

be dodging our responsibility if we don't make the most of it, for Democracy is on trial.

When the Hawley-Smoot tariff was being discussed, in 1930, one thousand leading economists of our country warned President Hoover that dire results would follow the enactment of that bill. Hoover ignored their admonitions, and thereby intensified the economic problem. If, at that critical time, we who believe in Free Trade had actively and unflinchingly campaigned against the bill, if we had petitioned conscientious citizens and secured a million or more signatures, if we had strongly endorsed the economists' plea, it is not unlikely that the passage of that iniquitous bill might have been prevented. We must never again let such opportunities slip by.

Fundamental Democracy stands for Freedom—and that means free land, free trade, free speech, free press, free assemblage, free religious worship, free enterprise, and free initiative. We must constantly fight encroachments upon all the forms of freedom by privileged classes and the State. We must never permit an assault on Freedom to go unchallenged. We must never waver in our struggle for a free Humanity.

New York, N. Y.

AMALIA E. DuBOIS.

THE FINAL LINK

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

In reply to Donald MacDonald's arguments in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, I would like to submit the following:

All labor saving inventions tend to increase the value of land. Trade is a labor-saving invention, therefore, the less it is hampered, the greater will be its tendency to save labor, and so increase rent. This is not to say that certain tariffs will not raise the value of some lands. If we must buy our timber in a certain locality, the timber lands in it will of course increase in value. If, however, we can buy timber in any number of places, the competition will reduce the cost of lumber. This will induce building, and site values will eventually absorb the benefit.

Tariffs are important, and we should work for their removal, but let us bear in mind that no matter how harmful they are, their cause is the private collection of economic rent. Let us work for freedom in all directions, always remembering the final link in the chain, the monopoly of land.

Bronx, N. Y.

ANDREW P. CHRISTIANSON.

A WORD FROM FRANCE

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Georgeist activity in France is necessarily very limited at the present time. *Terre et Liberté* has been suspended since the war. We feel ashamed when we read about the movement in the United States, and the progress of the Henry George School. Americans have reason to be encouraged. I don't agree with Mr. Jackson Ralston's pessimism, or his proposition of compromise.

Summer Welles' proposals to Paul Reynaud sound very promising, if he intends free trade. But does he? Or is it only the eternal bilateral?

Moulins, France.

PAVLOS GIANNELIA.

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

On April 19, Hon. Emanuel Celler, Member of Congress (Brooklyn), spoke over the radio on "Balkanizing the United States." It was an impassioned attack on the tariffs that are developing between States.

I have sent Mr. Celler a copy of Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade," and I would like to urge others to write to him suggesting that he read that book, and telling him about the free courses offered by the Henry George School.

New York, N. Y.

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE.

ECONOMICS AS AN EXACT SCIENCE

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

In these last few years, thanks to Ingersoll, Beckwith and others, a new realization seems to have developed of the immediate need for a scientific approach to this subject of Economics. While the fields of Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics and Engineering have been studiously classifying and organizing their data, Economics appears to have marked time, in this respect. Isn't it the duty of this generation to correct this condition?

To date, so far as I am aware, there is no such thing as a Scientific Text-book of Economics. We have books galore, it is true, but no logical, consecutive chain of reasoning from the simple to the complex. The subject appears to be in the same stage of evolution as Mathematics in the pre-Euclidean era, a verbal foot-ball to be argued about and kicked around from pillar to post.

It seems to me that any attempt to bring order out of the present chaos requires:

1. Authoritative definitions of terms.
2. Axiomatic statements of basic truths.
3. A system of rigid, consistent, step-by-step proofs from axioms to theorems representing basic laws and principles by as nearly mathematical treatment as possible.
4. Units for measurement and comparison of quantitative relations.
5. Symbols and formulae for brevity and exactitude of expression.

Just because the field of Economics involves the sometimes uncertain element of human nature, do we have to throw up our hands and say no positive statement is possible? Personally, I am unwilling to admit it.

Economics deals with "Matter," as does Physics, only Economic Matter consists of "Goods with the power of satisfying Desire." It deals with "Force," but instead of a push or pull, Economic Force is "Desire," the greatest of all forces. And it deals with "Resistance," but instead of mechanical friction or electrical ohms, "Economic Resistance" is the man-hours of work to be overcome in the production and transportation from raw material to product in the consumer's hands. Tie these quantities together by the formula

$$W = \frac{D}{R} \quad \text{where } W = \text{Wealth expressed in Goods}$$

D = Desire
R = Resistance

and we have the simplest possible expression of a basic truth.

The above is mentioned only as a sample. The ground work of definitions and axioms should of course come first; then the superstructure. Yet if such a method could once establish the truths of Economics on as sound and reliable a basis as has been laid for our other Sciences, one of the greatest sources of confusion and misunderstanding would be removed.

We no longer argue about the law of gravity, the combination of chemical reagents, the bending movement of a beam or the flow of current in an electric circuit. We know these things. In case a question arises, we turn directly to the text-book for verification. Why not for Economics?

LAND AND FREEDOM is our best publication. It can speak most authoritatively for the movement. It has the widest circle of contacts. Would it not be worth while to invite its readers to offer their consideration toward such a purpose, so that after summarizing and sifting out the best of the material received, publication of the final results might be made in text-book form?

Chula Vista, Calif.

RAY H. TABER.

[Mr. Taber makes a valuable suggestion, albeit the task he proposes is a difficult one. We would like to hear more about it from our readers.—ED.]