

January—February, 1931

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

Georgism and The Mexican Revolution

Prof. R. B. Brinsmade

Our Australian Letter

Percy R. Meggy

Lecture Work of James R. Brown

Reviews of Louis Post's
Prophet of San Francisco

The San Diego Campaign

Chester C. Platt

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$2.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York
JAMAICA OFFICE, 72 Johnson Avenue, Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 305 Broadway, New York City

OSCAR H. GEIGER, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 165 Broadway, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$2.00 per year. Libraries and Reading Rooms, \$1.00. Club subscriptions, 5 for \$7.00. Payable in advance.

Entered as second-class matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1897.

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1931

VOL. XXXI

No. 1, WHOLE No. 164

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

SPAIN: Antonio Albendin, Cadiz.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY, Prof. Robt. Braun, Budapest.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade, Av. Pal Legislativo 40, Mexico City.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....	3
HENRY GEORGE AND THE GLADSTONES.....	4
GEORGISM AND THE MEXICAN REVOLUTION	
Prof. R. B. Brinsmade	6
MISTAKES OF INGERSOLL.....James Eugene Oliver	10
OUR AUSTRALIAN LETTER.....Percy R. Meggy	12
LECTURE WORK OF JAMES R. BROWN.....	15
HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS TO MEET IN BALTIMORE	18
THE SAN DIEGO CAMPAIGN.....Chester C. Platt	19
HARRY WEINBERGER CREATES A DIVERSION.....	20
DEATH OF J. R. HERMANN.....	21
REVIEWS OF POST'S "PROPHET OF SAN FRANCISCO".	22
TAXATION OF LAND VALUES. Prize Winning Essay.	
W. C. Wright	23
PAMPHLET NOTICES.....	27
CORRESPONDENCE	27
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS	29

WHAT LAND AND FREEDOM STANDS FOR

Taking the full rent of land for public purposes insures the fullest and best use of all land. In cities this would mean more homes and more places to do business and therefore lower rents. In rural communities it would mean the freedom of the farmer from land mortgages and would guarantee him full possession of his entire product at a small land rental to the government without the payment of any taxes. It would prevent the holding of mines idle for the purpose of monopoly and would immensely increase the production and therefore greatly lower the price of mine products.

Land can be used only by the employment of labor. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. With an unlimited demand for labor, the job would seek the man, not the man seek the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product.

The freeing from taxation of all buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries, incomes and every product of labor and intellect, will encourage men to build and to produce, will reward them for their efforts to improve the land, to produce wealth and to render the services that the people need, instead of penalizing them for these efforts as taxation does now.

It will put an end to legalized robbery by the government which now pries into men's private affairs and exacts fines and penalties in the shape of tolls and taxes on every evidence of man's industry and thrift.

All labor and industry depend basically on land, and only in the measure that land is attainable can labor and industry be prosperous. The taking of the full Rent of Land for public purposes would put and keep all land forever in use to the fullest extent of the people's needs, and so would insure real and permanent prosperity for all.

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXXI

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1931

No. 1

Comment and Reflection

“THE time is ripe for trying compulsory unemployment insurance as the only tested device for reducing the misery and poverty that follow these inevitable waves of industrial unemployment.” So says *The New Republic* in concluding an article on the subject. We say now, and we have believed for a long time, that such papers as *The New Republic*, despite a formidable list of contributors, are a distinct detriment to the cause of real economic progress. It is impossible to believe that some among those who comprise its editorial staff—Bruce Bliven, for example—is not perfectly well aware that it is not compulsory unemployment insurance but Justice that provides a remedy for present conditions, and that when they speak of the “inevitable” waves of unemployment they know that these are not inevitable at all. Or do they?

HOW much longer can papers like *The New Republic* conceal from their readers a poverty of thought in multitudinous seas of words? It is supposed to be a very radical paper because it says a kind word for Soviet Russia now and then and disapproves of imperialistic policies in Haiti and Nicaragua. So far so good. But what about the economic situation? We believe one or more of the editors of *The New Republic* know. Are they lockjawed by the management as one of them was for so long by the “capitalistic” newspaper for which he wrote. In a word are the editors of that paper free men and is the paper itself free? Knowing that every metropolitan newspaper is the organ of some economic or financial group, we are impelled to ask just who it is that *The New Republic* represents?

THE resources of the English vocabulary are a convenient refuge from the more obvious explanations. We have spoken of this before and we continue to be impressed by the expedients that language supplies to the resourceful who would dodge the plainer but inconvenient implications. Andre Maurois, in the *New York Times*, is the latest to supply us with a fine example which we commend to our friends of *The New Republic*. He says: “Financial and industrial crises are, above all, psychological phenomena and collective neuroses.” Repeat that to the man who is looking for a job!

PLEASE do not laugh. This is modern thinking. There are tons of it. It is to be found in hundreds of magazine articles and is bound up in books. It has earned for many a reputation for profundity. It will be looked at curiously by coming generations, much as we regard the strange speculations of the old theologians, which are much more enlightening, for in these latter, despite their general sterility, glimpses of spiritual truth are discernable.

WHAT is the matter? What is it that keeps these writers from seeing the truth. Or do they see it? The earth is a closed reservoir. The stream of tribute that goes to a privileged class is wrung from labor in blood and tears. The poverty and destitution are due primarily to the denial of access to the earth. And, last of all, why should they fail to see the efficacy of that remedy that would open the great natural storehouse, lift the burden from the shoulders of the poor, and turn the stream of economic rent into the public treasury?

IT would be very interesting to note the different explanations of the present depression. Such a collection would furnish a curious but not a very enlightening array of reasons, weird, distorted, fantastic. Some are merely inadequate, like the following: “The fundamental cause of the trouble is the lack of new enterprise due to an unsatisfactory market for capital investment.” Thus John Maynard Keynes in the *Forum* for January. Mr. Keynes is an international authority on business and finance. He talks of what he calls “consumption goods” and “capital goods,” the first being those which satisfy human wants and desires, such as food and clothing. “Capital goods” are those which are used to promote the production of other goods, such as raw materials, industrial machinery, factory buildings and the like. His suggestion is that production and consumption be speeded up by the great central banks of the creditor nations joining together in a concerted attempt to restore confidence to what he calls “the international long-term market.”

The slump is due, according to Mr. Keynes, to higher rates to lenders than it is possible for new enterprises to support. Borrowers as well as lenders have been at fault, according to Mr. Keynes, for they have encouraged lenders to expect much higher rates as they took part in

stock exchange booms, or sought to make good their losses from falling prices.

A LITTLE vague, perhaps—very much so as an explanation, for it seems not to have occurred to him that the only money that banks can lend is money derived from production, that the failure of a revival of industry does not lie with the banks but must be traced to the sources of production. He makes no reference to tariffs. This might lead him directly to the trail where the land question lies only partly concealed. But the trouble with Mr. Keynes and like minded observers is that they are concerned with *symptoms* and not with *causes*. And they move these symptoms like figures on a chess board, placing now one and now another in a position of supposed advantage. They never really play the game out because of the missing chess men, but it is a great game while it lasts. And they talk of banking and capital—which banks of course do not supply—without reference to the missing chess men, Land, Economic Rent and Taxes.

The Secret Is Out

IN another column we have expressed our distrust of *The New Republic* and our belief that it serves but poorly the cause of progressivism. This complaint was based chiefly on what that paper has refrained from saying, sins of omission in its varied preachments, not definite pronouncements upon which we could comment.

In our mild but long continued bewilderment as to what this periodical stood for, if it stood for anything at all, we earnestly hoped for some statement of policy that might go a little ways toward reassuring its readers that it had some sort of programme that might be useful in these "times of hesitation" and general muddlement.

At last we have it from one of the editors, Edmund Wilson, in an article in issue of Jan. 14, entitled "An Appeal to Progressives." Let us hope that there are few progressives like those to whom this appeal is addressed. This article is featured on the cover with a running head, "Should American radicals take communism from the communists and come out unreservedly for the collective ownership of the means of production?" To such a pass come those who have no anchor but drift with the drifting tide.

We are told that the liberalism which *The New Republic* has stood for in the past was derived primarily from Herbert Croly's book, "The Promise of American Life," written more than twenty years ago. Croly offered in this book "an original interpretation of American history which in its field set a new standard of realism." So says Mr. Wilson. That is no doubt important. We suppose that we need some realism now and then.

That we may understand just what we are to expect from this new declaration of policy a few quo-

tations from this remarkable article may be given.

"The time may come, Croly tells us, when the fulfillment of a justifiable democratic purpose may demand the limitation of certain rights to which the Constitution affords such absolute guarantees." This is quoted approvingly, as is the following:

"What was needed was a frank confession that genuine democracy meant not unlimited freedom but a sensible and systematic curtailment of the right of everybody in the interests of all."

And Mr. Wilson says further on: "A genuine opposition, must, it seems to me, openly confess that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are due to be supplanted by some new manifesto and some new bill of rights."

We would remark that "A systematic curtailment of the rights of everybody in the interests of all," has been the plea and defence of every despotism since Nero. But it comes curiously from the mouth of a "progressive." The idea that democracy demands the curtailment of any right is a wholly new doctrine. Of course, to rush pell mell into the arms of communism demands that human rights along with property rights must go into the discard.

Mr. Wilson is in a panic and the article is a wail. He sees the present system crumbling. He thinks the alternative is communism. He is mistaken—it is freedom. Salvation lies in the very thing he denies—the establishment of human rights, the contempt for which the French Assembly told us was responsible for most of the ills of mankind.

Maybe we shall embrace communism. But Mr. Wilson has given us some excellent reason why we should not. He tells us this in a great many words and promises to return to the subject in a future number. For the time being we leave him beside the Wailing Wall.

Henry George and The Gladstones

"MARY GLADSTONE, Her Diaries and Letters," is a fascinating book. We could perhaps have been spared the somewhat irritating evaluations of her editor, Lucy Masterman. Hereafter we shall contend that all volumes of Letters and Diaries appear unedited (except as emendated) and printed without comment.

This book is intensely interesting. It introduces us again to nearly all the great Victorians, and Mary Gladstone's remarks are shrewd, interpretative and revealing. We can pardon the wholly unquestioning admiration for her great father and her contempt for "Dizzy," sentiments quite natural in a devoted daughter, whose sympathies not less than her intellectual qualities are wholly admirable.

But it is what she says of Henry George that is of in-

terest to readers of LAND AND FREEDOM. On August 17, 1883, she writes:

Yesterday I began "Progress and Poverty," supposed to be the most upsetting book of the age. At present Maggie and I both agree with it, and most brilliantly written it is. We had a long discussions. He (W. E. Gladstone, the Prime Minister) is reading it, too.

On September 6: Finished reading "Progress and Poverty" with feelings of deep admiration—felt desperately impressed, and he is a Christian.

On March 8, 1884, she writes:

On the way to Town Hall for George's lecture. At first it seemed very doubtful whether he would be heard, and he was not well or up to the mark. Still, on the whole, considering the audience disagreed with him and were undergraduates, his fate was better than was expected, and certainly he has a good deal of the genius of oratory about him, and sometimes the divine spark—he is also a man possessed, and he often carried one away. Questions were asked him of all kinds at the end. He did not flinch, and had a wonderful way of leaping to his feet and answering with great spirit and manliness.

Again she writes:

To Trinity, where we had tea with Professor Stuart, meeting Mr. Henry George. Professor Stuart boldly rushed into "Progress and Poverty," and long and earnest and keen was the discussion on nationalizing the land, etc. We tried our very utmost to convert him, but alas! he far more nearly converted us. He deeply impressed us with his earnestness, conviction, and singleness and height of aim. I don't think we made the slightest impression on him, and he was very quick and clear in argument. Helen and Mr. Sedley Taylor and Mr. Butler, and the son of Henry George, sat mum throughout. I made two or three desperate ventures, and got red as my gown, but felt crushed. Perhaps Professor Stuart hardly stood to his guns. Walked to chapel with the man, and he told me of his horrid meeting at Oxford. Mem.: Lord Rayleigh in ante-chapel, and Henry George. We dined with Professor Stuart; also present, Nora Sidgwick. . . . Stories only at first, but we got on to George and luxuries, and long and earnest was the discussion.

Later in her Diary she says:

We had, over tea, a conference with George; Herbert (Gladstone), and Professor Stuart, chief questioners and examiners; Alfred Lyttelton listening and putting in much sympathizing with Mr. George. A great success, for they much liked and softened towards the good little man; and as to Maggie, she was converted. On the whole, he stood his ground well.

That the subject was on her mind is revealed later by an entry in which she tells of a dinner at which she sat next to Alfred Milner, afterwards Viscount Milner, and talked of Henry George, but does not tell us what was said. A dinner in London a few days later found her seated with James Russell Lowell and the question of compensation to land owners was brought up. Lowell said he would not have been in favor of compensation to slave owners but thought there was a difference in kind as property between slaves and land. She breaks off, as she frequently

does, with some girlish irrelevance, "He was a kill-joy somehow all the way through."

Of Henry George she says, with deep feeling:

"I think he impressed us all very deeply, and even if his remedy left the world in as bad a condition as it is now, I feel unspeakable admiration for the man who is fighting this battle. I often feel that we have no business to have one moment of peace or happiness because of the intense misery around us. He has not a moment's rest because of it and I honor and revere him for it."

She expresses her regret at the behavior of the Oxford students:

"I am very sorry indeed to hear how disgraceful had been the meeting at Oxford. At Cambridge, though they disagreed with him utterly, they treated him with courtesy. Arthur Lyttelton and Prof. Stuart went with me, and they were both struck. He answered questions in such a spirited way, I thought, leaping to his feet, and sometimes his action is so fine. We mean to tackle him once more."

An amusing entry is the following:

"Some one, chaffing Miss Max Muller, asked her whether she was not afraid Mr. George would run off with her father's forks and spoons, she answered, No, since her father had paid for them with his earnings—an answer that sounds sufficiently orthodox!

How explain, in view of the interest excited by the visit of Henry George, and the favorable impression made by his teachings on the Prime Minister's favorite daughter, that the only reference ever made in Parliament by the Great Commoner to "Progress and Poverty" was a sneer?

THE idea of a gasoline tax to pay for roads, has been been pushed to the front * * * by land speculators to avoid paying * * * a part of the increased land values which the roads create * * *

The popular political slogan is: "When in doubt, put a tax on gasoline!" —Princeton, N. J. *Packet*

HE who owns more land than is necessary for him to feed himself and his family is not only a party to, but is to blame for that want and depravity and all those miseries from which the masses of the people suffer.

—LEO TOLSTOY.

EVERY one knows very well, knows without a doubt, with all his being, that all men are equal. And, at the same time, he sees round him the division of all people into two castes; the one laboring, oppressed, needy and suffering; and the other—idle, oppressing, living in luxury and making merry. He not only sees this, but willy-nilly, on one side or another, he takes part in this division of people which is rejected by his conscience; and he cannot fail to suffer from the consciousness of such a contradiction and from his participation in it.

—LEO TOLSTOY

Georgism and the Mexican Revolution

PAPER READ AT HENRY GEORGE CONGRESS,
SAN FRANCISCO, AND WRITTEN BY
PROF. R. B. BRINSMADE

SINCE 1910 the United States has been deluged with a flood of news regarding the Mexican revolution. As this "news," which had to do with political, economic and social changes, has usually been colored for partisan purposes, it should be labelled rather "propaganda" and always viewed with distrust unless it can be verified from original sources. In response to a request from your programme committee, I venture to offer a little of this original evidence, which I have been able to garner during a continuous residence, since 1911, in both urban and rural sections of several Mexican states.

A SERIES OF REVOLTS

The Revolution began in the winter of 1910 and within a few months had toppled over the bronze image, with feet of clay, which had been worshipped for 34 years. The apostle of revolt, Francisco Madero, was eloquent and honest but with poor judgments, as proved by his acceptance of the national presidency when he had no administrative talent. This mistake of his resulted in constant minor revolts, which were terminated in 1913, by his betrayal by the trusted general, Victoriano Huerta who then became president. This counter-revolution resulted in a general renewal of civil war and, when Huerta was finally ousted himself in 1914, the revolutionary leaders Carranza, Villa and Zapata, soon began to disagree and fight each other. However, Carranza was cunning enough to obtain his recognition by the U. S. in 1915 and to adopt a new national constitution at Queretaro in 1917 under which he became President. The next election in 1920 produced the usual revolt, when Obregon succeeded in overthrowing the Carranza government and seating himself as president, after he had first reconciled the Villista and Zapatista factions to his own (Carranzista) and stopped the civil war which had raged destructively for six years. The next election in 1924 caused the revolt of candidate De La Huerta which was unsuccessful, as was also the rebellion—last year—of candidate Valenzuela for the "election" which took place this spring. Meanwhile, the revolt of the Cristeros (Catholics) broke out in the West and was active from 1926 till ended by the truce of last year between Church and State.

