

January—February, 1936

# Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

*An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901*

## The Enigma of Money

Raymond V. McNally

## A Few Random Land Value Facts

Hon. George H. Duncan

## The California Campaign

Jackson H. Ralston

*Books Reviewed:* The Path to Prosperity,  
Growth and Distribution of Population,  
Land and Unemployment, Life of Abram S. Hewitt, etc.

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, 147-17 95th Ave., Jamaica, Long Island

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

HERMAN G. LOEW, Pres., 302 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES JOSEPH SMITH, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec., 150 Nassau Street, 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, 1936

VOL. XXXVI

No. 1 WHOLE No. 194

### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace.

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

SPAIN: A. Matheu ALONSO, Salamanca.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade,  
Av. Centenario 219, San Luis Potosi City, Mexico.

### INDEX TO CONTENTS

|                                                                  | PAGE |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| COMMENT AND REFLECTION.....The Editor                            | 3    |
| SOMETHIN'S GOTTA BE DONE.....Thomas N. Ashton                    | 5    |
| A FEW RANDOM LAND VALUE FACTS...George H. Duncan                 | 5    |
| THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN.....Jackson H. Ralston                   | 7    |
| ANNA GEORGE IN CALIFORNIA.....N. D. Alper                        | 8    |
| THE ENIGMA OF MONEY.....Raymond V. McNally                       | 9    |
| AROUND THE WORLD WITH HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL<br>.....George Bingham | 14   |
| EXTENSION CLASSES OF THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL                     | 15   |
| ACTIVITIES OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB                      | 17   |
| BOOK REVIEWS.....                                                | 23   |
| 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. XXXVI

JANUARY—FEBRUARY, 1936

No. 1

## Comment and Reflection

WE have been called to task by some of our subscribers for a lack of sympathy with the New Deal. They do not ask us to endorse the acts of the administration, but beg us to regard with a more sympathetic attitude the policies now in operation at Washington, because these acts and policies are undertaken in a humanitarian spirit and by men who are kindly disposed, and who have the welfare of the people at heart. It may be said that autocracies and dictatorships have always begun in this way. The gloved hand preceded the mailed fist. The initial pretence was always to provide for the wellbeing of the people. The claim is not that the people be granted *freedom to do things for themselves* but that those higher up—the government in short—*do something for them*.

IT is for this reason that we do not care a hoot how well meaning are the New Dealers, or how many things they do for the people, or how tremendously vituperative they become. They have yet to assail even the outposts of privilege. Who own the earth own us. This great wrong cannot be overthrown by taking from some and giving to others, by silly regimentation, by reducing acreage, or plowing under cotton, or killing little pigs. In the face of all that is being done we are asked to refrain from harsh criticism. Are they not trying to do something for the people, we are asked.

WE shall try to be polite. Cardinal Newman said it was a mark of good breeding to be merciful to the absurd. But it is mighty difficult at times. It is precisely because these strange policies are not only absurd but are fraught with grave dangers that the Henry George men of the nation should raise their voices with a unanimous shout of disapproval.

BUT when all is said that can be said against the New Deal we cannot accept as an alternative policy tariffs and subsidies which the Old Deal offers us. As yet there is no sign in political life of any prominent leader standing for an unfettered industry. The Republican party is traditionally hobbled by its protectionist tradi-

tions. It cannot break away from the body of death which binds it to outworn shibboleths. It seems quite impossible that it can blaze a new pathway. Yet until it does the New Deal with all its preposterous experimentation has the field to itself.

SO far no one in political life seems willing or able to take up the cudgels for the true doctrine of unfettered competition? Is no one equal to the task? Even those who look with distrust upon the New Deal and its spending orgy seem hopelessly confused. Professor McBain of Columbia who is a critic of the New Deal, nevertheless has this to say: "I think the traditional American system shows that it is no longer capable of self-operation to the satisfaction of a sufficiently large portion of the people of the country." He gave it as his opinion that business, as now organized, will never again absorb enough of the unemployed."

IS it necessary to say that "as organized" it never has? The unemployed we have always with us, in the best of times from one to three millions. Why? Because men are shut out from the opportunities for employment. In new countries with vast tracts of land unappropriated there are no unemployed. This constant attempt to discuss the problem without reference to the factors in the problem is the besetting sin of the professorial mind. It has filled the world with a perfect Babel of incoherence. If these professors would only see that the problem is one of the relation of labor to land, of the willing hands to the natural resources of the earth, they would save themselves a world of trouble, and their readers a lot of perplexity in the vain effort to understand them, any one of them we may say, for they all differ, thus proving that ninety-nine per cent of them must be wrong.

THERE are a very few factors in the problem. The professors inject many more. Here are men at work on a problem in which the solution is absurdly simple if the real factors are considered. Along come a group of experimentors who lug in each his imaginary factor, one or more. The problem is thus rendered increasingly intricate and complicated. But if ninety per cent of the remaining factors are thrown out of the window, the whole sum of the problem is laid bare. It is not merely

a problem in economics, it is a problem in ratiocination by which if we consider only the necessary or active factors we have the correct answer. The confusion arises from the introduction of factors that do not belong.

**B**UT the professors like them. It lends a semblance of great profundity. It enables them to pick flaws in the speculations of their brother professors. The infinite refinements of their theorizing add to their stature, immeasurably increasing their importance. If they ever see that it is not so complicated as all that, they thrust the suggestion aside. It looks profound to them and so it must be. Chesterton has hit it off well:

"Oh, we have learned to peer and pore  
On tortuous problems from our youth;  
We know all labyrinthian lore,  
We are the Three Wise Men of yore,  
And we know all things but the truth."

**I**T is frequently a matter of surprise that the average thinking that goes on seems to take so little account of laws and principles. From which we are prone to argue that what is needed is more knowledge, and, what concerns us most, more knowledge of economics. In the main, this of course is true. But the conclusion needs some qualification. For many of those from whom we get some of the most astounding results in thinking have studied economics and are familiar with Adam Smith, McCulloch, Perry, Tausig and others from whom, even if in broken lights, we get some economic principles. With these opinions and teachings Lippman, Moley and Tugwell, even Roosevelt himself, are not unfamiliar. Some of them even profess to know Henry George.

**T**HERE must be some other explanation why these presumably informed persons fail to "think through." This explanation that should be forthcoming must also account for a similar failure on the part of mass thinking. We have a certain body of knowledge, volumes of statistics, results of intensive study and research, and a thousand ingenious speculations. Some thinking must accompany the exercise that has resulted in this vast material. But conclusions that hang together seem to be wholly lacking. Nothing enduring has come from it; only syntheses in which any agreement seems pitifully small.

**T**HERE are premises which if granted lead up to rational summarizing. There are prodigious arrays of facts, but we look in vain for anything save now and then a few significant hints. There are writers like Lippman, Stuart Chase, and contributors to the *Nation* and the *New Republic* who toy with problems and leave us dangling in the air. They are sure of nothing; they retrace their steps continuously and seem to take all sides at once. They attack communism, socialism,

Douglassism, Townsendism, but not being themselves fundamental these attacks seem distressingly futile. They have no real social philosophy on which they can fall back, no solid ground for their feet. •

**T**HE explanation is this: Thought is for the most part Two Dimensional. But there is a Third Dimension. Real thought must be Three Dimensional. Within the first two speculation may run rampant; conclusions from observed facts are left to the vagaries of imagination and are the prey of personal preference and education and predilection. There may be correct diagnosis, and keen minds working in the first two dimensions may arrive at correct conclusions and true remedies and solutions. But usually by accident, and always with the risks of possible loss, or the entrance of fallacies that vitiate conclusions. Such minds working in the first two dimensions have done much useful work in the world of thought but they are not among the great thinkers, save only as they have contributed to the conclusions of others.

**I**T is the workers in the Third Dimension, only those indeed, who do the real thinking. In the Third Dimension are Laws and Principles without which no philosophy of Life, or Religion, or Economics can be enduring. Facts, statistics, all knowledge, are of use only as they derive their strength from Laws and Principles. Workers in the Third Dimension judge the passing panorama not by any temporary standards, but by codes of ethical value which have eternal validity.

**P**OLITICAL Economy is a body of such laws—all in the Third Dimension, but not on that account difficult to understand. Instinctively we recognize them in the order in which they make their appearance. First: Facts, Second: Conclusions. But in the Third Dimension we come up with Laws and Principles. If Principles and Laws do not support the conclusions we must abandon the facts and reconstruct the conclusions.

**O**NE of the characteristics of writers on economics of the present day is their talkativeness. With such small bases of principles to guide them they possess amazing fluency. Talk is cheap and we have more of it where opinions are many and unsound. Some of it is entirely incomprehensible, as for example much of Mr. Tugwell's "speculations." Those who contend that language is a device to conceal thought will find here abundant confirmation. There is more to talk about. Variety of opinions and confusion of opinions lead to a strange and unusual verbosity. This is at the basis of the charge against Henry George men that they are people of one idea. It is a familiar reproach of those who because they have many opinions and few fundamental

principles find it incumbent upon them to spread their language so lavishly. Their paucity of laws and principles are the explanation of their plethora of words.

## "Somethin's Gotta be Done"

IT was the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight. The GREAT and HONORABLE General Court (House of Representatives to you) of Massachusetts was deep in the depths of profound meditation. It was sorely perplexed. Taxation—the ever present problem—was receiving special attention at this particular session. Special attention was being given and the Commonwealth's most prominent personage, in the field of legal experts on common and statutory law concerned with taxation, had persuaded the House and Senate leaders that "somethin's gotta be done" in regard to the menacing growth of the taxation muddle.

Emerging from the inner sanctum of the inner sanctoria, the legislative representatives solemnly informed the House and Senate that "somethin's gotta be done" to get at the bottom of the hopeless mess of tax laws. The sober and solemn members of the sober and solemn legislature nodded their heads in wisely profound significance and agreed, one with another, that "somethin's gotta be done."

So somethin' was done.

The very prominent personage who, though not a member of the GREAT and HONORABLE General Court, knew all the answers in legal terminology on common and statute law, was appointed chairman of a body of illustrious representatives and senators whose duty it was to hold a summer session and to find THE solution to all this annoying mess which had resulted from an accumulation of necessary tax laws.

The summer came and went. The harvest moon shone down upon the frazzled State of the Pilgrim fathers. The day for the filing of legislative reports arrived. Ah! Relief at last; relief from the eternal question of multiple taxes and tax laws! The special session experts had experted; the legal luminary leader of the special session was ready to report. With precision and detail he set forth the multitude of facts found during the summer's stifling session; and, whereas, wherefore and therefore, he and his solemnly profound associates were in duty bound to inform the Great and Honorable Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that

"Somethin's gotta be done."

\* \* \*

Time and tide wait for no man, consequently seven years have passed since the Great and Honorable General Court of the "State of Mind" discovered that "somethin's gotta be done."

The scene shifts. We are in the parish rooms of a very snooty church of the fifty-seven varieties. The intelligentsia has foregathered to listen to words of wisdom

and of warning which are about to drip from the vocal chords of an "undersecretary" of the U. S. Treasury. The "undersecretary," as such are styled in proper, old 'Hengland, has traveled far and wide on the eastern continent. He has studied, at short range, the hopeful conditions prognosticated in Japan's employment of regimented boys and girls at twenty cents per diem. He has marveled at Bonny 'Hengland's production of "things at two and one-half pence per dozen" (tuppence 'apenny, to you). He has studied the alarming overload on Massachusetts "real estate" and informs us that such property now carried sixty-five per cent of the tax load while possessing only "thirty per cent of the wealth." His audience teter on the edges of their seats as they brace themselves to hear his pronouncement which will solve our economic distress for all time. He gives pause to his words as he approaches the climax of his evening's dissertation. The psychological effect of the temporary silence has the desired result. The truth is here.

"SOMETHIN'S GOTTA BE DONE!"

Significant nods of approval begin to gather into a wave which finally engulfs the whole audience. Bald heads, bushy heads, lean heads, fat heads, soft heads and bone heads, nod and nod and nod like a field of ox-eyed daisies bowing to the summer breeze.

"Yeah, somethin's gotta be done," says one to another.

"Somethin's gotta be done. The undersecretary said so."

\* \* \*

The Great and Honorable General Court of the old Bay State, and the undersecretary of the Treasury of the United States, both are right.

"Somethin's gotta be done."

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

## A Few Random Land Value Facts

AS one of those interested in support of the bill introduced in Congress by Representative Moritz of Pittsburgh (H. R. 6026) to impose an excise charge of one per cent upon the privilege of owning land in excess of \$3,000 value by one owner, I assumed the task of collecting data for presentation to the House Ways and Means Committee in the event of a hearing, indicating the amount of revenue to be derived from such a charge. I knew that little information of this character was available; but I hoped that I might develop sample figures which might be extended on some basis to larger areas and thus to the United States as a whole.

The task has proved almost impossible. No authentic figures are available anywhere to show the land values of the United States. On page 261 of the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1934, issued by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, it is stated:

"There have been no official estimates of wealth since 1922." Census figures give values of farms; but nowhere is there any breakdown of land values and improvement values—not even value of buildings. As a Civil Works project early in 1934, there was made a "Real Property Inventory" in some ninety cities. This was so meticulous as to tabulate dwelling units by number of rooms; by number of persons per room; by lighting facilities; by cooking facilities; by mortgages; by condition of repair and a mass of other detail. But the value of dwellings ascertained was a composite, site and structure being lumped together.

The National Resources Board spent millions of dollars to ascertain that seventy-five million acres of submarginal farming land should be "retired;" but nowhere in the beautifully printed and charted 400-page report is there any inkling of the value of such lands.

It seems essential, when presenting our proposal to any legislative body, that we must be prepared to show the fiscal effect to some extent at least. Such committees are faced with practical revenue problems; and it is idle to expect them, no matter how impressed with the justice of our claims, to favor legislation, unknowing its effect on the treasury.

Through the courtesy of John A. Zangerle, Auditor, Cuyahoga County, O., and with the cooperation of John Lawrence Monroe, Field Director Henry George School of Social Science, a sampling of Cleveland was secured.

In Cleveland (city proper) the total number of tracts assessed is 195,087, with a total valuation of \$357,866,620. One thousand taxpayers, taken at random, were shown to own 1,400 tracts. Thus it may be assumed that the total number of taxpayers is five-sevenths the number of tracts, or 136,561 taxpayers in the city.

Of the 1,000 taxpayers, ninety-two owned land of a value in excess of \$3,000 each, to a total value of \$2,301,730—an average value of \$25,019. Nine hundred and eight owned land of a total value of \$773,110. Applying the ratio, 9.2 per cent, to the total number of taxpayers, it may be assumed that there are 12,463 owning tracts of an average value of \$25,019 each. Deducting the exemption, \$3,000 each, gives a taxable value of \$22,019; a tax at one per cent of \$220.19 each; and a total revenue from Cleveland under the proposed bill of \$2,644,227.

For the whole of Cuyahoga County, land values are \$560,325,060 in 383,402 tracts. Applying the percentage of taxpayers over \$3,000 found in the city proper, it may be assumed that in the County there are 26,164. The ratio of holdings above \$3,000 to the total value of holdings in the sample group is seventy-five per cent. Applying this ratio to the County, the average of the above—\$3,000 holdings are found to be \$16,043; and deducting the \$3,000 exemption, the revenue at one per cent of the excess would be \$130.43 each, or \$3,412,510 for the County.

Figures collected by John C. Rose for Pittsburgh show

that 901 landowners have holdings valued at \$328,480,380. It is simple, then, to compute that the charge on these 901 at one per cent with an exemption of \$3,000 each would be \$3,257,773. But we can go no further, since we have no data on the holdings of the balance of 161,700 landowners, with a balance valuation of \$233,885,180.

But a comparison of Pittsburgh with Cleveland shows other facts inciting mental speculation. 161,799 landowners in Pittsburgh own land valued at \$562,365,560, an average of \$3,478 each. 136,561 owners in Cleveland have \$357,866,620, and average of \$2,620 each. The population of Pittsburgh (1930 census) is 669,817, giving a per capita valuation of \$490; Cleveland, with a population of 900,429, shows per capita valuation of \$397. Since we believe that land values, to a certain extent, bear a relation to population, the figures given above indicate either errors in official valuation or other influences at present unascertained. This situation is introduced simply to indicate the impossibility of extending data found in one locality to another locality and points the necessity of extensive and intensive investigation.

