a Methodist Minister

Jonathon Downs — a Presbyterian Minister

A Messenger

Prophet Isaiah

Scene: A well-lighted, spacious room with windows overlooking a garden. Walls are hung with large, astronomical maps. In center of room, a white-clad figure is writing at a flat-topped desk, bearing two small signs, "Recording Angel" and "Information." Half a dozen comfortable-looking chairs are placed near the desk.

(Enter three middle-aged gentlemen, dressed in clerical clothes. The Recording Angel looks up inquiringly. The central figure advances diffidently.)

Clergyman: Pardon me, sir, perhaps you can help us. We have been commissioned by our respective congregations—that is, by our religious organizations—to petition, or to appeal to—(he hesitates).

Angel: Yes?

Clergyman: Well, you see, sir, we have come to present a very urgent case—in short—we wish to see God.

Angel: (kindly) But, gentlemen, you must understand that no one sees God.

Clergyman: (with astonishment) No one sees God?

Angel: No. Never. Those who have complaints or requests to make must do so through His assistants. You represent others and wish to make an appeal in their behalf?

Clergyman: Yes, sir, we wish to report conditions in our land; and ask for Divine help in correcting those conditions.

Angel: Be seated, gentlemen, I cannot promise you assistance, but I can assure you that your case will receive the most careful consideration.

(He touches a button on the desk. A boy appears with unusual alacrity.)

Angel: (to boy) Tell Prophet Isaiah there is a delegation to see him. Also, ask Mark to relieve you; then you may go.

(A few moments elapse during which the Angel resumes his writing. The clergymen remain silent and look wonderingly toward the great maps. Enter Isaiah. The three clergymen rise respectfully with evident awe. The messenger boy places a chair for Isaiah and retires. Isaiah bows to the clergymen and motions for them to be seated.)

Isaiah: (pleasantly) Be at your ease, gentlemen. There is no cause here for fear or timidity.

(The central figure of the three clergymen resumes the role of spokesman.)

Clergyman: We are from the United States of America, sir.

(Isaiah glances inquiringly toward the Recording Angel.)

Angel: America is on the planet, Earth, in the Solar System, one of the lesser groups in the Galaxy which the gentlemen recognize as the Milky Way. It is your home planet, by the way.

Isaiah: (smiling a little) Of course. For the moment it slipped my mind. Now, gentlemen. Of the United States, I know only by hearsay. It was not a part of the world I knew, but I learned its language long ago and have conversed with many of its countrymen.

Clergyman: It is in behalf of our countrymen that we have come. The gentleman on my right is Reverend Steven Braswell, of the Baptist faith; on my left is Reverend Jonathon Downs, a Presbyterian. I, sir, am a Methodist. My name is Thomas Barcklay. We have come here because the situation in our country is most distressing, and our prayers, our most fervent prayers, seem to have been somewhat—well, seem to have been—

Isaiah: Slighted, or ignored?

Mr. Barcklay: (in some confusion) Well, sir, to be frank with you, they didn't seem to be receiving the attention we would naturally expect. To put it bluntly, sir, our prayers for the mitigation of economic distress did remain unanswered.

(Isaiah nods understandingly.)

Mr. Barcklay: You see, conditions have become very bad, very bad, indeed. Millions of people are out of jobs and many of them, even some who have occasional work have no homes, or are poorly housed. They are not adequately clothed. They are undernourished. Many would starve if the government did not feed them or make jobs for them.

Isaiah: (with a puzzled look) One moment, Mr. Barcklay. I don't quite follow you. You say that millions of people are out of work, yet many of them have no homes. Your planet, I know, is subject to great, and often destructive, cataclysms of nature. Have these forces of nature destroyed all of the building materials? Is there no more wood and stone in your country, no more clay from which bricks can be made?

Mr. Barcklay: (hastily) Oh no, sir. I didn't mean that. Our forests have been greatly depleted, it is true, but there is plenty of lumber and plenty of cement and clay and steel, and all the things we need for the construction of dwellings. But, you see, these people have no jobs and, consequently, no pay. They cannot afford to build homes.

Isaiah: Still, I do not understand. These people who have no work and no homes, why don't they build homes for themselves? Building is working, is it not?

Mr. Barcklay: (becoming confused) Yes, sir, but there is no one to employ them—I mean no one does employ them.

Isaiah: But if they need these homes, can they not employ themselves, even as their ancestors did when they built their log cabins?

Mr. Barcklay: But you see, sir, the thing has become very complicated. In the first place, a man must have somewhere to build his house, and if he can't afford to buy a plot of land, he can't build at all. And then if he has no money, he can't buy building materials.

Isaiah: Just what do you mean when you say that if a man cannot afford to buy a bit of land, he cannot build a home? Has the population of your country increased to such an extent that every foot of land is occupied?

Mr. Barcklay: Oh no, sir. There is a great deal of land in our country that could be used. There are many acres that are not being farmed, and in and near our towns and cities there is a good deal of vacant land. But you see it is already owned by somebody, and the others cannot afford to buy it. Indeed, many of them cannot afford to pay their rent. No, our problem has nothing to do with land; there is plenty of that. Ours is an economic

problem, lack of purchasing power. As a matter of fact, many farmers do not own the land they are working. Share-croppers, we call them, and their condition is deplorable. Our government has tried many plans for relieving both agriculture and industry, but we continue to have these industrial depressions, and each one seems to be worse than the one before.

The situation has been further complicated by the propaganda of Communists and Socialists who have sent their agitators among our laborers. My brothers of the cloth (indicating his two companions) will confirm my statement that every church in the country has sent up prayer after prayer, asking God to do something to relieve the suffering of our poorer classes, of women and little children who are forced to work in sweat-shops, of the men who toil in mines and at the forges in the great steel works—

Isaiah: (interrupting) Why do men work in mines and factories, and little children in sweat-shops if they don't want to when there are fields for pleasant labor and sweet meadows for little children to romp in?

Mr. Barcklay: Well, but they must earn a living, even though it is a meager one. They must take any jobs they can get, although the work may be very disagreeable. It means bread and butter to them. Though they live in miserable tenements, there is rent to pay. Labor unions have succeeded in forcing up the wages and cutting down the hours for certain groups, but that does not affect all workers. Many are working long hours at very low wages. As I said before, millions have no jobs at all.

Isaiah: (looking very keenly at Mr. Barcklay) A moment ago, Mr. Barcklay, you said that many people have not sufficient food. Has something happened to destroy the fertility of the soil, or is there lack of rainfall and not sufficient moisture, or not the right temperature for the maturing of crops? Old Mother Earth is not as young as she used to be.

Mr. Barcklay: No, sir, it isn't that. I didn't mean that. We have our droughts and floods and unseasonable hot and cold spells, but the fact is, our farmers and orchardists raised too much. The government had to curtail their production—kill some of the stock, plow under some of their crops, let some of their land lie idle—that sort of thing. But we made it up to them with what we call benefit payments through a processing tax, money raised by taxing industry. Of course, the consumers really paid that. You see, by curtailing the production of food stuffs, the farmers could raise their prices. That helped to increase their incomes.

Isaiah: (with a puzzled look) But you just said that many people had no jobs at all, and others had very low wages. How can they pay these increased prices?

Mr. Barcklay: (hesitatingly) Well, of course, it is very difficult for them. But when you try to help out one

group, I suppose some others naturally have to sacrifice a little.

Isaiah: But those who are working long hours, Mr. Barcklay. They must make a good many things during those hours. Why don't they trade what they make for the foodstuffs that the farmers raise?

Mr. Barcklay: Well, you see, these people are all employed by some one. They don't keep what they make; it belongs to their employers. There are some people who say that what is produced belongs to the producer, if you know what I mean. But those people are reformers, not practical business men. If an employer pays wages to his workers, of course what they make belongs to him. Still, it is all very complicated and confusing. That is why we have come here. Unless God will intervene, I don't see how we ever can solve our problem and relieve this very serious condition. God is merciful. I am sure He cannot be aware of the plight we are in, of the suffering of mankind, or He would not permit it. If you could lay these facts before Him, tell Him that all our efforts have failed, I am sure He would take some steps to restore man to—to—

Isaiah: (with some agitation) To what, Mr. Barcklay? In Heaven's name, restore man to what? As a minister of the Gospel, you must know that God has made both material and spiritual laws to rule the universe. The earth is no exception. Like all the other celestial bodies, it performs in every particular in accordance with Divine law. And this law governs the behavior of men in their social, as well as in their individual lives. Did you think that God would make laws governing the melting of ice and the budding of flowers and forget to make rules to govern the economic life of social units—of nations and civilizations? Whenever men come together to live and think and act in groups, they make rules to govern their conduct and activities, but if those rules run contrary to the laws already ordained by God, disaster will follow. In that case, you men must change *your* laws, not expect God to alter *His*.

God created a beautiful world, well dressed with plant and animal life, and gave man dominion over all the earth and the fruits thereof. He gave man all the raw materials, as you call it, that he could possibly need for his comfort and well-being, even for his pleasure. He gave these things, not to one man nor to any group of men, but to all men. He requires only one thing of mankind—labor. Human effort applied to these materials is the only method God provided for creating wealth—that is, the things that men need and want and can use and enjoy. No man, or group or men, has the right to deprive others of free access to these materials any more than one man has the right to deprive another of life itself. To deny a man the means of livelihood *is* to deprive him of life. Every babe that is born on earth, by the mere fact that it

is born, inherits as much of the earth as it needs for a comfortable, happy life—as much as it needs, and no more. When a man dies, his need ceases, and he automatically relinquishes any right to further control.

You say that your problem is an economic problem and has nothing to do with the land. Is it possible to produce food or build homes or carry on trade without using land? Your economic problem, Mr. Barclay, is, first, last, and all the time, a land problem. In your greed and selfishness you have robbed each other of the earth and its resources that God intended for the use of all. In consequence, you wrangle and quarrel among yourselves and plunder each other and suffer economic disaster. You refuse to obey the Divine laws that were laid down for you. That is why your prayers remained unanswered, as you say. You want the rules changed to save you from your own mistakes. God's laws are eternal and cannot be set aside because of human ignorance and error.

Men are not born with knowledge, but with the capacity for learning. In what manner all may enjoy the fruits of the earth as God intended, is not a difficult problem. In fact, it has already been solved by some of your own countrymen. But the rest of you will not listen. You will not even try to understand, but call them theorists and dreamers, and try by all possible means to get some little advantage over your fellows. You buy and sell the God-given earth as if you had made it yourselves. You will not let one man build a home or plant a garden unless he pays another for the privilege of using the earth to which he has as much right as anyone. God has no favorites among the little babies when they are born on earth. They all share and share alike in that Divine inheritance.

(Isaiah rises, and the three clergymen do likewise.)

Isaiah: Mr. Barclay, and you, Mr. Braswell, and you, Mr. Downs, go back and tell your congregations that they may pray and pray and pray, but unless they change the laws governing their social life, unless they restore the land to the people, they can expect no relief. Salvation lies not in prayer, but in action. Go back and tell your people that God cannot alter His laws to save mankind from its own mistakes. I am not at liberty to discuss with you the details of the solution of your problem. You would not believe me if I did. It is not necessary, because, as I have said, some of your own countrymen have already found the answer.

You would have no cause to fear the false doctrines of Socialists and Communists if you would make a few simple adjustments in your laws. Make them coincide with God's laws, and you will rob no one of his earnings. You will restore to all, that freedom that is their inherent right, that equality of opportunity that you promised yourselves in your own Constitution. Go back and tell your congregations to act like intelligent, tolerant, thinking people,

not like stupid, selfish brutes, and they will soon solve their problem.

