

Men go on this earth where they think they can most easily get the provisions of nature. These they know they must have to sustain their lives. The land is *nature*, their medium, the source and container of their livelihood, as water is the source and container of the livelihood of fish, which likewise go, in *their* medium, where they can most easily get it. But, to me, obsession with land in a treatise on man's livelihood is as irrelevant as obsession with water would be in a treatise on the livelihood of fish. To me, it befalls the only real issue; that men must work for their livings, and unless there is to be everlasting dissension and war, men must compensate all others who lighten their toil.

Millions are hungering for a message which they can understand. These will not have to "be educated all over again to the same idea"; they never have been educated at all. And whether they are right or wrong (which is unimportant) many who have had to be re-educated have perceived it as a new idea. How often have I heard them say: "That's a *new* idea, I can understand *that*, but I never could get that Single Tax idea."

Eugene, Oregon.

W. R. B.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

As to terms employed in presentation of the fiscal measure, we recognize the practical usefulness in "A Single Tax on Land Values" with its long-established meaning; and we must all recognize the frequent need of using "*land rent*" (or *ground-rent*), because of badly confused ordinary usage of the word "rent,"—and of similarly using "rental values of land" instead of the less specific scientific term "land values." All this aims simply at *clarifying intended meanings*.

But how can we present "interest" as a scientific term meaning "all returns for the use of capital,—and not merely those that pass from the borrower to the lender" (its meaning "as commonly used"—Henry George in "Progress and Poverty")? For "all returns for the use of capital" includes returns which go neither to the borrower or to the lender—even the vast "returns" *which are obviously distributed to all* by reduced labor costs and resulting in reduced selling prices of products. Such returns have no connection whatever with "interest as commonly used" and do not go "exclusively to capital." Therefore their inclusion makes the term inherently as unclear and unscientific as the term "profits" obviously is. Certainly presenting it as essential to the basic "philosophy of Henry George" is a serious "defect of presentation." He never publicly mentioned interest himself in twenty years of teaching, and himself demonstrated that the increased production due to ordinary using of tools benefits all consumers equally *regardless of ownership*—while above-average using entitles high *wages* to such users, *not* interest to owners.

And does it not discredit that philosophy to tie to it the belief and warning that normally provident and prosperous human beings *will not save wealth* merely to insure against future needs—and *will not lend* it for use as capital (instead of suffering the waste of it which nature decrees for non-use)—unless borrowers guarantee return of *more than is loaned*? "Business men" are naturally against increased outgo to mere lenders, and "scholars" resent inconsiderate pleading.

Followers of Henry George are individually responsible for correcting "defects in presentation" of his basic philosophy.

Even captious objecting is better than blind following—which at best is fanatical.

Reading, Pa.

WALTER G. STEWART.

#### EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

There is no argument against war, under present conditions.

Pacifism is a faith and not a syllogism

London, Canada,

CHRISTINE ROSS BARKER.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

### THE NEW YORK SUN TAKES NOTICE

In recent issues of LAND AND FREEDOM appeared especially prepared articles on the functioning of the United States Housing Authority. The March-April number carried one entitled "Federal Housing," the July-August number had another under the significant title of "Robbing Peter to Pay Paul." Both were painstakingly prepared and were highly critical with respect to the economic unsoundness of government housing projects. The editors and correspondents of LAND AND FREEDOM consider that they must be hitting the high spots in the publication of such timely material. This is further attested by the appearance of editorial comment in the conservative *New York Sun* of November 25. They said: "Recently, in LAND AND FREEDOM, issued by followers of Henry George, a writer said of Federal Housing"—and proceeded to quote from the article in question. Such a notice must be deserved and directly reflects on the value of the publication to editorial writers.

DR. HENRY NEUMANN of The Brooklyn Ethical Culture Society, on Sunday, November 19, delivered an address on Henry George.

GEORGE WHITE, who retired ten years ago from the editorship of *The Daily Record* of Long Branch, died at his home at Asbury Park, N. J., on Nov. 23, 1939, at the age of 84 years. Formerly a resident of Brooklyn, N. Y., he became a George disciple in 1881, and a close associate in the movement with Stephen Bell, Samuel Seabury, John Moody, Lawson Purdy and practically all the others who were active in the philosophy. He had written numerous pamphlets on economic subjects. Mr. White was a staunch follower of Henry George for many years. He contributed many articles to LAND AND FREEDOM throughout its existence and since the death of Joseph Dana Miller had sent in many reports and comments.

LEON ROBERT BONTA, 68, Single Tax leader and secretary of the New Jersey Progressive League, died of a heart attack at his home in East Orange, N. J., on Oct. 8, 1939.

Born in Lexington, Ky., he was a salesman and promotor for a number of oil and insurance firms until 10 years ago, when he retired from business to devote himself to the advancement of the Single Tax idea.

Mr. Bonta, with Alfred N. Chandler of Maplewood, founded the league four years ago. The league was an outgrowth of the Industrial Tax Relief Association. In furtherance of the Single Tax idea Mr. Bonta maintained many contacts with legislators and wrote numerous letters to newspapers and other publications and prepared pamphlets urging its adoption in New Jersey. He made an elaborate analysis of the results of the Single Tax in Pittsburgh and argued that the steady rise in taxes in this state could be solved if Pittsburgh's example were followed.

He had lived in East Orange four years. Before that he lived about seven years in Newark.

Surviving are his wife, Mrs. Wilma Bonta; two sons, Tom J. of New York and Henry G. of Livingston, and two daughters, Mrs. C. W. Halligan of New York and Mrs. H. O. Wilson of Benton, Pa.

THE following quotation is from an article by John Chamberlain in *Harper's Magazine* for September, 1939: "... the only way to increase our export trade is, first of all, to increase the total exchange of goods and services at home.

"The tail of the export trade might, conceivably, wag the dog of the U. S. home economy; such, at any rate, is Secretary of State Cordell Hull's assumption. But how much easier it is for a dog to wag a tail! Widen the home market and you automatically increase imports. Increase imports and you shake dollar exchange loose on the world. Shake dollar exchange loose and people will spend it