Coming to Greater New York, we find the total number of tracts to be 811,616, with a total valuation of \$8,000,995,996. Parenthetically, the per capita valuation here is \$1,154. A detailed study of the tax rolls for Manhattan Borough discloses that 6,065 tracts are owned by 4,843 owners. That is, the number of owners is eighty per cent of the number of tracts. If this ratio holds true throughout the city, the number of owners is \$579,726.

In Manhattan Borough the number of tracts valued at less than \$3,000 is practically negligible. Not having access to records of the other Boroughs, no information on this point is there available, but it is probable that in outlying districts such tracts will be found. However, eliminating this probability, the one per cent excise charge, after the \$3,000 exemption, would return \$60,530,870 for Greater New York.

In the November issue of *Tax-Bits*, publication of the Tax Policy League, the figures of land values in twenty-eight States were given as \$40,552,488,629 (with some additions and corrections made by this writer). These figures, however, give no adequate basis for estimates of revenue under our proposal, since the value of improvements in land is included; and withal fail to indicate the percentage reductions from true valuation observed by assessors in most sections. They disclose, however, a fact which may or may not have significance. *Tax-Bits* figures show 48.3 per cent of total assessed valuation as land value; New York State (Tax Commission Report, 1933) shows forty-four per cent land value; while Greater New York shows forty-seven per cent land values; Chicago shows forty-five per cent land values; Pittsburgh, forty-seven per cent and Cleveland, forty-two per cent.

Information from Massachusetts is to the effect that total land value (1932) is \$4,076,604,278 with 785,370 owners (1934). Other incomplete and inconsequential

figures have been secured and are of no particular interest until correlated with other data now unattainable.

These few fragmentary facts have been set down here for the dual purpose of preserving them for future general reference and with the hope of encouraging others similarly to collect and preserve their findings. What a wonderful opportunity is here presented for some fundamental and valuable "boon-doggling" for the "white-collar unemployed!"—GEORGE H. DUNCAN.

## The California Campaign

THE fight of a decade is on today in California. Let no one mistake this. Those who most thoroughly realize it are the great landed interests of California—controlling so largely the social, economic and political conditions which prevail here; naming governors, members of the legislature and local boards of supervisors and assessing officials. These are almost unanimously united in resisting the passage of our Constitutional Amendment; which abolishes the sales tax, and progressively gets rid of all taxes on improvements and personal property, transferring the same to land values.

Already privilege is beginning to show its fangs, and attempts are being made to persuade the people to believe that if this measure goes through the State of California will be driven to the wolves; that its credit will be destroyed; that the land values will be insufficient to meet the charges upon them.

The great real estate values of the State have gained in a tremendous measure through the building up of the educational system in the State; and now, owners of these values, pocketing their gains, insist the school teachers shall support the sales tax levy, which throws the cost of maintenance of the schools upon those least able to bear it; while the recipients of the swag seek to remain untouched.

Privilege, as I have said, is showing its fangs; and Privilege is to the last degree, alarmed.

I have just returned to Los Angeles from a three-day stay in San Diego, where I spoke before five large audiences; one of which was presided over by a leading realtor who declared to those who listened to him that the Governor of the State and the State's Finance Director, whom he had recently seen in Sacramento, were alarmed lest our amendment should receive endorsement of the people; and in the present condition of the minds of a majority of the people of the State, they feared such adoption.

In a few days a convention is to be held in Sacramento, by members chosen from the select, self-constituted, real rulers of the State, which the Governor will solicit to find some way of furnishing an escape from the abolition of the sales tax, and from the substitution of what he terms the Single Tax. He will ask them to consider the most

extreme measures to this end, including creation of a transaction tax. Of course this is in itself the worst form of sales tax the State can perpetrate. By this change of front, involving the abolition of the existing sales tax, he hopes to take the wind out of our sails. That he can succeed, I think, is improbable. It is not an easy task, as military men tell us, to change front in the face of the enemy. The measure, if taken, will be obviously one of desperation, and the procedure will tend to work its own defeat.

Will we succeed or not? I do not profess to know, but if I am to judge by the actions of our opponents, I am bound to believe that with work on our part, success will be assured.

My reception the past few days in San Diego has been very gratifying, as well as the reception in Los Angeles earlier, and I am sure the same will be true as to my present return.

Among the more significant of important recent developments have been these: The State Executive Board of the American Federation of Labor has recently issued instructions to every one of the 700 subordinate Unions to appoint committees to see that every member of the organization is registered, for the express purpose of voting for our amendment. It is made the duty of such committee to inform the membership of the merits of the measure and the arguments supporting it. This, together with the determined support of some twenty labor papers, indicates the mass feeling of labor toward our measure. I may add that favorable resolutions were passed only a few days ago by the Executive Board of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, which will go out immediately to the thousands of members of that organization. Last week a convention of what is known as the EPIC Democrats has been held in Los Angeles, at which were representatives from nineteen or twenty congressional districts of the State, and upon the unanimous report of its resolution committee, the 600 delegates unanimously resolved to support the measure in every possible way. This goes a long way toward success.

I am glad to see that those upon whom we rely for work in every part of the State are becoming more and more interested, determined and confident. Among those whom I have had the pleasure of meeting the past few days in San Diego, and this enumeration must be regarded as incomplete, are very effective workers in the persons of E. M. Stangland, George S. Siebert, City Councilman; Paul Richie, Epic Assemblyman; Judge Andrews, lately retired from the Supreme Court Bench; S. S. Taber, and particularly efficient among the real business men of San Diego, Henry R. Cramer. Others of equal capacity and devotion, I feel I have overlooked.

It is beyond question that our friends in Los Angeles



are presenting a more and more united front toward our common enemy, and the same is true in San Francisco.

I cannot close without urging upon friends everywhere that the crucial fight is here in California; that if we win here our movement will progress with tremendous rapidity in every State of the Union, and its reverberations will be heard in many lands. We are not fighting the battle for California alone. We are fighting the battle of Progress, the results of which will be of indefinite extension. With perfect assurance therefore we call upon our friends everywhere to come forward without any hesitation and help us. Our opponents are active, wealthy, and feel that they are engaged, so far as the State is concerned, in a last ditch conflict, and accordingly are ready to spend as many thousands as may be necessary in order to mislead the California public.—JACKSON H. RALSTON.

## Anna George in California

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE came, she saw, and we are simply overwhelmed—and we like it. We have asked her to return again to us soon.

During her stay here the name and mission of Henry George was brought to public notice in a favorable manner as it has not been for a number of years, possibly since the erecting of the plaque commemorating the writing of "Progress and Poverty" on its Fiftieth Anniversary.

On Wednesday of her visit, Judge Jackson H. Ralston, whose house guest she had been the previous evening, rushed her to San Francisco to fill an engagement at the San Francisco Girls High School. At noon she met the San Francisco "Stirring Committee" of the Sales Tax Repeal Association. Following that she was rushed to Oakland for a talk to the Economics section of Mills College.

On Thursday, Mrs. de Mille spoke over KYA, the Hearst Radio Station of San Francisco, and in the evening lectured on "The Life of My Father" at the Jewish Community Center, the organization which is the direct descendant of the Young Men's Hebrew Association where Henry George gave his original lecture on Moses.

On Friday morning the San Francisco Teachers College was visited and in the evening Mrs. de Mille lectured at the Emanu-El Sisterhood Residence Club on "The Prophet of San Francisco."

On Saturday evening the Henry George Club of San Francisco entertained at Milligans, famous Single Tax eating place, with a dinner. Mr. Milligan said this was the finest Single Tax meeting he had observed in San Francisco in years. Mr. Joseph S. Thompson, State Treasurer of the Sales Tax Repeal Association and civic leader of San Francisco, also added his voice.

Mrs. de Mille again spoke most interestingly on "The Prophet of San Francisco," and her intimate and friendly talk was vastly appreciated. An interesting incident on

this occasion was the attendance of some ten members of the San Francisco Section of the Extension Division of the Henry George School of Social Science.

The very practical proposals of Henry George are on the way up. There has been nothing done since the writing of "Progress and Poverty" that compares to the establishment of the Henry George School of Social Science and the gathering together of those who are with such idealism and such sacrifice carrying on. America will some day hail Oscar Geiger as a great mile-stone in the never-ending onward march of the work and spirit of Henry George.—N. D. ALPER.

## International Conference, 1936

A CABLEGRAM has been received by Charles O'Connor Hennessy from Arthur Madsen of London announcing that the Executive Committee of the Union for Free Trade and Land Value Taxation has decided to call an international gathering of the Georgeists of the world in London in the first week of September of this year. Further details will follow:

Mr. Hennessy who is president of the International Union writes:

"The Executive Committee of the union, with which I have been in touch, has been discussing the subject and have felt that this year would be an appropriate one for the holding of the Conference, which will deal particularly with the fundamental causes of war and the futility of the efforts that international statesmen and peace societies are proposing for ending war. The foolishness of continuing agitation for the disarmament of nations as a way toward peace while doing nothing at all toward ending the persistent *economic* wars between practically all nations, would seem to speak for the complete bankruptcy or hypocrisy of international diplomacy, as now carried on.

"So far as we can see, the Georgeists of the world are the only group of people who can see clearly and speak bravely about the causes of the wars of the past, the war of the present, and the inevitable wars of the future, which will occur until international economic freedom in the production and exchange of wealth is attained by the peoples of the world."

BUT to those who think as I do, the ethical is the more important side. Not only do we not wish to evade the question of private property in land, but to us it seems that the beneficent and far-reaching revolution we aim at is too great a thing to be accomplished by "intelligent self-interest," and can be carried by nothing less than the religious conscience.—"The Condition of Labor."

THE ideal social state is not that in which each gets an equal amount of wealth, but in which each gets in proportion to his contribution to the general stock.—"Social Problems."

## The Enigma of Money

By RAYMOND V. McNALLY

TO the average man, money is the staff of life. Although it has reigned supreme in the human mind for thousands of years, there has been no progress generally in a real understanding of what it actually means. When we work, we receive money as wages. When we wish to satisfy our desires, we spend money. All kinds of property are referred to in terms of money. Practically everything we do is measured by money which is used as a common standard of value. In fact, it intrudes upon almost every phase of our existence. Therefore, as we think constantly in terms of money, it is raised to a position of exaggerated importance; and political economy, which is the science that treats of the nature of wealth and of the laws that govern its production and distribution, comes to be known as a money science.

Money was wealth according to the old English mercantile theory, and governmental policies, which tended to restrict the production of real wealth, such as the protective tariff, were built around this idea. Although Adam Smith made a valiant attempt to discredit the notion, now, more than one hundred and fifty years later, most people are seen to be suffering from the same complex. The depression has been manifested by a cessation, relatively, of the exchanges and the destroying of values, and so the cause of it has been attributed to the lack of money or to defects in our money and credit system which has unduly expanded or contracted the means of payment.

More and more money then is believed to be the cure for unemployment. The business man complains about the lack of money in circulation. Some theorists, such as the noted English economist, J. M. Keynes, suggest an increase in the volume of money or credit; others recommend the transfer of money from one group of people to a less fortunate group, such as is done under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and by means of public relief projects. The popular belief is that there can be no employment without money—that it is people with money who give employment. And so saving by individuals is frowned upon and spending regarded as the road to prosperity. Money is regarded as the priming pump of production—that without it, labor could not work. But labor is not employed by money. Money is employed by labor. Men employed themselves before there was such a thing as money. If all of the money in the world were destroyed, could we for a moment believe that this would result in all people being idle? Down through the ages the unemployment problem existed under all kinds of money systems. I am not insisting, however, that undue contraction or expansion of money and credit plays no part in causing a depression or in prolonging it. The complexity and interdependence of modern industry have created such a delicate mechanism that the slightest

shock tends to throw it out of balance. What I mean is that we cannot logically consider it as the *primary* cause of a major depression such as the present one. Money is essentially a labor-saving device. It facilitates the exchanges and in so doing, adds to the productive power of labor by permitting greater specialization and division of effort. If we regarded money strictly as a medium of exchange and a measure of value, we would readily see that, as long as our wants remained unsatisfied, any disturbance caused by the money system alone could only be temporary. But when we use the term "money" for such economic concepts as wealth, wages, value, monopoly, land and capital, we are very apt to overlook first principles. The result is a distorted picture of economic life which leads to a false diagnosis of our economic problems.

The person who is untrained in economic reasoning, does not realize that the careless use of the term "money" obscures certain fundamental facts that must be considered before he can really understand the phenomena of the present depression. He is easily confused by those economists who, in their intense effort to be scientific in their investigations and analysis, overlook first principles entirely by compiling huge masses of statistics on symptoms and concentrating on a mere medium of exchange. But the really scientific method of economic investigation requires first of all the precise use of words. The tendency to confuse money with wealth lies at the bottom of all of the popular analysis of the depression and of the government's measures to stimulate recovery. It is responsible for the AAA, the NRA, the Home Loan Corporation, the RFC, the public works programme, devaluation of the dollar, the banking bill, the various proposals for inflation, the reluctance to reduce the tariff, the various share-the-wealth and pension schemes and unemployment insurance. In connection with these, not the slightest attempt has been made to reduce the problem of unemployment to its simplest terms. In order to solve a problem in mathematics, we reduce it to simple factors. We do not tackle the problem by retaining complex equations and making them more involved. We try to obtain the simplest equation we can through the process of elimination. But the customary method of handling an economic problem is to assume from the beginning that it is very complicated and that it is impossible to simplify it. Thus the problem becomes more and more involved so that one finds oneself reasoning in a circle and losing sight of fundamental principles. And so the task assumes such alarming proportions that we find one man specializing in the study of prices, another in currencies, another in labor questions, another in taxation and so on, each one representing a distinct viewpoint but each failing to see the picture as a whole—a veritable jumble of disjointed and uncorrelated theories.

To understand the problem, we must begin with simple facts. The purpose of economic activity is to satisfy our desires, material and otherwise, with the least exertion. In other words, while we must work in order to live, we try to do as little work as possible. This is a fundamental law of human nature and universal as it is, it appears to be little recognized. Like the law of gravitation, it is a natural law and cannot be affected by human will. Our natural impulse is to make a job as easy as possible and the more freedom this impulse has, the more prosperous we are. Therefore, we use every labor-saving device that we can think of, including money and credit, in order to satisfy our desires with the least amount of effort. Limiting the use of machinery and shortening the hours of labor, as has been done under the NRA, are actions that are directly contrary to this law of human nature. They make the job more difficult than it should be, because more men are used than are absolutely necessary. The result is a lower standard of living for the community. When human effort is wasted, some of our wants must unnecessarily remain unsatisfied. Increasing technological development cannot cause unemployment, because until our wants are fully satisfied (and I cannot conceive of such a happy condition), we need every man we can get to render us service of one kind or another. The remedies commonly advanced, however, for curing unemployment and stimulating recovery definitely ignore this self-evident fact. In fact, they imply just the opposite view, for they are based on the theory that there is not enough work for everybody to do and that therefore we must make work, regardless of what it might be, so that everyone will be employed. But if our wants have been fully satisfied, why should it be necessary to make more work? Work is not an end in itself but a means to an end—the satisfaction of our desires. The answer is obvious. Our wants have *not* been fully supplied and probably never will be, and while that condition exists, it should not be at all necessary to spread the work in private industry and to create artificial jobs on public relief projects in order to relieve unemployment. There is plenty of real work to be done. What is lacking is not work but the *opportunity* to work. Involuntary unemployment, therefore, can be due only to some maladjustment in the natural order of society. The fact that we deem it necessary to adopt unsound remedies based on false assumptions, while the real work is being neglected, should be sufficient warning that we are doing nothing to correct this maladjustment.