God has seen other civilizations rise and fall, and *He did not lift a finger to stay them in their downward course.* It may be that He will see this one pass into oblivion. Its fate hangs in the balance. But do not rely upon prayer to save it. Prayer did not save the other civilizations, and it will not save yours. Gentlemen, the interview is over.

(The three clergymen bow silently and walk with a crestfallen air toward the exit at the right.

Isaiah turns, and he and the Angel gaze at each other for a moment in silence.)

Isaiah: (musingly) I wonder! I wonder, after all, if God, in His infinite wisdom, who must have foreseen all things, really foresaw such colossal stupidity!

CURTAIN

Land Tax Campaign In New Jersey

BY ALFRED N. CHANDLER

THE Sanford bill 160, to permit any municipality by referendum vote therein, gradually, over a period of five years, to repeal taxes on improvements and tangible personal property, by shifting taxes to all taxable land value, passed the New Jersey State Assembly this year by a vote of 31 to 23, for the first time since its initial introduction a number of years ago.

The bill was drafted by the late George L. Record, an eminent attorney of New Jersey, and ardent Georgeist. It was presented and advocated by the Progressive League of New Jersey, organized exclusively for that purpose.

In the Senate: Of eleven votes necessary for passage, nine senators, including the President and Majority leader, said they would vote for it; eight others, from whom the remaining two votes were possible, had not expressed their intention when the legislature adjourned.

This advance was brought about solely by persistent work of the league in educating legislators, editors, and through the latter the public, and others of influence throughout the state that this bill would permit reduction in taxes on industry, homes and farms, and therefore be of inestimable benefit to the entire state.

The bill had substantial support of newspapers in many parts of the state, and this support, now that the bill has passed one House, can be increased, and the bill enacted, by continually keeping editors, legislators and business men informed of it from now until the next session of the legislature.

Meanwhile, we shall urge its merits, and also a surtax on unused land, before the two new State Tax Commissions appointed to (1) "study the entire tax structure

of the state" and (2) "recommend taxes for unemployment relief."

Without this urging, they are almost certain to (and may nevertheless) recommend a State Income tax, Sales tax, and other taxes on production and consumption.

For the information of those who may wish to undertake a similar campaign in their respective states, I give some details of our procedure and experience in New Jersey.

The movement had its initiative when the late Charles O'Connor Hennessy was a member of the State Senate, and had a bill introduced in 1915, to exempt improvements and personal property from taxation by increasing the tax rate on land value. No organized effort was made to give the bill publicity, and it was not reported out by the committee.

That prompted the late Edmund B. Osborne, a prominent Newark manufacturer, to publicly advocate such legislation. I wrote him suggesting that an organization be formed to promote it, with a salaried secretary to devote his entire time to it. The letter came to the notice of his secretary, Gladwin Bouton, a young man, Princeton graduate, who believed in the George philosophy.

Bouton said he would be willing to undertake it, and boldly relinquished his position to do so. With the help of Osborne and Charles H. Ingersoll, he formed a small group, mainly of manufacturers, but including Record and myself, to advocate the legislation.

Ingersoll was elected president, and Bouton, secretary. There were to be no fixed dues; the expenses to be met by contributions, though the group pledged monthly payments for a certain limited period.

To make the movement state wide, as it naturally should be to get legislative support, Bouton soon found it was a large undertaking, and I was asked to serve as chairman of a campaign committee.

In the autumn of 1916, Osborne became a candidate for state senator, expounding, among other issues, transferring taxes from buildings and personal property to land value, and was elected, but mainly on the other issues. Most unfortunately for the movement, he died one month after becoming senator. He was a vigorous campaigner, and in the opinion of many, would have later become Governor.

In 1917, this country entered the European war, and in September, Bouton was sent over seas. Before leaving, however, he decided that contributions to the movement were difficult to obtain, and insufficient to maintain an effective campaign. Upon his return he took up somewhat similar work in New York, but attended meetings of the league, and gave some part time service to it. Sad to relate, he has been in a hospital for several years past, where he will likely remain indefinitely.

For the purpose of showing that the land tax, with no

tax on improvements is in successful operation in many places, and to thereby stimulate support, the league wrote in 1919 to many manufacturers and city clerks in a number of cities and towns in Australia, New Zealand, and western Canada, where that system is in operation asking for information as to the effect of it in their respective municipalities, and whether "it had come to stay?" The names were obtained from directories in the Newark Library.

The replies were all highly encouraging, and excerpts, when printed in six-point type, covered four letter-sheet pages. These letters were helpful to a considerable extent with some, while not with some others.

Encouraged by these replies, we then had a resolution introduced at an annual convention of the New Jersey B. and L. Association, calling upon their secretary, who favored it, to write city officials in Australia and New Zealand, asking the effect of the system in those countries, that they might have first-hand information.

During the discussion, the remark that it would do no harm to know about it, brought the rejoinder from a back seat: "We don't want to know." The resolution failed. I cite this merely as an example of what we have found to be the attitude of many persons—they don't want to know. Since then, however, we have had real support from some B. and L. officials.

Two distinctly different activities were, and are, necessary: one, to have a bill introduced in the legislature and publicized for educational purposes, and enacted if possible, and the other, to collect the necessary funds to prosecute the campaign.

Such campaigns mean expense for printing, multi-graphing, mimeographing, typing, postage, traveling, considerable phoning, envelopes, and addressing them in large quantities, and other expenses. Also, if broad enough, to maintain some office space and mail address in a business location. The office space, with typist and phone, was maintained until the war. Since then the mail address has been at the office of some supporter, or an accommodation at a printing and multigraph establishment which we patronize.

To provide these essential expenses, some known Single Taxers in New Jersey, but none elsewhere, were invited to contribute, but relatively few have ever done so. It, therefore, was necessary to solicit funds of those who could be most readily shown would directly benefit from such legislation.

On the theory that the pocket nerve is the most sensitive, the legislation was urged upon business people as a business proposition, as one that would reduce their taxes and increase employment and buying-power. It soon became clear that merchants had no vision for fundamental legislation to benefit their business, especially if it meant any pecuniary help from them. Thenceforth, we con-

financed solicitation to manufacturers having plants in New Jersey. Very few of them knew anything of Henry George or his philosophy.

A directory of all industries in New Jersey published every few years gives the name, location and number of employees of each. But, except in the last edition, four years ago, the names of the executive officials, which it was imperative to learn, were not given, and we were obliged to seek them in the city directories of different cities and towns. Fortunately, every city directory published in the United States is in the Business Branch of the Newark Public Library.

When the executives of a New Jersey industry are outside the state, it is necessary to refer to the directory of the city where they are located. It would have been very difficult, and added to the expense, to learn all these names without this facility. Many executives have their offices in New York City, which meant foot-work in getting the individual names. Changes in officials entail frequent checking up on names.

At one time we had 6,000 names on addressograph plates. These included names of members of the legislature, some influential leaders, manufacturers executives, all New Jersey newspapers, Chamber of Commerce secretaries, all tax assessors and officials and all Grange officials in the state, to whom we have frequently written, and mailed literature.

But such plates are inadvisable because of many changes, and besides, it is readily apparent to many persons that it is circular matter, and is not read, especially so in recent years when business men have become overwhelmed with mail, including numerous questionnaires from Washington. They now give scant attention to any communication not directly relating to their business, if even it passes their secretary. Individual addressing is preferable, but the opening paragraph must be sufficiently appealing to get past the secretary. Phone calls for appointment are far more effective.

Assessed value of land, improvements and personal property in each municipality are given separately in the New Jersey annual Tax Report, which has been helpful in making individual exhibits, after learning the assessed values on each.

Our activities have also included speaking at meetings of different organizations (labor unions readily pass resolutions favoring the legislation), stereopticon lectures, some radio broadcasting, and nailing on fence posts along the highways 1,200 yellow embossed metal signs, 14 by 16 inches, some in every county, also having erected some large wooden signs. Often sending letters to editors, signed by some supporter in different parts of the state; addressing the envelopes, sealing and stamping, and then expressing the package to the signer to be mailed. These are sent to from 100 to 300 editors (not two in the same city); also mailing "statements" by the league. Both

these on some current subject. They are numerous printed.

Legislation exacting a tax on roadside signs, together with a rising objection to all such signs, discontinued their use, though some of the metal signs existed for a number of years, sticking out before passing motorists like the proverbial sore thumb. The signs proclaimed to an untold great number of people, in and outside the state, the merits of a site tax.

We have always presented our message in a friendly attitude, refrained from argument, or controverting any "pet" tax a person might favor, and confining our presentation to the advantages of the legislation we advocate.

Some persons see the advantages of this legislation and help get it. Many others do not, for one reason or another, including: (1) belief that the legislation cannot be obtained; (2) that, if had, the promised benefits would not result; (3) hold valuable unused land; (4) regardless of how explained, and shown by actual assessed figures on their own properties, they still cannot comprehend how shifting taxes from buildings and machinery to land value would make any difference in their tax bills; (5) cynical about public officials rightfully administering the law; (6) numerous other illogical reasons; (7) probably fear that if they assent to its merits they will be expected to contribute, preferring to joy ride at the expense of others; (8) do not want to know, and say "not interested." (9) Plain stupid about anything outside their business.

Year after year we have had some member of the Assembly introduce the bill, in the earlier years merely as a personal favor, to create a reason for publicity to educate the public. Membership of the Assembly is so changeable it was generally introduced each year by a different member. Meanwhile, Record and James C. Blauvelt, as candidates in different years for nomination for Governor or U. S. Senator, advocated higher taxes on land to exempt improvements.

Not until 1924, when Andrew G. Osborne, a son of the late senator of that name, was a member of the Assembly for one year, and introduced the bill, had it reported out of committee, but a poll by him of members showed so many votes lacking of a majority, and he did not bring it to a vote.

Eleven years later, in 1935, it was first voted on, 19 to 35; in 1936, 19 to 35; some who would have voted for it being absent, and this year, as stated, passed the Assembly 31 to 23. Some voted for it because it was permissive by local referendum. Because of the announcement that no tax legislation would be considered at the 1937 session, it was not introduced that year.

After Bouton ceased to be active, the financing continued to be my function, in addition to publicity. The work continued only by disregard of frequent discouragement.

In 1928, L. R. Bonta joined the league as secretary (without salary), succeeding J. W. Stegner; John H. Allen having previously succeeded Ingersoll. Allen and Ingersoll have given help and encouragement. Bonta has done valuable work in gaining support of legislators and others of influence. Except for him the bill would not have made the advance it has.

Many of the leading daily and weekly papers gave the bill liberal space; some giving editorial endorsements that it should be enacted.

This support has been had only by going after it all over the state, calling on editors and publishers, and advocating our purposes. Becoming better acquainted, and friendly, through repeated calls, submitting articles, often of column length (though shorter articles, when possible, are preferable). These articles have been almost always "run," and often with double column heads. The personal effort, and wear and tear on automobiles, in keeping up these acquaintances and friendships, have been well worth while by the support received.

The number of votes a bill receives depends largely upon becoming acquainted, and to a certain degree, friendly with the members of the legislature, and contacting them as often as possible or politic. We had so much to do, and so few to do it, that we have been unavoidably deficient in that respect.

As to the expenditures: For the first six years they averaged \$1,361 per annum, but in the depression year of 1921 following, they were perforce reduced to \$470. From that year they steadily increased, with increased activity, to \$4,275 in 1930, averaging \$2,912 per annum for that period. Then because the continuing depression caused so many to close their check books on contributions of all kinds, contributions became fewer and smaller, averaging \$1,200 annually for the four years preceding the vote on the bill. In the three years during which the bill has annually come to a vote, the contributions and expenses averaged \$560 per annum. As contributions decreased, the percentage of cost of collection naturally increased. No indebtedness was ever incurred beyond current monthly bills.

