surrounded and served by all the facilities of a modern city, as though it were an ordinary farmstead. Conversation with a town official brought this case to my notice. He could see certain injustices in the situation, but the idea that so simple an incident might furnish the key to the riddle of economics was in his opinion preposterous.

What kind of facts do we need? Can we find them in the projected programmes of slum improvement? Already the question of land values in relation to such projects is beginning to present a serious problem. And the haphazard development contains illustrations that will provide convincing evidence. Let us decide the kind of facts we need, assemble them and put them to work.

Brookline, Mass. GORDON L. MACLAREN.

ARE THE ECONOMIC LAWS NATURAL LAWS?

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I deplore your constant use of the expressions "natural taxation," natural rights and natural laws. Henry George followed the 19th century style in using words. I have no doubt he knew exactly what he meant by them. An exact scholar would not be confused. But most of us are not exact scholars. The words nature and natural rights have a pernicious history in the English language, beginning even before the time of Rosseau.

I commend a study of the works of the late Prof. Irving Babbitt to land taxers in that connection. As a result of that history these words have about as many meanings as there are readers of them. They serve as a basis for the antithesis of exact reasoning, and often confuse the idea and furnish opportunity for dangerous misconceptions. Land reform is nothing more than the application of human intelligence and common sense to problems created by human experience. To call it "natural" might easily lead to the idea, so often conveyed by the word, that it is something extra human, or a supernatural mystery, which it is not.

Cincinnati, O. F. B. MCCONAUGHY.

REPLY

Whether we choose to cite natural law in the movement of the heavenly bodies as furnishing an analogy, or whether we speak of the natural order as merely the sequence of cause and effect, makes but little difference. We need not summon Rousseau either in proof or disproof. His extravangances need not concern us. We assume a moral order in the universe; a physical law in the physical world; shall we then dispute economic sequence of cause and consequence? Shall we ignore also the lesson indicated when government is instituted and land values spring into being and are increased as the functions and services of government increase? If this does not point to a natural law, to which also the law of justice and morals is closely allied, we do not know the meaning of words.—EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.

QUESTION OF NAME

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

From time to time discussion rages over whether Single Taxers are adequately named. This is doubtless important, but it seems just as important adequately to designate their opponnets.

Multiple taxers is a term sometimes used. It designates, just as does the term Single Taxers. But it does not describe.

Multiple taxers believe in levying a number of taxes on every one. In addition, they believe in levying several other taxes, which will be passed to those on whom the first set of taxes are levied. As a corrolary they propose exemption of land, so that the payer of the two above set of taxes will be required to pay a high price, and give a large mortgage and on which he will pay much interest, when he establishes his homestead. The mortgage and the interest constitute tax No. 3.

Each of us is therefore loaded up under three well defined systems of taxation.

Triple taxers might be fairly discriptive of the opponents of Single Taxers.

High taxers might be a broader, more readily grasped, and consequenty more easily popularized term. By contrast, Single Taxers, standing for the extinction of the systems of the High Taxers, would become Low Taxers.

Madison, Wisc. CRAIG RALSTON.

FROM A NEW ZEALAND VETERAN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am much too busy to write you at length, but must say that LAND AND FREEDOM is always interesting, and with such an immense territory as your country comprises, you should have by this time a fairly large clientele. I am always wondering when the United States are likely to make an advance. It seems to me that your line of least resistance is the tariff. Woodrow Wilson was able to cut off 28 per cent of the American tariff at one fell swoop, imposing an income tax to replace the revenue. True, the war has given the tariff-mongers a chance of which they have taken the fullest advantage but the prevailing high tariff is working such mischief that it ought to yield to something like a strong attack, and even an income tax might be accepted by our men in the meantime, because it would be much easier to arouse opposition to that than to indirect taxation. However, I have never expected anything from the new Roosevelt regime inasmuch as Roosevelt, unlike Wilson, has come into power committed to nothing of a definite or tangible character.

In this country we are in the throes of industrial depression for some time now. To Henry George men the cause is quite clear, but it is wonderful how perverse men are, even those who affect an interest in social reform. The latest craze in this country is called the Douglas Social Credit Plan, but it is terribly respectable, and will soon run its course and go out of fashion.

Still, there are more Henry George men in this country now than ever before, and we keep on talking, .writing—and hoping. Though we have no organization in this country to push electoral reform, most of Henry George's followers both here and in Australia are in favor of proportional representation, and for my own part I am convinced that it is of great importance for the reason that were the proportional system in operation, we would have continual representation in Parliament. The single-member electorate make minority representation impossible, unless by accident.

Wellington, New Zealand. P. J. O'REGAN.

MORE OF NATURAL LAW

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

May I say a word of warning that the kindly article by Chester C Platt, page 185 in the Nov.—Dec. issue, may be misinterpreted?

I refer to his comment at the bottom of the first column, page 186 where he speaks of the belief of Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown that "we make too much of the theory that there are certain natural laws sacred because really of divine origin." Then he adds: "Consequently it is said we are always seeking natural laws of economics and then trying to conform to them. I know that a large school of Single Taxers hold to this view. Mr. Beckwith of *No Taxes* says in a recent article . . . . . "

"This, I know from experience, will be accepted as descriptive of the natural-law school to which I am proud to belong. One sure way to have weeds in a garden is not to have anything else there. In the absence of a correct statement of our position, this language in Mr. Platt's article opens the way to a gross misconception.

The trouble is in the word "sacred." Perhaps it must be admitted