Those who favor the creation of artificial jobs by means of public relief projects, claim that they will eventually lead to real jobs, because the spending done by those who receive these artificial jobs, will stimulate private industry. But transferring purchasing power from the taxpayer to the unemployed cannot lead to increased business. Better business can only result from an in-

crease in the opportunities for real work and these opportunities do not lie in public spending. In the natural order of things, as long as human wants remain unsatisfied, there should be no limit to the opportunities for employment. Why is it then that men remain idle instead of employing themselves? The socialist would reply that they had no capital, but he overlooks the fact that capital, which consists of buildings, machinery and goods in the process of production, is made by labor just as consumer goods are made by labor. This capital is obtained by exchanging consumer goods for it, through the medium of money or credit. The socialist would not admit this, because he holds the theory of the classical economists that labor is maintained by capital. But this notion was thoroughly discredited in the nineteenth century. Labor produces its own wages and subsistence. The average business man is inclined to admit this but then proceeds to offer and to uphold opinions that imply the classical concept of the relation of capital to labor. The false concept led to the fallacy that capital limits employment, a fallacy that runs through current popular economic thought and has resulted in the various inadequate explanations of the causes of the present depression. Capital, however, does not limit employment, but it may limit the *form* of employment—that is it may determine the direction that production will take and in that way limit the productiveness of labor. But while capital may limit the form of production, in actual practice it is seen that even this does not actually take place. To say that men cannot employ themselves until they have capital is to put the cart before the horse. Capital is the product of labor and obviously the product cannot come before the producer. This fundamental fact is doubtless obscured by the complexities of modern industry. To make this point absolutely clear, it might be desirable to submit a detailed analysis of the processes of production and of the dynamics of capital production, but the lack of space limits us to a discussion of unemployment from the money angle. When men start in business, they either borrow capital that has been made by other men or they use their own savings to obtain it. The savings are the result of their own labor and consist of either actual money or of bank deposits. They do not represent real capital but abstinence from consuming that share of the wealth produced to which they are rightfully entitled because of their contribution to production. While it would appear from this that capital is necessary before men can employ themselves, it must be kept in mind that the capital they use has been produced by other men, because the spending of the savings of the former has directed production to that end. This is not to say that savings limit employment any more than capital does. As far as the whole community is concerned, the employment of labor does not depend on accumulated savings. All



that is necessary is that some men devote their time or part of their time to the production of capital while other men devote their time to producing wealth for immediate consumption. Nor are accumulated savings absolutely necessary, as far as individual employment is concerned. Capital and also subsistence may be obtained by means of credit—not necessarily bank credit, but the credit extended by one business man to another.

It should be clear from the foregoing that the exaggerated emphasis placed upon money is due to confusing money with wealth and with that part of wealth that is used to produce more wealth. Those who believe that the spending of money is necessary in order to stimulate recovery and to cure unemployment, have fallen victim to the false notion that capital employs labor and that capital limits employment. When they talk of money, they are unconsciously referring to capital. Money is not capital. It has a characteristic in common with capital, however, in that the use of it adds to the productive power of labor. But this is not the same thing as saying that money is necessary before there can be any employment. Employment precedes both money and capital. Yet we hear all about us the statement that before unemployment can be reduced, there must be more confidence in the capital market. Idle funds must be invested, is the cry; but idle funds are not capital nor do they consist of money except to a limited degree. They represent mostly bank deposits and government securities and these constitute claims on wealth that is being produced or that is to be produced. The false notion that these idle funds have the power to give employment and to stimulate industry underlies the consternation that has been caused by the proposal to tax large incomes. It is pointed out that a tax on large incomes will tend to discourage productive effort and to divert capital from productive investments into tax-exempt securities. Insofar as the tax falls on *earned* incomes, productive effort may be discouraged, but all large incomes are not earned wealth. However, a tax on incomes, large or small, does not discriminate between what is earned wealth and what is unearned wealth. For this reason, it cannot be justified on moral grounds, whatever we might think of its economic expediency. At the same time, it cannot be denied that it is less injurious to industry than the vast majority of indirect taxes that are a direct burden on production and increase the cost of doing business.

The old classical theory that capital limits employment is the basis for the so-called modern doctrine, made prominent by J. M. Keynes, that spending (money being substituted for capital through the confusion of terms) leads to prosperity. It is said that there are many people with large incomes who do not spend enough—that they accumulate enormous savings that constitute funds which belong normally in consumptive channels. When they

fail to spend, it is claimed that business suffers. This springs from the erroneous impression that there is a strict limit to human desires. When people save their money instead of spending it directly for commodities, they are only refraining from taking their share of the wealth that they have helped to produce. They have not done the community the slightest harm. If there were a limit to human desires, it would mean that the community would work less in order to satisfy its needs.

Naturally, under conditions in which all desires have been fully satisfied, there can be no involuntary unemployment, for where involuntary unemployment exists, human wants have not been entirely supplied. But in a dynamic society, such as we live in, human desires are unlimited. Therefore, if some people save their money instead of spending it, what these people fail to consume, others will consume. In other words, there will be no surplus of goods in the aggregate that remains unsold. But for the sake of argument, let us assume that a surplus has been created because these savings are not in circulation. The value of the savings, therefore, must be equivalent to the value of this surplus. But a surplus of goods for which there is no demand can have no value, and this means then that the savings that derive from this alleged surplus, also can have no value. This, of course, is contrary to fact, and so we are forced to the logical conclusion that saving money instead of spending it does not create a surplus of unsold goods. What actually takes place when some people save their money is that labor is freed so that it can supply to a greater extent the rest of the community with more consumer goods (there being no limit to the desires of the community) or, if the savings are invested in industry, with more capital goods. The failure to see this is due to confusing money with wealth, and this error has led to the idea that capital profits at the expense of labor. It is claimed that the wages of labor are not sufficient to enable it to absorb all of the goods produced, that the huge profits of employers have been diverted into building up an excess plant capacity and that this has resulted in an even greater overproduction of goods.

The average person seems to picture a supply of goods on one hand and a quantity of money equal in value on the other. If some of that money is removed, say for the purpose of saving it, he believes then that the supply of goods exceeds the demand for them. In confusing money with wealth, money is here regarded as purchasing power, but as a matter of fact, money only represents purchasing power. Purchasing power is wealth or goods and therefore springs from the ability to work. When a man works, he receives his wages in money, which is an order certifying to the fact that he has contributed to the production of wealth and that he has the right to claim a part of it. The demand for goods really lies in the goods themselves, and consequently supply cannot

exceed demand, for when considered in the general sense, supply is demand and demand is supply. What stimulates business then is not money but work. While it is true that without money we would be living on a lower standard, it is not because money is purchasing power but because by facilitating the exchanges it adds to productive power by permitting a greater specialization and division of labor. But credit does this to an even greater extent, because most business transactions are made by means of credit, even though they are customarily spoken of as involving the transfer of money. The popular demand for increasing the volume of money in circulation, or the volume of credit, by such means as minimum wage laws, public relief projects, or by liberalizing the banking system is not for the purpose of increasing the productive power of labor but for the purpose of building up purchasing power.

Eliminating the false notion, however, that money is purchasing power gives us a much clearer view of the whole matter. While a depression manifests itself in a diminution of purchasing power, we know now that it is not due to overproduction proceeding from a lack of money or credit or from a faulty distribution of wealth between labor and capital. On the contrary, it is plainly evident that it is caused by underproduction which is due to a restriction of the natural opportunities for work—a restriction that results in a contraction of purchasing power which propagates itself throughout the entire industrial system. This is not to say that the distribution of wealth has nothing to do with the problem of unemployment. From the observation of phenomena and the examination of first principles, it is clear that the problem of distribution and the problem of unemployment are one and the same thing. Solve distribution and we solve unemployment. Thinking in terms of money, however, will not lead us to the correct solution, for then it becomes a matter of dividing wealth between those who have money and those who haven't. Capital is regarded as possessing all of the money and labor as having none and therefore being subject to the will of the former for its wages. And so for thousands of years, men have tried to divide wealth by government fiat but have always failed, because any interference with distribution shows itself in lessened production. As I have already pointed out, labor produces capital and so neither can have a permanent advantage over the other. Large aggregations of capital appear to have labor at their mercy, but that is only because they can take advantage of the maladjustment in the natural order which restricts the opportunities for employment. While it is true that in any dispute between labor and capital, the latter may be able to hold out longer (capital wastes when idle but labor perishes), if the returns to capital rise, more labor will turn to producing capital and the tendency will be toward an equalization of the

returns of both. Some economists include the entrepreneur as a factor of production and believe that he should be considered in any discussion of the distribution of wealth. But the entrepreneur is only a laborer, in the economic sense, and receives only what he contributes to production.

Before we can determine how wealth is distributed, we must know what the fundamental factors of production are. These will be clear to us when we fix in our minds just what production is, or what amounts to the same thing, just what employment really means. Employment is the expenditure of human exertion in the production of services, both tangible and intangible. Tangible services are embodied in tangible products, such as food, clothing, shelter and all of the numerous articles that administer to our comfort. They form the basis for the enormous volume of intangible services which otherwise could not be rendered. Only the tangible services or the tangible products are wealth. The materials that go to make up these products come from land. Labor does not create these materials but merely removes and processes them so as to fit them for the satisfaction of human desires. Nothing is wealth, therefore, that is not the result of the application of labor to land. Many people cannot see what land has to do with modern industry. Land to them is only something that farmers use, but this narrow concept is a surviving relic of nineteenth century economics. Business is not carried on in the air. Land includes not only farm lands, but coal lands, oil lands, mineral deposits, forests, water, building sites, business locations and rights of way for pipe lines, railroads and public utilities. All occupations are founded on the primary occupations that are directly related to land, such as farming, fishing, mining, etc. The manufacturing and exchange occupations, while they use land directly only for standing room, are merely cooperative steps in the long process of production, because they handle the materials that come from land and from nowhere else. Land, obviously, is the source of all employment and therefore the source of all wealth. In the last analysis then, employment is the expenditure of human exertion on land, and the fundamental factors of production are seen to be Land, Labor and Capital.

Wealth is distributed among these factors and any attempt to solve distribution must embrace all three or it will be a complete failure. All legislation of the past and present has considered only labor and capital and has consisted of unscientific efforts to interfere *directly* with distribution by means of minimum wage, maximum hour and price-fixing laws. They have all failed for while wealth that is already produced can be divided in any way that men wish, wealth that is being produced or is yet to be produced cannot be divided by human will except *indirectly*. Interfering directly with distri-

bution results in lessened production, but fair and expedient distribution must be coexistent with greater and ever increasing production. Distribution must be tackled *indirectly* by *directly* reaching production, that is, by removing all obstacles to production. This would be in entire harmony with the natural order because distribution is determined by the natural law, previously stated, that men try to satisfy their desires with the least exertion. If they had free access to land, there would be no problem of unemployment to solve. But as all of the best land is privately owned, every single individual who works must pay for the use of it, directly or indirectly as the case may be, whether he be a book-keeper on the top floor of a New York skyscraper or a miner in the coal pits of Pennsylvania. This payment is economic rent and the value or selling price of land is determined by capitalizing it, less any taxes that are levied on it, at the current rate of interest.

Obedying their natural instincts, men try to obtain land that will yield them the best living with the least effort, whether it be a busy corner on which to sell hats or a mine or a farm near transportation facilities. It is the power to save human effort that makes some land more valuable than other land, the difference in productiveness being economic rent. This superior productiveness is not due to any effort on the part of the individual who happens to own the land. It is due to greater population, closer proximity to the center of trade and commerce and to better governmental services—in other words, to the collective effort of all the people. This productiveness, therefore, is a social, not an individual value. Labor and capital generally, as producers of wealth, do not profit from this superior productiveness, because they must pay for it as economic rent. Their returns are limited to what they could obtain on the least productive land in use with the same effort. The huge profits of some producers are largely economic rent because these producers are also landowners. This fact is obscured, particularly in the cases of large corporations whose land ownership is represented by stocks and bonds that are owned by many people. While any increase in the productive power of labor due to invention and discovery or due to improvement in manners, morals, education and government tends to increase economic rent, the natural tendency is also to increase the returns of labor and capital. However, the tendency of material progress to increase economic rent, combined with our unscientific system of taxation, encourages speculation in land. Future increases are anticipated by owners in the prices or rents that they demand. Land is held out of use (twenty per cent of New York City's land, for example, is listed as vacant—not that there is no demand for it, for the fact that it has value indicates there is a demand for it for the purpose of using it), \*creating an

artificial scarcity, until prices are met by labor and capital. Unlike the return to capital, economic rent cannot be held in check, for land cannot be reproduced. In the keen competition for land, the price is bid up and up and labor and capital are forced to yield the returns that would naturally accrue to them from material progress. Some producers will be forced to less productive land where less wealth will be produced with the same effort and this is the point at which the returns of all will be fixed. Billions of dollars are poured into land, and speculation, aided by liberal bank credit and the optimistic attitude of investors, becomes more intense. Mortgages and funded debts are piled up, and finally land values are bid up to such a point that producers are forced to yield not only everything above their customary returns but part of those returns as well. If they are unable to increase their productive efficiency or to adjust living standards downward fast enough, receiverships, bankruptcies, liquidations and foreclosures result. Thus production is checked, unemployment follows and purchasing power declines, spreading from one point to another until there is a general business slump and a collapse of land values. Is it not clear that an industrial depression is but the intensification of a chronic condition of bad distribution?

Modern society, in social matters, is no more intelligent than ancient society. Although society is entirely dependent for its welfare on the efforts of producers, it has entirely ignored the fundamental law of economics, that law of human nature which prompts men to seek the easiest way to satisfy their desires. While the government seems to be thoroughly confused as to the cause of the depression, it has been occupied for some time with treating the symptoms of land speculation as is evidenced by the refinancing of farm mortgages, the reclamation projects, the home subsistence schemes, the Home Loan Corporation activities, the slum clearance projects and the granting of credit to railroads, banks, insurance companies and industrial organizations. All of these measures have tended to prevent the establishing of a new equilibrium which was necessary in order to permit production to continue at the old tempo. This was possible only by a deflation of land values to their natural level, or by an increase in productive power due to new inventions, or by the willingness of producers to accept smaller incomes, or by the accomplishment of all three conditions. All of the superficial remedies that have been tried have succeeded only in laying the groundwork for the next depression. With millions of people unemployed, no attempt has been made to open up the natural opportunities for work. Instead we witness the strange spectacle of a desperate endeavor to *create* work by shortening hours and planning relief projects in a world in which there is plenty of *real* work to do. The failure to recog-

\*New York Times, June 25, 1935.

nize first principles in a maze of modern complexities has obscured the fundamental fact that employment, in the last analysis, is the application of labor to land.

Treating the *symptoms* of bad distribution cannot solve the problem of unemployment. The cause must be eliminated. All of the attempts to increase the productive power of producers, who are also consumers, by means of government improvements, such as better roads, harbors, bridges, inland waterways, education, supervision of health, restriction of crime and vice, a sounder credit and money system, lower rates from public utilities, etc., will be of no avail, for they tend merely to increase rent, encourage speculation and widen the gulf between rich and poor. Furthermore, not even regulation of the stock exchange and of the underwriting of securities can benefit the majority of the people. The stock market crash was largely a collapse of land values. Stocks and bonds, particularly the speculative part, were based chiefly on capitalized economic rent. As the cause of bad distribution is the private appropriation of economic rent, the remedy suggests itself: Divert economic rent into the public treasury. This would make it unprofitable to hold land out of use and by increasing the market supply of land, would destroy the speculative element in the price that labor and capital have to pay. The best land would be brought into use and with lower prices and lower rents and greater wealth production, the returns to labor and capital would rise. With easy access to the source of all employment, the natural opportunities for work would far exceed the available supply of labor and capital. If economic rent were used to defray the expenses of government, labor and capital would be still further benefited by freeing them from the multitude of taxes that now constitute a deduction from their earnings and hamper them in their efforts to produce. Economic rent would be sufficient for this purpose, because the *necessary* expenses of government cannot exceed the advantages of living under that government and these advantages are reflected in economic rent. This remedy does not violate sound economic principles, because it does not interfere directly with distribution and thereby lessen production but tackles distribution indirectly by removing the obstruction at the source, that is, by freeing production. Nor does it violate sound moral principles. Individual values would be left entirely with individuals and social values would be taken for society. An objection might be raised that this would not be just to those who have invested their savings in land, but it is extremely doubtful if it was just to permit anyone to invest in something that is absolutely essential for human existence and that was not made by man. The abolition of an injustice can hardly be considered unjust.