Had it been possible to have had the entire income within a period of three or four years, instead of being spread as it was, over a long time, a more effective campaign could have been conducted, and no doubt the bill could have passed both houses within those few years.

Some Georgeists seem to discredit efforts to obtain legislation until after people have been educated on, and understand the subject. Just how to know when enough have been educated on it is not stated. They do not seem to realize that working for legislation necessarily means the spreading of such education. Not merely to the legislators, but to the public through widespread newspaper publicity, which is an important part of it.

Most of the knowledge the general public has on any

subject claiming public attention, has not come from reading volumes, but from what they read in newspapers. The writer was a convinced Georgeist long before he read any book on the subject. It came from reading in the papers what George had said in speeches, that the rent of land is created by all the people, and should be collected for the public treasury to pay public expenses, and that along with the palace comes the almshouse. Of course there was much more, but when one gets that, and the remedy, they get the fundamental principles that will start one thinking.

This is what we have been giving the public in New Jersey through the courtesy of the newspapers, and it would not have been given had there not been a bill in the legislature to hook it on. Because of this, it is quite probable that the people of New Jersey are better informed on land value taxation than those of any other state.

But the more persons that take the fundamental courses of the Henry George School, the sooner land value taxation will be adopted, and sooner still if many of them will take their knowledge into politics, and to the legislatures, where it must be taken before it can be adopted.

Only because the Sanford bill passed the Assembly, and was on the verge of passing the Senate, that I am disposed to continue to urge it; for the longer I deal with the method of shifting taxes, the less I like it. It has the appearance of apology; of a bribe; of offering a ransom for the return of that which naturally belongs to one. To make terms, the government would say, "I will exempt your building from taxation, if you will allow me to collect my ground rents."

After it is enacted, then will come the task of educating the electorate in municipal elections to vote to adopt it. Short of it being made a plank in the platform of candidates for election for mayor, or city council, I can foresee that it will mean a prolonged effort; particularly in centers of beneficiaries of large unearned increment. And after it is adopted locally, repeal of the law will likely be agitated for several years thereafter, during which uncertainty, builders will defer taking advantage of it.

From my experience in this prolonged campaign, during more than twenty years past, in daily contact with people. I am convinced that the entire movement has been delayed everywhere by stressing reducing taxes on a building by increasing the tax on land values. One reason for this seems to be that, generally speaking, the human mind is so incapable of grasping two ideas at the same time, and becomes confused.

We all recognize that land value taxation can, and should, be had only by gradual steps. It has been all along considered that the shifting method is the proper approach to that end.

I believe in the gradual approach, but I now believe that the shifting method is not the best; that the most logical initial step in the gradual approach will be to vigor-

ously urge a surtax on unused land, at a low rate to begin with, the rate to be increased as rapidly as public opinion can be formulated to sanction it. When the full rental value of unused land is collected, the next step in the gradual approach, the public meanwhile becoming better educated on it, will be to gradually reach the point of collecting the rental value of all land.

The Pittsburgh tax plan, which has been so widely proclaimed, is, in the last analysis, purely a surtax on all land, at the rate of 1.03 per cent per annum. If one community approves a surtax on both used and unused land, is it not logical that another could be persuaded to levy a surtax merely on unused land, when the proceeds in both cases go to reducing the general tax levy?

To prevent locating a shack on a valuable site, and calling it "improved" to avoid the tax, the difference between the assessed value of the land and the assessed value of the building, to be taxable as inadequately used land.

There is no great love for the man who is holding land out of use on speculation. Naturally, he will object to, and even fight against an increased tax on his land. But his opposing force will be augmented by hosts of holders of some improved land, including insurance and trust companies, and banks, who will oppose the shifting method because they hold mortgages on high priced land, more valuable than the improvement.

A tax on unused land, void of involvement with any reference to exemptions, which has caused so much confusion, is a clean cut proposal, which any school boy can readily understand.

Make it clear to the people that this land rent belongs proportionally to each one; that from the beginning it has been denied them; that neglect to collect it for public purposes is what is causing heavy taxation on all commodities they must buy, and further, it is the cause of land, the source of all employment, being held out of use on speculation, with resulting unemployment, poverty and crime.

It can be perceived that when the iniquity of holding land—the source of all employment—out of use is properly presented, thousands of people can be convinced of the unrighteousness of it, and demand a surtax on unused land to every hundred who will, in their natural and artificially created confusion, assent to an increased tax on land on which a home is located, even though the building be exempted.

Knowing Henry George as I did, I believe that if he were speaking and writing today he would advocate land value taxation purely as a social welfare measure, and give but little heed to specifically exempting buildings; the resulting revenue to provide the vast amount of revenue which is now needed annually, and which otherwise must be raised by more taxes, and will be for many years to come.

Presently, some time, there will arise a clamor to reduce

the public debt. Where is there a better source than land value from which to get the funds to do it? Shifting taxes from buildings to land value does not provide added revenue.

Charles H. Ingersoll's Broadcasts

TIT FOR TAT, SAYS ISABEL PATERSON TO SECRETARY HULL ON HIS CONFISCATION CHARGE AGAINST CARDENAS. "Your government took many more hundred millions when it devalued the dollar! Yes, and she could go back much further than the New Deal—I think even for that trick of evaluation—but perhaps not made quite so rough on the "money changers". But the columnist will have no trouble—if she only cares to—to find plenty of big precedents of confiscation in the fifty years uninterrupted GOP record of subsidy protection and consumer taxation, that built our monopolies of all kinds so high, wide and handsome!

THE PENNSYLVANIA MINERS UNION BOUNCES BACK BETWEEN LEWIS AND GREEN, EARL AND GUFFEY, and is used as the pawn by the most obvious of all monopolies—coal lands—to help collect its royalties. And it does nothing to help those bootleggers who are the only ones doing anything real in the monopoly fight. They are taking direct action in going to their mother earth and taking the subsistence that nature guarantees them. But they are horrifying all the reputable politicians, financiers and labor exploiters.

DEPORTING COMMUNIST LABOR LEADER, HARRY BRIDGES, BRING MME. SECRETARY PERKINS INTO CONFLICT with un-American activity committee man, Dies, who wants to shoot Harry back to Australia where he thinks he belongs. And Miss Perkins is always in the game trying to stop any rodeo that interferes with the labor rodeo. Her last exhibition of New Deal influence was when she said, "it was not yet decided whether sitting down in factories was legal!" I hate the idea of deportation but wish I might defend some labor leaders that understood the scientific and sensible way to get all of labor's rights.

A CITY EMPLOYEE SAVING \$192,000 INTO A TIN BOX ON A \$2,400 salary harmonizes more with the good old 20's than now—especially as Mr. Lange was in the real estate division of "doing people good." With all we see everywhere of what government does for and to us is it not strange that we are always willing to go further into its control? And the most astonishing thing is the wholesale New Deal Braintrust Collectivist dash toward 100 per cent government. There is only one answer—the determination of people for freedom from monopoly—in the natural way if possible—but any way—freedom!

IS THERE STILL SOME THINKING TO DO IN THE GEORGIA MOVEMENT? As perhaps the most direct answer, I might suggest a list of thirty questions elsewhere asked. Or I might cite the case of the most voluminous writer the movement has ever evolved; teaching that (a) rent (saying there is but one kind, so this must be "economic rent to him") is added to price; (b) that there are "no adjectives to rent"; (c) that rent makes jobs hard to get and wages low. Or the HGSSS issuing an elaborate chart headed "The Law of Rent," showing that rent is a deduction from wages without referring to either monopoly rent or taxation; both of which—and according to Henry George—are necessary to the process of reducing wages (i. e., it is not the "rent but monopoly and taxes that reduce wages). Henry George wrote magnificently and voluminously; his capacity for detail was limited. He evolved not only new philosophy but new economics, new science—a new formula of economics. He died a young man according to Dr. Tilden's statement of normal expectancy; he died with his book

on—his pen poised for another chapter. He even set aside specific space to complete and round out his transcendent theory. He did not have time before he was suddenly "called" to do the vitally important thing of placing in its proper place his tremendous "after-thought." "But there is the power to extract a rent, which may be called monopoly rent." But even had George essayed to write a textbook suitable for a school with 200 branches, we might find fault with him. But he did not. Therefore with those responsible for this vast enterprise rests also the responsibility of putting his series of essays into suitable form for teaching. And this is only one of a hundred odd jobs of thinking our movement now urgently needs doing. And to do these there are no available brains that should not be utilized. So again, I move "*the 20th Century Physiocrats Society*."

HOW COMPLETELY IN DEFAULT IS OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM IN ITS DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS is shown in many vital ways. Toll roads and bridges—the former having been abolished as archaic, return in guise of the latter. The Atlantic Ave. L. I. R. is abolishing seven grade crossings and the wise Transit Commission 'will finance this "with a slight increase in fares." I wonder would Jimmy Walker have done worse.) Hospitals—and now doctors—are putting their cost up to the "customers" at 3 cents a day, and doctors at 4 cents, equal 7 cents, equal \$25 a year! Our Mayor is never so proud as when he has devised some new impost on his humblest—and dumbest—voters. Pile it onto the consumer until he breaks so completely down that he carries all of us who monopolize the "savoir faire" (who also ride on his back) down—and makes us so uncomfortable! Economics would show us other ways—of using the values we all create collectively, to take care of all these things—and all the other taxes and fines. And the struggle would only be over taking—say 15 billion—away from our most highly esteemed racketeers "landlords" who build us our monopolies with them!

A. W. ROBERTSON, HEAD OF WESTINGHOUSE, AT THE "MANAGEMENT" MEETING, calls on the stockholders to "form a union." I wonder does he know what a big thing he proposes. It has the salvation of business in it, but ten times greater it would be accomplished wholly by making strong, prosperous and happy all the customers and employees of business—and that is about everyone. This union of stockholders would be easy to start since everyone is listed—and there are millions to start. After they are organized, they should invite in another even more numerous class—every employee in every company and their slogan should be a leaf from the communist-union scheme:—"Solidarity! Solidarity between all the producers of wealth—Capital and Labor!"

To make this successful a simple principle would have to be adopted. This would be about all the constitution and by-laws needed, and all friction would be forestalled, as the interests of these twins of production would be completely harmonized. Here it is:—that all the product of the joint activities of capital and labor is to be divided between these parties exclusively, according to their participation in production. And none is to be given to any alien interest directly or through any system of taxation, or otherwise.

THE wrong that produces inequality; the wrong that in the midst of abundance tortures men with want or harries them with the fear of want; that stunts them physically, degrades them intellectually, and distorts them morally, is what alone prevents harmonious social development.—PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

Problems of Political Economy and Scale Models for the Construction of Prosperity*

Copyright 1938, by Henry J. Foley

(Concluded)

ENTER THE TARIFF

The American government lays a tariff of \$2.50 on food, and the price of food rises to \$5. South Americaa lays a tariff of \$5 on materials, and the price rises in South America to \$10. Jones, who had left the farm to make more money at materials, must now return to the farm, making \$10 and spending it at the higher prices, leaving no money for savings. Every American is spending \$2.50 more per day for food, and every South American is spending \$5 per day more for materials.

Or to look at it from another angle: Smith is making suits of clothes to sell for \$30, which could be purchased abroad for \$20. A tariff of \$10 is laid on clothing so that Jones must pay \$10 more for clothing and allow Smith to keep his price at \$30.

