

column of the front page in the *Herald-Tribune*, and I suppose is similarly featured in the other papers.

After all these years, they are beginning to catch up with the *starting-point* of Henry George so many years ago. What a heaven-sent opportunity to drive the lesson home, and to call attention to the fact that the "discovery" of the committee is simply that which "Progress and Poverty" pointed out with unerring clarity. The only difference is that Henry George was not content to verify the fact, but also analyzed the cause, and pointed out the remedy. Must it take another fifty odd years before those who have just arrived at his starting-point will learn also to follow out the problem to its only answer?

Paterson, N. J.

JAMES F. MORTON.

ENDORSES OUR PROPOSAL FOR A HENRY GEORGE DAY EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In my humble judgment, whatever that may be worth, the suggestion of a Henry George Day as proposed by LAND AND FREEDOM, is a most excellent one. I believe the observance of such a day by as large number as possible of local organizations, even with modest functions at first, would contribute most substantially to putting the Single Tax movement forward, and that of course is the prime desideratum with us.

The Annual Henry George Conferences are delightful and edifying to those who can attend, as they are to a much less extent to those who must be content to read about them. I am, however, quite inclined to feel as indeed I have felt for some while that they are a luxury which the movement can scarcely afford, as yet.

As I have said before, I am always reminded that at such gatherings, those in attendance enjoy a degree of sentimental satisfaction and mutual pleasure, and they extract considerable that is stimulating and helpful, but we go on milling around, holding aloft our nice, spotless banner, only no one outside those immediately concerned or participating cares a whoop about it. No impressive steps, no real stages of progress are marked. No one pays any particular attention. Not even publicity of any consequence is obtained.

With Henry George Day, luncheons, banquets or local annual gatherings, literally millions of people would at least hear something of the movement, for local newspapers are not so chary of space about reform activities which would provide publicity throughout the entire country. There would result, I believe, renewed and increased zeal and activity, and thousands would become interested. Educational opportunities would develop and out of all this certainly much good would result.

It appears to me that Labor Day would not be a desirable date to be celebrated as Henry George Day, though I admit the closely allied interest. One would detract from the other, resulting in no net gain perhaps for either. I believe Mr. George's birthday would be infinitely better. Mr. George stood for men, neither unionists nor non-unionists, neither rich nor poor, but for men and the fundamental rights for men. This is merely my thought on the matter, I do believe that such a combination would be unfortunate, that the psychology of it would be unfavorable and there would be a good deal of misinterpreting of it.

The observance of a Henry George Day, as you have proposed, would I think be a very great aid to the cause of the true economic philosophy.

Seattle, Wash.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY.

A WORLD CONVERTED

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I agree with Frank Stephens when he expresses regret that so many in the Single Tax movement have not a knowledge of the fundamentals of our common belief. But I think also that many misjudge the relative importance of the ideas that Henry George gave to the world.

The greatest discovery set forth in "Progress and Poverty," in my opinion, is not the Single Tax but what I call The Gospel of Plenty.

George wrote at a time, as the book clearly shows, when all the world believed that poverty, even death by starvation, was the inevitable fate of many in a progressive society. The reason was very simple—the alleged rapidity of increase of population in comparison with the increase in the means of subsistence. With such belief widely accepted, it would have been foolish to prove that the Single Tax would distribute wealth more evenly, for that would only mean a diminishing ratio for everyone. Had this been George's belief he would never have written at all.

But he saw that in a progressive society plenty was not only possible but inevitable. In fact he saw that the means of wealth production in his own time had actually produced a condition of plenty. What he had to do was to destroy the false and horrible doctrines of that day and demonstrate the true science of political economy.

His very first word is a declaration of the existence of plenty—see the opening sentence and the rest of the first chapter of "Progress and Poverty." He not only declared this doctrine—which was not wholly new—but he proceeded to prove it. This he accomplished so effectively that no scientist with a reputation to lose has, since that time, squarely declared his belief in the old Malthusian doctrine.

But the world generally, including many Single Taxers, misses the second great invention of this master mind—that the product of labor is the wages of the laborer. This wholly upsets a doctrine which, in some form prevails everywhere today—that wages and subsistence of the laborer are paid out of capital.

Then came the third discovery—the Single Tax, which is a simple and practical means to assure to the laborer access to materials and practically guarantees him power to keep his product as his wages.

Many of George's followers accept the idea of plenty as axiomatic, or, rather, as trite. They fail to see it in its proper relation as the bedrock foundation of George's system. Thus, they misunderstand, or perhaps ignore, the second discovery, the law of wages. They therefore arrive at the Single Tax which they use only as a working tool of propaganda. Their ignorance of the science innate in the tool prevents them from using it to advantage.

Here we have a whole world of people who accept—whether understandingly or not—the basic doctrine of Henry George, the doctrine that in a progressive society there is plenty for all. But there is no one to show them that this plenty for all is only the first step toward truth. The second step is that everyone must have a job, which is nothing but freedom to apply labor to materials, and the right to take the product as wages. Then—third and final step—access to materials and right of absolute property in product is assured by the Single Tax. There is an added step in practice and necessarily covered by the above theory—that laborers of all kinds must be free to exchange what they produce. This is the way to translate plenty for all into plenty for each.

All this seems to me so plain, so vital, that I give all my time to making it known. I believe that to preach the Single Tax is to begin at the wrong end. For one thing, we lose the advantage which we have every right to claim—the rights of discovery in the great new fact of plenty. Instead of regretting so much the scarcity of our numbers as Single Taxers, let us declare our world conquest as preachers of our Prophet's faith in overflowing and assured abundance! Let us make it known to all the world that the same principle of justice the operation of which has produced this miracle of abundance, if trusted, will distribute abundance to every human creature.

Ottawa, Canada.

A. C. CAMPBELL.

HENRY FORD AND HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have just finished reading "Henry George and Henry Ford" by Charles O'Connor Hennessy.