MONOPOLY OF THE NATIONAL DOMAIN

An American from Main Street, accustomed to judge things from his local standpoint, would imagine that some vital principles must have been at stake (as in his own Civil War) to cause all the slaughter just outlined. But he would be quite wrong and might be easily convinced of his mistake by a perusal of H. H. Bancroft's "History

of Mexico," where he would learn that such turbulence was the normal condition of independent Mexico, from 1811 onward, until Porfirio Diaz seized the presidency, as a *Rebel* general, himself, in 1876. The internal tranquility maintained for 34 years during the Diaz regime was the usual thing in modern white Europe but a freak of chance in this medieval Amerindian land, all of whose prevailing conditions favored anarchy, as may be easily shown. At the Conquest in 1521, the Spaniards found here an Amerindian population of Neolithic men living in the middle stage of Barbarism, a cultural stage beyond which the conqueror's ancestors had advanced more than 40 centuries previously; even in 1910 only 10 per cent of the Mexican population was of pure white blood. Thus Diaz had three contemporaneous cultures; the modern civilized of the larger cities, the Medieval civilized of the small towns, and the Barbarian of the Indian villages and egidos. Next he had a political organization which, liberal in theory, had been imported from European or United States sources and never been readjusted to suit Mexican society. Finally Diaz found a feudal economic organization, with scarcely any middle class to act as a buffer between a small selfish aristocracy of *hacendados* (great landlords) and an illiterate and poverty-stricken proletariat. Unfortunately, Diaz rested content with the temporary success of his twin policies; the maintenance of internal peace and encouragement to foreign investors, and neglected to provide for a future of political stability when his own senility or death would leave his autocratic centralized administration in less competent hands. This inevitable decline happened indeed during his last decade of power, for the aging dictator fell into the hands of a gang of speculators, derisively nicknamed Cientificos (scientists) who proceeded to fill their pockets from rapacious public contracts and from new factories subsidized by a protective tariff; also, they got concessions monopolizing the remaining national domain for a song, in order to sell them to foreign companies. But probably the most profitable of all these political piracies of the Cientifico group was the speculation of *colonias* (building land subdivisions) of the Federal District, whose population was rapidly growing, due to its being the site of many of the new factories and the residence of most of the recipients of a federal budget, whose expenditures were ever more concentrated at the Capital. Besides this increase of population, the Cientifico realtors enjoyed two financial advantages, undreamed of by their American counterparts, due to the prevailing system of urban taxation inherited from medieval Spain. The influential realtor first had his wild land urbanized (with streets, sewers and waterpipes) at the expense of the municipal treasury; whose funds, usually obtained from *local* taxation, were augmented, whenever necessary for this purpose, by the diversion of some of the proceeds from the foreign sale of *national* bonds. Then the law allowed a new colonia to be assessed at its old value, as *wild* land, until sold to some victim and built upon; as the local

tax-rate on this low assessment was only 1 per cent annually, the realtors could hold large areas vacant, indefinitely, at a trifling expense and thus maintain a land monopoly which gave them often a gain on their land, when sold, of many times their original investment.

The final collapse of the Diaz regime was caused by the weakness of the national army, due to padded payrolls, and the discontent of a multitude of rural Indians who, having been impoverished by unbridled landlordism, flocked with alacrity to the rebel standards.

From this summary of the Diaz regime—which, unjust as it was, still maintained effectively the two essentials of civilized government, protection to life and property—I will pass to outline the present situation, so you may judge if the nation has been in any way adequately compensated for the past 20 years of anarchy with its wholesale destruction of people and things—a destruction which has mostly spared the big cities but devastated the small towns, mines and plantations. The Constitution of Queretaro, which embodied the Carranzista ideals, has now been the supreme law since 1917, and, though too long a document to here criticize in detail, a few remarks as to its main political and economic provisions may give as good an idea of the changes due to the Revolution as any other way.

ELECTION FRAUDS AND POLITICAL CORRUPTION

In its general political scheme, the constitution is the same as the old one of 1857 which formed a union of sovereign states—each with a legislature of two houses and a governor—all united in a federation with a president, senate, house and supreme Court, as at Washington. The institution of *universal* male suffrage was also reestablished, though the experience of 60 years had shown it to be absolutely unsuited to Mexico. Since 1857, there had seldom occurred a change of presidents without preliminary bloodshed, and for 34 years of that period the presidency was occupied by one man, although the constitution had forbidden reelection after one four-year term. The first essential for genuine elections are *competent* voters, and when 60 per cent of Mexican “voters” are not only illiterate, but too stupid or cowardly to be able even effectively to prevent frauds on the part of the authorities, who handle the ballot boxes, the final result can only be a burlesque of representative government. No matter how repugnant the officials in a town may be to the *intelligent* citizens, it is impossible for the latter to oust them by ballots, for the simple reason that the vast majority of *nominal* voters are illiterate Indians who sometimes vote in herds, when cajoled by cunning demagogues, but usually refrain from voting and supinely allow their names to be used for ballot-box stuffing by the officials.

Until, then, the right of suffrage here be restricted to such citizens as have both literacy to comprehend issues and civic *courage* to defend the purity of elections, there can be no change in the present form of government which is

a bureaucracy, irresponsible to the citizenry, similar to that of imperial Russia, with the difference that its chief is not a hereditary czar but a successful general or one of his civilian satellites. For, as the only way to oust the bureaucracy in power is by bullets, rather than ballots, it is clear that the dominant party needs a soldier to defend it and that the opposition must have another soldier for leader, if it ever expects to capture the existing government.

While it is possible that some of the Queretaro constituents were sincere in their support of *unrestricted* suffrage (being blind adherents of Jacobin equalitarian doctrines which were long ago exploded by modern anthropology and ethnology,) as much cannot be said for Carranza (a former national senator under Diaz) and the other leaders, who desired nothing better than a new military despotism with themselves as chiefs. Subsequent history justified Carranza's plans and he enjoyed three more years of unbridled power, as “constitutional president,” before he met the usual swift death of Mexican autocrats.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

The revolutionary economic articles of the new constitution are Nos. 27 and 123; the former treats of lands, the latter of labor. I will first dispose briefly of Art. 123 leaving the other, because of its great interest for Georgists, for an ampler criticism.

Art. 123 applies syndicalistic doctrines to all classes of labor, from intellectuals down to domestic servants or muleteers. Its foundation is the principle of compulsory arbitration which is to be effected by *juntas* (courts) in every town, whose members are to be elected equally by employers' and workmen's associations, with an odd member appointed by the government. These *juntas* are given power not only to enforce the labor-protective clauses of Art. 123, but to fix minimum wage-rates in every employment and to decree how annual profits are to be divided between an employer and his workmen. They can also pronounce on the legality of strikes and, for a legal strike, can prohibit the employer from continuing the employment of non-strikers or hiring new hands until their decision be rendered. If the decision favors the strikers, the *junta* may condemn the employer to re-employ them all with full pay for the time lost during the controversy. They can also decide if an employee has been dismissed “unjustly” and award him the three months extra pay which this article allows as a compensation for such cases. Such political meddling must be condemned in theory, by all Georgists, as it denies the principle of freedom for both laborer and employer. In practice, it puts every employer at the mercy of the local *junta* as Art. 123 places no limit, except the caprice of its members, upon its power of dominating his business. In Australia, where officials are fairly intelligent and honest, compulsory arbitration has been a failure, so what can be expected as things are here? The net results of Art. 123, after a trial of 13 years

in some places, are an encouragement of extortion and labor monopolies on the part of unions, and the ruin of many enterprises as a consequence of a junta's decisions.

Instead of preventing strikes, this system tends to multiply them without limit, as is proved by recent statistics which record 88,648 strikes in the five-year period from 1924 to 1929 when Art. 123 was first put into operation everywhere. This is indeed a record for a small population, with few enterprises employing much labor, and goes far to explain why Mexico is now generally shunned for the location of new factories or the extension of old ones. Besides, Art. 123 forbids an employer to quit work without a permit from the junta and, as the permit may involve a long delay to secure, this regulation may mean bankruptcy to an established factory or mine running at a loss. The worst effects for labor of Art. 123 have been much alleviated, till recently, by an immense emigration of the unemployed to the United States. In brief, the radical syndicalism of Art. 123 is an importation, essentially alien to domestic customs; moreover it tends not only to incite the native to class-war, but it aggravates his industrial defects such as laziness, indifference, and carelessness, and to hinder his acquirement of the discipline, responsibility and spirit of cooperation which are essential to efficient factory production.

Art. 27 replaces the old article, containing 3 short paragraphs, with 25 long ones. While the old article simply forbade the public taking of private property without compensation and limited rights of religious and civil corporations to hold real estate, the new article enters extensively into all phases of landed property in both principle and practice. Of its many provisions, I will here only discuss the principal ones dealing with land, water and subsoil rights.

THE RIGHT TO LAND

There are several of its established principles which will please all Georgists. The State conserves the right to regulate the use of, as well as to tax, private lands and can expropriate them for any public use on paying to the holder the *fiscal* value plus 10 per cent. The last provision prevents the extortion of the government by landlords, as occurs so often in England and the United States, and is a vital safeguard in the extensive purchases being conducted to carry out the socialistic programme of the universal establishment of village *egidos* (commons). However, as this programme has been fully discussed in my colleague Rolland's paper entitled "The Agrarian Problem in Mexico," I will not further mention it here.

This expropriation clause is also exactly suited to the successful application of the Australian system for the correct self-assessment, by its holders, of landed property; as any undervalued property can be acquired by the government at its manifested price plus 10 per cent. With this idea in mind, a bill for the self-assessment of real estate in the Federal District was drawn up by an official

commission (which included the writer), in 1922, but it was never passed into law, being blocked by the "new" Cientificos. In 1917, Carranza was requested by one of his aides, a Georgist, to have inserted in the constitution a clause declaring: "Economic rent belongs to the nation"; but, being an hacendado himself, Carranza refused pointblank on the pretext: "The people don't want it."

The constitution states sound Georgist doctrine when it declares all federal lakes and rivers (including practically all the permanent streams of the country) to be inalienable national property which can only be exploited by the individual, for irrigation or powers under, leasehold titles. This principle is not new, being an inheritance from Spain, but the quoted declaration is the most definite and comprehensive of any hitherto made in Mexican constitutions. A small national annual tax for the use of water which was decreed by Carranza in 1918, at the writer's suggestion, gives the Government a fiscal weapon, along with its strict written contracts with water leasers, to control that unbridled speculation and monopoly in water rights which curses many other countries, including the United States.

SUBSOIL RIGHTS

When Art. 27 also declares all subsoil minerals to be inalienable national property, it is merely reaffirming the famous mining code of 1785 issued by the Spanish reformer, Charles III. Unfortunately, Diaz's satellite, President Gonzales, had his own private theory of subsoil rights (his hacienda in Coahuila being underlaid by a coal bed) so he told the Congress of 1884 (as usual a mere rubber stamp for the executive) to decree a new mining code, giving, gratis, all *non-metallic* mineral rights to the surface landlords. This gift was restated in the Diaz mining codes of 1892 and 1909, but was never confirmed by a constitutional amendment as legality required. Meanwhile, foreign explorers had struck a rich oil field, for the first time in 1902, on land acquired from Vera Cruz hacendados and, before the adoption of the constitution, had developed a large production. Thus the constitutional abrogation in 1917 of the landlord's control of non-metallic minerals (as decreed by the mining codes of 1884, 1892 and 1909) aroused at once a clamor in Wall Street, where the monopoly of several million hectares of Mexican oil lands had been used as the basis for the issue of floods of watered stock.

This clamor became a terrific din in 1918, when Carranza issued three decrees (at the writer's suggestion) assessing a sizable annual *areal* tax against all oil lands and commanding their holders to apply for federal concessions to their property. This soon resulted in the enlistment of the United States department as *special agent* to protect the oil "rights" of Wall Street, whose alleged wrongs thereafter absorbed at Washington all the attention which had much better been spent in behalf of the many Ameri-

cans who had been *genuine* instead of *speculative*, sufferers from the Revolution. The latter had actually repudiated 2½ billion pesos of Carranzista money, ruined the state banks and rural mortgage companies, and destroyed the plants of countless mines, farms and factories to the vast damage and often ruin of their foreign owners, many of them small investors.

As a concession to the pressure from Washington, Obregon in 1920 suspended the operation of the oil decrees of 1918 but was allowed to assess heavy taxes, on the production and export of oil, without protest. Wall Street seemed not to mind the payment of such taxes but became frantic at the thought of the smaller areal tax, because it established the dangerous precedent (for foreign land speculation) of the public ownership of the oil-bearing subsoil.

THE PROGRAMME OF JUSTICE DEFEATED

In 1925, the Mexican Bureau of Mines drew up a new code to regulate mining, property on the basis of the public ownership of all minerals (non-metallic as well as metallic) instead of just the metals as prescribed in the three previous codes. This was a harmonious, scientific plan and carefully guarded all *legitimate* vested interests. But Wall Street wasn't looking for justice but privileges, so it hired an ex-minister of finance as attorney, who soon found means to detach the oil section from the mining code and to persuade a complaisant labor minister to make a *special* oil code, for his clients, which was issued in December, 1925. The new code was foolishly liberal except on one point—it refused to give *Fee-simple* titles for the "old" oil lands (leased as such before 1917) and offered only 50-year renewable leaseholds.

In spite of more pressure from Washington, the Government refused to budge until a new ambassador, backed by an aggressive *personal* press bureau, arrived on the scene in October, 1927. Inside of a few weeks, this Mercury of the modern financial Olympus had gained undying newspaper fame by accomplishing the "impossible" and securing an amendment to the new code, granting fee-simple titles to the same old oil lands which plutocratic Washington had been treating as a *casus-belli* since 1917.

After this breach in the *theoretical* Georgist wall of Mexican oil-land legislation, Wall Street began to get busy on the *practical* side by using the new code (of its own composing) which granted 30-year renewable concessions in units of 100,000 hect. (360 square miles) for classified, and 200,000 hect. for unclassified oil lands. A unit could be secured by depositing 55,000 pesos, as a guarantee, and thereafter expending 100,000 pesos annually in development. If any oil were found, it would be exempt from the production and export taxes, provided it were sold in Mexico. As the code did not limit the number of such huge units to be held by one leaser, here evidently was an opportunity which monopolists dream about, but seldom encounter. That no time was lost in materializing

this dream may be judged from the fact that within a year 26,000,000 more hect. (about one-eighth of the national territory) had been plastered with these new oil concessions, besides over 3,000,000 hect. already held in fee-simple.

Having thus forestalled any possible rivals, by monopolizing almost all Mexican subsoil of any petroleum possibilities, and diminished their Vera Cruz production to a plausible minimum, our Jolly Rogers gathered up their surplus well-rigs and set sail for the Spanish Main where, in the swamps about Lake Maracaibo, they had found a new oil paradise, where no reformers dare to legislate nor Georgists break in and tax.

ALIENATION OF MINING RESOURCES

As for metal mines, the old Spanish Code required each lease to be worked continuously, most of the year, with a specified minimum of hands. At the suggestion of Americans, this labor requirement was unwisely abrogated in the Diaz code of 1892 in favor of a small annual *pertenencia* (areal) tax. In consequence I found, when I arrived here in 1911, that all mineral outcrops of any promise, even in remote districts, were cornered for the purpose of monopoly or speculation by private interests. These paper titles, blocking everywhere the beneficent activity of prospectors, were soon blown away after 1915, when the Carranza Bureau of Mines had raised the trifling Diaz *pertenencia*-tax to a figure sufficiently high to dislodge the forestallers.

The new mining code of 1926, which covers all minerals except petroleum, has retained a small *pertenencia*-tax, but its main defence against forestalling is a return to the ancient requirement, for lease-titles, of a minimum quantity of development or output. As in all previous codes for the leasing of national waters or subsoil, a lease is deemed a public utility enjoying the right of eminent domain. Since some of the new Code's provisions have proved impractical, it will be amended this winter. However, the main revenue from mining here has never been obtained from the *pertenencia*-tax (even the heavy one of 1915) but from a levy on *gross* output. This means that a miner of lean ore pays the same tax on the metal it yields as one who works a bonanza—a complete negation of Georgist principles which prescribe a tax on the *net* value of ore in the ground.

EXACTIONS OF THE MEXICAN TARIFF

Regarding the protective import-tariff, already mentioned, its result has been similar to the experience of Russia whose artisans, even at lower wages, lack the inherited social discipline and industrial ability to compete with western Europe. There are many new factories, supported by the tariff crutches, but the chief consequence is that the peasants, who compose about 90 per cent of the nation, are paying more for a worse quality of manufactures with little hope for an early improvement. Instead of the peasants, whose blood won the Revolution,

being relieved of the tariff burden, by their victory it is now much heavier than before on most articles of their clothing, food and housing; a surprising example is the duty on shoes which has advanced 200 per cent since 1914. An important aid to this counter-reform has been the ominous Art. 123 which has bred a school of selfish labor leaders which looks abroad for its technique and argues: "If the trade unions in the United States and Australia find it profitable to back their employers politically and share the loot from their schemes, of mulcting the morons through higher tariffs, why shouldn't we do the same here?"

TAXES FAVORING LAND SPECULATION

Finally, I will glance at the effect of the Revolution on the main source for Cientifico plunder, land speculation in the Federal District. On reviewing the main provisions of the latest (1929) tax law, I find all the old legal aristocratic European devices, for diverting public wealth to private pockets, in full operation. House property when occupied pays a local *predial* (real-estate) and sewer tax of 12.7 per cent on the annual rent; but if unoccupied the tax is reduced 50 per cent, thus encouraging house monopolies for raising rents. The system of taxing rent (rather than selling value) is itself a scheme for encouraging land speculation, by enabling valuable lots to be held cheaply by covering them with shacks leased at low rentals.