The greatest possible benefit which Jones, as a worker, could receive from the tariff is the extra \$10 taken from him as a consumer. From this \$10 must be taken the cost of custom houses and highly paid officials. Even the remainder does not go to Jones but to his employer, who is under no obligation, legal or otherwise, to give it to Jones, and Jones gets little, if any.

The tariff is a device for robbing Peter to pay Paul, and robbing Paul to pay Peter, except that the loot does not reach either Peter or Paul. The advocates of a tariff are justified in claiming that it creates work. It forces a man to furnish two days' work for one day's supplies.

HOW THE TARIFF WORKS WITH PRIVATE CONTROL OF LAND

We will use the same men and the same plots as in the last problem, but the plots are now owned by a landlord. Production of food and materials has been speeded up under mass production to \$20 per day, the share of wages being \$10. Jones, instead of being a farmer, is a farm hand, and Smith, instead of a manufacturer, is a mill hand.

The best unowned land can produce \$50 per month, and this sets the minimum wage; but industry is prospering, labor unions are powerful, and wages are set at \$10 per day. The men are comfortably fixed, food costing \$5, and materials \$5 per day.

Then it is once more found that food from South America can be sold here for \$2.50. Jones' employer can no longer

sell his food at \$5, the American farm business must end, and neither Jones nor his employer has any place to make a living. Now there arises a clamor from farmer and farm hand for a tariff on South American food, so that every American must pay double prices to support a food industry which can not support itself and pay a heavy tribute in rent.

Where the land was not under private control and men were free to work, Jones could work where he wished and at any occupation, and he would go into the production of high-priced materials to exchange for low-priced food. Under private control of land, where men have no place to make a living for themselves, industries which can not support themselves in competition must be supported by double prices extracted from the people.

ANOTHER SCALE MODEL TO SHOW THE WORKINGS OF A TARIFF

Three men are working individually, and each produces in a year his food, his clothing, and an automobile. One is an expert mechanic and could produce six automobiles, another is an expert farmer and could produce food for six men, and another is a tailor who could produce enough clothing for six men.

Now each devotes himself to his favorite work, and the mechanic trades two automobiles for two years' food supplies, and two automobiles for two years' clothing supplies, keeping two automobiles for himself. Similarly, each of the other men has two years' supplies; each man is wealthy.

The use of money in these transactions will not alter the results. Money is only a medium of exchange.

No man can eat a double supply of food, and no one wishes double quantities of clothing or automobiles, but they would like some of the luxuries. A man in Spain can produce excellent wines, a man in Havana can make fragrant cigars, and a man in France has learned the art of making perfumes. Our farmer exchanges his extra supplies for wines, cigars and perfumes.

Now a paternalistic government undertakes to protect these men against competition, and to assure them work. It takes a quarter of each man's production to finance the work, and government lays a tariff on wines, cigars and perfumes.

The farmer is now left with three-quarters of his produce, leaving one-quarter available for exchange. Due to the tariff, foreign products are twice as expensive, and the one-fourth of the farmer's produce buys only half as much as the same one-fourth would have bought before. The foreign goods he buys have been halved twice, once by taxes and again by the tariff.

All the wealth of the world is nothing but the natural resources worked up by labor. If every man were free on equal terms to use these natural resources he would produce his maximum of wealth in his line. Every other man would be producing his maximum of wealth in other

kinds, and each would be exchanging for the maximum of the kinds of wealth his heart desired. No tariff and no other interference of government could possibly improve upon this happy condition.

THE TARIFF IS ONLY ONE VARIETY OF GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE, ALL OF THEM HINDERING PROSPERITY

Every interference by government with the legitimate activities of a man or of a corporation must either reduce the product or increase the expense, either of which means a reduction of the wealth produced for consumption. The huge cost of administration *and of waste* in such bureaucratic systems must also be taken from the proceeds of industry, further reducing the amount to be distributed.

If interference could benefit a business every business would welcome interference by people and governments, a reduction to absurdity.

New York City is providing an actual working model in interference, called racketeering, and the working model is working. The racketeer graciously allows the business man to continue business on the payment of a satisfactory tribute, and the danger to business has become so wide-spread that the Mayor has appointed a committee to end the abuse.

Meantime, the citizens of New York City and New York State, the owners by right of eminent domain, of "all the lands in the State of New York," are told by their government that they make a living at any place provided they will contribute, in whatever unlimited amounts may be demanded, to the support of those who have been given control over the lands on which the citizens can make a living.

Interference by private racketeers is a drop in the bucket compared with the interference by state and national governments with the conduct of business; and the staggering total of such interferences is as the dew on the mountains to the waters in the ocean, when compared with the one colossal interference of depriving the population by law of a place to make a living.

THEOREM X

OVER-PRODUCTION WOULD BE IMPOSSIBLE WHERE LAND IS NOT PROPERTY

We will take for our scale models twelve men, and the three plots below. The nine other plots are available, but we are disregarding them.

Factory property.....	product, \$10 per day
Farm.....	product, 10 per day
Sub-marginal farm.....	product, 1 per day

The people own the plots. Six men work at the factory and six at the better farm. Each man needs \$5 per day for food and \$5 for materials, and the \$10 per day are ample for all requirements.

No matter whether a man's scale of living is at \$10 per day or \$10,000, the only reason men work is to fill their wants, and any man in his right mind will stop work when there is nothing else he wants. When our six farmers have raised all the food they can eat, when they have sold all the food the factory workers can eat, and have purchased all the materials they want, they will certainly not produce more food so that they can watch it decay.

If some of their wants must be filled from abroad they will produce enough food and materials to exchange for the foreign goods, but they will stop as before when their wants in foreign goods are supplied. The workman or the employer who should continue to produce what no one wants or can buy should be examined for his sanity.

Now let us suppose that our twelve men, instead of working individually, are working for an employer for wages of \$10 per day. Suppose that over-production begins, and the employer announces a cut in wages to \$5. The men immediately go to work on the other plots and make a living, employers without workmen have no money to pay the rents, the leases would lapse, and men would go to work anywhere. Employers could no longer hire men at half wages while they pile up products in the insane hope that some one will buy them, perhaps the inhabitants of the moon.

There would still be room for employers and captains of industry without over-production. The man who could organize production so that our twelve men could produce all their requirements in less time and with less rudgery, would deserve and should receive a higher return which would give him a better standard of living and the well-earned status of a public benefactor. But he could never start the infernal train of low wages, under-consumption, over-production, and panic.

ENTER LAND MONOPOLY

The factory land and the better farm are now owned by private person, who leases them to a manufacturer and farmer. The men are working for \$10 per day. Production is \$20, the other \$10 going to employer and landlord.

The men, as before, purchase \$10 worth of the products per day, and whether or not their wants are supplied they have no wages with which to buy more, and half the food and materials, \$10 per day, must remain unsold, must be over-production.

The employers with unsold products on their hands are finding money scarce, and are forced even against their better instincts, to cut wages, say to \$5, half as much as men need to supply their wants, and over-production piles up at the rate of \$15 per day.

The men can no longer stop work, because they will have no money for tomorrow's wants. They have no place to work for themselves, and they must hold the job or die. Neither the farm nor the factory can stop pro-

duction, because they are under a heavy rental, but the time must come when their funds will be exhausted, tied up in decaying food and useless materials.

THEOREM XI

MONEY SCARCITY AND NATIONAL DEBT ARE CAUSED BY PRIVATE CONTROL OF LAND

Our scale model consists of the twelve men and the twelve plots of Theorem I. The farmer exchanges food for clothing and other wants. The clothing-maker exchanges clothing for food and other things. The total production is ample for all, and each man can see to it that he gets a fair return for what his labor has produced, that he gets approximately a day's production of clothing for a day's production of food; otherwise he would take up the production of clothing.

The conditions would be the same if money were used. The farmer who could not sell his day's production for enough to buy a day's production of clothing would go into the better paid business of making clothing.

Now we introduce private control of land. Robinson buys up the land, or is given a grant by a beneficent government. He has no desire to use the land, but allows any one to use it on the payment of a satisfactory figure. Jones formerly produced \$5 worth of food and turned it into money, and spent it on clothing and other things. He still produces \$5 worth per day and sells it, pays \$2 for rent, and spends the remainder.

Suppose the government has placed \$10,000 in circulation. The twelve men are earning and receiving \$60 per day, \$24 of which goes to the landlord. Robinson does not eat more than the day laborer, nor wear many more clothes though they may be more luxurious, but we will suppose he buys three times as much of the production as any of the twelve, \$9 per day, leaving \$15 in his money box.

Now Robinson may endow hospitals and museums, or spend his money in Europe, but there is no way in which this excess money can find its way into the pockets of the twelve, because they have nothing to exchange for it. At the end of 666 days, less than two years, the money has disappeared from circulation.

The government must now inflate the currency, but if it be inflated to any point short of infinity there can be only one ending, money scarcity.

With currency money absorbed, the only course is credit money—debt, and the \$15 per day deficit in currency in our community of 12, develops in our community of 130,000,000 into a national debt of \$36,000,000,000.

The mathematician who could discover a method of paying a national debt of \$36,000,000,000 by daily going into debt should occupy the place now dedicated to Sir Isaac Newton. It is physically impossible for a system of private control of land to end in anything but money scarcity, and an unpayable national debt.

THEOREM XII

PROPERTY IN LAND MEANS THE ENDING OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Our scale model will be the same twelve men and the landowner, as in Theorem IX, and we will take up the problem where the problem of money scarcity ended. The men have not only a money scarcity, but a staggering total of debt which is impossible of payment.

Let us suppose, what is most unlikely, that all the men are working, and making each \$5 per day, of which they get \$3 after the rent has been paid.

The government is making heroic efforts to balance the budget, which must include a huge interest on the ever-mounting debt, and this interest, besides the normal expenses of the community, can come from nowhere except the wealth produced, from the \$5 per day of our worker, and his \$3 per day must be reduced by taxation to \$2.50, to \$2, to—Where can it stop?

Our twelve men are not philosophers nor students of government. They can not discover what is wrong, and the efforts of the philosophers to tell them what is wrong do not make sense. They only know that private ownership of land is the very foundation of civilization, and must not be questioned even if one man owns a territory equal to that of eight states, or if three men should own the entire area of the earth, and that they are privileged to look anywhere else in heaven or on earth for the cause of their poverty.

They only know that all the wealth is the product of their hands, that the wealth is in the hands of some one else, that their families are destitute, and that their leaders have not even the glimmerings of a plan for their relief.

They will do what was done in the French Revolution, what in our own day has been done in Russia and Mexico and France and Spain. They will seize the wealth wherever it is located, in all probability to the tune of fire and slaughter, and no fine distinctions will be drawn between the wealth of the landowner and the wealth of the manufacturer and the merchant. This is not a threat, only a prediction. "I know of no way to judge the future but by the past."

The Spanish merchant or manufacturer whose work was a blessing to the nation, and whose wealth was drained off by the landowner as scientifically as was that of the truck driver, can get little consolation as his factory burns or is taken over by a soviet, from the knowledge that he is not the guilty party. He might have been presumed to have the leisure and the intelligence to know that non-producers with the legal privilege to take without limit from producers could not possibly end in anything but starvation or revolution.

Will American captains of industry take up the problem while there is yet time, or will they leave the solution to be provided by a soviet?

THEOREM XIII

A FAVORABLE BALANCE OF TRADE MAY BE AN UNFAVORABLE STATE OF AFFAIRS

Our scale models will be a farm and a factory, on each of which a man can produce \$10 per day. There are twelve men, six on each plot, and another man, Robinson, who has bought both plots. The men pay \$5 each per day for rent. The product is just enough for the needs of the twelve men, and each man's wages, \$10, would be enough to purchase an ample supply. The rent leaves him with enough for half a day's supply.

