

mutter, 'perhaps this would be better.' And then scratch, scratch, scratch. One day they threatened to cut the margins off, top, bottom and sides, but an inconsiderate foreman interfered.

But these little things were all on the surface. They might swear, but they loved him, as we all did. 'It is a way compositors have.'

"And so we lived our lives in the effort to please him, made happy by his presence, and going home at night sustained by the hope of seeing him on the morrow, disappointed if he didn't come, and doubly glad when he appeared after an absence of a few days. Nobody loved him more than we did. To us no better man ever lived, and I, for one, never expect to meet another as good, as sincerely and truly noble as Henry George."

Free Trade—Pro and Con

PRO

By J. RUPERT MASON

THE most immediate opportunity facing us, it seems to me, is to fairly scream to every one within hearing to urge his Senators and Congressmen to support the reciprocal trade treaty efforts of this Administration. The opponents are sure to be ferocious!

Now that the President has appealed for authority to provide greater freedom of trade between nations, let us not fail to give the suggestion support in every way at the disposal of any of us.

No one realized more completely than Henry George that taxation of land values, alone, would not eliminate unjust privileges, and that the abolition of trade barriers between nations constituted just as integral and essential a step before justice can prevail.

Many Georgeists appear to have all but forgotten this, for they have all but limited their thinking to the importance of government collecting all of the publicly created rental value of land, instead of only part of it, as at present.

Henry George, who launched the Georgeist movement, was of a much broader turn of mind than are his followers. No one can deny that he saw the necessity of collecting all the rent of land. But he also saw the question of Freedom in its larger aspects. In an editorial in *The Standard*, signed by him (reprinted by C. Le Baron Goeller), we find the following:

"As for those of our friends who think we ought to leave protection undisturbed until we have succeeded in taking land values for public benefit, and those who express the same underlying thought by asking why free land will not lead to free trade much more naturally than free trade will lead to free land, it seems to me that they can hardly fully realize the great object which is to be attained

by the Single Tax, nor yet the practical means by which the adoption of this Single Tax is to be secured. Like those who oppose us, or fail to go with us from sheer inability to see how the taxation of land values can abolish poverty, their mental gaze seems to be concentrated on what we propose to do, ignoring what we propose to do away with. The great benefit of the appropriation of land values (i.e., economic rent) to public use would not be in the revenue that it would give, so much as in the abolition of restrictions upon the free play of productive forces it would involve or permit. It is not by the mere levying of a tax that we propose to abolish poverty; it is by 'securing the blessings of liberty.'

"The abolition of all taxes that restrain production or hamper exchange, the doing away with all monopolies and special privileges that enable one citizen to levy toll upon the industries of other citizens, is an integral part of our program. To *merely* take land values in taxation for public purposes would *not of itself* suffice. If the proceeds were spent in maintaining useless parasites or standing armies, labor might still be oppressed and harried by taxes and special privileges. We might still have poverty, and people might still beg for alms or die of starvation. What we are really aiming at is . . . 'the freedom of the individual to use his labor and capital in any way that may seem proper to him and will not interfere with the equal rights of others' and 'to leave to the producer the full fruits of his exertion.' To do this it is necessary to abolish land monopoly. And it is *also necessary to abolish tariffs*."

By enlisting aggressively with this Administration with regard to its present attempts to lessen trade barriers, the Administration leaders *might* discover that there is much about which we both think alike.

We know that any lowering of tariff barriers must increase the difficulty of private interests continuing to pocket for themselves as much of the publicly created rental value of land as at present. Very few land speculators have caught this, so they may not be as vicious in their opposition to Secretary Hull's aims, as they are to any taxation of land values.

This seems to me to be the most concrete opportunity facing us in many years. I hope it may be soberly considered by every lover of liberty.

CON

By PETER D. HALEY

All the free trade in the world is not going to make better the lot of the German masses. Prior to the World War the German people were faring better than the people of England despite the fact of England's democracy, because landlordism was a little less intense in Germany than in England. The mass of people in tariff-protected

England today are faring as well as they did under the free trade regime of some years back.