In 1922 the old local tax rate of 1 per cent on vacant lots was raised for a while to 2 per cent, but this mistake was soon "corrected" by a new schedule dividing lots into 6 classes, according to value, with a different tax-rate for each class. While the first class (over \$75 a square meter) is taxed at 3 per cent, the fifth class (\$3 to \$8) pays 1 per cent and the sixth class (under \$3) only 0.5 per cent. Since most of the colonia land is included in the last two classes, the value of the "correction" for the Cientifico speculators is evident. Moreover, the assessment being usually only 50 per cent of the true value makes these nominal rates really double the real ones. A further reduction can be secured, of 15 to 40 per cent of these rates, by planting a vacant lot with trees. The above *local* rates in the capital (as everywhere else) are always increased by a *federal* tax which varies from year to year; this increase is now 20 per cent and puts the total rate on house rent at 15.24 per cent.

The writer made a detailed fiscal investigation in 1921 of the Federal District, for the Ministry of Finance, and later published his report entitled: "Catastro Democratico," in the "Memorias de la Sociedad Cientifica Alzate," Vol. 45 for 1926; a copy of which will be found in any of the world's scientific libraries. This report summarized that real estate was paying only 26 per cent of local taxation or (if 50 per cent of this figure be subtracted for the tax on buildings) that land values were only paying 13 per cent of the total. Later, in 1922,

the writer worked on an official commission which drew up a complete plan for the gradual shifting of the taxation of the Federal District from the consuming masses to the land holders; but its report was repudiated and the Diaz system has continued to the present, as the reviewed law of 1929 proves, in spite of two decades of "popular" revolution.

BLOCKING REFORMS

As novices in Latin intrigue, you could never guess the why of such ridiculous self-contradictions of government, but initiated Mexicans explain the mystery as follows: The Cientifico leaders in 1911, as soon as they surmised the probable fall of Diaz, selected some of their bright young disciples (not known as such to the public) as "The second line of defence." Later, when the leaders had to flee abroad, their disciples remained on guard to "join the Revolution," and soon rose to such political prominence as to have been able ever since (as "new" Cientificos) to block the efforts of any meddling reformers who might try to disturb the vested graft of their exiled friends as publicly-subsidized manufacturers and realtors.

My hasty sketch of the Mexican revolution may perhaps seem incredible to such of you as have long drunk deep at the well of propaganda, but, before voicing your doubts, remember that: "Truth is stranger than fiction," and that there is no locality where that old adage can be better demonstrated than in this queer land of fantastic happenings of which the half cannot now be told.

Mistakes of Ingersoll

IN that unsettled period after the Civil War, Robert G. Ingersoll, orator and agnostic, did as much as any other to mould and direct the political opinion of the Nation. He met the argument, then often urged, that slave labor would bring down the wages of free labor by saying, "If I belong to a superior race, I will not fear the competition of an inferior race."

Is there any principle or proposition less in need of elaboration—less open to dispute? What, indeed, is the use of being intelligent or superior if you can't compete with the inferior? What is the test or proof of superiority? Without doubt, the swimmer who comes ashore after the race is won, the skipper who is defeated by a coat of paint, the jockey who is beaten by a nose, would urge in vain the claim of superiority.

And if it be true that the superior, the intelligent and the skillful can compete without fear with the inferior, the ignorant and the unskillful, we have completely refuted, have we not, the propaganda of the protectionist? For have they not always claimed that a protective tariff was necessary because intelligent American labor could not compete with the unintelligent pauper labor of Europe?

Yet, strange as it may seem, Ingersoll was always a protectionist. He must, therefore, have believed that there

was some peculiar ingredient in foreign inferiority that differentiated it from American inferiority and placed the foreign brand in such a favorable position that it could enter into competition with the superior labor of America and excel it by producing the same goods at lower cost or better goods at the same cost.

Inferiority, you see, was not to be feared unless it was foreign inferiority; the home brand could be grappled with successfully by the superior class in the country.

If the South, for instance, had won the war that slavery caused, the principle so clearly and concisely stated by Ingersoll, instead of operating as it now does throughout the territorial limits of the Nation, would have been confined within the boundaries of the North and South respectively.

I would rather believe such a conclusion to be a mistake of Ingersoll's rather than to think that a principle so fundamental would change its hue, chameleon-like, on the result of a war or on the crossing of an artificial boundary line.

Again, in what he called a "Lay Sermon" delivered in New York in 1886, Ingersoll expressed opinions that should lead one inevitably to the acceptance of the philosophy of the Single Tax, and yet he was unwilling to acknowledge any such doctrine. Here is what he said: "There is something wrong in a government where they who do the most have the least. There is something wrong when honesty wears a rag and rascality a robe." ^{see Is-4}

Then he puts his finger squarely on the trouble:—"No man should be allowed to own any land that he does not use. Everybody knows that—I do not care whether he has thousands or millions. I have owned a great deal of land but I know just as well as I know I am living that I should not be allowed to have it unless I use it."

Continuing, he says: "Now, the land belongs to the children of Nature. Nature invites into this world every babe that is born. And what would you think of me, for instance, tonight, if I had invited you here—nobody had charged you anything, but you had been invited—and when you got here you had found one man pretending to occupy a hundred seats, another fifty, and another seventy-five, and thereupon you were compelled to stand—what would you think of the invitation? It seems to me that every child of Nature is entitled to his share of the land, and that he should not be compelled to beg the privilege to work the soil of a babe that happened to be born before him. And why do I say this? Because it is not to our interest to have a few landlords and millions of tenants."

Splendid. No one can find fault with that. If words mean anything, Ingersoll's doctrine was—and it's my doctrine, too—that a child born into the world must not be at a disadvantage so far as the land is concerned because others were born before it; that the earth—the storehouse of all wealth—is the provision that Nature made for all just as the manna that fell from heaven was the

provision that Jehovah made for all the Israelites when Moses led them on that march of forty years through the wilderness and out of a certain kind of bondage.

Then, as though he had forgotten the foregoing or was unconscious of its meaning, Ingersoll proceeds: "I do not want to take, and I would not take, an inch of land from any human being that belonged to him. If we ever take it, we must pay for it—condemn it and take it—do not rob anybody."

Is it possible to harmonize this last paragraph with what has gone before? The fact of the matter is Ingersoll has contradicted himself in succeeding sentences. He takes on this subject both sides of the question. He affirms and denies. So he must be at least fifty per cent mistaken.

Either the ones who came early in response to his invitation had a right to monopolize the seats as they claimed to the disadvantage of those who came later, or they did not have the right. If they didn't have the right to more seats than they could use, their claim was false and it's folly to suggest that they be paid to surrender such a claim. To pay them is to acknowledge their title.

So, either the land belongs to the children of Nature or it doesn't. If it doesn't, we should pay the price of the ones who are monopolizing it if we want to use it. This means that we must humbly beg the privilege to work the soil of the babes who are holding it on such terms as they may specify. Their terms become increasingly oppressive as land is taken up until as now, we are compelled to give about everything we have for the privilege to work the land that Nature gave. Under this principle, labor is enslaved and work is everywhere regarded as a curse; idleness is respectable; those who toil most get the least; millions, plundered and discouraged, turn to crime; the President appoints a crime commission to ascertain the cause of wide-spread disrespect for law, and a civilization such as we now have is produced—the necessary and natural result of such a theory.

On the other hand, if the land belongs to the children of Nature, as Ingersoll stated, all have the right to use it on equal terms, and so long as there is idle land there need be no idle men. There is ever present the opportunity to work and to obtain the full reward of the effort exerted. The means of a livelihood being within the reach of all, want and the fear of want is done away with and man is economically free. And economic freedom is the basis of all other forms of freedom.

Ingersoll proved conclusively that his thought on this subject was ill-considered and merely impromptu when he said that the land belonged to the children of Nature, but in order to get it they should pay the price exacted by the land monopolist. This is as though he were to say it doesn't belong to them at all. To pay the price exacted is to recognize the soundness of the title of the monopolist. How did he get the land, anyway? Did he make it? Can he trace his title to the maker? Of

course not. It is quite evident that force and not justice is the basis of his claim of ownership.

If it is finally determined that the children of Nature are the rightful owners of the land, as Ingersoll said they were, this change in the theory of land tenure would be prejudicial to the rights of none except those holding land unused, hoping to reap the harvest that belongs to others.

—JAMES EUGENE OLIVER

Where Voltaire Stood

DURING the reign of Louis XV there arose in France a group of economic students, who were later called "physiocrats", and who had advanced ideas on political economy. They antedated Adam Smith as free traders and Henry George as Single Taxers. Like modern advocates of the same ideas they were misunderstood and one of those who misunderstood their doctrines was Voltaire. He satirized what he erroneously supposed to be their proposal in his "Man of Forty Crowns", which was a forerunner of the modern objection to the Single Tax wherein there is presented a millionaire "who owns no land" and whose fortune is all invested in securities and a farmer "who owns nothing but land". Voltaire overlooked that the millionaire's securities are but title deeds to or liens upon valuable land while the farmer's land has little or no value aside from improvements. Perhaps the physiocrats failed themselves to make this as clear as they should. But Voltaire was a wise man and consequently was not averse to changing his mind. He did so in this case. This is a fact not stated in Professor E. R. A. Seligman's use of this satire as a refutation of modern Single Tax arguments, nor is it mentioned in the tract issued by the National Association of Real Estate Boards which follows Seligman's example.

Voltaire made clear his change of view when the landed gentry of France and their sycophants, the Babbitts of that day, made war on Turgot, the physiocratic Finance Minister who established free trade in grain, abolished forced labor on the public roads, recommended taxing land values to pay for road improvements and, the landed interests feared, was about to put into effect the Single Tax advocated by the physiocrats after abolishing the local tariffs. Voltaire came to Turgot's aid with a pamphlet in defense of his views. It must have been unanswerable for the parlement of Paris suppressed it. Turgot was dismissed and on hearing of this Voltaire wrote:

"I have nothing but death to look forward to since M. Turgot is out of office. The thunderbolt has blasted my brain and my heart."

This was more than mere rhetoric. He died shortly afterward. Undoubtedly he recognized the calamity to France involved in the loss of opportunity to put in effect the principles he had once satirized.

—SAMUEL DANZIGER.

Our Australian Letter

TWO economic missions, one invited by a Nationalist and the other by a Labor Government, have visited Australia from high financial and industrial circles in England, have examined into our condition, and have pronounced what is practically the same verdict, namely, that national bankruptcy can only be averted by a complete change of system. A few figures will disclose what our financial position really is. According to the latest figures just issued we owe over a billion pounds sterling—£1,100,598,000 to be precise—on account of the Commonwealth and States, on which we pay interest amounting to over £55,000,000 every year, with the rate of interest continually increasing. Our budgets both commonwealth and State show a deficit every year, there are only a trifle over 6,000,000 people to bear the burden, and oversea financiers have refused to lend us any more till our credit is restored. Both Commonwealth and State Governments in a panic have resolved to make their future budgets balance; they are decreasing expenditure in every direction, public works are being abandoned, salaries and wages are coming down with a rush, and everything but the right thing is about to be done to put our house in order and restore our credit. No competent person who has watched our policy in the past is surprised at what has happened. The only surprise is that Australia has not broken down long before. For her position is utterly unsound.

Australia is like a pyramid resting on a three-cornered foundation—Protection, Land Monopoly, and Artificial Wages—each of which is morally inequitable and therefore economically unsound. While drastic reductions are good in their way they are only palliatives at the best and our position can never be wholly retrieved so long as our foundations are unsound. The Labor Party—or at any rate the Industrial and Trade Union section of it—denounces any reduction in wages so long as the present high rate of interest is still paid. Some even go so far as to advocate the repudiation of the immense debt we incurred for carrying on the war, As if war debts were in a water tight compartment all by themselves and could be dealt with apart from other debts, which economists tell us they can't. The principle at stake is the same. If you repudiate one you must repudiate the other.

WHAT IS WANTED

What is wanted is not repudiation of the war debt but the repudiation of false principles, of the rotten foundation on which our policy has been hitherto reared. Let us consider for a moment what these rotten foundations are. I: In the first place, Protection, which is the pet hobby of the Labor Party as it is the fetish of them all, is the compulsory enrichment of one section of the community at the expense of the primary producers and the rest of the community. This is manifestly unfair to the

primary producers whom it overloads with burdens to such an extent that few can profitably export their produce, so that, paradoxical as it may seem, the more they produce the more they lose. II. In the second place Land Monopoly is encouraged by the existing system of land value taxation, under which one section of the community—supposed to be the workers—is exempted from federal land taxation, while all the other sections are super-taxed. This again is manifestly unfair. Like protection it is supported by all the political parties, on the mistaken assumption that it promotes the abolition of large estates. According to figures recently published in the *Sydney Morning Herald* it appears that there were 80,065 rural holdings in 1920-1 as against 78,380 in 1926-7 while the acreage was about the same, namely, 172,795,213 in the former year as against 172,795,213 in the latter, showing that the number of rural holdings had increased instead of diminished during the period named, while their value was scarcely different. But while the expedient has failed in what was considered its good object it has vastly increased the evils of land monopoly, and made it almost impossible for would-be settlers to obtain access to land on reasonable terms. III. In the third place, the system of industrial arbitration, under which wages are based not on what an industry produces but on the supposed requirements of the workers, is self-evidently unsound, and has had as much to do as the other two inequitable principles in bringing about the unfortunate position in which Australia finds herself today.

Australia can only be restored to a condition of health by laying her foundations on principles that are morally equitable and economically sound—by substituting freedom of exchange for tariff restriction; by introducing freedom of production through the uniform appropriation of land values irrespective of improvements; and by a system of wages boards composed of an equal number of employers and employees, who will fix the wages of every industry on the basis of what it can afford to pay. Make our foundations right and the superstructure, which is now tottering to the ground, will be right too. We will have no difficulty in balancing our budgets, and there need not be a single man or woman unemployed.

WHAT PEOPLE THINK.

It is both interesting and instructive to read what people generally think of the existing financial crisis. A recent issue of the *Sydney Morning Herald* contained so many expressions of opinion from different quarters that I thought a brief summary of the more important of them would do good. In the first place, as showing the view of organized labor, the Interstate Conference of the Australasian Council of Trades Unions adopted the report prepared by a sub-committee recommending that provision should be made by the federal government for a credit fund of £20,000,000 for industry, that the Loan Council (which pooled and limited the borrowing powers

of the Federal Government and the different States) should be abolished and its recommendations annulled, that there should be a general reduction in interest charges, that negotiations should be opened with the British Government to readjust Australia's war debt, and that, if these recommendations were not satisfactorily carried out, a Conference of all the Unions should be called to take some compulsory action (apparently in the nature of a general strike.)

That these views are also held by a large number of Laborites, at any rate in New South Wales, may be inferred from the fact that they were partly embodied by Mr. Lang in his recent policy speech, when he was profuse in his promises of what he would do if the Loan Council were repudiated and he could borrow money in the State for the solution of the unemployed problem by the construction of public works. That the problem can be solved by the easy method of further borrowing is extremely questionable in view of the fact that the banks refuse to grant any more loans till our budgets are balanced and our credit is restored. The position is rendered all the more difficult by the frequently pronounced view in Labor circles that the unemployed, whether competent or no, shall be paid Trade Union rates. Everyone deprecates the tremendous interest that is being paid for loans, whether on account of the war or otherwise, but the rate is determined by well known economic laws and, however great the strain of paying that interest, the strain which would result from refusing to pay it would be more serious still, and would destroy whatever hope we now have of raising future loans. Under existing conditions Mr. Lang's proposal to get out of the difficulty by raising more loans would be frustrated by the extra heavy interest which would be demanded now that the risk of future repudiation has to be met.

"MOONSHINE AND NONSENSE!"

One of the principal reasons alleged by the committee, whose report was adopted by the A. L. P., for asking the British Government to readjust our war debts was that all the Dominions, with the exception of Australia, had a large proportion of their war expenses paid by the British Government. This has since been categorically denied so far as Canada is concerned, which is officially stated to have paid every penny of the expenses, so that to ask Britain to bear any part of our war expenses at this or any other stage would be a gross reflection on ourselves, and would be an attempt to place an additional burden on the British taxpayers which they are quite unable to bear. Fortunately for Australia the Labor Government at the head of Australia has a backbone of its own, and refuses "to accept dictation from either the A. C. T. U. Congress or the A. L. P. Conferences which have lately endeavored to mould the policy of the Federal Government." As a matter of fact the "pious aspirations" of these bodies stand not the least chance of

influencing the acting Prime Minister (Mr. Fenton) in the discharge of his arduous task. In the adjoining State of Victoria a Conference of the A. L. P. declared that the present financial stringency was manipulated by the financial interests, whereupon the Labor Premier (Mr. Hogan) declared that the statement was untrue, and that the report issued by the Conference was "three pages of moonshine and nonsense," a stinging phrase which exactly applies to the report of the Conference by the same body in New South Wales referred to above as also to Mr. Lang's policy speech. It is for Australians to face their responsibilities like men and not to go whining about repudiating this, that, and the other, and this they will have the opportunity of doing in New South Wales by returning the Nationalists to power at the forthcoming election for the State.