While a remedy that is economically expedient cannot be anything else but the purest justice, any prolonged discussion of it can be of little value, until the principles

underlying it are thoroughly understood. What is of prime importance at this time is the matter of acquainting ourselves with the fundamentals of economic life and of training ourselves in the precise use of words. Loose terminology has strangled thought in the economic field too long a time, and we would be taking a big step forward, if we could free our minds from all of the false concepts that have been engendered largely by the confounding of money with wealth.

## Around The World With The Henry George School of Social Science

By GEORGE BINGHAM

Mr. Bingham is a member of the class in Journalism, a group of eighteen persons training themselves to undertake the education of the public in social and economic questions as newswriters, feature writers, editorialists and correspondents.

To provide the members of the group with experience, Mr. Monroe arranged that he should be interviewed by them. Instead of making a formal report to the movement, he is presenting his report through the newswriting group.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

NEW YORK, JAN. 7, 1936

**M**ORE than 1,200 students attended the courses of the Henry George School of Social Science at its national headquarters in New York and at extension classes throughout the country in the fall semester just ending, John Lawrence Monroe, field director of the School, announced tonight.

Progress toward the goal in 100 cities by July 1, and 100,000 students completely familiar with the philosophy of Henry George in five years was shown by the reports from extension secretaries in fifty-two localities. All of these will give courses in the winter and spring semesters.

Spread of the school movement over the world has also begun, the field director disclosed. Twenty-five copies of the Teachers' Manual prepared by the late Oscar H. Geiger, founder of the School, have just been sent to the Rev. David H. Stewart, pastor of the Baptist Church of Tauranga, North Island, New Zealand.

The Rev. Mr. Stewart is starting a branch of the School which, like the New York School, will organize extension classes throughout New Zealand. He had intended to start a school which was to have been called the Henry George Institute. But on learning of the activities of the nation-wide American School, he decided that it would be best for the New Zealand movement to be identified with the American institution, the educational standing of which is attested by its charter from the University of the State of New York.

Not only in New Zealand but in Australia, the United Kingdom, Canada, Mexico and Peru, branches of the School are being established.

In Australia three headquarters cities are organizing

classes, in Adelaide, South Australia; Melbourne, Victoria and Brisbane, Queensland. Arthur Masden, secretary of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, obtained materials for twenty teachers on his visit to the United States to attend the recent Henry George Congress.

E. S. Westrup, missionary attached to the Mexican Mission of the Church of Christ, Monterey, Mexico, is translating the manual into Spanish. The School hopes to make a copy of the translation available to Gerardo Klinge of Lima, Peru. Mr. Klinge has just been provided with teaching materials in English.

The social benefits of the educational movement founded by Oscar Geiger have been established in Milk River, Alberta. There a group of Georgeists considered the possibility of launching an extension school and all but J. B. Ellert of that town thought the method was inapplicable to the local situation.

Mr. Ellert persisted and launched a class, to which he attracted several university graduates who in their courses in economics had not been acquainted with the work of Henry George. As he put it, he "muddled through," reading "Progress and Poverty," with the principles of which he was acquainted by other names, for the first time himself.

The province was swept by Social Credit agitation recently and the graduates of Mr. Ellert's class, now supported by other old-timers in the section, fought the proposals of the Social Credit group as an unworkable palliative liable to inflict great damage to the economic system of Alberta.

The Social Credit group carried the province by sizeable pluralities, but failed to carry those localities in which graduates of the School, who had been trained in economic analysis and discussion by their study of "Progress and Poverty," had contested the doctrines of the Social Credit group.

The first class in "Progress and Poverty" integrated into labor education is opening under the auspices of the New York Printing Pressman's Union, No. 51, Mr. Monroe said. The instructor is Charles Erwood, of the staff at national headquarters. The enthusiasm of labor delegates at the sessions of the recent Henry George Congress indicated that this phase of the School's activity will be extended.

THE hero of that classic song "On the Bowery" was taken from life. His indignation when the policeman rescued him from the designs of a confidence swindler shows he was modeled after the head of one of those agricultural organizations which are now protesting against the reciprocity treaties.

UNLESS its foundations be laid in justice the social structure cannot stand.—"Progress and Poverty."

## Extension Classes of the Henry George School

### ALABAMA

FAIRHOPE: *Instructor:* R. L. Rockwell.

SELMA: *Instructor:* William H. Dinkins, A. M., President, Selma University.

### CALIFORNIA

GLENDALE: *Instructor:* Hollis C. Joy, 1850 Verdugo Knolls Drive.

LONG BEACH: *Instructor:* Cary Richard Colburn, 1011 E. Broadway.

LOS ANGELES. *Extension Director for Southern California:* Harry Ferrell, 539 Bradbury Bldg.

PASADENA. *Instructor:* George E. Lee, 1900 Paloma Street.

SAN DIEGO. *Extension Secretary:* E. M. Stangland, 2660 National Avenue.

SAN FRANCISCO. *Extension Secretary:* N. D. Alper, 83 McAllister Street.

SANTA ANA. *Instructor:* Ben E. Tarver, Suite 418, Otis Building.

### CONNECTICUT

HARTFORD. *Instructor:* Mrs. Nathan Hillman, 19 West Raymond Street.

NORFOLK. *Instructor:* Joseph R. Carroll.

STRATFORD. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Lee, 219 Burritt Avenue.

WATERBURY. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. Royal E. S. Hayes, 314 W. Main Street.

### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WASHINGTON. *Extension Secretary:* Miss Edith Swanton, 1464 Belmont St., N.W.

### ILLINOIS

CANTON. *Instructor:* Mabell Brooks, Moran Apts.

CHICAGO. *Extension Secretary:* Maurice Welty, 4833 Dakin Street.

OAK PARK. *Extension Secretary:* J. Edward Jones, 137 N. Marion Street.

PEORIA. *Extension Secretary:* Albert Henniges, 326 Harrison Street.

### MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Francis G. Goodale, 79 Webster Road, Weston, Mass.

CHICOPEE FALLS. *Instructor:* John B. Knight, 91 Main Street.

FALL RIVER. *Instructor:* Rev. William R. Reid, 373 N. Main Street.

GREAT BARRINGTON. *Extension Secretary:* M. Rees Moffatt, Savings Bank Bldg.



GREENFIELD. *Instructor:* Bernard Dirks.  
SANDWICH. *Instructor:* Lincoln Crowell.

## MICHIGAN

CEDAR SPRINGS. *Instructor:* J. S. Tindall.  
DETROIT. *Extension Secretary:* William J. Palmer, 1257  
National Bank Building.  
GRAND RAPIDS. *Extension Secretary:* M. Herman Friedrich, 701 Livingston, N.E.

## MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS. *Extension Secretary:* Louis B. Schwartz,  
310 McKnight Bldg.  
ST. PAUL. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Irene Lucier Buell,  
378 N. Franklin Street.

## MISSOURI

KANSAS CITY. *Extension Secretary:* Edward White, 300  
La Salle Building.  
SPRINGFIELD. *Extension Secretary:* Dr. J. V. Boswell,  
823 Woodruff Building.

## NEBRASKA

OMAHA. *Extension Secretary:* A. W. Falvey, 2618 S.  
26th street.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

EAST ALSTEAD. *Instructor:* Hartley Dennett.

## NEW JERSEY

NEWARK. *Instructor:* Dr. Elizabeth E. Bowen, Jacksonville Road; Towaco, N. J.  
WESTFIELD. *Instructor:* Edwin J. Jones, 311 Prospect Street.

## NEW YORK

BROOKLYN. *Instructor:* John Luxton, 496 E. 46th Street.  
*Instructor:* David Chodorov, Executive's  
Secretarial Training School, 1560 Flatbush Avenue.  
BRONX. *Instructor:* Max Berkowitz, 655 E. 223rd Street.  
FLORAL PARK, L. I. *Instructor:* Leonard T. Recker, 230  
W. 17th Street, New York City.  
MIDDLETOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Miss Candace B.  
Fuller, 128 Academy Road.  
NEW YORK CITY. *National Headquarters:* O. K. Dorn,  
Business Manager, 211 West 79th Street.  
SCHENECTADY. *Extension Secretary:* W. W. Munro, R.  
D. No. 3.

## OHIO

CINCINNATI. *Extension Secretary:* E. E. Hardcastle,  
Union Central Life Insurance Co.  
CLEVELAND. *Extension Secretary:* Virgil D. Allen, 2304  
Bellfield Road, Cleveland Heights.  
COLUMBUS. *Extension Secretary:* J. H. Kauffman, 403  
State House Annex.

YOUNGSTOWN. *Extension Secretary:* Charles C. McGowan,  
25 S. Hazel Street.

## PENNSYLVANIA

INGRAM. *Instructor:* Richard E. Howe, 810 Keystone  
Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
PHILADELPHIA. *Extension Secretary:* Julian P. Hickok,  
315 Zeralda Street.  
PITTSBURGH. *Extension Secretary:* Richard E. Howe, 810  
Keystone Building.

*Ukrainian Extension Secretary:* Miss Mary  
Zenchak, 7th and Carson Streets.

SOMERSET. *Instructor:* Ernest O. Kooser.

## TEXAS

HOUSTON. *Extension Secretary:* Mrs. Bessie Beach Trueheart, 5308 Alameda Road.

## WASHINGTON

ALDERWOOD MANOR. *Instructor:* W. H. Proctor.  
TACOMA. *Instructor:* Robert S. Doubleday, 2306 S.  
Yakima Avenue.

## CANADA

MILK RIVER, ALBERTA. *Instructor:* J. B. Ellert.  
TORONTO, ONTARIO. *Extension Secretary:* Miss Dorothy  
E. Coate, 140 Arlington Avenue.

## MEXICO

MONTERREY. *Instructor:* E. S. Westrup, Ave Morales  
132, Ote.

## NEW ZEALAND

TAURANGA. *Field Director for the Dominion of New Zealand:* Rev. David H. Stewart, Cameron Road.

## AUSTRALIA

ADELAIDE. *Instructor:* A. S. Bayly, Henry George League  
of South Australia, George Parade.

It is a position not to be controverted that the earth in its natural uncultivated state was, and ever would have continued to be, the common property of the human race. In that state every man would have been born to property. He would have been a joint life-proprietor with the rest in the property of the soil, and in all natural productions. . . . It is the value of the improvement, and not the earth itself, that is individual property.

—THOMAS PAINE.

Men of England, wherefore plough  
For the lords to lay you low?  
Wherefore weave with toil and care  
The rich robes your tyrants wear.

Wherefore feed and clothe and save,  
From the cradle to the grave  
Those ungrateful drones who would  
Drain your sweat—nay, drink your blood?  
—SHELLEY, Song—To the Men of England.



of state socialism; my impression is that the Constitution will not prevent them; if we can't stop them with public opinion, we may as well forget our democracy and try a few hundred years of collectivism.

\* \* \*

The announcement by the President of a budget of about seven billion dollars, which does not include relief, which is vaguely stated as anywhere from one to three billions, seems to be only a large incident in this hectic day of court decisions and discussion of AAA, the NRA and the Constitution:—yes, a ten billion dollar distribution of money by our Federal government does not any more excite protest and resentment as it would have done before we had three or four years of immersion in big figures of taxation and expenditure; all this has built a toleration in us so that a ten times multiplied disbursement doesn't make a riot.

Nor does it start the necessary process of survey, research, and thinking, which would, logically, be invited by such bankrupting figures, and which would solve our financial problem;—any average business man having this problem, as relating to his own business, no matter what kind or how modest, would quickly aid the solution: he would find that Uncle Sam is impoverishing all his 125,000,000 citizens by taxing them, their homes, their business, their profits and wages, and above all, their consumption of necessities; and that he was doing that in order to protect not over two or three per cent of owners of property that Uncle Sam should be conserving for all the people, but which he is letting racketeers walk away with.

\* \* \*

One court decision against a proposition is bad, and another is not merely twice as bad, but geometrically worse; so now, as the originator of the 'fair trade' idea and president of the league bearing that name, for twenty-five years, I am pained to report another defeat of the Feld-Crawford fair trade law by R. H. Macy against Doubleday-Doran in the Court of Appeals; of course, I think the court is wrong, and that it confuses the idea of protecting brain products with the ordinary products of production and distribution:—in the field of patents, trade marks and copyright, our government has always functioned in protecting originality—invention, in designing, in authorship and in creation generally; and in this decision, the judicial arm of the government reaches out and smites the creative genius of the nation; these intangibles can be protected in no other way than through denial of the right of price cutters to drag reputations in the mud, as bait, in their alleged bargain sales.

\* \* \*

Little old New York is going to be pretty well bridged and tunneled if our efficient Mayor and Governor have their way, as they seem to be getting it, quite generally:—the newspaper editions hardly come out fast enough to keep us informed of the \$60,000,000 'grants' by Washington and Albany of funds for tunnels eastward into Brooklyn and Queens:—it was not many hours after fifty-eight millions was voted for the midtown tunnel into Queens, when another sixty or sixty-five million comes along for one from South Ferry to Hamilton Avenue, Brooklyn; and to you ordinary everyday citizens who are not used to such big figures and to such big loans, we may reassure you by saying that the legislature has placed these two adventures in the hands of an 'authority,' which is the latest invention for doing a lot of things that regularly appointed officials are not empowered to do; however, I must enlighten you a little further:—this one hundred and twenty millions will create at least an equal amount of land values here, which will go into speculator's pockets while you pay for the tunnels with taxes on your daily necessities that double your living cost and cut in half wages and profits.

These tunnels should be paid for out of the land values they create; they would then be a real public benefaction, and make this community richer; but now, while you can ride through them, and perhaps cheaply, the ones who own this one hundred and twenty million

dollars of land value will jack up your rents and take away from you every dollar of benefit you get from this service and its low fares.

\* \* \*

I ran across an editorial in *Liberty* magazine, which I do not often read; but this editorial by Bernarr Macfadden, the publisher, started me thinking:—it was not a bid for nomination to the Presidency of the United States—it only exercised a prominent citizen's right to talk about the President, his job, and of the people's interests; and what it made me think was;—here's a man who I am told, has six million customers—readers of his dozen or so periodicals—and a man who has grown from a modest start to a real captain of industry; and therefore one who has had the experience that should be the only qualification accepted for the chief executive.

Try and think of the difference in the outlook of a man like this and that of the various ones we have had in the past few decades—or most of them. I do not mean to bow down to mere business ability, nor bigness, nor even to publishing or editorial genius, but Macfadden has a special viewpoint that should also be a requisite for the big job of running this country; I have for years been reading his special articles or editorials, and I know he has the real social viewpoint; and I say 'real' because Macfadden understands economics, without which 'social' means nothing.

\* \* \*

Candidates for President often bloom from 'State Houses':—two Roosevelts, Wilson, and Cleveland are notable examples. Governor Landon is a promising candidate, based principally on his record of budget balancing, or coming somewhere near it; and now Governor Talmadge of Georgia is making a bid on a similar basis:—he has wiped out, during the three years in which the President has succeeded in increasing our national debt nine billions, fifty millions of Georgian debt, and is probably saving his State ten millions in taxes annually.

To the average viewpoint, this seems final as summing up the qualifications for President, as it has been so satisfactory for state chief executives; but even relating to the finances of the country, this is not the last word, and there are many considerations, other than financial:—the great mistake is made in relation to budgets and taxation, in considering sum totals and ignoring sources and principles of taxation; it would be no credit to a governor to balance a budget by squeezing pennies from the mass of consumers with a sales tax; and the palm will one day go to the governor, who will operate under the only right principle of 'benefits rendered' in levying and collecting taxes, and this will result in that other principle, 'collecting social values for social needs;' this will be a tax on monopoly values in natural resources and franchises.

HEAR, O thou Righteous Spirit of the whole creation, and judge who is the thief, he who takes away the freedom of the common earth from me, which is my creation rights; . . . or I, who take the common earth to plant upon for my free livelihood, endeavouring to live as a free commoner in a free commonwealth, in righteousness and peace.—GERALD WINSTANLEY (1652).

Thus saith the Lord! You weary Me  
With prayers and waste your own short years;  
Eternal truth you cannot see  
Who weep and shed your sight in tears!  
In vain you wait and watch the skies,  
No better fortune thus will fall;  
Up from your knees I bid YOU rise,  
And claim the Earth for All.