Robinson is a man of leisure and culture, he can get little enjoyment from associating with twelve busy workmen, and he moves his residence to where he can meet other men of leisure, say in London. Of the products of the twelve men, \$120 per day, \$60 worth, the amount of their wages, is purchased by the men. As there are no other people in the place, the balance must be sent abroad for sale. It is sold in London, and the proceeds, \$60, are just enough to pay the rent to Robinson.

Our community has a very favorable balance of trade, \$60 per day, \$21,000 per annum in exports, and no imports. Our community should be in the height of prosperity, but no one has more than half enough to eat or to wear.

Now Robinson raises the rent to \$6 per day. The men now buy \$48 of the products each day, and \$72 worth is exported and sold to pay Robinson's rent. The splendid trade balance is now still more favorable, but the men, who produce \$10 per day, must now live on \$4.

As far as the prosperity of our community is concerned the case will not be altered if Robinson returns. In that case, the \$72 from the exports to London will be returned to him. This money, is not wealth, but only a token of wealth. It is a certificate that some persons abroad owe to Robinson \$72 worth of wealth which must be returned on demand. There is no one in our community who can cash these certificates, there is no one in the community who can sell anything to Robinson. His gold or paper money can not be eaten nor worn, and until it is used to buy goods in Europe it is as worthless as an estate in litigation.

The only way in which Robinson can use his piled-up money is to send it back to Europe in exchange for products, and this is reversing the favorable trade balance. The only way in which a favorable balance of trade can be of benefit to the community is to cancel it by an excess of imports over exports. A favorable balance of trade is a delusion.

THEOREM XIV

THE FINAL RESTING PLACE OF ALMS IS IN THE STRONGBOX

We will again use the scale model of Theorem I, with a landlord who is also the captain of industry.

Of the twelve men, three are working at the gold mine, and three on a farm, all at \$150 each per month, and six are working on the sub-marginal farm at \$50.

A charity drive is inaugurated, and among others, the three men at the gold mine contribute \$25 each per month, which happens to be the share in the charity received by each of three on the \$50 farm.

Under private control of land, which bars the worker from any control over wages, there is nothing to fix the amount of wages except the lowest amount for which the man will consent to work, or the lowest amount which will keep him alive. The man who formerly received \$50 wages can now live on the same amount, \$25 being made in wages, and \$25 contributed in charity.

The charity drive has changed the location of the money fund as follows: The \$50 man is still a \$50 man; the \$150 man is now a \$125 man. The income of the landowner-business man has been increased in this small section of the drive by \$75 per month.

THEOREM XV

A PLANNED ECONOMY IS PLANNING FOR DISASTER

ORGANISMS vs. ORGANIZATIONS

There are two kinds of organizations: Those which are operated by human intelligence, and which are properly called "organizations," such as an army; and those which operate themselves, and which are properly called "organisms," such as a tree. An organization and an organism are diametrically opposite in everything except that each is a collection of individuals which work together.

An organization is a lifeless thing which can be operated only by an outside force which pulls the strings. An organism is replete with vitality which can be destroyed only by the destruction of the organism.

An organization functions through the direction of human intelligence. An organism is an unintelligent thing, devoid of any power to think or to choose, and its operations are performed under the impetus of natural and unchangeable laws.

An organization can be created and maintained only by a directing human mind. An organism develops itself and operates itself.

The purpose of an organism is its own welfare and the welfare of its members. A tree does not exist to adorn the landscape nor to feed men. These may be incidental results, but a tree could be a perfect tree if there were neither men nor landscapes. An organization is a body whose object is outside itself. The object of an army is to conquer an enemy, even at the cost of its own injury or destruction.

Other examples of organizations are—a factory, an automaton. Other examples of organisms are—a human body, and human society.

Society is composed of living men with intelligence and free will, but society, like a business corporation,

which is also composed of living men, is a thing without soul or mind. It can no more choose its way nor control its operations than a tree can do. It organizes itself under the driving force of the natural law which impels men to join together for the better production of wealth and for other purposes. It is an organism.

Under the compelling force of natural law, each man chooses the position in society where he can best produce wealth, and this is the position in which he can best serve the interests of every other man in society, just as each leaf in a tree chooses the amount of sap it needs for its growth, and secures its own growth and the growth of the tree.

The treatment of two things so essentially different as an organization and an organism must be essentially different, and the treatment proper to one would bring disaster to the other. An army left to organize itself and operate itself would end in a colossal tragedy. A tree whose growth should be at the mercy of human intelligence which should direct the movements and the composition of the sap, the placement and coloring of the leaves, and performing for the tree the million of activities which the tree now directs for itself, would end in a withered tree and a disordered mind.

The proper functioning of the millions of activities of all the people in a nation is a task of infinite complexity, as far beyond the possibilities of any man or group of men as it would be for these men to take from nature and the natural laws the work of making all the grass and the plants and the trees of the world to grow. And if these men could succeed in this impossible undertaking, the results could not possibly be better than those the organism would have worked out by itself, and the work of the supermen would have been in vain.

A planned economy means the turning of society from an organism into an organization, and turning men, the individual members of society, from intelligent beings into mechanical robots.

The only thing which a directing human intellect can possibly do for an organism, whether a tree or human society, is to guarantee it freedom to develop under the natural laws.

The driving force in political economy is the urge of individual men to create wealth to satisfy *their* desires—not the desires of some one else, or of a state. This is the fundamental law under which society was born, and under which it must develop and function, as the law of gravity holds the universe together.

A state is a thing as lifeless as a stone, and more lifeless than a tree. It could no more harbor a desire for wealth than could a cloud. Production under the control of a state is an engine without the steam, an electric dynamo without the motor. No such state has ever operated to the happiness of its citizens. It is the prostitution of political economy, whose fundamental law is that men seek wealth to satisfy *their* desires. Such a state can act only

as a ventriloquist's dummy, the real motive power is in the hands of individuals, and men are working at forced labor to satisfy the desires of some one else.

THEOREM XVI

HOUSING

A SUCCESSFUL SLUM CLEARANCE PROJECT IS AN IMPOSSIBILITY

We will take as our scale model a community of four men with incomes respectively of \$4,000, \$2,000, \$1,000 and \$500 a year, and each has as good a dwelling as he can afford. Each man is paying one-fourth of his income for house rent, \$1,000, \$500, \$250 and \$125. The dwelling renting for \$125 a year is a hovel which offends the sensibilities of the more prosperous, and the government undertakes to come to the poor man's assistance, and to build for him a home as good as that of the next prosperous neighbor, a \$250 home to rent for \$125.

Government needs \$125 per year for this project, besides large sums for administration, and it can not draw money from the air. The money can come from nowhere but the four men, and taxes are levied on food and clothing, reducing each man's income by approximately \$30 a year. The slum is torn down and the new building is erected.

The poor man's income has been reduced by taxes to \$95, it is impossible for him to pay \$125, and he goes—nowhere. Each of the other three men has also suffered a loss of income, and he moves to a cheaper home, and somewhere along the line a good house is offered for rent, with no takers.

If the slum dweller were given access to the earth and its resources he would create wealth for himself, and, as laborers did in the time of the world war, he would move into a better house with no assistance from housing schemes.

No housing scheme in the history of the world has been a success, because they are foredoomed to failure. The history of every housing scheme is that the houses are occupied by people with the next higher grade of income, and the slum dweller is left without even the slum. He may retire to the docks, or to the city dumps.

ALL MEN SHOULD HAVE EQUAL ACCESS TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES, INCLUDING THE LAND

How is wealth produced?

By the application of labor to the materials of the earth.

Can not labor, by itself, produce wealth without the natural resources?

There is not a dollar's worth of wealth in the world which was not in existence in the form of natural resources before the first man lived.

How about the work of bankers, scientists, accountants, and other people who never work upon material things?

These men work indirectly upon the material things

which constitute wealth. Their work is in aiding the work of the farmer and the manufacturer, who are working on the material things. If the material workers ceased their work, the banker, the scientist, and the accountant would find their occupations gone.

What is the effect of forbidding some men to use the natural resources?

It is equivalent to forbidding these men to work for a living.

How is this prohibition brought about?

By laws which allow private ownership and control of land and natural resources.

Is not private ownership of the natural resources sanctioned by legislation?

Yes. But legislation can not prevent natural laws from producing their effects.

What is the effect of private control of the natural resources, upon the men who are barred from their use?

These men are unemployed, or they must sell their labor at any wages offered.

What is the effect upon society?

Society is divided into two groups; one group in absolute domination, and in complete control of the wealth, and another group in helplessness and poverty.

What can human laws do in this situation?

They can only interfere with employers, and force them to release some of the wealth to which they are entitled under the law.

What effect has this upon the law?

The laws become a jumbled mass of interferences.

What is the effect upon private property?

Private property loses its meaning. No man has a right to own anything if the government decides to take it away from him.

What is the effect upon business and industry?

Industry can not function without plans, and plans are not possible with a government which must break all plans to prevent the extinction of a population.

What is the effect upon democracy?

Democracy is a government by free men. A government by free men not "free" to make a living can no more endure than any other absurdity. Its progress is to the philanthropist, the demagogue, and the dictator.

What is the effect upon political economy?

Political economy can be nothing but a collection of prohibitions, a study in the inhibitions of human nature, and efforts to prevent the catastrophes inevitable with a violation of the natural laws.

Or the parent science, political economy, can be decently buried to make room for the baby sciences of banking and farming and transportation and exchange and finance.

AN EXPERIMENT TO END EXPERIMENTS

Of all the foregoing experiments, every one which ended in depression and poverty was an interference with the citizens' freedom to work or to trade. We might go

on to hundreds of other experiments with interference, and every one of them would work out to poverty. Therefore, instead of endless experiments with interference, let us make one experiment with non-interference.

If a man were alone on earth he could make a living, because he would be let alone. If a million men occupied the earth and kept to themselves every one of them could make a living as easily as a million birds or beasts—if they were let alone. If these million men came together to cooperate, with the aid of science and machinery and division of labor and mass production they could make an infinitely better living—if they were let alone.

But the strong would exploit the weak, would refuse to let them alone, and society and cooperation would be impossible. Therefore men invented government, not to furnish interference, but to keep the strong man from interfering, to assure that the citizen would be let alone,

But the strong man took the reins of government, and where the citizen might have forced the strong man to let him alone, he is absolutely powerless to force government to let him alone. There is hardly a government on earth today which is much more than a collection of devices to interfere with the citizen's legitimate activities; and there is not a government on earth where the masses are not in distress, with the government floundering between old deals, new deals, socialism, communism, fascism and other isms, all of which are only variations of the theme—interference. And the only difference between them all is as to the victim and the amount of interference.

The basic interference of all governments is the bestowing of the lands upon private persons, and condemning the remainder of the population to work for whatever wages may be offered. This is why men can not support themselves, even while the wild animals thrive.

Unemployment is not a sad result of the advance of civilization, nor of the advent of machinery, nor of "technological" disarrangement. It is the logical and inevitable result of a perversion of government power.

If the United States were inhabited by 130 000,000 sheep instead of by that many human beings, there would be no unemployment. Any band of enterprising sheep attempting to persuade or to compel 130,000,000 sheep to abstain from the grazing grounds would find the undertaking absolutely impossible.