BOUNTIES, SUBSIDIES AND TARIFFS

Another and totally different view-point to that noted above is expressed by W. K. Hancock, Professor of Modern History at the University of Adelaide, whose just published book on "Australia" contains a scathing criticism of the system of bounties, subsidies, and tariffs to which a great deal of our present chaotic position is due. In a leader on "Failure of the Tariff" the *Sydney Morning Herald* puts its finger on one of the most important causes of the crisis when it referred to the "doctrine wherein the Federal Arbitration Court Bench propounded a system of wage fixation based on cost of living requirements and on nothing else. When our Customs tariffs began to soar to very great heights, still without affording adequate protection to home industries, the fallacy of the Court's standard was exposed for all who cared to pay heed." That the tariff has proved a tremendous failure the present crisis abundantly shows, but the fixation of wages by the number of bonnets that a worker's wife considers necessary to wear instead of on what industry can afford to pay is responsible for a large proportion of our present ills. Earl Beauchamp, who is probably more optimistic than anyone else as to the future prosperity of Australia, caused no little merriment at the Millions Club when he told members that during his term as Governor of New South Wales 30 years ago he had learned one principle which he had done his best to inculcate in England, and which had done more than anything else to improve the social welfare of Great Britain and of its working classes, and that, said his lordship with a twinkle in his eye knowing the Millions Club to be densely protectionist, was free trade!

"ABSURDLY UNSCIENTIFIC"

At the annual conference of the Printing and Allied Trades Employers' Federation the President (Mr. W. A. Crichton) took an almost similar view. At any rate he denounced the tariff which, he said, had destroyed our export trade in many industries, and prevented both our primary and secondary industries from exporting at a

profit. He was convinced that our secondary industries, if relieved of "absurdly unscientific Customs duties conceived without regard to their effect on industry generally," and with lower working and overhead costs, could well work out their own destinies. A speech on similar lines was delivered on the same day at the annual conference of the Federated Master Tanners and Leather Manufacturers' Association by the President (Mr. R. J. Anderson). There were other references to the same subject in the same issue of the *Herald*, but enough had been said to show what people generally think of the present situation and how it can be cured. There is one significant point about all these utterances, namely, that not one of them makes any allusion to land value taxation. In a subsequent speech, however, Earl Beauchamp noted the tremendous advance in that direction made since he was here 30 years ago. The Official Yearbook shows that the amount of municipal rates throughout New South Wales, except the city of Sydney, which are based on land values apart from improvements, amounted to a little over £1,000,000 in 1917 and had risen to £2,287,584 in 1927. A significant fact is that one-third of the total cost, estimated at £6,000,000, of the Sydney Harbor Bridge, which is now nearly completed, is being paid by a rate of ½d. in the £ on the unimproved capital value of land in the vicinity.

Before concluding I must not omit to mention the splendid work for the Single Tax that has been and is being done by Mr. A. G. Huie, our indefatigable secretary, who is again contesting the Western Suburbs in the present election: by Mr. E. J. Craigie, whose brilliant work in South Australia has been several times referred to in your columns, by Mr. Hobbs, who has again toured the country districts of New South Wales with magnificent results, and by several who have led the campaign in the Sydney Domain, or assisted in various ways. The several Henry George Leagues are being solidly supported by the Henry George Foundation of Australia which was endowed with £20,000 a year or two ago.

—PERCY R. MEGGY.

BUDDING Political Economist: "Dad, what's the difference between a scientific and an unscientific Tariff?"

Protected Manufacturer: "Well my boy, you see a scientific tariff is a tariff which enables me to charge more for my goods than they are worth; an unscientific tariff is one which enables the other fellow to charge more for his goods than they are worth."

—Sydney, Australia, *Standard*.

THE equal right of all men to the use of land is as clear as their equal right to breathe the air—it is a right proclaimed by the fact of their existence. For we can not suppose that some men have a right to be in this world, and others no right.—HENRY GEORGE.

Lecture Work of James R. Brown

THERE can be no question that James R. Brown is arousing a sentiment in favor of our principles over a widely extended area. The proof lies before us in dozens of letters which show how favorable has been the reception accorded to the message. There can be no minimizing of these welcome testimonials. They come from many sources and are overwhelming as evidence of the profound appreciation from understanding audiences.

The headmaster Samuel F. Holmes, of Worcester Academy, Worcester, Mass., writes on December 17, 1930:

"Your visit is pleasantly remembered by us. I hope you will put us on your list for another visit next year. I have on my desk a copy of Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty.'"

"I am sure that the club enjoyed your talk. They are still discussing it," writes Lyman P. Wilson, president of the Rotary Club of Ithaca, N. Y. under date of December 18.

Frederick M. Holbrook wrote on December 3 after Mr. Brown's address at the Men's Club of Ridgeview Congregational Church: "As president of the Club I wish to thank you whole-heartedly not only for the message you brought us but for the rare treat of your personality. In the buzz that followed your departure I was asked by many how I *found* you and, more searchingly, how I got you. Of course I had to explain to them very much in detail that it was a secret."

From Robert D. Hawley, of the Massachusetts Agricultural College at Amherst, came the following:

"We were very glad to have you talk to our students and appreciate your kindness in coming to us and bringing your very interesting message."

Following is from the editor of the Fort Myers, Florida, *Press*.

"Sure, we want your 'stuff.' It's always good and sometimes better. We are of that great class trying so hard to make both ends meet we have no time to do the nice things of life, such as write you and say how we appreciate your contributions and assure you it gets printed while our waste basket is filled daily with the usual publicity junk."

"Your talk aroused much interest in those who heard it," writes Prof. Claude M. Fuess, of Phillips Academy at Andover, Mass.

"Your talk here will not be forgotten," writes R. W. Haist, secretary of the Lion's Club, of Niagara Falls, Ontario. "One more of your talks will convert our entire club."

O. L. Puth, secretary of the Kiwanis Club, of Newark, where Mr. Brown addressed a fine gathering, writes:

"Almost immediately after your address before us, the clipping enclosed appeared in the *Newark Sunday Call*. It certainly bears out your contention that you are

soaked just as soon as you commence to improve.

"We enjoyed your speech immensely filled as it was with so much horse sense, humor and human nature, and hope to have you with us each year so long as you continue to appear before the public."

T. G. Pullen, principal of the Cantonsville, Md. High School, and evidently an earnest inquirer, writes:

"I thank you very much for the pamphlets you sent me. I have enjoyed reading them very much. When I hear you talk on these subjects your arguments seem unanswerable.—Later, to be perfectly frank, certain practical questions arise that I am not able to answer to my satisfaction. I hope that when you come this way again I shall have the opportunity of discussing with you certain of these points."

J. Albert Brien, chairman of the Programme Committee of the Kiwanis Club, of Taunton, Mass., writes on January 6 to the Manhattan Single Tax Club:

"Some time ago we had the pleasure of hearing your President, Mr. James R. Brown, speak at one of our weekly meetings. Will you kindly advise when Mr. Brown will again be in this part of the country?"

"We would like to arrange our programme so as to have some open dates about that time. It is needless to say that we appreciated his talk, and we are more than anxious to hear him again."

"Mr. Brown's address was very instructive with just enough humor to make it interesting," says Ralph A. Johnson, chairman Programme Committee of the Kiwanis Club, of Lowell, Mass.

Norman R. Hamilton, publisher of the Portsmouth, Va., *Star* writes: "I want to tell you how much we have enjoyed your articles in the past, and each of these have been printed.

"We will be pleased to receive your articles in the future and hope you will let them come forward to us with such regularity they may be prepared for general use."

W. M. Southam, editor of the *Ottawa Citizen*, one of the largest as well as the leading papers of Canada, says: "I am glad you are sticking to the work—first, because it is work you are eminently fitted for and which you are doing so well, and, secondly, because it seems to me the most feasible way out of the present difficult situation. * * * So good luck to you."

Stanley T. Floyd, who is one of the most active Single Taxers of Toronto, sends the following communication:

"In the name of the Single Tax Association I can assure you there never has been a more effective propaganda carried on than your method of presenting the Single Tax proposition, our only regret being that we cannot have you here more frequently.

"One of the most important things, which make your work so effective, is the class of audience which you are able to address, and you have gained access to places we have never been able to reach; more than this you appear to be welcome to return at any

time, without apology, where ever you have once spoken.

"It is with no idea of flattering you that I write but we are convinced that our cause is definitely advanced by your visit and the great number of people you have spoken to."

Edwin B. Hill, Principal of the School of Commercial Sciences at Woonsocket, R. I., writes: "Our students were obviously enjoying with keenest interest your talk last Tuesday morning. I watched them through the entire address and never saw a more appreciative audience."

NEWSPAPERS THAT USE SYNDICATE SERVICE

The Syndicate Service of the Manhattan Single Tax Club is especially efficient. Articles by Mr. Brown go to 750 papers every month. Even the papers that do not use this service may be expected to benefit by it. But a surprising number do use it. Among the papers which have printed these articles, one or more, some regularly, are:

The Fairhope Courier, Fairhope, Ala.; *The Bell Herald*, Bell, Calif.; *The Free Press*, Trinidad, Colo.; *The Hartford Courant*, Hartford, Conn.; *The Journal-Courier*, New Haven, Conn.; *Fort Myers Press*, Fort Myers, Fla.; *Suburban Leader*, Cicero, Ill.; *The Standard*, Chicago Heights, Ill.; *The Daily Gate City*, Keokuk, Iowa; *Collinsville Herald*, Collinsville, Ill.; *Old Colony Memorial*, Plymouth, Mass.; *The Quincy Patriot Ledger*, Quincy, Mass.; *The Saugus Herald*, Saugus, Mass.; *The Daily Commercial Dispatch*, Columbus, Miss.; *Atlantic City Daily Press*, Atlantic City, N. J.; *Inklings*, Englewood, N. J.; *Rutherford Republican and American*, Rutherford, N. J.; *The Batavia Times*, Batavia, N. Y.; *The American City*, New York, N. Y.; *The World*, New York, N. Y.; *Land and Freedom*, New York, N. Y.; *Herald and Adirondack Mt. Press*, Tupper Lake, N. Y.; *The Workman*, Westchester County, Yonkers, N. Y.; *The Goldsboro Weekly Record*, Goldsboro, N. Car.; *The Standard*, Celina, Ohio; *Coshocton Tribune*, Coshocton, Ohio; *The Daily Chief*, Upper Sandusky, Ohio; *King Jack*, Picher, Okla.; *The Duquesne Times*, Duquesne, Pa.; *Johnstown Democrat*, Johnstown, Pa.; *The Daily News*, McKeesport, Pa.; *La Tribune*, Woonsocket, R. I.; *Portsmouth Star*, Portsmouth, Va.; *Buffalo County Journal*, Alma, Wisc.; *The Sydney Post*, Sydney, Nova Scotia.; *The Dunnville Gazette*, Dunnville, Ontario; *The Standard*, Sydney, N. S. W., Australia; *Peoples Advocate*, Adelaide, So. Australia; *Liberator*, Auckland, New Zealand; *Springfield Daily News*, Springfield, Mass.

During last year Mr. Brown addressed over 25,000 students of High Schools and Preparatory Schools. He believes that our doctrine can be successfully presented to the ordinary boy and girl of fifteen, and that it is a great deal more profitable to talk to the coming generation than to the going one.

LECTURES FOR DECEMBER AND JANUARY

Dec. 1. White Plains, N. Y. Men's Club of Ridgeview Congregational Church. The subject of this talk was: "Is It To Be Socialism, Anarchy or Freedom?"

There were 75 men present, a splendid group of clean-cut, intelligent citizens. Their receptivity was everything that could be asked for.

Dec. 2. Owego, N. Y. Rotary Club; 30 present. This was Mr. Brown's third visit to this Club and they are getting pretty well inoculated. A very pleasant, agreeable time and a hearty invitation to come back soon.

Dec. 3. Canisteo, N. Y. Rotary Club; 32 present. This was the first visit; the Club is made up of business men of a country town and for the first time turning their eyes toward the tax question.

Dec. 4. Rome, N. Y. Rotary Club at noon; 70 men. This is Mr. Brown's second visit. A splendid group of alive, alert business men, the increased growth of Single Tax sentiment quite perceptible.

In the afternoon an address to the Assembly at the Rome Free Academy, 600 scholars and a most enjoyable time.

Dec. 9. Saranac Lake, N. Y. Rotary Club; 58 present. A most interesting meeting with interested people.

Dec. 10. Ithaca, N. Y. Rotary Club; 180 present. Prof. Lyman P. Wilson, of the Legal Department of Cornell, presiding. Mr. Brown was informed there were about 20 members of the faculty in the audience. A splendid meeting, attitude kindly, receptive and encouraging.

Dec. 11. Gloversville, N. Y. Kiwanis Club; 55 present. This was a particularly lively group and like other groups, interested today in the question of taxation. Third visit to Gloversville and from appearances, it will not be the last.

Dec. 15. Hartford, Conn. Weaver High School; 1,400 students. Never a brighter or more alert group, reception by principal and faculty most friendly and kindly with a hearty invitation to come back.

Dec. 16. Nyack, N. Y. Rotary Club; 46 present. Third visit and the Single Tax certainly has a number of friends in this town and some very bright minds among them.

Dec. 18. Stamford, Conn. Lions Club. Fifth visit to Stamford. They certainly have an appetite for Single Tax. About 40 present and still the invitation extended, "come back and go on with the argument."

Then at 8 P. M., Knights of Columbus. This was a small group of about 20. Had a very jovial time, met some old friends of Father Malone's and Father McGlynn's.

Dec. 19. Waterbury, Conn. Post's Business College. Second visit; 85 students and it certainly is a privilege to talk to them.

Dec. 23. Tuckerton, N. J. Exchange Club. This is a very small group but made up of very earnest men. There were about 15 at the dinner, the Mayor and Assessors were there; very friendly to our proposition.

Jan. 2. New York, N. Y. New Era Club. Third visit; a splendid group of about 70 mostly young folks who are very much interested in social questions.

Jan. 6. Woonsocket, R. I. School of Commercial

Sciences; 100 students. Mr. Brown's address is the first talk any of them, including the owner and the faculty, ever heard on the Single Tax, but they took to it like a duck takes to water; it is so obviously sensible, business-like and reasonable. The door will always be open.

Woonsocket, R. I. Kiwanis Club; 30 present at the dinner, earnest, sincere men, important men of the town.

Jan. 15. Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Exchange Club; 35 present. This Club was very much interested and a nice group to talk to; very friendly to our attitude and of an inquiring turn of mind.

Jan. 20. North Hudson, N. J. Kiwanis Club; 81 present. Very kindly disposed and very receptive and the usual invitation, "be sure to come again."

On Jan. 27, the Kiwanis Club of Port Chester, N. Y.

LECTURES FOR FEBRUARY AND MARCH

Sunday, Feb. 1. Baltimore, Md., open forum; Afternoon.

Feb. 1. Baltimore, Md.. Cosmopolitan Community Church; 8.30 P. M.

Feb. 2. Baltimore, Md., Robert Beach School; 8.30 A. M.

Monday, Feb. 2. Towson, Md., State Normal School; 11.30 A. M.

Monday, Feb. 2. Baltimore, Md., Baltimore City Council; 4.00 P. M.

Feb. 2. Baltimore, Md., Radio Talk. Station W C B M; 7.30 P. M.

Tuesday, Feb. 3. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins University; 10.30 A. M.

Tuesday, Feb. 3. Baltimore, Md., Johns Hopkins University; 8.00 P. M.

Feb. 3. Baltimore, Md., Strayers Bryant Stratton College; 11.40 A. M.

Wednesday, Feb. 4. Catonsville, Md. High School; 9.00 A. M.

Thursday, Feb. 5. Washington, D. C., Georgetown University; class.

Friday, Feb. 6. Washington, D. C., Georgetown University; Seminar 5 to 7 P. M.

Wednesday, Feb. 11. Taunton, Mass. Kiwanis Club; Noon.

Wednesday, Feb. 11. East Weymouth, Mass. Men's Club; Evening.

Sunday, Feb. 15. Whitford, Pa. Forum at Whitford Lodge; 4.30 P. M.

Tuesday, Feb. 17. Rochester, Pa. Junior and Senior High School.

Tuesday, Feb. 17. Rochester, Pa. Rotary Club; 6.00 P. M.

Wednesday, Feb. 18. Cincinnati, Ohio. Lions Club; 12.15 Noon.

Thursday, Feb. 19. Cincinnati, Ohio. Rotary Club; 12.15 Noon.

Friday, Feb. 20. Chicago, Ill. University of Chicago, Liberal Club; 4.30 P. M.

Monday, Feb. 23. Peoria, Ill. Advertising and Selling Club; Noon.

Monday, Feb. 23. Bloomington, Ill. Illinois Wesleyan University; 7 to 8 P. M.

Tuesday, Feb. 24. Bloomington, Ill. Illinois Wesleyan University; 8 A. M. Class.

Tuesday, Feb. 24. Bloomington, Ill. Illinois Wesleyan University; 9 A. M. Class.

Tuesday, Feb. 24. Bloomington, Ill. Illinois Wesleyan University; 10 A. M. Assembly.

Tuesday, Feb. 24. Bloomington, Ill. Young Men's Club; 12.15 Noon.