—GERALD MASSEY.

## The Social Problem in Israel and Other Nations

IN essential features, the social and economic problem of ancient Israel, was the same as in other countries. All nations are overtaken, soon or later, by the double pressure of heavy taxes and concentrated land ownership. But among Gentile peoples this problem has been expressed in secular phraseology; whereas, in ancient Israel the problem clothed itself in religious terms, owing to the peculiar course of social development among the Hebrews. No other national evolution has enthroned a cult of desert origin over cities representing a previously rooted commercialism. This peculiar structural fact in Hebrew history made it possible to formulate reactions between the nomadic and the territorial points of view in terms of cult-rivalry. And thus, while the social and economic problem of ancient Israel was the same as in other parts of the world, there is a difference in the forms of expression, whereby the God-idea was uniquely welded into the process which at length gave rise to Judaism and Christianity.

"God and the Social Process," by LOUIS WALLIS.

PRIVATE ownership in the soil has obtained among all nations; but, at the same time, it has always gravitated into the hands of the few. The problem was attacked in vain by Greece and Rome through readjustment of debts and interest. France guillotined her landed nobles, and reapportioned her soil among the peasantry. Russia's landed nobility was expropriated in the Red Terror. America more recently has undertaken to stay the concentration of land by legal moratoria and national guaranty of mortgage bonds. The mass of Great Britain's population was long ago swept off the soil into overcrowded centers where the productive capital of the middle class pays ground rent, and also carries a mounting burden of direct taxation. Since modern society has not thus far discriminated the moral and economic factors of its collective problem, we cannot, with frankness, go back twenty-eight hundred years into the past and blame the prophets of Israel for not opposing the institution of human slavery; nor should we pick flaws when they assail the concentration of private land ownership among a small clique of nobles, while ignoring the deeper question of individual proprietorship in the earth as a moral issue. . . . One of the greatest problems which ultimately confront all nations is that of recognizing the social character of land, while simultaneously guaranteeing secure and absolute private possession; so that the benefits of personal enterprise and work may accrue to the individual. But this problem has never been solved by any nation at any time during the course of history.

"God and the Social Process," by LOUIS WALLIS.

## Not A Free Advertisement

ABOUT a generation ago, it was common to hear people say that Miller & Lux could drive their herds a thousand miles through California without leaving their own lands. Miller & Lux, Inc., still control immense tracts of land throughout California. Through the Hearst papers they are exploiting these lands—"Controlled Irrigation Farm Lands." Get in on the ground floor. "There are prospects of recovery." Even "fool" Henry George folk know that the first indication of any kind of "recovery" at once is reflected in the price and rent of land. The *Los Angeles Times* says "Sit tight. Don't let go your holdings." They will have to come to you before they can "recover." Take your "share" of that "recovery" before the producers of future wealth get it.

Of course, thinking people know that the exploiters cannot grab wealth before it is produced, but they are few in number. The "masses" believe that wealth is handed down from those above in the social scale. It is they who "pay wages," and furnish employment. But the real exploiters know how to do the trick. They know that the only necessity is to get hold of the source of supply of all wealth—land. So today Miller & Lux, Inc.,—through ads in the Hearst papers—say "Put part of your funds into Controlled Irrigation Lands." Let us not forget that slogan. It is going to become very popular—in California! Sunny California waxes mighty torrid at times, especially in the "rich San Joaquin Valley," where these M. & L. lands lie unshaded out of doors in blistering heat. So there are those "Controlled Irrigation" channels through which these lands might be made profitable—or otherwise. That the lands in that Valley are rich in every quality necessary for agriculture, every one knows—who knows California. During the winters, when there is abundant rainfall, those lands blossom forth with the most gorgeous wild flowers—hundreds of varieties—that may be found anywhere on earth. But—from May until February—those lands are waterless as dust, except where there is "Controlled Irrigation," chiefly "controlled."

I wonder if the "ad" writer for Miller & Lux, Inc., is just naive, or if he is "putting over some Single Tax propaganda" on the boss. (If the latter, God bless him, however absurd the hope.) For here is a quote from the ad in the Hearst papers:

Many investors have found these Miller & Lux lands unusually profitable investments . . . They do not intend to farm the land themselves, but, based upon the experience of others, they expect it to yield a profitable return on their investments. No matter what might happen to their other holdings, they know that at all times the land is *there* . . . and it is *theirs!* . . . None of these men (and there are more like them) farm their lands. None of them expect to. Miller & Lux has helped them to get experienced farmers to operate their holdings and

do so at a profit while maintaining these properties as sound . . . and very "tangible" . . . assets.

Except for the absence of the display, the foregoing is a literal quotation from the ad. The italics are theirs and the separated "full points," too. And why "tangible" is in "quotes" I give up, unless it be to infer that there is nothing "tangible" about land as an investment, except that upon it some form of labor will be applied in the production of wealth. But we are assured that these investors do not intend to use these lands in that way. Miller & Lux will help them "to get experienced farmers" whom the said investor can "farm." So there you have it. Yet some "innocent" like myself might ask, if the "experienced farmer" farms the farm, and the investor farms the farmer, to whom will go the wealth which the "experienced farmer" farms from the farm, if not alone to the farmer of the farmer of the farm?

LAURIE J. QUINBY.

## Single Tax And Cuspidors

JAMES MICHAEL CURLEY, as Governor-elect of Massachusetts, was being interviewed by a *Boston Globe* reporter. The occasion was one of note in that James Michael had just defeated the offspring of the Hamiltonian Federalists in the rock-ribbed Republican State of Massachusetts in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four. The victory was doubly sweet because "Jim" had also, just a few weeks before, soundly trounced his own Democratic party in its attempt to relegate "Jim" to the limbo of "also-rans." The Rooseveltian New Deal constituted the top, bottom and sides of "Jim's" campaign, morning, noon and night: the New Deal was vindicated and James Michael was victorious. Massachusetts, long noted as the State of mind—as the home of the Cabots and the Lodges—as the seat of the Harvard Preparatory School for all who would enter the Kingdom of Heaven—had swallowed the New Deal, hook, line and sinker.

It is customary for newspaper reporters to ask Governors-elect, Mayors-elect and Town Constables-elect, to reminisce. The procedure lends an Horatio Alger atmosphere to the news-story which customarily features successful elections to public office. It inspires all boot-blacks and newsboys to go and do likewise; if this procedure was not faithfully followed our nation would soon be sadly lacking in Presidential, gubernatorial and mayoral timber, and what a plight THAT would be!

So "Jim" Curley reminisced.

'Twas back in 1898, m'lads, when "Jim" shoved off into the slippery sea of politics. His twenty-four years found him with the oratorical ability of the customary City Councilor candidate limited to a five-minute vocabulary. His political partner, Tom Curley, had an eight-minute vocabulary. Any platform performance which

extended beyond these sidereal limitations found both Jim and Tom speechless.

These budding statesmen 'ad aspirations (as the Englishman says) and wished to stage a two-hour rally. What to do about it? Luckily they had heard a long-winded soap-box orator energetically expound the marvels and panaceas pertinent to the Single Tax. What the subject was all about—what it meant—didn't matter. The Single Taxer could talk—and how! He was the solution to Jim's and Tom's two-hour dilemma. So-o-o-o, the Single Taxer was invited to be the piece-de-resistance at the rally. Listen, now, to Jim's own description:

"It was a hurly-burly meeting because our opponents had first hired the hall. But they had not paid for it, though they had moved in their liquid refreshment. So we got the hall and their liquor and we were first there. There was a fight but we held the hall and all that went with it.

"But while our Single Taxer was speaking one of the enemy hurled a heavy steel cuspidor. I saw it and jammed him (the Single Taxer) down in his chair just as it flew over his head to take out the window, casing and all. He wouldn't finish his speech."

End of quotation.

Gadzooks! Single Tax was killed, at its Bay State birth, by a lowly cuspidor hurled by a cuspidorian. 'Twere better so, m'lads, otherwise the New Deal would never have seen the light of day, and Jim Curley would never have had excellent campaign material against the profound mentality of the Harvardian offspring of the Cabots and the Lodges, and Jim Curley would never have been the Governor-elect of our State of Mind. Cruel fate can, indeed, be kind at times.

Query: If one cuspidor can forestall Single Tax from 1898 until 1934—and if we have one million, nine hundred seventy-six thousand, three hundred and twenty-eight cuspidors in Massachusetts—how long will it be before Single Tax will be adopted in the grand and glorious Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

It is your Deal and political Clubs are trumps.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

## Wise Words From A Jewish Organ

IF the Jewish National Fund were to collect the full annual rental value of the land which it owns, it would have today at its disposal a larger fund with which to purchase additional land in Palestine, and thus be able to redeem more land for Jewish settlement in the Jewish homeland. In that case, it would not have to be as entirely dependent upon individual contributions as it is today, though of course the Jewish people all over the world would continue to contribute to this perhaps most beloved of Jewish funds and swell its coffers by the pennies, dimes and quarters which are thrown into J. N. F. boxes.

### NOT FULL SINGLE TAX

That the community should collect the full rent of land, since the

value of land is created by communal growth and activity, and use the monies thus collected for public purposes, has been advocated by many others besides Henry George and the Single Taxers. Single Taxers want not only this, but also the abolition of all, or most, taxes upon capital and labor. One need not agree entirely with the latter part of this program; and yet be in thorough agreement with the former half—the taking of the rent of land by the community and using it for communal purposes.

—ELEAZOR SHERMAN in *The Jewish Times*.

## Fixed Versus Flexible Institutions

CAN one generation legislate for another? In 1789 Thomas Jefferson wrote from Paris in a letter to James Madison saying that "The question of whether one generation of men has a right to bind another, seems never to have been started, either on this or our side of the water." This seemed rather strange to Jefferson since, "It is a question of such consequence as not only to merit discussion, but to be placed also among the fundamental principles of any government."—ALLEN OSCAR HANSEN, "Liberalism and American Education in the Eighteenth Century."

## Professional Ignorance

HOW much economic ignorance is essential to make a college professor eligible to the brain trust? It seems that inability to answer correctly the following questions would be ample.

- 1 What is labor?
- 2 Why do men want to labor?
- 3 What is essential to their doing so?
- 4 What prevents men able and willing to work from using these essentials?
- 5 How can these obstacles be removed?

Only one able to answer these questions correctly can solve the problems of depression and unemployment and no such person is wanted on the Brain Trust. This explains the kind of measures championed by the group and why they have made no dent on the depression. Yet the answers to these questions are so easy that the intelligence or sincerity of the one claiming or displaying ignorance may be questioned. These answers are:

- 1 Labor is any exertion to produce wealth to satisfy a human desire.
- 2 Men want to labor in order to satisfy their desires.
- 3 Essential to labor's human faculties are natural resources or land. These are indispensable. In addition capital is a helpful but not indispensable factor which can be kept available when there is no interference with labor's access to land but which can be monopolized and made hard to obtain when access to land has been obstructed or closed.
- 4 Ownership of land which empowers owners to refrain from using it and to prevent others from doing so. They are further encouraged to make such bad use of their power by a tax system which penalizes industry and thrift and encourages land speculation.
- 5 By making unprofitable the withholding of land from use. This can be accomplished through transfer of taxation from industry and its products to the value of land aside from value of improvements upon it, and by making these land value taxes high enough to absorb the entire annual rental value.

While some braintrusts are honestly ignorant of these answers there are others, including the leading one, who only pretend to be, and thus consciously and deliberately are misleaders. Their tenure of office depends upon defending economic fallacies. For the same reason economic fallacies are taught in universities by professors who know better. Such false educators are largely responsible for bewilderment prevailing among statesmen concerning economic matters and helplessness in dealing with the depression displayed by presidents and legislators now making themselves pathetic as well as comic spectacles.

ROBERT S. DOUBLEDAY.

AS early as Dec. 14, 1784, Washington wrote to the President of Congress, Richard H. Lee: "Would there be any impropriety, do you think, Sir, in reserving for special sale all mines, minerals, and salt springs, in the general grant of land belonging to the United States? The public instead of the few knowing ones, might in this case receive the benefits which would result from the sale of them, without infringing any rule of justice known to me."

## Peter Witt at the Bier of Ed Doty

AS come it must to all, death came to him whose passing brings us together. We are here to console those who weep, to mourn with the ones who grieve, to pay our respects and bid a last goodbye to him we knew so well and loved so much.

Ed Doty was not an ordinary man. No matter how you approach the personality that was his you discover that he was different.

His vigorous brain never had a robust body to support it. And yet in spite of physical frailty he passed three score ten and two, and was busy and active every moment of his long career.

I knew him for almost half a century and knew him as well at the beginning of our acquaintance as I did on the day when death ended our friendship. And so it was with all who knew him. Those who knew him a little while, knew him as well as did his intimates who knew him a long time.

Well may some one ask, how was this possible? The answer is simple. Ed Doty was a straightforward man. He never concealed what anyone and everyone had a right to know. He spoke what he thought, regardless of the place where it was spoken or the person or persons to whom it was said.

In religion he was a deist, in politics an independent, in economics a thinker.

His principles were as fixed as the stars and as immutable as the laws which govern rotation.

He hated fraud and took delight in uncovering it. He despised hypocrisy and loved to expose it. He followed truth, wholly unmindful of the place where it led or the price exacted.

Early in life he took the step which led to a public career.

He held many offices and filled innumerable places of trust, all with credit to himself, the public he represented, and the institutions he served.

I know it is expected, on occasions such as this, that the one officiating shall dwell at length on the big and the little things which made up the life of the departed. This I cannot do. Even if I could do it I would not do it. To do it would only add to our grief, already too heavy to bear, and deepen the wound which only time can heal.

To the woman whom he led to the altar forty-seven years ago, and who throughout those years was not only wife and mother but helpmate and companion as well; to the son and daughter who blessed their union; to the grandchildren who filled to overflowing the cup of joy in the autumn of his life; to them may I suggest, in this, the darkest hour of their lives; think not of him as he lies so still in death, but think of him as he was in life, during the days, the weeks, the months, and the years he was yours and yours alone. May the memory of the joy and the happiness he gave you, and which in turn you gave him, be with you now and always.

\* \* \*

At the Mausoleum in Lakewood Park Cemetery, Rocky River:

We have come to the journey's end. Here will rest forever the remains of him it was our privilege to know, our right to love. Husband, father, grandfather, relative, friend, Farewell, Ed, Farewell.

## Why Industry Lags

**T**AXATION is a question which is agitating the public mind to a very great extent at present. We have taxpayers' associations, taxpayers' welfare leagues, and quite a number of organizations all appointed for the purpose, if possible, of trying to get the other fellow to pay the taxes. I believe that every person who is the recipient of benefit from government expenditure should make his contribution to the cost of government. If we look at the figures of taxation, say, from the inception of Federation, we find that in this State we have been doing an exceedingly good job in extracting wealth from those who have brought it into existence. By reference to the official figures I find that in the first year of Federation the total taxation in South Australia amounted to £248,127, or 14s. 8d. per head of population. Last year we did a very much better job, and took £3,224,480, or £5 10s. 3d. per head. That shows that there is some justification on the part of taxpayers for the protests which they are issuing from time to time in regard to the burden imposed upon them. Then it is advisable to compare the growth of taxation in relation to the total production of the State. I have taken out figures for ten year periods since 1901, and this is what I have found has been happening in that time. In 1901 the total taxation levied in South Australia represented one quarter of 1 per cent of the total production. In 1911 the figure was 3.28 per cent, and in 1921 5.15 per cent. We did a very good job in 1931, and levied taxation until we took 9.31 per cent of the total production. Last year we even excelled those figures, and for 1934-5 we took 11.50 per cent. That is merely for State taxation. I have isolated the figures in regard to Federal taxation, and find that Federal taxation took 17.06 per cent from the people of this State last year. State and Federal taxation for the last financial year took out of the pockets of the people of South Australia no less than 28.56 per cent of the total wealth which their labor and capital have brought into existence. In addition there is the power of private taxation placed in the hands of certain instrumentalities, which I cannot elaborate upon this afternoon, but it is safe to say that under our present method of collecting revenue approximately 50 per cent of the total production that is brought into existence is taken today by public and private taxation. When these facts are realized one is compelled to confess it is no wonder that industry is in such a stagnant position, and that many people desirous of the opportunity to employ their labor find that none is available.

