

declined the article, one sapient editor declaring that the subject had been worn threadbare.

To those who have learned from Henry George the truth that the seeming overproduction is in reality underconsumption, the present situation offers an opportunity to at least try to stir the dull and stupid editors of the country into opening up their columns for a serious discussion of this great issue. As we have often advised our readers, the most valuable service that they can render to the cause of economic freedom is that of stirring up the newspapers and other journals to publish essential facts relating to present economic conditions. Whoever you are, or wherever you may be, you can write letters protesting against the conspiracy of silence with which the real cause of industrial depression is ignored. Challenge the editors to say whether they believe that it is in the natural order of things that men should suffer because they can produce far more than they can use. Ask what the editors think about this omnipresent problem of too much of everything in a world where everyone, with the exception of a beggarly handful, wants far more than they now get. Tell them that you will give their readers the true explanation of insufficient demand for goods if they will allow you space. You will often be ignored, but here and there you will strike an editor who will think that his readers may be interested and this will be your opportunity. In any case, this is your job. See if you cannot stir up the animals a bit.

Antagonistic Farm Economic Policies

OUT of the confused and conflicting expert advice and suggestions for restoring prosperity to the American farmers, put forward by editors, economists, bankers, and politicians, there have emerged what may be regarded as policies favored by two opposing schools, whose study of the problems involved have brought them to radically differing conclusions. On one side there are those who look to some form of government aid;—further extensions of the Federal Land loan system; a higher protective tariff on all foreign farm products; national regulation of, and subsidies for, co-operative marketing associations; Federal maintenance of prices of staple crops by the purchase and storage on government account of the surplus over domestic needs; and the regulation, through the co-operation of the Department of Agriculture, of cultivation, so as to prevent recurring excess production that forces down prices.

As against these plans for what may be termed "prosperity by legislation," there has been manifested a widespread sentiment, found largely among the farmers themselves, and those who by their close business relations with them are in a position to judge of the causes of present un-

favorable conditions in agriculture and the most practicable method of improving them, to the effect that the permanent solution of the farm relief problem is not to be found in paternalistic legislation, but in reducing the farmer's cost of living, through lower tariff and other taxes; cheaper implements, fertilizers and other supplies; and cheaper transportation. Just how this can be brought about may not be clearly foreseen, but the dividing line between the advocates of the two policies, roughly speaking, is that while one school looks to an increase of prices for what the farmer sells, and price maintenance on an artificial basis, the other regards the farmer as a consumer, who is, first of all, interested in low prices for what he buys, low taxes, and reduced freight charges. Behind these conflicting theories there lies the issue of the high wages paid to workers in the tariff protected industries, who are accustomed to much higher standards of living than prevail on the great majority of American farms, which in one form or another will affect the future course of all efforts to put the farmer's earning power on an equality with that of the industrial worker.

Good News For Zion

TIDINGS of great joy come from Palestine, where under a British Protectorate the long-dispersed Jewish people are permitted to live on an equality with the other inhabitants of that land, and an effort is being made to establish a National centre for the Jews of all the world. The sentiment behind the Zionists movement is wholly admirable, and if the plans for restoration are wisely drawn, and faithfully carried out, the result should be to prove that the miserable condition of most of the people of Palestine has been due to Turkish misgovernment, and that under political and religious freedom the land may again be made fruitful and self-sustaining.

There is, however, a discordant note in the song of final triumph over the adversity of many centuries that suggests that the prosperity that is coming will not be for all the people, but for the relatively few who own the land on which the newcomers, as well as the former population, must live. In an interview published in the New York press a representative of the Zionist organization gave as one reason why American Jews should take part in the development of Palestine the wonderful possibilities for making money by buying and selling land. He pointed to Tel-Aviv, a new city built near Jaffa, as showing an increase in the value of lots running from 100 to 300 per cent.; certainly a good thing for the fortunate speculators. But how about the immigrants who want land to build homes upon? Is it to their interest that land prices should soar, as they certainly will if there is an increase in population? Perhaps all the new arrivals will be able to make a living by speculating in real estate, so they need not worry over high land prices. What of the natives of the country,

Christian, Jewish, or Arab? Is their condition likely to be improved by making it harder for the landless to get land? Will the country as a whole become more prosperous because a lot of parasites and non-producers are able to manipulate land sales so as to boost prices? If the increasing values of Palestine land were taken for public purposes, and devoted to providing the essentials of a well governed community, the situation would be different. Until they learn better the sincere and well-meaning Zionists will be working only for the benefit of a landlord and land-speculating class.