Wednesday, Feb. 25. St. Louis, Mo. Washington University; 11.00 A. M.

Wednesday, Feb. 25. St. Louis, Mo. Scottish Rite Club; Noon.

Thursday, Feb. 26. St. Louis, Mo. Rotary Club; Noon.

Thursday, Feb. 26. St. Louis Mo. Y. M. H. A. and Junior C. of C.; Evening.

Friday, Feb. 27. St. Louis, Mo. Washington University; Morning.

Friday, Feb. 27. St. Louis, Mo. Optimist Club; Noon.

Tuesday, March 3. St. Louis, Mo. City Club of St. Louis; Noon.

Wednesday, March 4. Alton, Ill. Rotary Club; Noon.

Thursday, March 5. South Bend, Ind. Kiwanis Club; Noon.

Tuesday, March 10. Reading, Pa. Rotary Club; 12.10 Noon.

Well, We Can Still Make Land Free

WHATEVER form unemployment insurance may eventually take in this country, the system is as yet only in its beginnings. As long as there were *free lands in the United States* and *abundant* opportunities for earning a living open to every *able-bodied worker the problem of providing a permanent basis of unemployment relief was not urgent.*—N. Y. World.

Where the Soviet Farmer Has the Advantage

IN one very important respect Soviet state farms have an insuperable advantage over the farmers of the outside world, in that the land costs nothing. In America interest on capital investment in the land itself has been estimated to equal 35 per cent of the whole cost of production. Other things being equal, this gives the Soviet state farms a 35 per cent lead over their competitors abroad.

From "The Red Trade Menace,"

—N. Y. Evening Post, Nov. 28.

Henry George Congress To Meet in Baltimore

THE Sixth Annual Henry George Congress will be held in Baltimore, this decision having been made by the trustees of the Henry George Foundation at their annual meeting held in Pittsburgh on January 9th. The very cordial invitation extended by the Maryland Tax Reform Association of which Charles G. Baldwin is President, was strongly supported by a telegram from Governor Albert C. Ritchie, and letters from Mayor William F. Broening, the Baltimore Association of Commerce and all the leading service clubs of Baltimore, conveying assurance of their hearty cooperation. It is felt that the selection of Baltimore practically assures both a large and successful convention. The dates to be fixed for this year's congress will be announced soon after the appointment of the Convention Committee.

At the annual meeting of the trustees all of the officers now serving were unanimously re-elected for the ensuing year, viz: President, George E. Evans; Vice President, Joseph Dana Miller; Honorary Vice President, Mrs. Anna George de Mille; Treasurer, William E. Schoyer; Executive Secretary, P. R. Williams; Associate Secretary, John Lawrence Monroe; Assistant Secretary, Francis W. Maguire. Clayton J. Ewing, President of the Chicago Single Tax Club, was elected a member of the Board of Trustees.

As the new members of the National Advisory Commission, the following persons were elected: Clarence Darrow, Chicago, Illinois; John S. Codman, Boston, Mass.; Edward Polak, New York City; A. J. Milligan, San Francisco, Calif.; L. D. Beckwith, Stockton, Calif.; Edward B. Swinney, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Lona Ingham Robinson, Glendale, Calif.; Nicholas A. Vyne, Camp Verde, Ariz.

A special committee was created to investigate and report on the feasibility of erecting a Henry George Memorial Building at some strategic location such as New York, Chicago or Washington, D. C. Edward Polak, of New York City, who first conceived the idea of a Memorial Building, has been appointed Chairman of this committee and the committee will report the result of the inquiry into this subject at the Baltimore convention.

Dr. Mark Millikin, of Hamilton, Ohio, was appointed Chairman of a committee to interview President Hoover on the unemployment situation, following up the action of the Henry George Congress at San Francisco where a resolution on unemployment was adopted and submitted to the President and certain members of the President's cabinet.

The following Resolutions were adopted:

WHEREAS, there is a growing demand for a concrete programme of action and for a more aggressive promotion of the Single Tax movement in the United States with a

view to actual achievement in applying the Single Tax principle, therefore be it

RESOLVED that the officers and the executive committee of the Henry George Foundation are hereby authorized to plan, organize and conduct a legislative campaign in support of specific measures tending toward the concentration of taxation upon land values with a view to winning a substantial victory for the Single Tax.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an announcement of a programme of organized concentration with the said purpose in view be made through the Henry George Foundation to the Single Taxers of America and that every effort be made to obtain strong moral and financial support in order to assure the success of the undertaking.

A Very Clear Statement

IT is impossible to write on existing industrial conditions and ignore the nonsense being uttered on every hand. No one can circulate among men at the present time without hearing bitter complaints that "Capital" has not kept the promise made a year ago to keep up wages and maintain working forces. The complaint is for the most part unjustified. No one a year ago realized the gravity of the situation and the impossibility of the general run of employers maintaining full forces at full wages throughout the depression then beginning. The complaint, however, is unjustified on quite other grounds as well.

The old theory that wages were derived from capital was long since exploded. Wages are derived from production. But when production does not sell, what is to become of wages?

Both capital and labor, however, are culpable in that they did not long since investigate this branch of economics and discover what it is that several times in each generation dissolves markets by undermining the public buying power.

High wages have been relied on to maintain this buying power. It is obvious that if wages (using the term to describe the reward of all productive effort, whether of hand or brain) be high enough, they could absorb all production. It is obvious that as the world is economically organized today it is not possible to raise and maintain wages at any such figure. That being the case it is in order to find out what there is in our economic system that prevents it. Is it not possible to find out what it is that in some obscure way absorbs so large a portion of the nation's legitimate earnings that neither capital nor labor can prosper?

—STEPHEN BELL in *Commerce and Finance*.

GREEK history tells that King Bion offered to sacrifice a thousand oxen in honor of any man who brought forward a new thought; and that it was noted ever after.

The San Diego Campaign for Collecting Economic Rent

IN San Diego I find an energetic group of advocates of fundamental reforms maintaining a weekly publication, holding two meetings a week, and publishing and circulating some excellent reform literature.

Only a few weeks before the Wall Street boom collapsed (or perhaps it was a few months), Frederick F. Ingram, of Detroit, sold out his manufacturing plant in that city for a good price. He had always mixed politics with business. I use the word politics in the good sense, and he found each helped the other. He had been decidedly successful in business, but grew tired of adding golden numbers to golden numbers. He was a radical, but not one of the tired radicals whom we have heard so much about. And he did not think within himself saying to his soul, "Soul, thou hast much wealth laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry." He said something quite different.

And so it happens that the Ingram Institute of San Diego has come into existence. It states its purpose to be, "research to discover the basic causes of poverty, vice, and all other social maladjustments; to publish the results of its work, to the end that a better social condition may be brought about." Prof. Roman, of Los Angeles, was associated with the Institute for some time. Some of its principal research work is now carried on by W. N. McNair, formerly of Pittsburgh, who was a candidate for United States Senator in Pennsylvania in 1928, and received over 1,000,000 votes. He ran on a platform declaring, "The rent of the land belongs to the people and the first duty of the Government is to collect it and abolish all taxes. Therefore I favor collecting school and county taxes the way Pittsburgh collects city taxes, half rate on buildings." For some time past the Institute has been holding weekly luncheon meetings, attended by from 25 to 50 business men, and weekly evening meetings at the headquarters of the Institute, 854 Eighth Street, which is almost across the street from the San Diego city library. At these gatherings Mr. McNair has been the principal speaker, and questions and discussions have followed each talk.

At the meetings of the Institute, and in its weekly publication, the words "Single Tax" are never used, nor is Henry George often quoted. But a good deal is said about the Pittsburgh Plan and "collecting economic rent." While the Institute group is for step-by-step methods, nevertheless its nomenclature in many ways is like that of the London Commonwealth Land Party. Nomenclatures differ, but so long as aims are similar why quarrel about names?

Among pamphlets published and circulated are "An Unshackled Civilization," by Jackson H. Ralston of Palo Alto, "An Analysis of Economic Laws," by Prof. Harry

Gunnison Brown, "Causes of Business Depression," by Henry George, and "Anti-Filipino Race Riots." The latter interested me deeply, and is a report made to the Ingram Institute by E. S. Bogardus, of the University of Southern California.

The Institute has taken a firm stand against a scheme of real estate dealers called The Collier-Ten-Year-Plan under which it is sought to sell vacant lots, not to persons who may want to use them, but to persons who will hold them out of use for future sale at a profit. For instance, the Collier Plan printed matter says, "If you believe that 1940 San Diego will be a larger and better city than today, it is *your privilege to reap the profits of growth* during the next ten years on an investment of only 20 per cent—one-fifth of today's value."

The Institute started right in to show that for individuals "to reap the profits of growth" was all wrong, and that the profits of growth promoted by the presence of population should be used in common, for the benefit of all. Henry B. Cramer, president of the Cramer Bakery Company, appreciating the justice of the position taken by the Institute, joined with others in writing a letter to the San Diego *Union* in which he pointed out that although San Diego had had a wonderful growth in population, yet that growth was checked in 1928 in a very marked manner. And he traced the cause to a change in city assessed valuations. For a long time land values were taxed on a basis of around \$72,000,000, while buildings were taxed on an assessment of from \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000.

At a later date land values were assessed around \$92,000,000 and buildings at from \$16,000,000 to \$19,000,000. This heavy tax on land values and comparatively light tax on improvements kept down the price of vacant land and thus encouraged home building.

In 1928 a radical change was made in the relative assessment of land values and improvements. The office of city assessor was abolished and county assessment values became the city assessment values. This brought about the reduction of land value assessments to about \$54,000,000, and the value of improvements to about \$24,000,000. At the same time there was a considerable increase in the assessments of personal property.

The letter mentioned, commenting on these radical changes of assessments, said, "Thus the industrious and thrifty were penalized and those who were speculating in the sites which were needed to do business were favored with a lighter tax burden."

The letter pointed out a down town block where land value assessments had been cut in half. The relative land value taxation on seven blocks investigated indicated that under the new assessments there was a saving of almost \$6,000,000 in taxes to the owners of land, and a corresponding increase on improvements.

Florida was pointed out as an example to show that high land values do not make for prosperity, but on the contrary they check it and bring disaster. My observation

confirms this emphatically. The disastrous bank failures in every large city in Florida were to a great extent caused by land booming tactics. School houses were built, not for educational purposes but to help sell lots in subdivisions. Hundreds of miles of broad paved streets were built, not needed at all for transportation purposes, but to enhance the selling price of land. Bond issues for all sorts of purposes were recklessly voted. The enormous aggregation of these bond issues soon resulted in the default of principal and interest on millions of dollars worth of paving bonds, school bonds and municipal, town and county bonds.

These defalcations ruined hundreds of banks and caused thousands of individual bankruptcies.

The Collier-Ten-Year-Plan people at first met the letter of Mr. Cramer and his associates in a typical land booming manner. Instead of answering the letter they said they would have his bakery boycotted. But the threat has not intimidated Mr. Cramer, nor any of the Ingram Institute group, but on the contrary it has put pep into their battle for a correction of the evils of unjust taxation.

—CHESTER C. PLATT.

Harry Weinberger Creates A Diversion

AT a luncheon held Jan. 3, 1931, by the Foreign Policy Association at the Hotel Astor, this city, the subject for discussion was "The World Wide Depression—Ways Out." The principal speaker was Professor Hamilton. In the course of his speech he was interrupted by a questioner from the balcony who asked, "What about the Single Tax?"

Professor Hamilton, who had admitted that he knew of no way out, attempted to answer. The answer must have seemed inadequate to the audience, for Chairman McDonald commented as follows:

"I am sure that answer hasn't been satisfactory to everybody. I know it hasn't been satisfactory to our Single Tax friends, and so we are very fortunate to have here at the guest-table a gentleman, a distinguished member of the New York Bar, Mr. Harry Weinberger, who says he would be delighted to show Professor Hamilton why Mr. Henry George's theory is a way out." Mr. Weinberger then addressed the audience as follows, his speech being punctuated with applause:

"Mr. McDonald wanted something with a little more excitement and perhaps the gentleman up in the balcony started it. If Professor Hamilton read 'Progress and Poverty' so long ago, the probabilities are he has forgotten most of the book and he ought to go back and read it over again. (Laughter). I say that without any intention to belittle the Professor's speech, which I enjoyed very much, especially his admission that he knew

no 'way out.' Henry George's idea of taxing the land, or rather taking the full rental value of the land and taking off all taxes from industry, is not a rural form of economics. The same thing applies today as it did then. The professor might read the speech of 1885 of Mr. George, called 'The Crime of Poverty,' and if he didn't look at the date when it was delivered, he would imagine that he was hearing a speech of today. There was then the same so-called overproduction, the same unemployment, the same question of free trade or tariff, except that Henry George did have, in his opinion, and in my opinion, a 'way out.'

One of our friends said something about having a tremendous building boom, lending people money to build houses. Certainly, let's say a building boom right here in New York,—that is a city problem, that is a so-called civilized problem that we have in the cities. Suppose we all began to build houses or wanted to build houses, what would happen? Why the price of land would go up so greatly that after a while building would stop and you would have the same stagnation that you have today. You read about the New School down on 12th Street paying \$200,000 or more for the mere fee of the land to build the building on. No one produced that land; no one except the community produced the value of that land. If I dropped 1,000,000 people in the City of New York tomorrow, the value of the land of the City of New York would go up tremendously.

Might I urge as an immediate way out that we take off all the taxes from all industry tomorrow. If we then put all the taxes upon the bare rental value of the ground, certainly there wouldn't be any less ground tomorrow than there is today, except that the speculative value of the ground would disappear.

You have recurring depressions, as one of the speakers stated. You find it every five years, or every ten years, or every two or three years, and the question is, 'why?' Some people talk of overproduction. I am glad most of the speakers here today did not take that fallacious point of view, though some of them hinted at it.

The most notable description of short-sightedness in history is one of the old fables of a king who said he would walk abroad in a marvelous costume. Everybody said, 'How beautiful and wonderful it is,' until one child said, 'Why, the king is naked.' We, too, are similarly short-sighted. We have this wonderful machinery making too much clothing so that millions are without clothes. We have agriculture—that produces so much wheat that millions have to go hungry. There is no limit to human consumptive power. There is only under-consumption caused by inability to purchase, and the question is, 'how and why?'

At the table here we were talking about emergency measures. There are certain emergency measures. That is not the thing I am going to talk about, except to mention one or two. We might say this is an emergency like war

and we will take 100 per cent. of all incomes over \$100,000 net for the coming year. We might say we will use the army for some purpose beside killing, by turning the army loose with its army kitchens to feed the hungry and use the armories for the purpose of giving homeless men and women a place to lay their heads.

Only one thing more in my five minutes. The most I can possibly do is drop a thought in your mind that may grow and lead you to investigate and read the book 'Progress and Poverty' as well, and find out whether, if you took all taxes off industry, if you took all taxes off buildings and put them upon the bare rental value of the ground, it wouldn't create more jobs, create more jobs than men. When you have more jobs than men, wages go up and the consumption power and the demand for goods and food are increased. By employing the unemployed you produce more goods and under the law of supply and demand prices will come down. By taking the full rental value of the ground and removing absolutely the speculative value of the ground, taking for the community that which the community creates, the value of ground today, you will not have building booms and speculations as we had in Florida, not building booms as you have down in New Jersey and also over in Queens every time they build a subway, every time they build a bridge. Whenever science creates a new and better form of society, and population increases, the man and the individual who gets the greatest benefit is the one who owns the land.

If we had the best police department, and the best fire department, and the best schools, and the cleanest streets, with the best of everything here in the City of New York tomorrow, what would happen? An influx of people, and an increase in the value of the ground, and higher rents.

I am surprised here today, with all these learned men at the table, I am surprised as I read all the articles on the 'way out,' that none of them talk about the need of rent coming down and the doing away with the speculative value of land which keeps people from the use of it. They tell you that in the pioneer form of society you did not have unemployment. That is the very thing which our complicated form of society stops us from seeing. If a savage, if a pioneer without the help of civilization and machinery, can earn enough money to support himself, where does the tremendous value of increase of products go to when science teaches man how to turn out by the millions and the billions things that man could not do with his bare hands? So I say, my friends, if I have left just one real thought in your minds, if I have helped Professor Hamilton, if I have caused him to think, maybe he will go back and read 'Progress and Poverty' over again. If so, this afternoon is not in vain as far as I am concerned. I thank you." (Applause).

UNTIL God's soil is rescued from the clutch of Greed and given back to Labor, let no man call this the Land of Freedom.—ELLA WHEELER WILCOX.

Death of J. R. Hermann

IN the death of Jacob R. Herman, of Portland, Oregon, the Single Tax movement loses one of its bravest soldiers, one of its great Field Marshals. He died December 12, of pneumonia, after a brief illness.

Mr. Hermann was born near Rowley, Iowa, in 1870. At the age of 16 he went to Chicago where he learned the painter's and glazier's trade. After four years he returned to Iowa and entered the Northwest University, later called Morningside College, at Sioux City, Iowa. He worked his way through school and while studying law under Herbert Quick became a convert to the economic philosophy of Henry George. He then began to travel and lecture for the Single Tax.