If the sheep, in their desire for the more abundant life, should organize a government based on private control of land, that government, with the moral and military support of 130,000,000 sheep might bar 130,000,000 sheep from the right to nibble grass. The commonwealth of sheep would have done what no band of racketeering sheep, and no band of murderous wolves would have even attempted to do.

The use of the law, the organized power of all men, to enforce the barring of all men from the right to use the earth, is an unbelievable prostitution of law, and the most scientific device which the brain of man could conceive

for the production of unemployment, low wages, and depression.

Let us make clear what we mean by "letting us alone." We mean that every human being shall be as free as if he were the only human being on the earth, except as his liberty is restricted by the equal liberty of every one else. A man is free to work and to trade, but he is not free to murder or rob, nor is he free to jockey any man into a position where he is helpless and subject to exploitation. Every man is free to work alone or to cooperate, but forcing any man to do anything is a crime. The prevention of this crime is the duty, *and the only duty* of society and government.

An important part of this duty is to see that foreign nations let its people alone. The government must provide for defense against foreign aggression as well as against domestic racketeering.

CONCLUSION

I am looking out upon a giant tree which spreads its branches to the sky. That tree, like all its ancestors for a million years, has grown without assistance from man. From its own inherent powers it has conquered enemies, insects, and droughts, and storms which strove to tear its branches from the stem and its roots from the ground. Had men taken charge of its growth and decided what chemical elements it might take from the ground, and when and how it should put forth its leaves, the tree would be a twisted eye-sore. If men had torn it from the ground as men have been separated from the earth from which tree and man and insect must draw the wherewith to live, the tree would long since have become a rotten log.

Our magnificent tree asks nothing but access to the earth, and protection from interference. Every drop of water, and every atom of every chemical absorbed by the roots seeks that spot in the tree which suits it best, which, by some marvelous law of nature, happens to be the spot where it will best nourish the tree, and the result is one of the noblest works of God, a perfect organism.

Society is an organism more wonderful than any tree. Every man in society seeks the spot where he can best live, which happens to be the spot where he can best cooperate with other men, and the result would be a world where every man is working, consciously for his own betterment, and unconsciously for the building up of a complete and perfect world.

Private racketeering, interference by criminals, is a canker which the tree might overcome. Legal interference by government with private initiative transforms the tree of society into a gnarled and ugly mass. Tearing the tree from the ground, and barring men from the earth from which all their wants must be supplied, can not be classed as anything but atrocities.

THE END

Our Lop-Sided Taxation

AN EXPERT EXAMINATION BY LOUIS WALLIS, ESQ. OF
NEW YORK *Financial World*, U. S. A.

OUR system of industry is complicated with methods of taxation, which are slowly poisoning the sources of economic life.

We have a lop-sided, unbalanced fiscal power by which productive business of all kinds is overburdened with heavy and increasing taxes; while at the same time a lower scale of assessment upon the unearned value of both improved and vacant land has the effect of giving a subsidy to speculation. In other words, the state, acting through its power to tax, puts a penalty upon production and a premium upon speculation.

Everybody knows that when a given piece of land is brought into use for any productive purpose, the aggregate property is taxed on a far higher scale of assessment than when the same piece of land is held vacant.

But most people are so busy trying to make a living in this complex and uncertain world that very few of us have the time or the opportunity to follow these well known facts into their economic results.

The significance of lop-sided taxation, however, is not found merely in its appalling distinction between productive industry and the speculative holding of unearned land values which are due to the presence of the community.

Because the lighter tax resting upon the aggregate land of any given country has the inevitable effect of conferring upon land an artificial market price, which, along with its rise in value through increase of population, makes it a burdensome and growing liability upon all productive business.

It was found in Sydney, Australia, that when municipal taxation was transferred from buildings to land values, both improved and vacant, the real estate sub-dividers had to offer much larger pieces of land in order to attract home builders. In other words, the price of land was reduced by heavier taxation.

On the contrary, when buildings are taxed more heavily in proportion than land values (which is the case in most countries), the builder not only has to carry heavy taxes on his building; but at the same time, since the ground itself is taxed more lightly, he also has to pay a higher and more burdensome price for land.

Every country has large amounts of unused space in and about its towns and cities, and also in the rural districts. But almost everywhere lop-sided taxation makes it necessary to pay a high rental or purchase price for land; while at the same time, the business installed upon the location is immediately burdened with a huge load of taxes.

The result is to hinder the productive use of capital and thus to blockade the nation's business development, hold back the employment of labor, and keep down the purchasing power of the general public.

The English common law declares that every man has equal rights to justice. But this promising maxim of jurisprudence is contravened by statute law which penalises productive industry while putting a premium on land speculation and upon the unearned rental value of the ground.

The political and economic problem now facing Britain and modern civilization is as great and critical as the issue which led to the downfall of the Stuart Dynasty and the revolution of 1688.

The taxing power of parliament was controlled in the middle ages by the landed aristocracy who owned the legislature and constantly put heavier and heavier taxes on commerce and industry, symbolized by the wool-sack in the House of Lords.

Parliamentary democracy as we have it today is the result of a long painful struggle between the ground landlords and the rising business class. The masses of the people have gradually won the right to vote; but this right has been secured only by a compromise which has relieved land values from proper taxation while putting the tax burden mainly

upon productive industry in such a way as to reach the pockets of the middle and laboring classes with deadly effectiveness.

The issue which is coming into the foreground is non-partisan. It is not the tenet of any one political party. Conservative, Liberal or Labor. The veto power of the House of Lords over taxation has been cancelled by constitutional amendment. Two hundred and thirty municipal councils throughout England, Scotland and Wales have recently memorialized Parliament for a statute which will open the way toward reorganization of the fiscal power so as to shift the tax burden from industry and agriculture on to the ground rental value of both improved and vacant land. Britain to-day is on the verge of a new chapter in history. (Loud applause.)

Our Income Tax Expert, Jim Marshall, at once rose and opened "When I saw in *The London Rotarian* a few weeks ago that you were going to speak on 'Lop-Sided Taxation,' I thought that as a Collector of Taxes I was the most suitable person to propose the vote of thanks. I also thought, without knowing what Mr. Wallis was going to say, that all taxation must be lop-sided unless it was founded on taxation of land value. So you see I happen to agree with what we have heard this morning.

I remember many years ago when Mr. Henry George visited this country I went to hear him speak. I did that forty years ago and ever since I have agreed with the principle, which is known in America as 'Single Tax,' and I think it is most essential that business men should consider this principle.

It is amazing to me that you business men should allow the value of land to increase and go into private pockets. It appalls me as almost indescribable fatuity. (Loud laughter.)

I suggest to you that the Speaker you have heard to-day should be taken very seriously and his address considered on its merits.

I am thanking the Speaker not so much on your behalf as personally, but I am sure you all know my thoughts, and on my own behalf for what we have heard today, many thanks. (Loud cheers.)

A good meeting ended promptly with the toast "Rotary all over the World."—*The London Rotarian*.

LEWIS WALLIS BEFORE THE LONDON ROTARIAN

Working Together For Success

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE AT TORONTO

IN 1857 Lord Macauley wrote to those on this side of the Atlantic:

"As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land your laboring population will be far more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World, and while this is the case, the Jefferson political may continue to exist without any fatal calamity. But the time will come when wages will be as low and fluctuate as much with you as with us. You will have your Manchesters and Birminghams, and in these Manchester and Birminghams hundreds of thousands of artisans will assuredly be out of work. Then your institutions will be brought to the test."

We have reached that point now; we have our Manchesters and Birminghams in the United States and while we have not proportionately as much unoccupied territory as you in Canada, we have hundreds of thousands of acres of desirable unused land. Indeed, according to Mayor LaGuardia's report there are approximately 40,000 acres of unused land in New York City.

But through stupid ignorance of natural law we have permitted the margin of cultivation to be pushed so far

that our "frontiers" seem to have disappeared and labor and capital are becoming beggars in a land of vast opportunity. Fulfilling Lord Macauley's prophesy, our institutions are "brought to the test."

"Doing for men," says Emerson, "what they should do for themselves, is the one ugliness in all the governments of the world."

If that were true when Emerson wrote those words, how much truer it is now. And yet in spite of European examples of what totalitarian programmes really entail and the crushing of freedom that we, on this continent count our birthright—paternalism of one sort or another being urged by some, in both Canada and the United States, who, a generation ago, would have shied at anything remotely resembling it, since it is the antithesis of the American ideal—liberty. And these urgings toward regimentation come chiefly through ignorance of the *science* of political economy. Certainly it is for us, who realize that it is economic maladjustment which is dragging nation after nation into the morass of hatred and force, to work together as we have never worked before. Single Taxers are of necessity individualists, but now is the time for "united we stand," if we hope to point the only way for a lasting peace for a war-crazed world.

There are many different ways of carrying our message and there are Single Taxers to carry it. Obviously, however, if we work together, since that gives us greater power, we must choose the greatest common denominator—and the one programme on which we can all agree, I believe is *education*.

Some of us may contend that political action is the quickest road to education, although it develops bitter resistance and intolerance. Judge Jackson Ralston thinks that putting an Amendment on the ballot for the voters

California to pass on, is the quickest and surest means of educating them. Be that as it may, I wish there had been a hundred extension classes and a few thousand students taking the correspondence course up and down California for two solid years before Judge Ralston had again launched the measure.

If that had happened enough voters in that State would know what the economics of Henry George connoted to make a telling stand against lying opposition and could force proper interpretation where now is powerful misinterpretation. But without such far-reaching preparation by the Henry George School of Social Science the Ralston Amendment is on the ballot, to be voted on in November, and it seems plainly the duty of Single Taxers everywhere, regardless of national or state lines, to help our valiant cohorts in California combat the vicious onslaught made by the privileged powers under the banner of the "Anti-Single Tax League."

Therefore I beg that this Conference make it a major accomplishment to use this great opportunity to spread education in a field where the fear on the part of our

enemies proves our strength; that we do everything possible immediately to make the voters of California understand what the taxation of land values in lieu of all other taxes and the philosophy that goes with it, mean—for ignorance is the only thing we Georgeists dread and we are working together for certain success when we work to spread the Henry George School of Social Science.

For then, with the ever-growing army that understands the natural law "if" as says Henry George, "while there is yet time, we turn to justice and obey her, if we trust liberty and follow her, the dangers that now threaten must disappear, the forces that now menace will turn to agencies of elevation."

From Director Chodorov's Address at Toronto

THE expenses of the Henry George School in 1937 amounted to \$28,150, an average of \$3.47 per student enrolled during that year.

Between January 1 and June 30, 1938, 1,861 men and women took the ten week's course in New York City; during the same time 2,862 attended the extension classes scattered all over the United States. In addition, 2,055 persons took the Correspondence Course.

The new building, 30 East 29th Street, where the School commences its sessions on October 3, contains twenty-one class rooms. At full capacity it will train six thousand students weekly.

Mr. Chodorov's address was indeed most inspiring. On the Foundation which Oscar Geiger gave with so much love and suffering is being reared a lighthouse of economic truth and justice.

Correspondence

HOPEFUL OF REAL PROGRESS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Disappointment was expressed by some speakers at the recent Congress of the Henry George Foundation in Toronto that more progress has not been made in the movement for the taxation of land values. When I first became a convert through reading "Progress and Poverty" I believed such a principle would be adopted very soon because of its justice and far-reaching beneficial results. When that desirable result failed to materialize, even where the curse of landlordism was most acute, it caused discouragement among its ardent advocates, and they became inactive in the cause. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick."

We have been unable to put a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in the hands of but a few people, hence lack of converts. If we could afford a weekly nation-wide broadcast of the Single Tax doctrine it does not follow that converts could be made in that way. There is no guarantee that people would listen-in, except those who are interested. Religious revival meetings are largely attended by church members because they are interested.