Free trade can only intensify the suffering of the producing masses, since trade is the food which feeds the maw of rent collectors. There will be more nearly a parity of opportunity to all in a county where there is little trade. Trade breeds rent and rent is the vampire which sucks the producing masses to emaciation. Bright and Cobden soon came to realize that the benefits they expected from free trade did not materialize, that the rent collector absorbed it all and more.

Man's prosperity or well-being is determined by his relation to the land. All the tariffs in the world cannot have any influence on this. Free trade cannot affect it. There is no need of all this stupidity about free trade, trade barriers and other hokum. Man's well-being is governed by the terms on which he contacts land. There is no other formula. Free trade would be a virtue in a free society—a competitive economy. It is positively harmful to the producing masses in our land monopoly society, our sweepstakes economy.

The farmers of the South and the West have been free to engage in tariff-protected commodities. There is no law against farmers processing. All the farmers need to is to meet the terms of land monopoly. Tariffs apply alike to all the ports and to every inch of our millions of square miles of free trade area. This cry of the North and East having robbed the South and the West is the sheerest bunk. The South and the West have men who have fared as well as any in the East. Too, we have our millions in poverty and distress just the same as is found under the shadows of the tariff-protected factories of the East. These lines—North, South, East and West—mean nothing in economics. If Texas would open opportunity to the masses to contact the land on equal terms, it would soon be seen that the masses would be faring well.

Tariffs have nothing to do with our relation to the land, and that ridiculous idea should be liquidated at the earliest moment. Free traders, free silverites and free spenders of the Doc Townsend variety are of the same breed and we should weed them out. The evils society has suffered through ages have come largely from stupidity and not rascality. We are confronted with one crackpot scheme after another. Free silver has been put to sleep but men in high places trot out another will-o'-the-wisp to take its place.

Why cannot man exercise his brain and examine the fundamentals? Why does he have to go from one hokum to another? Land is the source of subsistence. Exchange of labor is the great facilitating factor in production. The terms of bargain are governed by the terms of contacting land for production. Taxation is the instrument to set the terms of contact in a free society.

House to House, Field to Field

By STEPHEN BELL

And he looked for judgment, but behold oppression; for righteousness, but behold a cry.

Woe unto them that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no place, that they may be placed alone in the midst of the earth.

In mine ears, said the Lord, Of a truth many houses shall be desolate, even great and fair, without inhabitant. . . .

Therefore my people are gone into captivity, because they have no knowledge; and their honorable men are famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst.

—ISAIAH.

ALL the wars of conquest waged in recent years, and all previous wars of conquest, have been the natural result of permitting the laying of field to field till there be no place for growing populations, and then trying to create employment by holding domestic markets against "foreigners," by which the economic life of all nations is choked in greater or lesser degree. Nations deficient in natural resources, though failing to adequately develop the resources they have, see supplies and markets abroad which they need, but see no way of acquiring them except by the might of their arms, though each and every one of them has it within its own power to remove half or more of the obstacles in its way by abolishing its own trade barriers.

There can be no doubt that Woodrow Wilson's outline of peace terms which embodied his famous Fourteen Points for a just and durable peace, the third of which called for "the elimination as far as possible of economic barriers," did much to break down the military morale of Germany and shorten the World War. As the German people realized what the old Imperial German Government had gotten them into they rose in revolution against it and it fell. It was the German Republic which sent its delegates to Versailles, where Wilson's Fourteen Points were cast into the discard and the Treaty of Vengeance was imposed on the German Republic.

I need not recite the many years during which the democratic and conciliatory elements in Germany sought ameliorations and concessions from the impossible terms of that treaty. In 1923 a young Austrian housepainter who had been discharged from the Army with the rank of sergeant, led a movement to overthrow the German Republic, declaring that conciliation would win nothing for Germany, and that Germany would get no relief until she was strong enough to take it by force. He failed and was imprisoned. He wrote a book, "Mein Kampf," and after his release from prison continued his efforts.

He had little success until in 1931. In that year, Germany and Austria decided to provide a little relief for themselves by abolishing the tariff wall between them