Endorsing A Statesman

"THIS talk about the high cost of living is all bunk. Secretary Hoover had the right idea, when he told how good times were coming because the ravages of the boll weevil were putting up the price of cotton. I see he is advising the President that there ought to be higher tariff taxes on foreign farm products. That will put up food prices to the 60,000,000 dwellers in the cities and towns, so they'll buy less, and the farmers won't have to work so hard getting out a lot of stuff that the city people now eat. If Hoover will get a law passed prohibiting all these factory hands asking for more wages, just because they have to pay more for their food, the rural real estate business ought to have a boom, as everybody will want to move out into the country and go to growing vegetables."

Overheard at the Moron Club

"WHO says that there are only 15,000 Communists in the United States? What about all these New England textile workers who have had their wages cut down 10 per cent.? And these thousands in Schenectady who are out of work because of lack of demand for what they were making? Then there are about a million farmers who are just on the edge of bankruptcy. If all these fellows aren't on the way to Bolshevism, it's because they want something worse. I tell you we need a lot more laws to put down discontent, and keep the country as prosperous as it is now."

YOU and I side with the public interest. Let the value of land be assessed independently of the buildings upon it, and upon such valuation let contributions be made to those public services which create the value. This is not to disturb the balance of equity, but to redress it. The unfairness is in the present state of things. Why should one man reap what another man sows? We would give to the landowner all that is his, but we would prevent him taking something which belongs to other people.—SIR HENRY CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.

SYDNEY SMITH said the Anglo Saxon race was made for two things—"to manufacture calico and steal land."

New Developments in Denmark

(Concluded from March-April issue of LAND AND FREEDOM)

IN 1921 the Municipality of Copenhagen sanctioned a bill changing the communal property tax to a land value tax with a tax on increase of values. This measure undoubtedly influenced later bills, especially the proposition now under consideration. The bill proposed to do away with property taxes, to bring all the real property taxes into a settled "old tax" and to introduce a land value tax of 1½ per cent. as well as a tax of 1 per cent. on increase of land value. And finally the bill contained a provision for a so-called building tax of 3 per cent. on the buildings increase of value.

In the summer of 1922 the Government presented a bill for a change in state taxation of real property, a measure which was adopted in August of that year. By this bill the State tax on real property was divided into a land value tax of 1½ per thousand and a smaller improvement tax of 1.1 per thousand on buildings with an exemption of 10,000 crowns.

This little step in the direction of a land value tax could naturally have no deep influence as yet or bring about much shift in taxation. Its importance lay in the fact that it legalized the valuation of land and gave this valuation a definite meaning in tax assessments. The Government worked out another measure for a communal land value tax, which however was not even presented to Parliament, as the Minister of the Interior declared for a postponement to await the result of the land valuation of 1923.

All these different measures show a definite line of advance in the frank repudiation of taxation of values created by thrift and industry, and in the assertion of the principle of using community-created values as a basis for taxation.

Three political parties can lay claim to this advance. It was a Copenhagen Commission with a Social Democrat as Chairman and a Radical as spokesman, which worked out the first attempt at a tax on increase of land values and at a definite valuation of land without improvements. It was a Government of the Left which put through the first experimental valuation for taxation purposes. It was a Radical Government which, with the aid of the Left and the Social Democrats, put through the general valuation of the land of the entire country and which presented the first bill for a State and Communal land value tax. It was a Government of the Left which, with the aid of the Radicals and Social Democrats, passed the first bill for State taxation of land values, and now the Social Democratic Government, with the aid of the two other Democratic Parties, is working to put through the first Communal land value tax.

The bill now presented by the Government shows the influence of all that has gone before. It bears as well the trade mark of a bill which the Government believes pos-