E. J. CRAIGIE in Australian Parliament

## From An Early American Book

**T**HE bulk of mankind were not only cheated out of their right to the soil, but were held ineligible to office in the government, because they were not freeholders. First cruelly to wrest from them the paternal inheritance of their universal Father, and then to make this outrageous act an excuse for denying them the rights of citizenship. This is the history of civil society in which our duty and happiness are so admirably woven together. We will however never believe, that men originally entered into a compact by which they excluded themselves from all right to the bounties of Providence, and if they had, the contract could not be binding on their posterity; for although a man may give away his own right, he cannot give away the right of another.

Merit is but an abortive, useless gift to the possessor, unless accompanied with wealth; he might choose which tree whereon to hang himself, did not his virtuous mind tell him to "dig, beg, rot and perish well content, so he but wrap himself in honest rags at his last gasp, and die in peace." It is a melancholy reflection that in almost all ages and countries, men have been cruelly butchered, for crimes

occasioned by the laws; and which they never would have committed had they not been deprived of their natural means of subsistence. But the governors of mankind seem never to have made any allowance for poverty; but like the stupid physician who prescribed bleeding for every disorder, they seem ever to have been distinguished by an amiable thirst for human blood. The altars of a merciful God, have been washed to their foundation, from the veins of miserable men; and the double edged sword of Justice, with all its formality and parade, seems calculated to cut off equally the innocent and guilty. Between religion and law, man has had literally no rest for the sole of his foot.

\* \* \*

Society should furnish the people with means of subsistence, and those means should be an inherited quality in the nature of the government, universal, permanent and uniform, because their natural means were so. . . . In the single reign of Henry VIII, we are informed by Harrison, that seventy-two thousand thieves and rogues were hanged in England. How shall we account for this number of executions? Shall we suppose that the English nation at this period, were a pack of thieves, and that every one of this number richly deserved his fate? Or shall we say, that the lives of so many citizens were sacrificed to a wretched and barbarous policy? The latter seems to be the fact. The lands in England at this time, were held under the feudal system, in large tracts, by lords; the people were called vassals; but the conditions of their servitude were so hard, their yoke so grievous to be borne, that numbers left the service of their lords; but where could they fly? or how were they to provide for subsistence? The cultivation of the soil was denied them, except upon terms too vile and degrading to be accepted; and arts and commerce, which at this day maintain the bulk of the people, were then in their infancy, and probably employed but a small proportion of the people. We despise thieves, not caring to reflect that human nature is always the same; that when it is a man's interest to be a thief, he becomes one; but when it is his interest to support a good character, he becomes an honest man. That even thieves are honest among each other, because it is their interest to be so. We seldom hear of a man in independent circumstances being indicted for petit felony; the man would be an idiot (sic) indeed, who would stake a fair character for a few shillings, which he did not need;—but the greatest part of those indicted for petit felonies, are men who have no characters to lose, that is, no substance, which the world always takes for good character.

\* \* \*

Is it any wonder that poverty should be such a formidable terror to civilized nations, when it never meets with quarter, but always with persecution, when both religion and law declare it to be the object of their most implacable hatred and disgust. English vagrant acts, although they are a manifest abuse of civilization, have been hitherto impregnable to the attacks of sound reason and elegant satire. Many English authors have honestly reprobated them; Mr. Fielding in several of his novels, has highly ridiculed them; and Doctor Goldsmith has exposed them in a vein of inimitable satire, in his history of a poor soldier. Pity such philosophers were not magistrates! "In vain," says Raynal, "does custom, prejudice, ignorance and hard labor stupify the lower class of mankind, so as to render them insensible of their degradation; neither religion nor morality can hinder them from seeing, and feeling, the injustice of the arrangements of policy in the distribution of good and evil."

**EDITORIAL NOTE:**—The foregoing are excerpts from a volume not previously known to our followers. The author had more than a glimpse of the land question and saw it in many of its implications. He seems to have had a special animus against Blackstone. In this he is somewhat vague and we do not follow him. Maybe a closer reading would make clearer the grounds of his antagonism. Mrs. Emily E. F. Skeel is responsible for the discovery of this book. It was written nearly a hundred years before "Progress and Poverty" by Robert Coram, entitled "Political Inquirers," and was published in one of our Southern States.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.



## BOOK REVIEWS

## ANOTHER USEFUL BOOK

"Land and Unemployment." By James F. Muirhead, M.A., L.H.D. 12mo. Clo. 211 pp. Price \$2.50. Oxford University Press, New York and London.

Here is another book among the growing number that seek to present the Henry George philosophy as the antithesis of socialism. It would seem that in the world of books at least the issue is being sharply drawn. Against a flood of books that advocate the teachings of communism, or the parlor pink school of socialism, or the New Deal brand, books like those of Francis Neilson, Albert Jay Nock, Gilbert M. Tucker, Louis Wallis, Prof. George Raymond Geiger, Henry Ware Allen, Dr. S. Vere Pearson, Frederick Verinder, the late Dr. Muirhead and many others, the literature of protest against the present trend and in favor of the teachings of the great American economist is receiving adequate presentation as the alternative philosophy.

The editor of LAND AND FREEDOM has already reviewed Dr. Muirhead's "Land and Unemployment" in the *Survey Graphic* of this city, but it is well to call attention to it here, for it is a work which merits careful consideration. It is an Oxford book which label bespeaks its character. It is worth reading if for nothing more than the "foreword" of Arnold Wilson, conservative member of Parliament, and the slight but significant sketch of Henry George by its scholarly editor, Garnet Smith.

Perhaps the most portentous of Dr. Muirhead's statement, and he writes with amazing clarity, is the following:

"The Old Order seems to have more or less collapsed; the outlines of the New Order to arise out of the ruins remains very vague. We begin to realize how much of our civilization rested on tradition and how little on reason. We are amazed, now that the crash has shaken the blindness from our eyes, how preposterous were many of the conditions that we accepted unthinkingly and even complacently."

It should be said that the chapter on "Tariffs and Trade" is a bit disappointing.

The absence of a concluding chapter that would "appropriately follow the appeal and exhortation struck at the beginning" is noted by the Editor, and the fact recalls the unfinished task of Henry George in his "Science of Political Economy." In each case death intervened. But while this is to be regretted Dr. Muirhead in his present work has left us material in which the finely persuasive character of the appeal is certain to be of value to the movement.

The progress that has been made in many countries is outlined in one of the latter chapters and reference is had for some of these historic instances to the Single Tax Year Book published and edited by Joseph Dana Miller in 1917, as well as to Prof. George Raymond Geiger, author of "The Philosophy of Henry George," and to Frederick C. Leubuscher from his address at Copenhagen.—J. D. M.

## A VALUABLE BOOK

"The Path to Prosperity." By Gilbert M. Tucker. 12mo. Clo. 312 pp. Price \$2.50. G. P. Putnam's Sons. New York and London.

Here at last is a book we can recommend without apology or dissent, practically without qualification of any sort, and with all the enthusiasm of which we are capable.

On the "jacket" of the book we are told something of its author whose father was the writer of several books and the editor of *The Country Gentleman*, with which the son became associated on his graduation from Cornell University in 1901. From that time to this Gilbert M. Tucker has been interested in the teachings of Henry George, and this work is the ripened fruit of prolonged study and observation.

It is not easy to review a work in which there is so much that tempts us to quote. There are wise words in defense of the "profit motive," against which so many socialistically inclined professors and well-meaning divines have thundered. To these our author replies (page 74) as follows:

"Why labor with brains and muscle? Why wear ourselves out

teaching and training? \* \* \* Why lie awake nights, thinking, planning, working to organize a new industry, to develop a new process or invent a new tool for mankind? Is not our incentive nearly always the hope of profit?"

And again:

"And to some of us this expectation of profit is a far more powerful incentive to achievement than any vague dream of some hazy social benefit, as conceived and planned by some official."

Mr. Tucker indicates that this incentive may be misdirected. "Any good quality" may be carried to excess." Surveying the practical side of the question he contrasts the private physician, "frankly expecting his fee," with the less efficient service of the great public clinic. It is such considerations as these that are lost sight of by those who decry the profit motive, and our author presses home his argument from every angle.

We can picture the sentimental and benevolently sloppy, condemning the author for his contention that it is no business of government to regulate wages nor to tax the employing class in the interests of so-called "social security." Socialists and trade unionists who obstinately refuse to take the necessary steps to solve both the wage question and the question of the unemployed will not agree with Mr. Tucker when he says:

"The sum and substance of it is that the State cannot justly interfere in the freedom of contract and compel employers to pay higher wages than conditions justify, or dispense charitable benefits. The obligations of charity and generosity are very real obligations but they should not be made compulsory by mandates of the State"

These are brave utterances in a timid and cowardly world, and we thank whatever gods there be for the man who stands up and says them. And this chapter is further enriched by historical analogies and illustrations. Mr. Tucker shows that unemployment insurance, especially when such plans involve the taxing of pay rolls, is a policy which must slow down employment.

On page 99 Mr. Tucker says (under the heading, "Regulating Business"):

"Not content with various schemes of making the employer play the combined role of fairy godmother and nursemaid, not only to his own employees but to the public at large, Uncle Sam must have his finger in the pie of business management at every turn, fixing prices, regulating methods, and meddling with every aspect of trade policy."

It is impossible not to admire the author's pointed thrusts at the stupid persons in charge of public affairs. What can be better than this:

"Only two centuries after the Norman Conquest there was passed The Assize of Bread and Beer, the first statute drawn in the curious old Bastard Norman-French which displaced Latin. This was an attempt to set prices on a sliding scale, based on the price of wheat, and our British progenitors, with typical British tenacity, kept experimenting with such follies for hundreds of years, despite the monotonous futility of bucking natural laws. Apparently the lesson was learned and the fallacious scheme abandoned, but just when we think we are done with them, they crop up again with the next generation, determined never to learn by experience unless it be their own. One wonders sometimes if the Brain Trust in spite of all its erudition, college degrees and economic standing, is not a bit rusty on economic history. (Pages 102-103.)

The chapter on "Regulating Business" is full of meat. It should be read by every business man and by every one who is seeking relief from oppressive government policies. "There is scarcely a trade practice that is not in constant danger of some new ruling or decision," our author tells us. This chapter reviews the many preposterous interferences with the normal process of industry and closes with restrained eloquence in a picture detailing the progressive abandonment of what we have won in a thousand years of struggle.

The chapter on "Money and Credit" will not find favor with those who entertain weird notions of the circulating medium, but it is a very sane contribution to the subject. We can imagine the anger of this class of thinkers at Mr. Tucker's statement that he would "like to see the value of the dollar definitely established in terms



of gold by amendment to the Federal Constitution." Such a doctrine is anathema among those who propound theories of money in which no two out of a hundred are in agreement. Mr. Tucker's contention that it is the wealthy interests that profit by the devaluation of the dollar, and his accompanying demonstration will be new to the loose thinkers who argue for inflation in the interests of the poor debtor. This Mr. Tucker makes clear. Nothing can be better than the way this is done.

The chapter on "Government and Law" carries us into higher fields of thought, and in Chapter XIII, which is entitled "The Land Privilege" he approaches the problem on which all these minor problems rest. Here he says: "The outstanding instance of the perpetuation of privilege is our recognition of private property in what should be the heritage of all."

Unlike so many writers of the day who, deriving their economics from Henry George fall into the fashion of belittling him on some minor point, our author acknowledges his indebtedness to "Progress and Poverty" and lists the names of prominent Americans who are similarly indebted. This is refreshing in one who has made so important a contribution to the subject.

In Chapter XIV Mr. Tucker deals with the practical aspect of the remedy. In his definitions he treads ground familiar to most of us and no fault can be found with his treatment. It is essentially unsailable.

In his chapters on "Corporations and Utilities" he approaches more controversial grounds. To give it fair treatment would require more space than we can devote. With the degree of caution that is necessary for their consideration our author nevertheless argues for regulation that will avoid the abuses which have grown painfully familiar to us. He is not afraid of the cry of socialism that may greet his recommendations, for he reminds us that "no principle is involved." It simmers down to questions of expediency and the adequate protection of the public, and he stops far short, as we should expect, of government ownership or public operation. His arguments against the assumption of the "utilities" by the State are effectively marshalled. Our author lays down the kind and degree of regulation he would recommend, and here he has some sharp things to say of public accounting in the business operations of government.

The chapter on "Taxation" is alone worth the price of the book. No one has written more effectively on the subject. If the author cannot restrain his indignation and contempt for the wiles of the politician and the dumbness of the average citizen it is a reaction which most of us who have any knowledge at all of the subject will share. In this chapter Mr. Tucker has made what we regard as an original contribution put forth with much clarity. There is so much that is quotable that we hesitate at appropriate instances like the following which might be indefinitely extended:

"The writer will freely concede that until we have the brains to take for public use the rent that belongs to us, and as long as we support government by the confiscation of private property, the ability to pay theory of taxation is not to be entirely discredited; if we must support government by theft, let us at least steal from those who can best afford the losses."

We might, if we choose, take exceptions to some of the arguments advanced under the chapter headed "The Privilege of Inheritance." We are so convinced of the right of property as a sacred right that we would extend such right even to its disposal at time of death. But we are content to leave the problems involved to the reader of this remarkable book, for the author confesses that they must be solved by compromise and judgment, for "here things are not sharply black and white." It seems to us that fortunes left by inheritance are frequently dissipated, more frequently than not we think, and so no harm is done to society but only to the individual, and again if there is a chance, as there always is, of its being placed to profitable use, and thus benefiting society, public policy might well dictate the leaving of inheritances to find their level. But even in this chapter it

will be well for the reader to carefully consider the suggestions that are advanced as a study of the question rather than positive solutions.

The chapter on "Privilege and Labor" will be found difficult doctrine for organized labor, yet it is true in every word.

The chapter on "A Programme" is our programme, definitely and conservatively stated.

In Chapter XXII, "The Prospect," the author advances into the question of ethics and concludes, this being the last chapter, as follows:

"Those who seek enlightenment on some of the purely personal relations of ethics and economics may well read that unfinished and comparatively little known fragment of Robert Louis Stevenson's 'Lay Morals'—a bit upsetting but so is much worthwhile literature; and there is another book, especially valuable if one will read it without prejudice or seeking to ease his conscience by twisting its teachings and seeking there only metaphors and analogies;—it was written by a man named Luke nearly two thousand years ago."

Thus ends this very valuable contribution to our philosophy. It is written with splendid clarity. It is the book of a decade; no one can read it without profit. It supports the accepted teachings of Henry George and stands on the shelf side by side with the few which constitute permanent additions to the philosophy of freedom.

J. D. M.

#### LIFE OF ABRAM S. HEWITT

"Abram S. Hewitt with Some Account of Peter Cooper." By Allan Nevins. 605 pp. Price \$4.00. Harper Bros., N. Y. City.

The life of Peter Cooper is the story of a country boy who made good in the big city. True, New York was his birthplace, "but that was when it had fewer than 35,000 people." When he died in 1883, at the age of 92, he had given Cooper Union \$1,500,000, besides leaving it an additional \$150,000. Magnificent sums for those days, and for these days too.

Abram Hewitt, on the other hand, although born poor, enjoyed a more even flow of this world's goods. He managed to be graduated from Columbia College, and, for one year thereafter, to travel with Cooper's only son through England, France, Germany and Italy.

Since his sixteenth year he had been the intimate friend of the latter and had come under the eye of his future father-in-law. For over sixty years he was to be associated in business with them. In 1853, eight years after Hewitt had returned, penniless, from his European trip, he was worth \$175,000.

The interest of readers of LAND AND FREEDOM will be drawn to the chapter describing the New York City mayoralty campaign of 1886, wherein Henry George, Abram Hewitt and Theodore Roosevelt were pitted against one another. In facial outline, and testiness of manner, Hewitt reminds me of William J. Gaynor who succeeded him as Mayor.

Professor Nevins states that George had disclaimed any intention, if elected, of trying to put his economic ideas into execution. (Page 464). What is his authority for this statement? His campaign speeches, compiled by Post and Leubuscher in 1887, (which Professor Nevins fails to mention) indicate the contrary.

