

that of George. If the person has the right to buy, sell, bequeath, or devise, anything in his possession, it is a corollary that he also has the right to mortgage or pledge the thing which he may sell, bequeath, or devise. How do you explain this?

I realize that when the Single Tax becomes one hundred per cent effective so as to confiscate all rent, as George further elucidates in the same paragraph, there will be no inducement for a land mortgage on the land but in the meantime when the tax takes only a portion of rent it seems that the point I make would apply.

Musselshell, Mont.

LAVERNE HAMILTON.

REPLY

It is rarely that a questioner answers his own question. The last paragraph of Mr. Hamilton's letter is an almost complete answer to the doubts he expresses above.

As Mr. Hamilton correctly quotes, the reply to John C. Rose in the March-April issue stated that "Under the Single Tax there would be no mortgages on land." Taking "only a portion of rent" that Mr. Hamilton postulates is not Single Tax; there is therefore no difference between him and us.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

JAMES MALCOLM COMES BACK AT US

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I regret that in your reply to my letter on the NRA in your issue of March-April you totally misinterpret the main purpose of that communication and unintentionally place me in a false light before your readers. Right at the outset I drew attention to public development, under the auspices of President Roosevelt, of such great enterprises as the Tennessee Valley water power, the St. Lawrence power, the Columbia River power and espousal by him of Boulder Dam in the Colorado River, as being quite in line with the Single Tax philosophy, in that they liberate natural resources for the benefit of the people.

In your reply you ignore this section of my letter and proceed to condemn codes, regulation and other devices of the NRA to meet emergencies and then add: "We did not dream that it ever would be necessary to argue this way with a Henry George man." Well, it certainly was not necessary in my case as I distinctly referred to water power development as logically worthy of praise by Single Taxers, and as an important part of their programme. I also made plain that codes, regulation, etc. should be understood as temporary in their character. In my nearly fifty years of Single Tax activity I do not need to be reminded of the vital difference between emergency or superficial remedies and those which are fundamental, but I shall continue to protest against the mistaken policy of indiscriminate and unjust condemnation of a President just because he does not agree with us on everything. I ask again: Why not give him credit for the stand he has taken on natural or utility monopolies? I recall that our platform contained a declaration for public ownership and operation of these monopolies. Is that declaration to be cast aside and forgotten just when Roosevelt has made it one of the great issues of our time?

Speaking of subjects supposed to be relevant or irrelevant in the consideration of the Single Tax, I recall that Henry George about forty years ago did not hesitate in the old *Standard* and in letters to the daily press to call upon his friends to support Grover Cleveland for president because he showed hostility to the humbug protective tariff. Mr. George took the practical and I think the wise stand of supporting candidates and parties when they showed a desire to go at least a part of the way toward economic freedom. Cleveland probably knew little about the Single Tax but that did not lead Mr. George to dub his accompanying ideas as "monstrous." I submit there is infinitely more reason for us to encourage President Roosevelt in what he is trying to do, notwithstanding the mistakes there may be in the codes, than when Henry George gave his support to Grover Cleveland.

The same was true in the presidential campaign of 1896 when Mr. George heartily by tongue and pen advocated the election of William J. Bryan although he did not agree with him on the money question.

He did this because of Bryan's aggressive attitude against privilege of all kinds and I venture to say that the great mass of Single Taxers agreed with him.

Albany, N. Y.

JAMES MALCOLM.

REPLY

Which only goes to prove that it's all in the point of view. The activities of the administration with reference to the Tennessee Valley the St. Lawrence and Columbia Rivers and Boulder Dam have already so raised land values that speculations (even of the wild cat variety) have very definitely manifested themselves. Were it not for the depression we would have seen in the Tennessee Valley a repetition of the land booms in the California of Henry George's day, and all the resulting evils.

Unless the rent of land is taken by the government all improvements redound only to the benefit of land owners. To the extent that water power is developed so that it renders a service to the community rent rises and wages fall.

The only condition under which the improvements Mr. Malcolm endorses can be of benefit to the people is if the rent these improvements create is taken by the people and better still, of course, if all the rent is taken by the people.

The platform declarations Mr. Malcolm speaks of was made in conjunction with the declaration that the rent of land belongs to the people and must be collected by government. This was the unequivocal position of Henry George.

If it is the ownership and operation of public utilities that we want (and all the corruption and evils that go with it—for they are inevitable under our present system of taxation) let us say so, but let us avoid calling down blessings upon them in the name of Single Tax and Single Taxers.

"By their fruits ye shall know them," seems just as helpful and just as valid now as when it was spoken. Thus far the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt has not brought forth fruit that follows of Henry George can recognize as health-giving or life-sustaining of any permanent good to man.

It is of course a moot question whether it was the course of wisdom to throw our forces to the support of William Jennings Bryan in 1896. A large number of representative Single Taxers did not follow Henry George in this policy and among them were such men as Arthur Stephenson, Frank Stephens, C. B. Fillebrown, William Lloyd Garrison, Whidden Graham, and others—quite a notable group, notwithstanding the more humble figure of the present editor of this paper.

Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

SAYS A GOOD WORD FOR THE NEW YORK TIMES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The Times is in no way friendly to the cause which we of the *Georgian* persuasion are committed, but it has no prejudices concerning our beliefs. We should be appreciative of this liberal breadth of vision and when we read a communication in *The Times* setting forth the cause of Henry George it is our duty (and also an opportunity) to write the editor and let him know there is a lot of us who are of the same belief. My batting average, in getting letters into the columns of *The Times* is only about 300 per cent. I suppose I present the cause too often. Nevertheless, to be fair, we should realize that space in *The Times* is decidedly valuable and that other views have to be given as well as our own. So, please Mr. Editor, will you not make a note of this in your columns and impress upon your readers the fact that our cause can be aided no end by commending all letters or articles which *The Times* may see fit to print which bear on the Georgist philosophy in the right way and spirit. We should always be ready to stand up and be counted and prove to all editors that there is a lot of us in existence. I was a member of *The Times* staff for five years and I know what that means.

Westfield, N. J.

EDWIN J. JONES