The Henry George School of Social Science is proving its worth as a disseminator of economic knowledge. Its success should give courage to the discouraged to revive their faith and help to the utmost of their ability to bring success in California and after that to unite for the educational campaign in Michigan.

Revere, Mass.

W. L. CROSMAN.

SEEING THINGS IN A DIFFERENT LIGHT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

May I extend my hearty congratulations on the article under

"Comment and Reflection" in the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM?

As you may have surmised, I have been a Democrat ever since the Cleveland campaign and was converted to free trade by General Francis Walker who was my Professor of Political Economy at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and have voted for President Roosevelt on both occasions; yet, as I have written Roger Babson and others, I suppose I am more fundamentally opposed to many of Roosevelt's doings than many Republicans who seem to have no fundamental ideas whatever.

Babson himself agrees that if we elect a Republican in 1940 he will probably have to carry on pretty much the same as Roosevelt, which indicates that the trouble is the unenlightenment of the people as a whole.

As Cleveland said, it is not a theory but a condition that confronts us, and while you would not administer strong medicine to a healthy person as a regular diet it must be given when people are sick. To continue the analogy, even medical treatment ought to be fundamental but unfortunately it is not. This is not always the case, but the use of "dope" by reputable physicians is all too common. So this palliative treatment is not confined to political spheres only but is an unfortunate state of mind of the people of today. Some of this comes, of course, from false leadership and its general acceptance is due to the mass psychology that was engendered during the War and it may take a generation to overcome.

People must learn to think for themselves and it is encouraging to note that some are beginning to do so more and more among the so-called "middle classes" rather than among the "Captains of Industry" and their satellites in small businesses.

I have heard it said that the servants of nobility in England are the most ardent supporters of the system under which they live and it seems that up to now some of those most seriously affected by the unjust system under which this Country is operating are its most ardent supporters.

But even the National Association of Manufacturers is beginning to see things in a different light and possibly we are on the verge of a new era.

Cincinnati, Ohio

CHARLES G. MERRELL

INTEREST RISES WITH PROSPERITY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My thanks to C. H. Nightingale for his argument that we should not drop this matter of interest till we get to the bottom of it; and my thanks to you for publishing his statement.

But while we are delving into this matter, and while C. H. Nightingale is supposing all these things mentioned (see your page 126, July-August, 1938), suppose some one devote himself to explaining how interest "would go to zero," if the earnings of the people (which would include the earnings of business) "increased to such an extent that every one became a capitalist."

Our earnings in the commercial sense include returns on our capital; this is interest. Suppose borrowing does cease, what of it? Interest is still interest; and it can't "go to zero," when it is soaring in the stratosphere of prosperity.

Stockton, California.

L. D. BECKWITH.

TAXES ON THE IRRIGATION DISTRICTS OF CALIFORNIA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Congratulations on Comment and Reflection upon the psychology of the New Deal voters.

Let me, also, add a word of caution relative to the paragraph on page 126 in which you appear to be quoting J. Rupert Mason on the tax system of the California irrigation districts.

It is true that improvements and personal property are exempt from these irrigation districts taxes. It is even true, as Mason failed

to state, that these taxes are levied on all land in the district, including speculative holdings in the towns and cities of the district and id land in the rural sections of the district.

But these taxes are flat or acre taxes. A farmer on the last far in the far corner of the district on a back country lane pays the same tax per acre that is paid by the owner of a finer farm at the edge of the county seat; so does the owner of a lot in the poorest section of town and on a back street, "down behind the gas works," pay the same tax that is paid by the owner of the best business corner in the county seat, assuming that the lots are of the same area.

There is another thing about these districts that ought to be better understood. Because there is no attempt to recover all the rent and every effort is made, on the contrary, to keep the taxes as low as possible, there is still a speculative value in these lands—that is, the privilege of collecting rent in the districts is still considered valuable.

However, because this value is much less than similar privileges in the cities, these district values have been hard hit by the depression so much so that they got behind on their bond interest.

Then a thing was done that will be remembered with shame when the people get their economies on straight. What happened is that the bondholders were "put through the wringer," and bought out at discounts running sometimes over 30 per cent, and bought out with federal money furnished for the refinancing. Of course it must be remembered in this connection that not a cent of our federal revenue is taxed against land!

It must also be kept in mind that these districts are in the heart of California where the state's fine highways system is at its best, and that not a cent of the expense of these highways is taxed against land!

Then, too, we have a sales tax which has reduced our school taxes about 80 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation, thus lifting that much more of the tax from land.

All in all, the receivers of rent have been well cared for.
Stockton, Calif.

L. D. BECKWITH.

A FUTILE CONTROVERSY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

There is among Georgists a controversy which has always seemed to me unnecessary, namely, on the question, "Does rent enter into price?" I have never been able to see that there is any real disagreement as to the answer to this question; but whether that answer is "Yes" or "No," all depends on what the question means to the individual answering it. If it means to him that rent, together with wages and interest, is a part of the price which has to be charged for commodities, then the obvious answer is "Yes." On the other hand, if the question means to him that prices of commodities are high because of the fact that rent has to be paid, then the answer is "No."

The latter interpretation of the question was, I think, the interpretation usually in mind until comparatively recently, and, therefore, the older Georgists agreed with Ricardo that rent did not enter into price. It was Mr. Emil Jorgensen, I think, who first prominently insisted that rent did enter into price, and this because his interpretation of the question was as first above given, and not because he had any real difference of opinion about the effect of rent on prices. This is clearly indicated by the following statement from page 31 of his book: "Did Henry George Confuse the Single Tax?": "The illustrious Scotchman (Adam Smith) knew as well as the next man that rent never operated to make the price of goods go up—in other words, that it did not result in making the goods produced on the high-rent lands any higher in price than the goods produced on the low-rent lands."

The moral to be drawn from the controversy is to avoid making a statement that rent does or does not enter into price, unless the statement is modified or enlarged so as to make its meaning clear.

Since the above was written a friend has sent me an apropos quotation from a book by the British economist, Alfred Marshall, as follows: "But it is easier to interpret the classical doctrine that (rent does not enter into the cost of production) in a sense in which it is not true, and to scoff at it, than in the sense in which it was intended and is true. It seems best, therefore, to avoid the phrase."

Boston, Mass.

JOHN S. CODMAN.

WANTED—MORE EXACT INFORMATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

"The Dilemma of Communists" in the last number of LAND AND FREEDOM is a timely antidote for Marxian narcotics now so freely distributed in many places. It leads me to suggest that you might fill a long-felt want by tabulating some statistics concerning the condition of labor in Russia.

Quite a number of publications of communistic origin have reached my desk. They are devoted pretty much to depicting Russia as a militious nation of mirth and song. Red armies and athletic girls in shorts, all ablaze with joy and patriotism, swarming about the Kremlin.

Collective farms, factories, power plants and other achievemants illustrated in approved Standard Oil and General Motors fashion. Comely nomads and factory girls surrounding Stalin, like Father Divine at Krum Elbow.

It strikes me these pictures and fulsome praise are not so much to the point in proving the success of communism or failure of "capitalism." One might gather up any amount of such pictures in the illustrated papers and magazines of all "capitalist" countries.

What seems to me so strangely lacking in this Russian propaganda, is data concerning the compensation meted out to these proletariats for the work they do. Following Chodorov's contribution, will you be kind enough to publish some information regarding wages and modes of living in this Russian Eldorado.

Digging the Volga Canal ranks as a great achievement. Can you tell us the class of labor that performed the work and wages received? Do they observe the Marxian rule: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs?"

There is no desire on my part of be captious, but a suspicion that the literature coming to my desk does not show more than one side of the shield. Communism has been in full swing in Russia for twenty years with its planned economy. Wages should be far in advance of what they are in capitalist countries, but are they? Please tell us.

Seattle, Washington.

OLIVER T. ERICKSON.

SOME THOUGHTS ON CONCENTRATION ON A SINGLE STATE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

An excellent circular letter has been received from the Henry George Constitutional "Committee On Organization And Action." The letter "talks turkey" and, in the parlance of the proletariat, it puts every Single Taxer "on the spot." The letter concludes by requesting each recipient to answer one way or another—"count me in or count me out."

Perhaps some of we Single Taxers are too diffident about getting into action—too lackadaisical about centralization of time, energy, finances and location, but there may be some who yet believe that the most logical plan for action has not been advanced. With due respect for the Committee's selection of Michigan as the scene of action, we arise to ask what determined this selection? Does this state offer the line of least resistance? Is it the most representative state?

Our curiosity leads us to learn that the following five States and District present the following situation as of the last federal survey:

State	Urban Pop.	Rural Pop.	Farm and Bldgs. values
District of Columbia.....	100%	0.0%	\$ 0,000,000,
Rhode Island	92.4	7.6	34,508,000

Massachusetts	90.2	9.8	773,663,000
Michigan	68.2	31.8	341,000,000
North Dakota.....	16.6	83.4	951,000,000

U. S. Totals..	56.2	43.8	\$47,879,838,000
----------------------	------	------	------------------

In selecting a state for taxational action, we believe that the prime question is, shall the state be dominantly urban or rural? In other words, which are more vulnerable to taxation talks and legislative action, farmers or flat dwellers? Which class is the immediate victim of ground-rent exactions?

The next question is which state presents the least number of constitutional obstructions to the inauguration, or wider application, of site-value taxation? Personally, I do not know the constitutional limitations set up in any of the five foregoing localities except those of Massachusetts. In the Bay State an old Act of the legislature provides that a "betterment tax" may be levied upon land values which result from public service—an old Act which has been on the books since the early days when the first publicly-constructed turnpike was financed by assessing the value of land resulting from this public service. This Act has passed the Supreme Court's scrutiny as to its constitutionality, and long has been in use in a desultory, incomplete and unpublicized manner. Our Constitution also follows the national custom of requiring the taxing of personal property except in certain exemptions.

The Massachusetts picture thus is shown to be one where half the usual tax battle may be avoided by authority of the "betterment tax" statute. The personal-property-tax obstacle may be coped with by a non-discriminatory reduction in personal-property valuations down to a very nominal amount—an amount which meets with the constitutional requirement to tax this class of wealth—a reduction which would impose the least load upon labor and capital.

Perhaps Michigan offers an equally inviting prospect as to legal limitations. We do not know. Whether or not, Massachusetts' population presents a far greater percentage of immediate victims of ground-rent exploitation than does Michigan; 90.2 per cent in the Bay State as against 68.2 per cent in the Wolverine State. In answer to this comparison it may be argued that such mode of procedure appeals to the tenant's pocket-book rather than to his understanding, but we have to "be shown" that the altruism of Michigan muddlists ranks higher than that of the canned culture of our state of mind.

Many of we Single Taxers cannot afford to attend a Single Tax congress and substitute action for words in a centralized campaign which, in principle, we heartily endorse; nor can we afford immediately to dispatch a devalued dollar to each individual, or nucleus, which advises us of its determination to go over the top pronto, because these number more than a few—a number which at once defeats the centralization principle.

Personally we believe that the Henry George Congress is the most appropriate body about which to centralize for organization and action, because it appears to be the largest representation of all the Single Tax factions. It appears to be the only faction acting in parliamentary-congressional manner periodically at divers points.

This communication is not to be construed as an ultimatum to the effect that if you do not fight in my backyard I wont fight at all. It is offered merely to suggest and to learn about the selection of a state for campaign action. There may be a better battle ground than either Michigan or Massachusetts. In other words, has the Committee on Organization and Action a better campaign outline than any other Single Tax nucleus or free lance?