Referring to the public collection of rent, our author states that Hewitt would have been willing to go as far as John Stuart Mill "but, like all economists of standing, *then and since*, he was unwilling to go as far as George." (Page 564). (Italics mine). Is it not a gratuitous assumption upon the part of our author that economists, then and since, see not eye to eye with George? If Professor Nevins will make discreet inquiry among American colleges, he will find, today, many teachers who not only agree with George, but study his writings in their class and openly espouse his philosophy.

Our author states that Hewitt "protested against class war ideas drawn from Karl Marx, for between Capital and Labor there never is, and never can be, any antagonism. They are natural and inseparable allies." (Page 465). Hewitt would have us infer that George

material accession to the ranks of those who see that only by following the teachings of Henry George shall we find our way to a greater measure of justice and a better social order. Read the book, and bring it to the attention of those to whom so often much existing Single Tax literature makes but little appeal.—GILBERT M. TUCKER.

#### IGNORES THE REAL PROBLEM

"Divine White Right". By Trevor Bowen and Ira De A. Reid. Clo. 12 mo. 310 pp. Price \$1.75. Harper Bros., N. Y. City.

It is with a sense of futility that one reads this book. Any honest man will admit the discrimination against the negro; that he is deprived of his right to work because he is a negro; that he can get menial work, regardless of education *only because he is a negro*; that he cannot find a bed in a hotel or food in a restaurant because of his color; that he is compelled to worship separate and apart from his white brother even though he professes the same God who enjoins love.

"Love which extends to all, knows no barriers or national boundaries, excludes no race and excepts not even one's own enemies."

(See Encyclical published by Pope Pius XI, Dec. 20, 1935)

Negroes apparently are beyond the pale even of enemies. With Lindbergh, they must wing to heaven *solo*.

It is not surprising they are discriminated against in "Jim Crow" cars, hospitals, colleges, Y. M. C. A's., etc.

Only once or twice do our authors give an inkling of the reason. In the preface Mr. Bowen writes that the causes of discrimination "pointed directly to economic forces as being fundamental in any consideration of the problem."

Only the poorer jobs go to the blacks, and in bad times even these are taken from them. More than one-half domestic servants are negroes who

"are meeting increased competition from whites who cannot find other employment." (Page 79).

Had Mr. Bowen fully developed that theme, he might have written a worthwhile book. Had he perceived that in an economic system where a few can claim to own the very planet and charge rent for its use, and thus live without themselves working, we have slavery, industrial slavery, the basis for all slavery. In such a system the white man is himself a slave and the colored man is only *the slave of a slave*.

Until we abolish *the slave system*, it is futile for one group of its victims to complain of discrimination. Catholics, Jews, Indians, Women, Foreigners, Immigrants, men past 45, may, with equal propriety, complain of the discrimination practiced against their groups.

The only remedy is to abolish the slave system from which all discrimination stems.—B. W. B.

#### LAND AND FREEDOM

By Frederick Verinder. 12mo. Clo. 200 pp. Price 75c. Hogarth Press. Henry George Foundation, London, England.

Under this title Mr. Verinder contributes a well stored little volume to the arsenal to which resort must be had for weapons in the up-to-date warfare against privilege. Mr. Verinder is secretary of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values and is the author of the work, well known among Henry George disciples in English speaking countries, "My Neighbor's Landmark," with its thorough and judicious selections from the Bible confirming the gospel of economic emancipation.

This little volume is arranged by chapters, and the subjects treated under special headings answer practically every question that will occur to earnest inquirers. These chapters entitled "The Mother of All Things," "The Value of Land," "Monopolies," "Landlord and Capitalist," "Our Heritage of Shame—the Slums," "Some Objections Considered," etc. Arthur Madsen contributes an appendix,

"Land Value Taxation in Practice," which cannot fail to impress the reader with the wide-spread progress that has been made in the partial application of our principles.

Rich in argument and historic facts, strong in its indictment against the fundamental evil of our times, with abundant footnotes and citations from numerous authorities, the work is calculated to do a world of good. Crowded into a small compact space it is full of what the British people, as well as our own people, should know about the land in which they live, the natives of which boast that none shall be slaves, unconscious of the fact that an overwhelming proportion of the population are slave-ridden.

The work is well written, as we would expect. In it even those who are familiar with the subject will find interest and profit. We have before this taken occasion to compliment our British advocates, among whom, and one of the foremost, is Frederick Verinder, on their thoroughness.

This is said without reflection upon such writers as H. Ellenoff, Dr. Padelford, Eugene Way, Peter Witt and many others who have contributed so much that is valuable to the literature of exposition. Our English friends seem to have it a shade over our American pamphleteers. This is not at all a question of difference of ability but rather a difference of outlook, and perhaps also of a certain orderly process peculiar to the British mind and method. This quality is especially noticeable in this little book and adds enormously to its propaganda value.

The work is accompanied by a very useful and complete index and a catalogue of the many books and pamphlets published by the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain.—J. D. M.

#### ADDITIONAL BOOK NOTICES

We are pleased to receive from Louis Wallis a copy of his scholarly and profoundly interesting work, "God and the Social Process," from which we have made a few quotations elsewhere in this issue. The work is dedicated to the memory of Joseph Fels and is devoted to the God idea in Jewish history, "forged," as a reviewer has said, "out of the tears and sufferings of the Hebrew people."

The reviews of this work from the religious press have been intensely appreciative. Among the denominational papers which have contained fine notices of the work are the *Presbyterian Banner*, the *Protestant Episcopal* periodical and many others. The comments of Biblical scholars, such as Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Rev. S. Parks Cadman, Rabbi Baruch Braunstein, and many others, voice the same enthusiastic commendation. It was the January selection of the Religious Book of the Month Club. We congratulate Mr. Wallis on its reception. It will help all those who follow the quest for social justice, and it can be had of the Chicago Press.

#### PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

"The Remedy," by R. B. Wilson of Emmett, Ida., is a pamphlet of 24 pages and cover, and can be procured of the author at fifteen cents a copy with reduction in quantities.

The writer reviews the field of political economy and defines some of its terms. This part of the pamphlet is well done. We wish, however, we could subscribe to all the author says about money and in advocacy of the income and inheritance tax. Candor compels us to express our rejection of much that is said as wholly unsound.

"Economic Fragments" is a pamphlet of 24 pages excellently printed and bound in stiff covers and written by James Bann of Cincinnati, O. This little work is for the most part accurate but there is an occasional looseness of expression which should be corrected. It is not correct to say that "Ground rent is one hundred per cent robbery, pure tribute and economic waste." There are similar errors

elsewhere in this little brochure. We are in doubt, despite the author's vigorous language, what he is really driving at.

"Ignorance of the Law is No Defense," is the title of a 15-page pamphlet by James F. Lincoln of the Lincoln Electric Company of Cleveland, O. It is a review of the present governmental trend by an industrialist. It is full of crackling phrases like bullets out of a gun and is immensely readable. Copies will be sent to any one wishing them from James F. Lincoln, P. O. Box 5758, Cleveland, O.

"The Truth About the Distressed Arrears" by Andrew Maclaren is an examination of the Government's Reports, a pamphlet of 40 pages and cover published by the English League for the Taxation of Land Values, London, England.

We know Andrew Maclaren from his visit to this country some years ago. We know of his competent and devoted work since that time. He has been constantly at it. In this interesting pamphlet he summarizes the recommendations of the government to minimize the evils indicated, and says: "Not one of these proposals will as much as touch the fringe of the problem."

"What to Emphasize in Teaching the Geogist Philosophy," by Benjamin W. Burger, published in Nov.-Dec. LAND AND FREEDOM, is now ready for delivery in pamphlet form. It is indispensable to teachers and speakers everywhere.

The notable satire, "The Keynote Convention Speech of 1940," by B. A. Partyman, written by Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown and printed in two issues of LAND AND FREEDOM for Sept.-Oct. and Nov.-Dec. is also ready for distribution. It comprises 32 pages with stiff board cover and is sold for 25 cents.

## Correspondence

### FROM THE DESIGNER OF PORTABLE HOUSES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Thanks for the mention you gave me in the last issue. When I review my experiences in attempting to get men to consider the possibilities of the portable structure, however, it seems quite unlikely that any of those who read the notice will go to the trouble of making inquiry.

The engineers whom I have approached, seem to consider economics as a sort of guessing game unworthy of their attention. Therefore, I find it impossible to center their attention upon the economic advantages of portability as a housing characteristic. In fact, they are usually inclined to favor a greater degree of stability in construction than is practiced at present. On the other hand, the economist seems quite immune to any suggestion that any relationship exists between the Science of Political Economy and so commonplace a science as engineering. Last spring, I quizzed a professor of economics from Mass. Tech. He was addressing the semi-annual meeting of the American Mechanical Engineers, on the housing problem. He spoke of the unearned increment of the land as one of the leading deterrents of the housing industry. I asked him how he would propose to remove this obstruction. Of course, being not of our faith, he could not give a solution. I then asked him what if any, in his opinion, would be the effect were we to adopt the construction of homes of portable or demountable design. This floored him completely. He hedged about for some minutes and finally said that he had never given thought to the idea. He intimated that he would like to know if I had any idea about it, and of course I tried in the few minutes allotted to outline my theory. The Chief Engineer of the Forestry Department of the U. S., who was present took a hand

in the discussion in a jocular vein, to which I replied somewhat sharply. The net result of it all was that the Chief Engineer sought me out after the meeting and apologized, saying that if he had considered the matter before he would not have been guilty of his remarks. He spent most of the time between then and his departure that night discussing the matter with me. He asked me to correspond with him further, but I have found the government so bound about with restrictions that nothing can be advanced there unless it is done through politics.

What I need is the assistance of some one who understands the land question and has sufficient to start the production of portable structures. I will make such a man rich, and at the same time open up an avenue along which the Single Taxer may advance to the land of his dreams.

Erie, Mich.

ROBERT L. MCCAIG.

### AN INTERESTING LETTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The tendency of the white man to want to "correct" that which he does not like in races less advanced in the arts, sciences, and sins of civilization is once more attested to by Miss Grace E. Wills in an article in the December issue of *Asia*. The article is entitled "Heaven-Bursts in Western Samoa."

Miss Wills points out the depredations suffered by Samoans at the hands of the whites until the hurricane in the eighties which tossed the warships of three powers about like straws. The German Adler had just been shelling Samoan villages when the wrath of the Great Creator of mankind struck it amidsthips, and today it may be seen lying on its port side in Apia Bay, a silent tribute to the awful power of natural forces. But one ship escaped, the British Calliope. Hundreds of sailors were either drowned or cast ashore. Did the Samoans wreak upon these the deserved fate of murderers and despoilers of homes? They did not. They forgot and forgave, rescued and nurtured their oppressors. This act, so unusual among Christian races, so moved the powers that they drafted and signed the Berlin Act in 1889, solemnly pledging themselves to protect the autonomy and independence of the Samoan people. This has never been rescinded, but in 1899 the islands were divided among Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. From that time until the World War Samoa enjoyed peace and happiness.

Let us hear what Miss Wills says of the German administration of their trust: "Dr. Solf, the German administrator under the new order, said in effect when he first took office (I quote Lloyd Osborne): 'Samoa is so small and so remote that it has fortunately no commercial future. . . . It is therefore my congenial duty to guard it as what it is, a little paradise, and to keep any passing serpent out of our Garden of Eden.' Dr. Schultz, who followed Dr. Solf, continued the happy understanding of Samoan customs and culture, and the relationship progressed in the same spirit until 1914, after the outbreak of the World War, an expeditionary force from New Zealand took possession of the islands and the powerful German wireless station near Apia."

Trouble developed for the natives and New Zealand at once. Every administrator from New Zealand has been a military man, with no understanding of the situation. New Zealand is a young and vigorous country, supposedly, which has done wonders in winning an empire from nature, and most of its people are probably as provincial in their ideas as most of our people are still. Cheap, small town lawyers, and politicians with war service records but no knowledge of affairs beyond their own bailiwicks, were sent out to administer these happy people. Miss Wills tells us that they interfered with their customs and that the "keenest minds among the Samoans soon detected something deeper behind the autocratic methods—an attempt to upset their ancient social and political system by making the common lands the property of individuals—always the beginning of the end for a primitive people. Eventually, they foresaw, they

were likely to become mere labor for the white man on their own ancestral holdings. They could not believe that they would be so happy under such a consumation, even though the world-wide depression had not then developed to a stage where it was a practical demonstration of the correctness of their reasoning."

Miss Wills goes on to say that the government set up was too expensive for the islands to maintain, too ambitious, and too bureaucratic. It attempted to substitute for the culture, habits, and customs of the islanders, which had been zealously guarded by the German administrators, the system and standards of the West, under which the greatest depression of modern times had been allowed to materialize to knock out some of the conceit of the Western wise men. Assassination by New Zealand police of Tamasese, High Chief and leader, on Dec. 28, 1929, shows how low the New Zealand administration has fallen. This man was not slain in open rebellion but in ambush while unarmed. Today his grave, not far from that of "Tusitala," (the teller of tales), Robert Louis Stevenson, has become a second shrine to the Samoan people. Together with Tamasese eleven Samoans were killed and fifty wounded. At the inquest the presiding judge said that no evidence had been presented showing the necessity for rifle fire.

Some of the things which the New Zealanders tried to enforce among the islanders, and for which the islanders could see no need, were the construction of unnecessary roads, new codes of sanitation, taxation without representation, reconstruction of houses and villages to conform with New Zealand ideas, in Miss Wills' words, "Town planning in paradise!" The presentation of fine mats is an indispensable part of every ceremony in life to the Samoans and yet this was to be restricted by white man's law. Disagreement with preemptory orders or a request for time to consider them became sedition, and imprisonment and exile were meted out to the seditious. Sedition against laws, the making of which was denied them! Exile, Miss Wills points out, is a worse punishment for Samoans than imprisonment. It was at the demonstration over the return of Mr. Smyth, an Apia merchant, from two years of exile that Tamasese was murdered by a police sniper. Tamasese had been exiled for neglecting to obey an order to cut down an hibiscus hedge around his dwelling. Imagine an English ancestor of the New Zealand responsible for that fool order obeying a similar order to cut down the hedgerow about his thatched cottage without some violent argument if not blows. But Tamasese's crime was that he believed in the preservation of the culture and customs of his people.

These customs and standards had begun far back in the history of the islanders. Their value is attested to by the great pains of the learned German administrators to preserve them intact, also by the fact that in American Samoa we merely protect the rights of a sovereign people. But there is greater proof of their value than mere recognition of it by wise administrators. It is in results. Let us listen again to Miss Wills:

"Not physical vigor alone but a simple and joyous naturalness toward all of life has always characterized the Samoans. They can regard even their white overseers with a shrewd and typically Polynesian sense of humor. . . . Time means nothing to the Samoans. A cricket match may last a week, whole villages participating. Money does not mean much either. The family system takes care of its own. Nobody starves. Have they not their food plantations, their forests, their fishing? They have their own crafts and occupations, all needful for their island life—building canoes, caring for the cocoanut plantations, keeping down the rhinoceros beetle, planting and gathering food, harvesting bananas from the forest. Often, when the moon floods the ocean and reef and palm-fringed shore with exquisite loveliness, the Samoans choose these hours to paddle out to sea and sing and fish."

Miss Wills deserves especial commendation for her article in *Asia*, not alone by Samoans, but by all New Zealanders who believe that New Zealand has a destiny to achieve. New Zealand has fallen far

short of that destiny, as is shown by recent labor troubles in the Commonwealth. It ill becomes her to oppress a people, primitive though they be, for being true to their ideals. Miss Wills is a New Zealander and was a school teacher. We have great need of such teachers in our own country, and such teachers in our movement. Let us congratulate her.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

#### DRIFTING FROM THEIR ANCHORAGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish to make a plea through your paper for the recognition by our people that the Georgeist plan can not be combined with other proposals for tax betterment. Any other course robs it of all logic. We must substitute for the present system the payment to all people by each person for the site value of the land he occupies and totally abolish all taxes on his industry and capital.

I cannot understand how those who have seen the scientific way can waste their time working for mere palliatives.