He settled in Denver where he worked at his trade and led in the Single Tax movements in Colorado. He was instrumental in helping to nominate Judge Lindsay for judge of the first Juvenile Court. He worked and spoke for W. J. Bryan in all three of that gentleman's campaigns for the presidency. He had a great gift of natural eloquence and his services as a campaigner were much sought after. He also campaigned for the Single Tax in California during the war, and traveled through the East to raise funds for the amendment. In 1918 he went to Portland, Oregon, and opened Single Tax headquarters in the Stock Exchange Building in that city. He organized the Oregon Single Tax League which under his leadership placed a Single Tax measure on the ballot in 1920 and 1922 which each time polled a vote of about 40,000.

On the day he died he asked his sister to read a letter received from a Single Tax friend in California telling of plans for helping in a future campaign in Oregon. Hermann said, "My! what a responsibility he places upon me." Before midnight he had passed away, and that responsibility now rests upon other shoulders.

Mr. Hermann was a member of the Building Trades Council and his splendid sincerity won many converts among the rank and file of the workers. He never wearied in his labors for the cause, though his heart as well as his patience were often sorely tried. He was uncompromising in his advocacy of the truth he had learned from Henry George and he was a great campaigner. He was present at the Henry George Congress in San Francisco in September of this year and his speech delivered on that occasion was printed in the Nov.-Dec. issue of LAND AND FREEDOM.

Hermann was a convinced spiritualist and the funeral service was conducted by Mrs. Zimmerman Smith, a minister of that faith. Mrs. Laura Lees read a beautiful tribute and there were flowers, music and song. In 1924 our friend published a book detailing his personal investigation over a long period of years into the phenomena of spirit return, under the title "Immortality Triumphant", and excerpts from this book were read at the service.

The Henry George movement has lost a great apostle, a fearless, rugged soul to whom the truth alone mattered.

Not for such as he the comforts and luxuries of existence. He trod the rough way of all great solitary reformers, but he had the love of many, certainly of all those who knew him best. And that is enough.

Death of Dr. Louis H. Davis

THE passing of Louis H. Davis, of St. Louis, Mo. is a great loss to the cause. Long a friend and contributor to LAND AND FREEDOM, he was active in all Single Tax work. Harlan Eugene Read and Charles Lischer spoke at the services. Dr. Davis was 67 years old.

The Single Tax League of Missouri passed the following resolutions:

"The League which stands for the right of all to the use of the Earth by taking the land values that all make for the benefit of all, thereby abolishing the primary cause of unemployment and poverty, has sustained a great loss in the death of our

DR. LOUIS H. DAVIS

We regret his leaving us. As Henry George said: "Strong soul and high endeavor the World needs them now." He kept the faith, gave himself and his means to the cause that will restore to man his birthright in the Earth.

"Ideals are like stars, We cannot touch them with our hands, but, like the Seafaring man upon the waste of the waters can choose them for our guide, and having chosen and following them they will lead us to our destiny."—CARL SCHURZ.

With this slight testimonial we wish to extend to his family our sincere sympathy in the loss of so worthy a husband and father."

Reviews of Louis Post's Prophet of San Francisco

AMONG the reviews of Louis Post's book recently published by the Vanguard Press of this city, is one by Alice Stone Blackwell in *Unity* edited by Rev. John Haynes Holmes. The reviewer says:

There is such a wealth of material in this book that it is hard even to outline its contents. The author tells of Henry George from many sides—his family-life, his spiritual vision, his chief works, his views on many subjects, including the future of his cause, which the author says is steadily though quietly gaining converts. There is a list of the men who advocate like ideas, before and since, and answers to the principal objections; a description of Henry George's chief works; and an account of the *Standard* and of the *Public*, which Mr. Post edited so ably for many years. It would be interesting to quote the explanation of the kind of Socialism that Henry George believed in and the kind he did not; his reasons for thinking permanent organization for the promotion of a political reform to be generally unwise; his argument for the immortality of human beings and of animals; and his opinions on many other subjects, including the right re-

lations between husband and wife. Henry George married at twenty-two a girl of eighteen, who was all his life, he declared, his best adviser. The present volume has been brought out under the intelligent and affectionate supervision of Alice Thacher Post, who was so sympathetically associated with her husband for years in Single Tax work and in the editorship of the *Public*. The book is a treasury of interesting and inspiring material.

A review from Prof. Paul H. Douglass appears in the *New Republic* of the issue of December 10. Mr. Douglass deprecates what he calls "the monotonous monomania" of Single Taxers, and he says "we have been largely a nation of real estate speculators and have, therefore, been reluctant to admit that increased rent which we expected to make us rich should be taken by the community." He adds however:

But neither intellectual fastidiousness nor economic interest should blind us to the robust central truth that the economic rent of bare land is a social product and should normally furnish a larger part than it now does of the revenues of society. It has been the supreme merit of Henry George that he pointed this out with extraordinary and genuine eloquence, even if not always with impeccable logic. Ricardo had, to be sure, laid the basis for such a social theory when he worked out the nature of rent by showing that it was the difference between the costs of cultivation on the better grades of land and those on the poorest pieces which were utilized. As population increases, the pressure upon the soil becomes greater; poorer and poorer lands would be resorted to and with the increase in the differential, rents and, therefore, the value of land would inevitably rise. It would have been only a logical extension of Ricardo's analysis to have concluded then and there that since rent was not a social cost of production and was, instead, a socially created surplus, the community should mark it as its very own. But this ethical application was not made by Ricardo or by any of his followers with the exception of John Stuart Mill.

We can afford to overlook the charge of "failing in impeccable logic" which the Professor brings against Henry George. It was but natural that George should have fallen into many errors." These the reviewer with commendable caution fails to indicate. It is a memory of many now living that certain very eminent gentlemen came to grief in trying to point out these "errors" and lapses of logic in Henry George's contentions. But Prof. Douglass is very fair in this review, and makes admissions enough to justify the taking, if not the whole, then a good part of this "socially created surplus," i. e., economic rent.

In a review of Mr. Post's book in the *New Church Messenger* signed by B. A. Whittemore we find the following clear cut statement:

The value of land in general being due to location on the one hand and to demand for occupancy on the other (an acre in the heart of the Sahara Desert, for instance, being worth nothing, but in the heart of Manhattan being worth a fortune—a value created not by any individual but solely by the entire community), the programme is, to take for community uses by taxation the rent that title ownership now enables the owner to exact from the user

for use of the land itself. Let title ownership to land remain as at present to begin with; but let the advantages of holding such title to land except by the actual user be taken away by taxation of the location to the extent of the amount of money the highest competitor for that location is willing to pay for occupancy and use. If land were taxed on that basis, speculation in land would become practically impossible, and everybody who cared to do so could occupy land somewhere, on the basis of paying the land-value taxation to the community in which located. Free land was one of the great inducements to immigration to this country. Alas, that in giving free occupancy the government did not see the unwisdom of giving property ownership! But after all, our government was not especially at fault, as the holding of land as property of individuals goes back throughout past history, and most (if not all) titles go back eventually to conquest and the assumption of ownership by the conquerors,—titles thus beginning with force and iniquity, later bulwarked and buttressed by human law in the interests of the holding class.

"The Prophet of San Francisco,"—Mr. Post has given to his book the title that the Duke of Argyll applied to Henry George in ridicule, when his doctrine of the taxation of land values first became known in Great Britain. Though first applied in ridicule, the appellation seems a most fitting one, as Henry George manifested the true spirit of the prophet in devoting his life to the promulgation of the message the Lord had given him for the advancement of His kingdom upon earth. That many persons sensed the prophetic element in his function was especially manifest by the burst of applause when, during the funeral service, on November 1, 1897, Father McGlynn in his eulogy said at the climax of his remarks:

We can say of him as the Scriptures say, there was a man sent of God whose name was John; and I believe that I mock not those sacred Scriptures when I say, there was a man sent of God whose name was Henry George. (P. 185.) -

ACCORDING to *Progress*, Melbourne Single Tax organ, Australia, Java, a little island about as large as England, supports a population of 37,400,000, and has no unemployment menace. How do they do it? High tariff? Prohibition? Gold standard? Private operation of public utilities? Not a bit of it. "Land speculation is forbidden. Land is treated as government property and is let on hereditary lease or in communal holdings."

THE Single Tax is aimed directly against occupation by decree. It is a practical means of nullifying the advantages, abso.ute.y extra-economic in character, which accrue to the beneficiaries of the political pre-emption of natural resources. It is a scientifically perfect pry by which the dead hand of predatory exploitation must be forced to relinquish its grip on land, and by which the wage-working class, without a single auxiliary statutory device being necessary, will be set free.

—MURRAY GODWIN in the *New Freeman*

The Taxation of Land Values

PRIZE WINNING ESSAY, 1930 CONTEST

By R. C. WIGHT, University of Va.

THERE is little, if anything, that an ordinary layman could conceive of in the way of praise to Henry George that has not been said whole heartedly by the leaders of our civilization in all walks of life. Yet for some indefinable reason he has not been accorded the universal preeminence in the instruction of students which he deserves in the estimation of such men as John Dewey, Irving Fisher, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and numerous others. Perhaps it is because the practical or material side of his work has tended to obscure his greater study of ideals of mankind from the vision of the ordinary student. Or it may be that America in her wild enthusiasm over material progress is slow to recognize great social philosophers in her midst; or more probably that Henry George thought mostly apart from the majority of students of social theory. The fact remains that as a thinker he justly deserves a place among the few greatest.

The problem dealt with here is one which is essentially ideal; yet it is so clear and of so great moment that it must be made very real and tangible, else it will remain forever a stumbling block to the insatiable hunger of man for a better quality in each aspect of life. We have the land and all that comes from it as an eternal endowment of nature; we likewise are capable of expending much more physical labor than is necessary; our accumulation of capital has kept pace with the growth in other ways; many of us have infinitely more than is necessary to satisfy our material wants. In the face of this there are millions who starve for want of the barest essentials, and hence cannot apply themselves to the higher developments of life. With an over-production at all times in some products, millions ready to produce more and a great demand for the primary wants of mankind, there is surely something very wrong with the balance of man's spiritual, intellectual, and physical life. It has remained to the present an enigma sufficiently baffling to thwart the first move toward a solution. It is this fact that has kept it in the realm of the ideal, but there is apparently no reason to believe that there isn't definite means of correcting this maladjustment. And the means of solving the enigma must be within the province of political economy. The problem presents first the discovery and interpretation of the law associating poverty with progress.

Animal and vegetable life tend to exhaust the resources of nature, but with human life this is not the case. It is a peculiar and perhaps the greatest prerogative of man that his desires and capability of desires are dynamic and infinite. The wants of all other life are fixed, but those of man evolve with his nature. To a certain point the two seek the same ends; namely, the acquisition of a sufficient quantity of objects for sustenance and the maxi-

mum of physical pleasure. But beyond this point the two diverge. The latter not only is not satisfied; he has merely found a basis for developing his desires and seeks quality which is of an infinite nature. His intellect reaches out for facts and laws associating phenomena; for ideals and means to their realization; for a discard of the old for the new which is beyond our ken. From this analogy it is obvious that the weakness of the productive forces is not the cause of the poverty which festers in the centers of civilization. Hence poverty is not due to over-population but to maladjustment.

The factors of production are Land, Labor, and Capital. The first includes the sum total of nature's endowment to man; the second, all human exertion of which man is capable; the third, the increment derived from the application of Labor to Land which accrues for the further production of wealth. A man with any part of the world to himself is indeed very poor. He has the best of the Land as it is, yet his is a sorry lot. But suppose others surround him and all communicate with each other in soul, mind, and body. He finds that with less exertion he can not only have more of the material goods, but he is also much happier and much more capable. The evolution of his desires is accentuated after being hampered by solitude. After a while his land is really poorer in physical elements, but it has a much higher value whether or not he has changed it. Leaving aside the improvement in the tools and methods of production, we see an added increment to the value of the land, because a superior power in labor is brought out which attaches to the Land, as climate, soil, etc.

In progressive or expanding countries, notably the United States, we find the margin of production extending beyond its natural limits, or the rent line reaching beyond the margin of production. This abnormal condition is the result of speculation which is always more conspicuous among newer peoples. This speculation is actually a display of confidence in the continued enhancement of land values. It is indeed a power, concurrent with physical advancement, which tends always to cause rent to increase at a rate out of proportion to that at which production increases with progress. Hence, it reduces wages absolutely as progress continues. The only force which limits speculation in land values is that which demands a minimum for wages and interest on capital.

It seems now that we have the basic cause of poverty, the reason why labor does not realize the benefits which accrue from increased land values and material progress; namely, that rent increases with productive power and at a higher rate. Every increase in the latter forces the former to a higher level, thus effecting greater demands on labor in utilizing its powers. It is the land-owners chiefly who reap the benefits of material progress. Inequality in the ownership of land is the direct and invariable cause of inequality in the distribution of wealth. Labor and Capital are impotent without Land; their

value is not inherent, but subject to the manner in which they are applied to Land. Any remedy for the situation must flow from a consideration of this fact.

Obviously, this remedy rests in the adjustment of the tenure of land, which holds its value only from the existence of the community. Value here is the price of monopoly; that is, a measure of the difference between the land in question and the best land which may be had free. Labor justly deserves to possess the rights that spring from its exertion, and this must be the sole criterion for affixing rights according to justice. Rent represents value created by the whole community and is, therefore, what the individual owes the community as its just due. The value from which rent springs is the community's equity in land privately owned. Conceding to all equal rights to the use of the land and admitting priority of possession as a just measure, we may reconcile the fixity of tenure by taxing rent for the benefit of the community.

The means of effecting this remedy are indeed simple, but they meet very grave obstacles in prejudice and mistaken ideas of the relations between Labor and Capital and between the two and land. But these means are already ours. It remains for us to develop them by the appropriation of rent by taxation, thus asserting the right of society to the value of land. The form of ownership may remain the same. All taxation save that on land values must be abolished. Taxation of rent must increase proportionately with progress until it will eventually supply the total amount necessary for government functions.

There is some argument for equal taxation of all property, in that all species are alleged to derive their value and protection from the state equally. This, however, should apply only to land values, which vanish with the disappearance of the community. It follows that a tax on the land values is the only really just and equal tax. Any advantage which remains to a citizen must then be the result of his own effort and ability. The alleged difficulty in distinguishing land from improvements and the emphasis laid thereon precludes any further argument against the single land tax and accentuates the need of making a distinction. For if it is admitted that a wrong ensues from taxing values which labor and capital produce, it would be contradictory to state that the remedy lies in a levy on all improvements.

At present industry is badly handicapped by the manner in which taxes are levied. Taxes really amount to a penalty for realizing the gains from earnest endeavor and for bestowing benefits upon society. The wheels of exchange are also badly clogged. It is hard to conceive of the significance of releasing industry and commerce of the bonds which now hover over them. Obviously a stimulus heretofore unparalleled would be given to individual effort. Instead of being amerced for each accomplishment, he would be allowed to enjoy to the fullest extent the fruits of his labors. Naturally, with the production of wealth

stimulated the public treasury would be fattened enormously. Furthermore new opportunities would be opened. Land would be cheaper, and speculation in and monopoly of land would be extirpated, so that an abundance of land now debarred from offering man its fruits would be put to its best use. Labor would be the object of competition, demand and supply would balance, and trade, which marks paramount advantage of the social state, would be unchecked.

Man has held poverty to mean shame and degradation as well as deprivation. It is the consequent fear coupled with other emotions which urges man to guard against poverty, sometimes by the foulest means. A more positive impetus is given him in public esteem as a winner if he frees himself from poverty. Give nature its just right to distribute wealth according to capability, and take for society that which it creates, and fear and suffering will be removed. That intangible force which is immortal in man existing above the material will be given free rein.

It was stated earlier that maladjustment underlay the enigma presented by the coexistence of excessive wealth and poverty. We have found that this is due to the fact that as material progress goes on, the possession of land lends more and more force to appropriation of wealth produced by capital and labor. By relieving the two of all taxation we would counteract this tendency. Wealth produced would be divided: one share would go to the producers in wages and interest; the other would accrue to society to be distributed equitably to its members. With the disappearance of poverty the incentive for the ardent quest for wealth would be moderated: a riddance of that quality in man which is the least human and most disgraceful of all. The change would be a gain to all those who live by wages directly, and to those who live by the joint application of labor and capital. In a word, individual reward would follow the dictates of intelligence, skill and prudence.

The evils arising from the unequal distribution of wealth are not incidents of progress but rather obstacles which must halt it if not removed. They spring from the shunting of natural laws, the denial of Justice, the ultimate law. We must give to every man the liberty to live his life and enjoy the product of his labor under nature's principles. It is the liberty which invites virtue, wealth, knowledge, and strength. The course is hard and paved with obstacles of prejudice, selfishness, but there can be no cause worthy of greater sacrifice.

THE masses of men, who in the midst of abundance, suffer want; who, clothed with political freedom, are condemned to the wages of slavery; to whose toil labor-saving inventions bring no relief, but rather seem to rob them of a privilege, instinctively feel that "there is something wrong." And they are right.

—HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George Foundation To Feature Political Action

SINCE its inception in the summer of 1926, the Henry George Foundation of America has been devoting its efforts chiefly to the field of economic education and, while not entirely disregarding opportunities to advance legislative efforts, the Foundation has not undertaken to develop or sponsor any programme of political or legislative action. This policy has been pursued because its founders appreciated the great need for popular education in fundamental economics and sought to concentrate upon this one task. As the result, however, of longer experience and careful study of the situation in its various aspects, the officers and trustees of the Foundation have reached the conclusion that in the long run Single Tax education cannot be advantageously divorced from political expression. Accordingly at the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees the resolution as printed on page 18 was unanimously adopted.

Under the new plan it is intended that education and political action shall go hand in hand. In this way an outlet will be afforded for the talents and energies of various types of Single Tax workers who are eager for activity. It will also be possible to develop organization to a much greater extent than heretofore,—a consideration of outstanding importance.

Since the days of Henry George, who himself took advantage of every opportunity to bring the land and tax questions into the political field, a very large section of American Single Taxers has always been keenly interested in working concretely to put the Single Tax into practical operation. The decade just preceding the great war witnessed live Single Tax campaigns in many parts of the United States and, while immediate success could hardly be reasonably expected, these campaigns gave evidence of life and progress and valuable experience was gained.

Again there comes a call from many quarters for political activity and the need is recognized for a strong national agency to plan, foster and support organized campaigns directed toward the practical application of the Single Tax principle. The Henry George Foundation is now prepared to assume this responsibility and will welcome the cooperation of Georgists throughout the United States.

A policy of organized concentration is believed to be essential for the success of this plan and will be recommended by the official board of the Foundation without, of course, presuming to dictate, but simply offering its leadership and cooperation. Naturally, a beginning must be made somewhere in the United States before strong popular support can be expected for campaigns embracing a wide territory.

It is proposed as a first step to make a rather careful survey of the situation in each of the states from the Single

Tax viewpoint. It will be the purpose, however, to expedite this survey so as to avoid unnecessary delay in the development of a concrete programme which can be presented to American Georgists interested in this very practical phase of the movement.

Information, ideas and suggestions from Georgists in all parts of the country are especially solicited and may be addressed to the headquarters of the Henry George Foundation, Berger Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

—P. R. WILLIAMS.

An Excellent Statement of Principle

THE first man who was condemned to labor and live by the sweat of his brow, when applying his labor to the earth and its resources, had as wages his whole product. It was immaterial whether he claimed this product as a landlord, a capitalist or a laborer, the product was his—all.

So today to the land-owning farmer, using his own improvements and tools—products of his previous labor—it is also immaterial whether he accept his crop as wages, rent for land or as interest on his capital; it is his—all. But if there were three persons between whom to divide the product, one representing labor, a second representing capital and a third representing land, it would make a vast difference to each just how the crop was divided.

It is plain that if the landlord as rent were to get more, then between them capital and labor must get less.

Now, since the production of commodities is not complete until they are marketed and are in the hands of the consumer, the producer must hire the warehouseman, the railroads, the commission man, the wholesaler and retailer, and in most cases a manufacturer or processer, and pay them out of the price paid by the consumer. Therefore, it makes a vast difference to the producer on what bases they charge him, because he can have only what is left after their charges are paid.

No farmer or other producer, it would appear, has reason to complain about the general wage scale, because working for wages is their line and the labor market is their line and the labor market is practically an open market, where all have equal opportunity to engage in any occupation which pays best.

Nor should any complain of the rates usually charged for the use of capital, because all can invest their capital where it will draw the largest pay, the same as labor. So it appears competition should fairly well equalize the earnings of both in all trades.

But how about land, a factor which both labor and capital must employ if they do anything? Is the supply of land open to competition, and does the law of supply and demand regulate rent the same as it regulates compensation paid labor and capital? What effect does this

factor—land—have on the retail price of products and the share that labor and capital receive? What share of present retail prices represents land rent or interest on capitalized land values?

Labor complains that wages are low as compared to retail prices. The farmer says the same thing about prices paid him for his products.

We all acknowledge that lack of purchasing power is the main cause of industrial depression. Is it not possible that excessive capitalization of land space in our industrial and trade centers, mines, water power, etc., is exacting an undue share that is unearned, thus reducing the purchasing power of labor and true capital?

Perhaps this would be a good field for one of Mr. Hoover's investigating committees.

—J. S. TINDALL in *Grand Rapids* (Mich.) *Herald*.

HENRY FORD is said to be having trouble in Brazil. His investment there involved the necessity of ousting a lot of tenants. An orphan asylum is listed as among the institutions to be disturbed. Not only are the natives displeased, but inclined to be violent in protest.

Apparently the Brazilians are not different from other people. Nobody yet has been discovered lavishing much affection on an absentee landlord.

—*Hollywood News*.

OUR beloved Will Rogers was this Christmas Day quoted by a large newspaper as saying, "We can hardly wait till the day is over to get back to our devilment again." In addition to what he may have meant by it, we wonder how many realize that therein he struck a cord that reverberates to thousands of homes where poverty and tragedy prevails by reason of our present land tenure system.

The most deceiving things in our social customs have the appearance of legitimacy. Today we celebrate the nativity of Him who said: "Whatsoever ye do unto the least of these ye have done it unto me."

We inflict injustice upon millions "of the least of these," because the majority have been designedly kept in ignorance as to how our land tenure system and manner of raising public budgets visits these injustices upon the victims. As Mr. Rogers says, we will tomorrow return to the practice of this system; the newspapers will sell large advertising space and donate much publicity to the special interests to bait the masses into buying and holding land for a rise in selling price, thus using it as a gambling device.

—C. A. MCLEMORE in *Hollywood News*.

IF by machinery we produce more, or by economy we save more, or by virtue we improve the level of culture, then by that much the area in which this takes place becomes a better place to live and do business in and land values go up and rent goes up—forcing wages and interest down.—Stockton, (Calif.) *Forum*.

NO man, I think, ever saw a herd of buffalo, of which a few were fat and the great majority lean. No man ever saw a flock of birds, of which two or three were swimming in grease, and the others all skin and bone. Nor in the savage life is there anything like the poverty that festers in our civilization. In a rude state of society there are seasons of want, seasons when people starve; but they are seasons when the earth has refused to yield her increase, when the rain has not fallen from the heavens, or when the land has been swept by some foe—not when there is plenty; and yet the peculiar characteristic of this modern poverty of ours is, that it is deepest where wealth most abounds.—HENRY GEORGE, in "The Crime of Poverty."

PAMPHLET NOTICES

A THOUGHTFUL WORK*

This is not an "easy" book—not at all light reading, so-called. This does not mean that Mr. Sinton fails to clearly explain his ideas and ideals. No fault can be found on that score. The Single Tax, an inadequate name, no doubt, is simple enough, for it has come to mean the right of all men to the use of the earth. But it involves many considerations not so obvious, and these considerations are what we know as political economy, a study which seems to have baffled some of the best minds of this and past generations.

First of all, how many working for this cause sense, as Mr. Sinton does, the tremendous change that its application to modern life would bring about? A change which Mr. Sinton tells us is so revolutionary that it "will make the Reds look White." Our author goes even further than this. He explains his belief that interest will disappear, that there will not only be no poor but no rich, that no one will gain by investment of wealth unless he himself also works. It may be objected that these considerations are largely academic; nevertheless they provide some interesting speculations. I remember many years ago when the late James MacGregor—peace to his ashes!—and I stopped before a building up town. I was a young man then and he was my mentor. He pointed to the building and said, "The Single Tax is an insidious proposal, young feller. When it comes to pass the value of every brick in this building will be cut in half." What other effect indeed could the wholesale freeing of the productive forces of the world have upon wealth in all its forms? It is something of this side of the question that Mr. Sinton sees and writes about.

He goes even further. Featuring the enormous impetus given to production by the removal of the shackles that bind it he declares that the change "would make wealth practically as free as air and water."

In a way no more startling book in advocacy of our cause has appeared in years. Somehow we are glad to get it. Perhaps it is not calculated to make converts—only exceptional souls are to be touched by such arguments. But it will stir our own believers, for he has taken us up into the very highest mountains and bade us behold a vision to which we have been too long unaccustomed, a vision too strong perhaps for the eyes of most.

The work is a series of letters written to friends, sometimes to resolve difficulties that have occurred to them. The work is compiled by Mabelle Hathaway Brooks.

Whether we agree or disagree with Mr. Sinton we find him always interesting and suggestive. There is more solid thinking in this little work than in dozens of volumes dealing with philosophy and economics. Bolton Hall accompanies his commendation of the work with a pledge to return the money if you don't like it. So take his dare.

—J. D. M.

*Spiritual Law and Economics Harmonized. By Walter I. Sinton. 206 pp. Soft cover. Price 75 cents. Published by the Author, San Francisco, Calif.

A NOVEL TREATMENT

"Light on the Land Question—the story of an Idea," is a pamphlet published by the United Committee at 11 Tothill Street, London, England, at six pence a copy. It is called "A Frank Inquiry into the Land Value Policy by the Man in the Street." It consists of 32 pages bound in stiff covers.

It reviews, we think, the course of reasoning which has been the experience of most of us—at all events, of many of us—in coming to a definite acceptance of the proposal. The Man in the Street who writes this pamphlet approaches the idea skeptically. At first he is intellectually repelled by the large claims made for it. He is suspicious that something is concealed that the advocates do not disclose, that the language is extravagant, that something is being put over on him, that something sinister lurks in the proposal. He says frankly that he was "irritated and annoyed."

He had been fooled so often, this Man in the Street, by preachers and politicians. When George says that the idea will find friends, those who will toil for it, suffer for it, and if need be die for it, he is even more skeptical. For he had fought in France and had been told this before as had the boys on many fronts—that here was something worth dying for. So he asked with some asperity of our Tothill friends if anybody had really ever died for it, and was told that the author himself might be said to have given his life for this truth.

Then the Man in the Street starts out on his inquiry, still suspicious and uneasy, fearing perhaps that he had got into a nest of fanatics. But he finds out that our friends are not fanatics, but argue with clearness and persuasiveness. So he examines one by one their various contentions. He is overcome by the inexorable logic. He tests every step in the process of their reasoning, taking nothing for granted, and emerges fully convinced, for he has answered to his own satisfaction every objection urged by the opponents.

It is a great pamphlet.

—J. D. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

ASKS SINGLE TAXERS AND SOCIALISTS TO UNITE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Since the excitement of the election is now past, it should be possible and in order to discuss our proper relation to the Socialists on the merits of the case, without bias or prejudice.

As to the way matters stand in this country, should the Single Taxers and the Socialists join forces? Most assuredly they should, and for good reasons. The goal of both is the same, even if they don't know that much—as yet. But they will learn as they proceed and get into contact with reality.

The Socialists want to use Government power to establish and maintain co-operation in the production and distribution of wealth. The Single Taxer fights for individual freedom with equality of right in the land, and looks upon the requirements of co-operation as only incidental. Neither of them realizes that the Co-operative Commonwealth is an accomplished fact, brought about, not by any man's design or planning, but by natural evolution, and that all there is to do, and must be done, is to adjust the machinery of its organic parts so as to bring it into orderly functioning.

Look around and open your mind to what you see. Observe that an up-to-date Nation is now a vast co-operative estate on which every worker is producing wealth and service, directly and indirectly, for anybody, for everybody and for the estate as a whole, and taking his own requirement from the general supply, the free and open market, into which he delivers the product of his own labor, receiving and giving money, in one form or another, as receipt for what is given and taken.

When the land question becomes a fiscal question the money question becomes part of it. When land monopoly is disposed of, the money monopoly must go too, if individual freedom with perfect co-operation

is to be attained. On this the Single Taxers and the Socialists will be in unison.

Public ownership of public utilities is now looming large on the horizon, prematurely it seems to me, but there it is. On that issue the Single Taxers and the Socialists will be found in the same camp.

Public utilities exist for public service. Just what constitutes public service in a co-operative commonwealth? When a man takes charge and direction of a group of other men's labor, or otherwise serves the public, does he not become a public servant, rightfully subject to such rules and regulations as public safety and welfare may require, especially for those that work under his direction? If an important industry in private hands refuses to function satisfactorily to the public, may not the commonwealth take it over to be directed by its responsible servants. Does not that seem the inevitable course of economic evolution? Talk about your "right to run the business to suit yourself;" Who gave that right in a complex co-operating society? Liberty is fine in the academy and the wilderness, and was always the watchword of thieves and freebooters; but in the practical life of the people, rights and duties take precedence. Such is nature's Law.

The reason for the confusion of professional economists and the disagreement between Single Taxers and Socialists appears to be that the transformation of individualistic production into a co-operative organic system has come about by a process of natural evolution, unheralded, without human plan or purpose. Everybody played his part in it unconsciously, and nobody noticed the essential nature of what was taking place. But few seem yet aware of it until their attention is purposely directed to it. Its rapid and luxurious growth is still in the anarchistic stage, without intelligent and orderly direction to definite purpose. It is time it be studied, understood and put into such order as to serve the common welfare. Humanity's fate hangs thereon.

There are principles to be applied, sincere and earnest work to be done by both Single Taxers and Socialists. It will be time enough for them to split when the aims they have in common have been accomplished.

Fisk, Mo.

S. TIDEMAN.

A STRANGE STATEMENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Those good disciples of Henry George who were on the Resolutions Committee of the recent Henry George Congress in San Francisco, make a strange statement in their "Resolutions on Agriculture." They say, in their first Whereas, that "the increasing mechanization of agriculture has thrown many farmers out of employment."

The only way to throw farmers out of work is to take their farms from them; and farm machinery never did that. Who ever saw a farmer out of work while he had a farm? A farmer with a farm always has access to land—always has natural opportunities—always has plenty of work and usually very small pay for doing it.

"The trouble with the farmers" is not unemployment; it is robbery—legalized robbery—a robbery to which the farmer himself is a *particeps criminis*. And it is not machinery, but ground rent made private property that cuts down the "dirt farmer's" share of production and keeps him in poverty—ground rent which in justice is public property and should be used for public purposes—speculative ground rent, which drives him from the markets of civilization into the wilderness—capitalized ground rent, which extorts from him a price for a bit of God's land—land even at the verge of cultivation—and mortgages years of his labor to pay for it—periodical ground rent, which takes a part of every crop he raises and gives no return for it. It is taxation which gives ground rent to "the farmers who farm farmers"—It is taxation which not only gives public property to private persons, but also takes private property for public purposes; it is taxation which "protects" great landed estates from their share of public expenses, plunders the people and forces the farmer to sell low and buy high;

it is taxation which makes low wages and small profits—creates disemployment and destroys purchasing power—robs toiling producers and hungry consumers—all to enrich grasping landlords and gambling speculators.

No student of "Progress and Poverty" ought ever to admit that machinery produces unemployment. Neither should he admit that man, "the only animal that is never satisfied," can ever be unemployed for lack of work to do. The word *unemployment*, like the word *protection*, is a lying misnomer. There is no "problem of the unemployed." What is glibly called so is in fact the problem of disemployment—the problem of "enforced idleness." That problem Henry George solved fifty years ago—and discovered not only "The Cause," but also "The Remedy."

And—to digress a little—any disciple of our beloved teacher who calls those great discoveries "the theories of Henry George," ought immediately to give more study to the book and become wiser and more accurate in the use of terms.

Warren, Pa.

ASHER GEO. BEECHER.

PLEASED WITH MR. BROWN'S RECEPTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It was cheering to read in your last number that James R. Brown has been receiving such cordial response to his talks in the East. The East seems to be better for Single Tax speakers than Kansas is. The last time that John Z. White was here he spoke in the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce and there were only about twenty persons in the audience and only one of those was a member of the Chamber.

Mr. Brown said, the field is ripe unto the harvest but few be the reapers therein. Mr. Brown apparently has the happy faculty of making his hearers laugh while injecting his points. Would that we had more of his kind!

All honor to you for conducting for so many years through thick and thin—mostly thin—a dignified, well poised, long sustained campaign through the medium of THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW and LAND AND FREEDOM.

Wichita, Kas.

E. E. SODERSTROM.

A SUGGESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wonder if we are not letting a propaganda chance slip by in the present depression. Especially does this seem to apply to what we might be telling the Democratic congressman and senators. In his message of 1916 President Wilson approved Louis F. Post's proposal—technically it was the official proposal of the Department of Labor—to put the unemployed in touch with unused land. Congressman Crosser, you may remember, introduced a bill to put it into effect. But Wilson's approval was merely perfunctory; he made no such effort to have it put over as he did with many measures of much less importance, and it never got out of committee. Now these Democratic congressmen, if they did not lack brains, could be raising a hullabaloo about how alert a Democratic Secretary of Labor and a Democratic President had been in regard to unemployment, how they urged preparations for such depressions as the present and how this policy shines by comparison with the do-nothing and know-nothing policy of Department of Labor since Wilson and Post left and the befuddled policy of Hoover. I wrote to Senator Wagner along this line some time ago but had no reply. He seems to prefer the bills he introduced which he must have gotten out of the libretto of some comic opera.

Baltimore, Md.

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

A WELCOME NEW YEAR'S GREETING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

At this time I want to express to you my earnest best wishes for a happy and prosperous New Year and to tell you how much I personally

appreciate the splendid service which you have rendered to the Single Tax cause during these many years past, faithfully giving to our own people and to the public the fruits of your fine editorials and publication work.

I am now having read to me "The Prophet of San Francisco" and I find this very interesting, recalling as it does incidents of the early days of Single Tax work.