If LAND AND FREEDOM is in a position to act as a clearing-house, perhaps many Single Taxers would like to learn campaign specifications of each Single Tax group which evidently prefers its own methods. Perhaps each group would inform us why "less than 10,000" of all the Single Taxers in this nation failed to sign up with Secretary Rule on the dotted line (not meaning that Mr. Rule is on the dotted line). Perhaps the great army of silent Single Taxers will inform us why Secretary Rule cannot count them either in or out.

In any event, is there a better place than Massachusetts or Michigan for "Organization and Action?"

Fall River, Mass.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

THE MAJOR CRIME OF THE AGES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I think it safe to say that a vast majority of our citizens do not know with any precision what the "Single Tax" is. The HGSSS is doing wonderful educational work. But the scattered disciples throughout the country seem not able to accomplish much individually. Would we not accomplish more by stating our case in more aggressive language, forgetting for the time the improved tax aspect of the subject, great as that is?

We propose to abolish landlordism without direct compensation to present land owners. Why not put the proposition in that form directly and often? Landlordism is the major crime of the ages. It is the cause of all class poverty, crime and war, in all countries. It is the cause of classes; class jealousy and bitterness; class want and misery; class pride, extravagances and waste; of huge fortunes, and widespread distress and indigence.

The institution of landlordism was introduced into this country from Europe. Now that land here is all "owned," landlordism is doing here what it has done there. Look at the farmers calling for government dole; the spreading slums in every city; the ten or twelve millions of unemployed; the constant increase of farm tenancy. No New Deal remedies have checked nor even reduced the onward march of these evils.

The Socialists and Communists see this condition and are urging their remedies, and may eventually put them in effect,—by force, if they cannot by the ballot. The fascists also see these growing conditions, and propose to crystalize them into permanence by force, with a standing army and concentration camps. We who believe in democracy, know that the one and only thing that can preserve democracy is to restore free land to the people, as we have free water, free air, free sunshine.

Our proposition, like the avoidance of sin, is one that does not have two sides. Can we not invent more methods of impressing the urgency of the Single Tax upon those who do not know what they need so much to know?—for much good or evil can happen in a generation or two.

Oshkosh, Wis.

JOHN HARRINGTON.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

THE death of Andrew P. Canning of Chicago, which occurred on September 10, is a great loss to the Henry George movement. Mr. Canning was born in Glasgow, Scotland. In 1869 he came to America when he was fifteen years old. His death was a shock to his family and friends, for he was apparently recovering from an operation and seemingly on the road to recovery. He was one of the real orators of our movement. He was a friend and subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM for a long time. He had been active in the real estate business in Chicago since 1893. He is survived by his widow and two sons, Gordon of Evanston, attorney in Chicago, and Graeme Canning, professor of zoology in the University of Tennessee. The notice of his death was received from Mr. Gordon Canning, and we may perhaps be pardoned for quoting from this communication. Mr. Canning writes: "Knowing of your long friendship with my father and his great admiration for you I wanted to convey the notice of his death personally." Andrew Canning was regarded as an authority on Robert Burns and could quote from him *ad libitum*. It is interesting to reflect that at the time he passed away many of his friends from Chicago were gathered in Toronto to uphold the cause to which so many of his years had been devoted.

An admirable review of Professor George Geiger's "Theory of the

Land Question," appears in the *Standard* of Sydney, Australia, from the practised pen of S. V. Larkin.

THE New Frontier Lecture Guild has been started by the Graded Tax Committee of this city. Mr. Walter Fairchild and Mr. Laue are prepared to cover dates in Ohio and Pennsylvania between October 17 and October 29, but both will be available locally after that and before they leave. The work of the Frontier Lecture Guild is purely educational and entirely separate from legislative effort. Several measures sponsored by the Graded Tax Committee are awaiting consideration by the City Council.

THE annual Henry George Birthday Meeting, for many years a feature of the first September Sunday, was held this year at Arden on Sunday, Sept. 4; Harry W. Hetzel presiding. Speakers were Harold Sudell, Julian Hickok, Grace Isabel Colbron, Katherine F. Ross and Thomas Jefferson Davis. There was a very good attendance in the beautiful little open-air theatre designed by Frank Stephens. His ashes lie in front of the big rock that backs the stage.

Another who was sadly missed was Edwin (Ned) Ross, for many years the genial chairman of that Birthday Meeting. This was the first meeting since his death.

THERE are few papers that come to our desk in which fundamental economics are taught so simply and effectively as in *Cause and Effect*, from Foley, Alabama, and edited by C. R. Walker.

WITH the great voice of Peter Witt in Toronto still sounding in our ears we are doubly gratified by the receipt from Mr. Witt of an autographed copy of his pamphlet containing his broadcast over the radio on Abraham Lincoln, the Man of Sorrow. It is published and copyrighted by the William Feather Company. Lancaster Greene, B. W. Burger and Charles H. Ingeisoll are similarly honored.

W. L. CROSMAN of Revere, Mass., writes: "There are the indifferent persons who do not concern themselves about our economic ills. They probably have a steady job and are not concerned about the jobless brother, believing he could find employment if he tried. Such persons are self-satisfied. They belong to the same class as those who think there is something wrong with the economic setup, but 'Let George do it.' What chance is there for progress along the lines of justice and freedom when so many are obsessed with the idea of keeping abreast of the times concerning most all sports? Watch the pages that street-car riders read."

Land and Liberty of London, tells us of the determination of the London County Council to promote land values legislation in Parliament. This is good news indeed.

THE Rural Problem is the title of an article which appears in the *Louisiana Teachers' Journal* from the pen of Dr. J. H. Dillard, a lifelong Georgeist. He concludes: "Good schools, good roads and other improvements are all right. But whatever we may do, the basic means for rural advancement and for assuring rural progress is more division of the land and more homes held by the people in their own right."

JOSEPH F. COWERN of St. Paul writes: "You get out a fine paper. It must be quite a job to find so much interesting material."

BOTH the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune* had long accounts of the purchase of the building for the Henry George School by the trustees of the School. Both accounts were in the form of an interview with Dr. Chodorov.

MRS. ELIZABETH M. PHILLIPPS, inventor of the original "Landlord's Game," later popularized as the game of Monopoly, writes: "LAND AND FREEDOM is getting better and better. It seems to have more articles that appeal to outsiders and these are the fellows we want to educate. By the way, your Jones Itemized Rent Bill is one of the best things I have seen. I use it on my hopefuls."

THERE was a Henry George Birthday Anniversary in Chicago on September 2, and among the speakers were J. Benton Schaub, John L. White and Francis Neilson. Geo. C. Olcott acted as toastmaster.

C. LEON DE ARYAN is a candidate in the San Diego, California, primaries for Republican nomination for the Assembly. Mr. De Arian is editor of *The Broom*. In an article in the San Diego *Transcript* accompanied by a portrait of the candidate, he says: "The rent accruing from publicly created land values is sufficient for all public expense of administration, and is the only source to which the public treasury is entitled for revenue."

FOR a privately printed book the "Life of Francis Maguire," by John C. Rose, is receiving much favorable comment. Those who desire to know more of this interesting little volume detailing the life of a devoted worker in the cause should communicate with Mr. John C. Rose, 491 Norton Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

"YOUR Comment and Reflection" in the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM is the best thing of its kind I have ever read," writes Francis Neilson.

AN admirable letter appears in a recent issue of the Gloucester, Mass., *Times* from the pen of that tried veteran, James B. Ellery, under the title "Economics as a Science." A statement which we must attribute to a mistake of the printer is that "The Henry George school has several classes throughout the country." It has several and more classes in all the principal cities.

E. H. BOECK of St. Louis, has circulated many earnest appeals for help for the California campaign. In one of these he says, "Let us not desert in this fight for new fields which would require years of effort to create the interest that has been aroused in California."

IN the *Evening Bulletin* of Philadelphia, September 2, is a column article, "A Noted Philadelphian's Career Recalled," in it the life of Henry George is reviewed. There is nothing in it that will be new to the followers of the Prophet but it is fair and friendly and will induce the reader to go further.

Pomeroy's Chatterbox, published by Edgar Pomeroy of San Francisco, calling itself "A Journal of Sport and Thought," is a house organ of the Pomeroy Sports Company. An editorial favoring the Single Tax appears on the first page of the September issue.

DR. C. J. LAVERY of Aberdeen, South Dakota, is indefatigable in letter writing to newspapers. He is an advocate of the shifting of all taxes from transportation facilities to land values in exchange for a cut in carrying charges of approximately fifty per cent.

JAMES B. ELLERY of Annisquam, Mass., says: "I am for organization."

J. F. GOODE of Sangudo, Alberta, was present at the Single Tax Conference in Toronto. Sangudo is a village run on Single Tax principles.

IN a letter received from Col. Victor A. Rule, secretary of the Tax Relief Association, he says: "Your paper still continues my favorite in its field. Congratulations!"

ONE of the students of the Henry George School recently was discussing current problems with a communist. Since they could only get together in agreeing that the problem of civilization is the increase in poverty in the face of increasing production, the student from HGSSS said, "I should be glad to take a course at the Worker's School if you will take a course at the HGSSS. I am learning more than I ever thought possible, and I am encouraged to seek truth wherever the chips may fall." The communist girl replied that she has been employed by the CP for several years and she was unwilling to risk learning anything which might make her a less effective worker for the party.

THE profusely illustrated article on the autogiro in the September *Popular Mechanics* magazine, entitled "The Missing Link in Aviation," by John H. Miller, is, in reality, by John M. Miller, an able Georgeist. Mr. Miller is a leading American authority on the autogiro. He holds many "firsts." He was the first American to own an autogiro; the first person to fly across the continent in one; the first to fly one west of the Mississippi river; the first to loop-the-loop with an autogiro. And he was the first instructor to hold a summer Henry George extension class. This class was held at South Egremont, Massachusetts.

THE death of Cardinal Hayes recalls the fact that some months ago he recommended for Catholic reading, Dr. S. Vere Pearson's work on population. Some of our readers know of this work in which Dr. Pearson treats of fundamental economic. He is a confirmed Georgeist.

LOUIS ADAMIC's recent work, "My America," quotes approvingly from "The Difficulties of Democracy," by Joseph Dana Miller in the *International Journal of Ethics* (London, England).

ANOTHER book from the pen of Francis Neilson, "The Man at the Cross Roads," is announced. Mr. Neilson is now at work on a volume of his reminiscences.

WE are glad to welcome *The Free People*, Single Tax organ of the Farmers and Workers Party of South Africa, from Johannesburg.

DR. S. A. SCHNEIDMAN, member of the faculty of the Henry George School of Social Science, addressed the Men's Club of the Queens Evangelical Church, Queens Village, Long Island, on Tuesday, September 27. Subject: How to untax business and remove the causes of the depression. There were thirty men present. A number signified their interest and desire to enroll in the forthcoming class in Fundamental Economics and Social Philosophy at Public School 109, Queens Village.

THE *Northport Journal* of Northport, Long Island, in a recent issue, contained a highly appreciative sketch of "Miss C. O. Schetter, "Economist, Artist, Philosopher, Traveler."

WE wonder how many of our subscribers will note that they are given in this issue forty pages in place of the usual thirty-two. This is at an extra cost of eighty dollars which we hope our friends will appreciate.

THE London and Liverpool papers gave liberal reports of Louis Wallis' address before the Rotarians which is reproduced on another page. Among the papers to give extracts from the address was the Liverpool *Echo*, the *Evening Express*, and others. Different editions kept running notices for successive days until the total number of readers reached over a million.