Wichita, Kas.

HENRY WARE ALLEN.

WANTS AN ENROLLMENT CAMPAIGN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I don't find that "nobody cares" or that "people are indifferent," even about "Single Tax." Most of them are too busy struggling for what they regard as a living, or trying to be amused (literally "thoughtless") to take much interest in what is still presented to them as "dismal science"—much of which they feel to be untrue.

There are millions who *do* care, but don't know what to do about it, and most of whom are, or would be, favorable to our doctrine.

All other "reforms" have begun with an enrollment—Suffrage, "anti-saloon," etc., but we have none. How often you hear, "O, yes, I used to be a S. T. but I don't hear much about it"—"you used to have a paper." Or, "I knew about Henry George and I think he is right but—."

Our "Lower Rents Campaign" is intended to be the foundation of an enrollment programme.

California gave over 200,000 votes for an immediate, straight-out, full S. T. law,—we have the names of not over 10,000 such voters in the whole U. S.

We must change all that. I have been, and am, afraid of organizations, but the time demands it.

New York City.

BOLTON HALL.

MR. SLOCUMB PROTESTS

We have received a letter from Geo. W. Slocumb of 426 No. Broadway, Los Angeles, California, publisher of a little work sold for fifty cents, reviewed in a recent issue of LAND AND FREEDOM. The letter is too long to print, dealing as it does with definitions of value. But to be perfectly fair to Mr. Slocumb we extract the following paragraph:

"I think I have learned something from forty years of experience, study and thought, and have recently written a book called 'Legal Stealing or Liberty and Justice, with Honest Money,' in which I have been careful not to compound concepts or transgress in the use of terms and the editor has criticized me for not doing so. He would have me continue to say, 'Collect the land values' and not destroy them. He is guilty as most Single Taxers are of the same transgression in the use of terms.

In the book I have discussed other legal stealing besides the private appropriation of rent—interest, dividends, taxation, banking, special privileges, public service and money, with a practical programme for political action. Let the editor be fair and not use the steam roller of silence."

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

MORRIS VAN VEEN addressed the Hamilton Community Council in this city on Jan. 6, speaking for an hour and answering questions at the close; about forty were present. On Jan. 8 he appeared before the University Heights Community Center, addressing over three hundred. Questions were answered at the conclusion. The Chairman complimented Mr. Van Veen, saying that it was unusual at these lectures for the entire attendance to remain seated but that on this occasion not a single person left the church during the address.

JACKSON A. GRAVES, who is called by the Los Angeles *Times*, "the pioneer president of the Farmers' and Merchants' National Bank"

of that city is quoted by the *Times* as follows, showing that at least one banker senses the real cause of business depression:

"I came to Los Angeles on June 5, 1875," the venerable banker said, "and I have seen several business depressions come and go since that time. I remember that only a few months after my arrival—in September, to be exact—we fell into the throes of a crazy real estate boom, occasioned by approaching completion of the Southern Pacific's line connecting Los Angeles with San Francisco. Subdivisions were laid out wherein the lots did not become occupied for from ten to fifteen years."

EUGENE MANLOVE RHODES, book reviewer of the Los Angeles *Times*, in a recent notice of a book says that the Navajo land system was pretty near that of Henry George, ownership going with use and ceasing when the land was no longer used.

ON January our old but ever young friend and devoted adherent of the cause, Eben Stillman Doubleday, was 91 years of age. Congratulations!

GUNS are thundering over a wide area in Burma and heavy casualties are reported. The disorder first began with the revolt of the insurgents north of Rangoon over a tax collection campaign. In Caucasian countries we grumble at taxes but never or rarely revolt.

MR. CHARLES E. MERRELL, of Worcester, Mass., has addressed a communication to the Sherman Corporation of this city. After relating the effect of present taxation on business Mr. Merrell says:

I read in the *Outlook* the other day, an article by the Washington correspondent of the Baltimore *Sun*, in which he pointed out the fact that on account of the excessive friendliness of our recent administration to the so-called "power trust" the people of this country are paying to watered capital about \$1,000,000,000 in excess of what they would pay if the rates paid on normal capital were the same as those charged by the Ontario Power Company, operated by the Province of Ontario.

This, I believe, is about one-fourth of the total income of the Government of the United States. Doubtless the other three quarters should be accounted for in other monopolies resting on land monopoly and if these unearned profits were retained by the Government or by the people all the present taxes on industry could be dispensed with and we might have a genuine prosperity which might not be interrupted by the so-called "business cycle" but would show a genuine, steady progress towards that Utopia which is the dream of every genuine American.

AMONG recent deaths in the movement is that of Mrs. Benjamin Nicoll, of this city, who passed away on Sept. 1st. She was long a subscriber and friend of this paper.

FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIVE books were sold by the Schalkenbach Foundation from December 2 to January 2 of this year, "Progress and Poverty" leading with 175 copies. In addition large numbers of pamphlets were sold or freely distributed. So Miss Adelaide Kaufmann, efficient secretary of the Foundation, is kept pretty busy. Over 1,000 inquiries were received.

A RECENT issue of the *Herald-Tribune* of this city contained nearly a column on Bolton Hall's Single Tax colony, Free Acres, in New Jersey. The colonists celebrated the New Year in deep libations of sweet cider. The account states that the Summer-time population of Free Acres numbers sixty-nine families.

DESPITE his eighty-one years, Alfred Bishop Mason, one time president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, continues his literary work in Florence, Italy, turning out books industriously. Many of these are boys' books. His latest work, however, is of a different kind, in which he appears as editor. It is entitled "Horace Walpole's England," in which selections are made from the epistles which won fame for

Walpole as a letter writer. "A substantial selection judiciously made," says the New York *Sun* reviewer in issue of Dec. 19. Mr. Mason will visit New York on April 26 remaining here till May 14.

THE Grange Power Bill won in the last Oregon election by a landslide. It was known as the Grange Amendment because it was backed by the granges, imitates the California system and permits the resort to land value taxation for the cost of irrigation. It was curious to find W. S. U'Ren and the late J. R. Hermann on opposite sides in this fight. Just before his death Mr. Hermann sent us a copy of the speech in defence of this measure which swept the state. The speech is by Mr. Slaughter who said, with special reference to Mr. U'Ren: "I can think of nothing so sad as beholding former champions of the people's rights betraying these same rights. Therefore, whatever I shall say with reference to those who are opposing the Grange Power Bill will be said in sadness."

THE official bulletin of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, of St. Louis, Mo., in its issue of Dec. 31 reprints Laurie J. Quinby "Spiritual Basis of Geogist Economics" from LAND AND FREEDOM, under the title of "Getting a Living and the Poetry of Life."

N. A. VYNE, of Camp Verde, Arizona, in a communication to the Stockton California *Forum* tells of his fight in his state and says, like the old Rough Rider he is: "Arizona will take care of its front without appealing for assistance. I think that every state should do that. With a primary vote of 1,508 in my favor I was defeated by about 330. Carried my own valley two to one."

MISS AGNES DEMILLE, daughter of Anna George deMille, will appear in a dance repertoire at the Craig Theatre, 54th Street, this city, in the first week in February.

IN speaking at the dinner of the Speakers Bureau of Tammany Hall, in January, former Governor Alfred E. Smith recalled the campaign days when no such bureau was available to inform the voters of public issues. He said: "There will never be anything invented by the mind of man that will carry the conviction of the spoken word of a man who could look you in the eye and tell you what he thinks about the issue." He then followed this up by saying: "When Henry George ran for Mayor he did not have an organization, he did not have a party, but he presented his case to the people so clearly that he aroused their interest. The character of the campaign conducted was such that the like of it had never before been heard in New York. He and his friends knew what they were talking about." If all campaign speakers, continued Mr. Smith, would familiarize themselves with the issues of a campaign, the public would be interested in the subject.

THE *Arizona Single Taxer* enlarged and improved continues to appear from Camp Verde, Arizona, under the able editorship of N. A. Vyne.

THE Newark *Evening News* contains a lengthy write-up, running through several issues, on the Pittsburgh Tax Plan. These articles are written by the Washington correspondent of the *News* who was sent to Pittsburgh to study the workings of the plan.

HAROLD SUDELL is increasingly active, writing letters to the papers and to prominent persons who fall into economic errors. Thomas Colegate, of Rome, Georgia, finds time from his Single Tax radio talks to write letters to the *Daily Telegraph*, of Macon, and other Georgia papers. K. P. Alexander, of Little Rock, Ark., writes a lengthy letter to Rev. Chas. E. Coughlin, of Detroit, in which he quotes Father McGlynn. Father Coughlin has broadcasted an address on present day economic problems, and Mr. Alexander seeks to set him right in a

well argued and respectful communication. John J. Egan keeps up his letters to the *Telegram* of this city. James Malcolm of Albany appears with a letter in the New York *World* in an answer to Floyd L. Carlisle, of the Niagara-Hudson Power Co.

"THE TRUE FUNCTION OF MONEY" is the title of a communication in the *Christian Science Monitor* from the pen of Robert Baker, life-long Single Taxer and former democratic Congressman from Brooklyn. While in Congress Mr. Baker did not hide his light under a bushel.

PROF. J. H. DILLARD, of the Slater and Jeanes Foundation, in a letter addressed to the members of the Boards, and entitled "Notes of a Trip," writes as follows:

"Late in the evening about six miles from Selma our gasoline gave out, and while waiting for supplies I had a good talk with an intelligent colored man whose car had kindly been put at our service to bring us relief. I enjoyed a lesson in Economics. This man paid \$4 rent per acre for 75 acres of land. I found out that this land was assessed for taxation at \$6 an acre and that the actual tax paid by the owner was 14 cents an acre. I heard that the land was thought to be worth something like \$100 per acre. This instance touches what is, I have long believed, by far the most important economic problem in the South, and of course it is not confined to the South."

THE United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, of London, England, has issued a manifesto, giving some startling examples of land monopoly, and differences in ratable and selling values. The Manifesto prints at the same time a list of nearly a hundred Town Councils which have declared for Land Value Rating, or, as we say here, the Taxation of Land Values.

THE Socialist party of Chicago issues a pamphlet in which they say: "Because we no longer have free land we are not born really free if we are workers. Workers must humbly beg for a job." That is coming close to the gist of the matter. But the taxation plank of the Socialist party for 1930 proposes "Appropriation by taxation of the rental value of all land held for speculation." This is meaningless. It would be impossible for the government to determine what land is held for speculation. Besides, with a curious fatuity, it ignores the billions in rental value which would then go, as it goes now, into private pockets. Is the Socialist party prepared to continue that inequity?

DAVID F. BOECHAT, of Buffalo, writes: "Your report of the excellent missionary work of James R. Brown shows that good seed is being planted. These should be the thinking days, providing abundant opportunity for Single Tax teachings."

THE *Conservator* is the name of a little weekly paper from Los Angeles edited by George F. Dyer. It is militantly Single Tax.

FRANK O. BROWN, of Dallas, Texas, is dead at the advanced age of ninety. He was one of the city's pioneers and an engineer on the iron-clad Merrimack in Civil War days. He conversed with President Lincoln two weeks before the president's assassination. He was owner of one of the largest passenger boats operating on the Trinity River and was president of the Trinity River Navigation Association and active in the affairs of the Association up to the time of his death. He was a friend of Henry George and a devoted disciple of his teachings.

"YOUR Nov.-Dec. issue of LAND AND FREEDOM is a real Christmas treat to any disciple of Henry George," writes W. H. Sikes, of Leonardville, Kansas.

MAURICE FIRTH, devoted Single Taxer, has been in the hospital for the last six months. Mr. Firth is a newspaper man formerly of London, and now of this city, where he pursues the same line of work, having been connected with the New York *Times*.

WE learn of the sudden death of Richard G. Riley, of Fall River, Mass., on September 23. Others who have recently passed away are Chas. S. Davis, of Washington, D. C., and Edward Hannitz, of Brooklyn, all of whom were Single Tax adherents and subscribers to this paper.

WALDO J. WERNICKE, of Los Angeles, writes: "Your steady and challenging editorial comments are to be noted for their continued excellence."

De Nieuwe Aarde (The New Earth) is the name of the new Single Tax paper of Holland. It is edited by Mr. L. A. B. Ulehake, at Gen. Vetterstra 32, Amsterdam. The first issue contains a Dutch translation of the Land Song and parts of W. R. Lester's pamphlet on Unemployment.

OUR old friend, Frank Chodorov, of Springfield, Mass., proprietor of a corporation manufacturing underwear has addressed a collection letter to his customers, in which he takes occasion to teach some straight economics.

"How speculation in land values affects prices of commodities and wages of labor can be readily reasoned out. The frozen "assets" that have caused a number of banks to close up is another evidence of the effects of land speculation on industry.

When land values 'hit the bottom,' capital is released for industry, idle lands which were held for speculation are opened up for labor to go to work on, jobs become more plentiful, and business starts up again."

In the Springfield *Union* Mr. Chodorov has a letter on the Causes of Business Depression in which he borrows liberally from Henry George.

THE *Fiery Cross* is the organ of the Scottish societies in America published in Boston. In its January issue is an article entitled "Robert Burns, the Poet of Liberalism." The writer says: "In 'The Twa Dogs' Burns paints a picture of the luxurious, wasteful life of the land-owning gentry, and the hard grinding life of the cotter, which has so affected Scotland and her people, that in no country in the world has the philosophy of that great liberal, Henry George, received such a warm and universal welcome."

THE death of R. L. Outhwaite on Nov. 6 deprives the Commonwealth Land Party of England of its foremost figure. He had worked for many years for the taxation of land values and was elected member for Hanley on that issue. Later he embraced the doctrine of the Commonwealth Land party, the immediate collection in full of the economic rent and the abolition of all taxation. He was the first Honorary Secretary of the party and fought as earnestly for the new doctrine as he had for the land value tax policy. He was always a fighter and a tower of strength for any cause he espoused. He was instrumental in inducing that great statesman, Henry Campbell Bannerman, to adopt a liberal policy in England's treatment of the Boers, which remains a bright spot in her history. He had no faith in politicians and distrusted the Liberal and Labor parties as much as the Conservatives. He faced obloquy and abuse in his brave defiance of the Jingoists in the Commons and refused to be carried away by the wave of war hysteria. He was a brave soul, a wonderful debater, a lover of liberty. From 1923 he had spent most of his time in retirement, but contributing every now and then articles to the *Commonweal* of London. These articles were as strong and uncompromising as had been his utterances in the Commons in the time of war delirium. He never sounded a retreat. The country which breeds such men is sound at the core.

CHESTER C. PLATT whose contribution on the Ingram Institute appears on another page, writes: "I believe the work done by Luke

North in 1916 and 1918 was an excellent fertilizer of California soil for the work of the Institute."

UNDER the heading "Squatter Invasion Balked," the Los Angeles *Times* gives an account of the attempt to secure entry on the Maribou Ranch near Santa Monica, California. The claim advanced is that portions of the ranch on which they wish to enter is part of the public domain, has never been surveyed, and therefore is open to them as claimants. A great array of mounted men and guards heavily armed oppose the men seeking entry. Among the sixty who advanced on the ranch are six majors in the World War and eight who were lieutenants. "My country tis of thee," and they believed they fought for it!

THE New York *Times* in a recent editorial says: "It will surprise nobody to learn that the new Eighth Avenue subway has already added millions to the value of land along its route and will add more when it is in actual operation. That has been the history of rapid transit construction throughout the city. Nor will there be any quarrel with the Committee's conclusion that the logical source of new revenue to finance the subway system is the specially benefitted land, the value of which is increased by such transit facilities." The progress of the *Times* is slow but it is very real.

THE election for a place in the Hall of Fame resulted in the election of four distinguished Americans, they having received a majority of the votes. Not over 20 of the 105 names submitted received a higher vote than that cast for Henry George. The next election is in 1935, when it seems likely that Henry George may be chosen for a place in this modern Pantheon.

WILLIAM MATTHEWS, of Spokane, Washington, writes: "Your editorials are very much to the point and masterful."

ARTHUR HENDERSON, British Foreign Minister, speaking at Bristol, where he opened the by-election campaign that is now taking place, assured his hearers that the coming Budget would contain provisions for the taxation of land values.

ALFRED N. CHANDLER, of Newark, N. J., has secured the publication in a number of papers in that state of abridged portions of the Causes of Business Depressions by Henry George.

THE columnist of the Hollywood *News*, California, Mr. Henry James, having referred to Mr. L. J. Quinby as "just another Single Taxer," received from Mr. Quinby a challenge to debate the question through the columns of that paper.

THE *Buffalo County Journal*, of Alma, Wisconsin, is running serially selections from Protection or Free Trade. Theodore Buehler, Jr., is editor and publisher of that paper.

A COLUMN article from the pen of Mr. W. R. Lester appears in the Mid Sussex (England) *Times* and is an admirable statement of what will follow the taxation of land values.

JULIUS ROSENWALD offers \$75,000 for a cure for unemployment. Mr. Rosenwald bears the reputation of being a good business man but there seems some mistake there. No good business man will pay \$75,000 for something he already possesses. If Mr. Rosenwald will look in his files for the year 1911 or 1912 he will find there a letter from Joseph Fels giving him the information he seeks. He need pay nothing for this tip. If he can not find the letter he will be told on request in substance what it said.