In your Sept.-Oct., 1935 issue, in reporting the Henry George Conference I find the following: "Mrs. Johnson laid our present difficulties to lack of purchasing power and strongly advocated the Townsend Plan as a remedy, but stipulated that the pension must be paid by collecting the economic rent." Mrs. Johnson seems to have failed entirely to see what has become of our purchasing power or to realize that collecting the economic rent would restore it and make gratuities to able bodied people unnecessary. She seems to be one of those who doubt the wisdom and goodness of God and think that when he implanted in us the intelligence to evolve machines and other helpful discoveries he implanted in us an intelligence which would encompass our ruin. As a matter of fact, although she did suggest to Dr. Townsend the idea of collecting the money for the pensions from a tax on land values, he evidently did not heed her suggestion but proposed a transaction tax. This failed to discourage Mrs. Johnson who is an earnest advocate of his plan which proposes to increase the wealth of our country by cutting down the number of producers.

Mrs. Johnson called my attention to the following excerpt from "Social Problems," Chapter XIX:

"This is the law of rent. As individuals come together in communities, and society grows, integrating more and more its individual members, and making general interests and general conditions of more and more relative importance, there arises, over and above the value which individuals can create for themselves, a value which is created by the community as a whole, and which, attaching to land, becomes tangible, definite and capable of computation and appropriation. As society grows, so grows this value, which springs from and represents in tangible form what society as a whole contributes to production, as distinguished from what is contributed by individual exertion. By virtue of natural law in those aspects which it is the purpose of the science we call political economy to discover—as it is the purpose of the sciences which we call chemistry and astronomy to discover other aspects of natural law—all social advance necessarily contributes to the increase of this common value; to the growth of this common fund.

"Here is a provision made by natural law for the increasing needs of social growth: here is an adaptation of nature by virtue of which the natural progress of society is a progress toward equality, not toward inequality; a centripetal force tending to unity, growing out of and ever balancing a centrifugal force tending to diversity. Here is a fund belonging to society as a whole from which, without the degradation of alms, private or public, provision can be made for the weak, the helpless and the aged; from which provision can be made for the common wants of all as a matter of common right to each, and by the utilization of which society, as it advances, may pass, by natural methods and easy stages, from a rude association for purposes of defence and police, into a cooperative association, in which

combined power guided by combined intelligence can give to each more than his own exertions multiplied many fold could produce."

This passage she regards as supporting the Townsend Plan. In the first place, the fund belonging to society which Mr. George speaks of is the value created by the community as a whole and which attaches itself to land, namely the unearned increment, and can have, no relation to a fund raised by a transaction tax. In the second place, the context, "provision for the weak, the helpless and the aged," would indicate that those who were so aged as to be unable to look after themselves were in Mr. George's mind, and certainly even by the imperfect means at our command we now have, for both the rich and the poor, many things that would be impossible for them to enjoy if limited to their own efforts; such as water mains, highways, sewers, etc. What we might do together if we took for society this fund can not be foreseen in its entirety.

Fairhope, Ala.

ANNE B. CALL.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

A. C. CAMPBELL of Ottawa, Canada, writes us on what seems to him and indeed to us so important—"the gospel of plenty." He notes that Henry George began his great work by making the fact of plenty the basis of our thinking and appeal. He urges us to use the people's knowledge of the fact of plenty to win them to an understanding of "the only philosophy that will enable them to lay the foundations of a real order of society." He encloses the speech of the Rt. Hon. Mackenzie King on the night of the general election when the first news of the sweeping Liberal victory was made evident. Mr. King said: "We take up at once, as our supreme task, the endeavor to end poverty in the midst of plenty."

ALBERT JAY NOCK reviews in January *American Mercury* a half dozen books on economics by Prof. John Dewey, Walter Lippman, Stuart Chase, David Lawrence and others. These reviews are done in rattling good style.

LYNN F. PERKINS of Luzerne, N. Y., writes: "If ever we needed the Single Tax we need it now. Mr. Burger is too optimistic. We just can't wait much longer. Where are the people with money? Inside of ten years we will be sunk in New York Harbor, food for fishes. Oh, how impatient I get. Talk and palaver while the fires of revolution smolder beneath the social structure."

OUR old friend Cornelius Kievit of Passaic, N. J., reached his eightieth birthday on June 11. The *Herald News* of that city, of which paper Mr. Kievit was once advertising manager, said editorially of this well known follower of Henry George: "Triumphing over ill health, Mr. Kievit has lived and served well—hard but joyously, frugally but royally; busily but playfully—in all things a benefaction to those who knew him, through the glance of his eye, the shake of his hand, the word of the moment, the kind and gentle deed." And it adds: "Single Tax Kievit he was called forty years ago, a title that many have continued to give him in esteem and affection."

FOLLOWING are a few of the commendations of LAND AND FREEDOM received. Frederick C. Leubuscher writes: "I think the editorials in your paper are the ablest discussions, both in substance and in form, of economic questions in this country." John A. Johnson of Chicago: "After reading through all the foggy stuff that is handed us in the magazines and newspapers your Comment and Reflection comes as a bright ray of sunshine." W. L. Crosman, of Revere, Mass: "Yours is a worth while publication that should be in the home of every Henry George advocate." Robert C. Bowers, Pittsburgh, Pa.: "LAND AND FREEDOM is such a valuable asset that it should be in the hands of every Georgeist. It grows better with each issue." Mrs. Emily E. F. Skeel: "I do not know what we should do without

your paper and you." John M. Moore of Lancaster, Pa.: "I want to repeat my former congratulations on the excellence of your publication. I am especially pleased with your editorials and wish that a great many more editors could express themselves as clearly as you on the economic situation." J. C. Ralston, of Madison, Wis.: "You are doing a better job than ever with LAND AND FREEDOM. It's about the only bright spot left."

WE are informed by A. Wernicke that a Mrs. Kranz of Los Angeles, has instituted legal proceedings in the Superior Court of California against the Sales Tax, claiming that the act is unconstitutional.

A. L. COLTON of Takoma Park, D. C., who has attained the age of 79 writes: "While yet a small boy I learned from Puritan literature that the good die young. This fills me with courage."

OUR friend Harold Sudell is busily engaged in his correspondence to set right on the question of taxation many of those who seem sorely perplexed. Among them are Edward Ball, head of the American Taxpayers' League, Congressman Adolph J. Sabbath, Thos. W. Phillips, Jr., former member of Congress, and many others. Besides Mr. Sudell keeps up his letter writing to the *Evening Bulletin*, *Philadelphia Ledger*, *Record*, etc.

HERBERT JANVRIN BROWNE, Single Taxer of Washington, D. C., is dead at the age of 74 after an illness of ten days. He was a former newspaper editor and one of the founders of the *Washington Times*. Later he was on the staff of the *New York World* and the *New York Evening Journal*. He was a long range weather forecaster and some of his prediction made years ahead were astonishingly accurate. In 1925 he predicted that 1927 would be a year without a summer and this forecast was well borne out. Snow fell in York, Pa., and the temperature for August that year over a wide area was the lowest in fifty years. Last year when in Washington we made an effort to see Mr. Browne, long a subscriber to LAND AND FREEDOM, but was told by his daughter that he had left town for the week end. We regret not having seen him. He leaves two daughters to whom is extended our sincerest condolence.

DON SEITZ, in his "Life and Letters of Joseph Pulitzer," quotes him as saying, in the campaign of 1907-8, that he wished *The World* to invite everybody of any race, party, sex or color to express their presidential preferences . . . "But except Single Taxers, because they are too verbose." The aversion to Single Taxers was not so much criticism as it seems. He was rather afraid of their talent as propagandists. In cautioning Cobb on another date, not to print too many Bryan letters without proper antidotes, he observed: "Never in my life did I receive so many letters, persistent, plausible and almost convincing as from the Single Taxers more than twenty years ago. One might have thought everybody was a Single Taxer, judging by the letters received at the *World* office."

LAWRENCE W. TRACY of this city writes:

"Some day, if writing continues as a profession, some enterprising person may find a market for a syndicated series of articles in which he will rewrite history; and one of his ideas may be to substitute the word "notorious" for the words "eminent," "famous" and "celebrated," which are now so frequently and indiscriminately used. Persons currently designated by those last three words seem to be mostly occupied in purveying dessicated sawdust, or worse, to a large and increasing audience with the bold, and no doubt sincere assertion that it is a fine brand of mental pabulum. It seems to me that such matter is serving a purpose not intended by the purveyors as it doubtless gets the attention and occupies the time and energies of many who have attained a degree of intellectual development such that if they were not so diverted, they might begin to realize that they still retain some remnants of the sense they were born with; and it is conceivable that they might begin to use those remnants in formulating their ideas on important subjects of which the "social problem"



is the most important, the most thoroughly discussed and the least understood."

FROM a letter received from Arthur Madsen of London we extract the following:

"It was a wonderful experience I had. The memories recur and repeat and to you I would say what a great pleasure it was to make your personal acquaintance. Many, many thanks for all kindnesses. When I was in New York and sometimes a bit high strung with all the excitement, I wondered if perhaps it was a dream and that I would waken up and tell others how realistically I can do such things."

CHARLES G. MERRELL of Cincinnati writes:

"I have not too much faith in any Peace movement in the present state of the world and I cannot have until there is the restoration of a genuine religion to counteract the selfishness and greed which seems to rule the world today.

"I have more faith in the movement headed by Mr. Cullman to interest business men in the Single Tax from the standpoint of enlightened selfishness, for after all if men cannot act from the spirit of brotherly love but will act from enlightened selfishness the end results so far as external effects are concerned will be very much the same; the only difference will be the motive of the two men, and this is well expressed in a couplet that I heard some time ago from an unknown source, that 'honesty is the best policy, but he who acts upon this principle is not an honest man.'"

HON. CHARLES O'CONNOR HENNESSY, now recuperating in Florida, writes:

"I did not have an opportunity until Friday to read the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, and I cannot refrain from again complimenting you upon the excellence of the editorial 'Comment and Reflection,' which this issue contains. It constitutes a splendid exposition of the Georgeist philosophy as applied to the passing scene in our country, as well as an illustration of the futility and ineptitude of the teachings of the so called leaders of opinion of today. There is everywhere, it appears, because of the economic ignorance among supposedly educated people, a steadily growing tendency toward socialistic solutions of the country's troubles. All this is tending, as it seems to me, toward fascism on one hand or communism on the other. It illustrates, incidentally, how greatly we need (if it be not too late) the extension work of the Henry George School of Social Science."

THE death of Charles Hecht, proprietor of the Hotel Manhattan, Lakewood, N. J., at the age of 80 is announced. A familiar figure at Single Tax gatherings and a life long advocate of our principles Charlie Hecht had many friends among the disciples of our cause. He was long a friend of this paper, a subscriber and contributor. He is survived by his wife, two daughters and a son. The *Lakewood Daily Times* said among other things:

"Born in Germany Mr. Hecht came to the United States in 1860 when he was but four years old. He settled in Lakewood in 1899, when the town consisted of few good dirt roads and a comparatively few residents.

His first local enterprise was the operation of a cottage on Sixth Street having as his neighbor the late heavyweight boxing champion James J. Corbett. In 1900 he constructed the Manhattan Hotel on Clifton Avenue and Sixth Street and seven years later enlarged the building to its present size.

Mr. Hecht was an organizer of the old Peoples National Bank and served as director of that institution until it was closed by the Federal government in March, 1933. Friends, close to Mr. Hecht, said it was the closing of this bank that began his physical break-up.

Mr. Hecht was a devoted disciple of Henry George and preached the Single Tax in and out of season. He took a very active part in the campaign of 1886, when Henry George ran on an independent ticket for mayor of the City of New York and he also was active in the mayoralty campaign of 1897 when Henry George died before the election. Mr. Hecht attended the funeral of Henry George.

He lectured and spoke on the Single Tax and always was ready to promote the movement. He placed a sign on the grounds in front of his hotel, which read as follows:

STOP! READ!! THINK!!!  
AS IT IS!!

If I employ labor and improve this lot, the tax assessor  
Will punish me with a high tax—

If I leave the lot as it is, I do not employ labor, and the  
Assessor encourages me by a lower tax.

AS IT SHOULD BE!!!

Tax all land at it's true value.  
Do not tax any improvements.

THE RESULT WOULD BE.

Land would be sold at a much lower price.  
The growth of Lakewood would be assured.  
More and better houses built.  
Would reduce rents and the high cost of living.  
More labor employed.  
Higher wages paid.  
A much lower tax.  
The only just tax.

ON Jan. 4, the *New York Sun* issued a special number in which are many interesting articles. One is on "Depressions" in which no attempt is made to determine their cause and origins. There are paragraphs listing the wealth of America in which land is included as wealth. There are fallacious figures giving the wage increases from 1850 to 1929. An article furnished by an official of Price Waterhouse and Company is interesting enough but again we note the lack of insistence on any fundamental principles. The best article is that by David Lawrence on "Washington—the Outlook."

MR. GEORGE F. DYER of Los Angeles, editor of the *Conservator*, of San Diego, Calif., passed away on Jan. 2, at the Sawtele Hospital in that city at the age of 77. For a long time through his little paper which he printed himself, and in letters to the press, he advocated Georgeist principles. We had a cordial and friendly letter from him a few days before his last illness. Our condolence to his widow, Mrs. Sarah K. Dyer.

JACKSON H. RALSTON in the Salina City (Calif.) *Independent* discusses the Single Tax amendment to be voted on a year from now. To the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM Mr. Ralston writes: "I do not think our friends elsewhere realize the number of friends here we are almost daily turning up for our cause—men who have in times past read 'Progress and Poverty' and were attracted by its fundamentals. People who have never given much attention to the subject are being awakened up. I am convinced that the way to education is to get an issue in politics, and this does not mean running for office. That raises a false issue and at best is confusing."

A MEMORIAL meeting in honor of the late Francis W. Maguire who died in 1934 after years of faithful service in the cause, was held in Pittsburgh on Jan. 21. The attendance exceeded three thousand. Two large charcoal pictures exhibited were enlargements of Maguire's photograph done by M. B. Leisser who is over ninety years old, but who despite his age is one of America's well known artists and makes frequent visits to the coast and forest to perfect his sketches. Mr. Leisser and Mr. Maguire were old friends. Music and entertainment were provided and Mayor McNair was master of ceremonies.

ERNEST GEOBEGAN, long an active worker for the cause in Malta, where he had lived for forty years, died in the fall of last year. He was indefatigable in his labors to spread the doctrine. He was present at the International Conference at Edinburgh in 1929, and read a paper which is reprinted in the Conference volume containing the speeches and papers delivered on that occasion.

FRANKLIN H. WENTWORTH, director of the Fire Protection Association, and well known to our readers, gave an informal talk before the Board of Trade of Wellesley, Mass., and explained the laws and incidence of taxation. The Needham, (Mass.) *Chronicle* gave a two-column report of the talk concluding as follows: "Carefully framed questions found the speaker ready to reply with clear-cut and decisive

answers. He was enthusiastically applauded at the conclusion of the talk and as he passed from the hall."

HON. WILLIAM N. MCNAIR, the indefatigable, gives a lot of time on the radio of the city of Pittsburgh of which he is mayor, and urges his hearers to read the twenty-fifth Chapter of Leviticus. When they write in and say they do not understand it, they receive from the mayor a printed explanation modernized to conform to the laws of Moses and an invitation to join the Henry George School of Social Science. Good work!

CARDINAL HAYES in an address made Dec. 18 quoted approvingly from S. Vere Pearson's work, "Growth and Distribution of Population," reviewed in this issue by Gilbert M. Tucker.

In the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* for January, appears a conservatively stated plea for the Single Tax by Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown. Outside of Prof. Brown's contribution there are over eighty articles in nearly every one of which we detect some transparent fallacy.

It is not a wholly unjustifiable guess that the active work of education carried on in Lansing, Mich., by Ray Robson may have been responsible for the rejection by a vote of nearly three to one of the proposal for a fifteen mill limitation of the tax on real estate which was adopted by nearly every other Michigan city.

WE note a recent letter in the *Hartford Courant* on "Economic Laws" by Joseph R. Carroll. Mr. Carroll who is a teacher in one of the Extension Classes of the Henry George School is a resident of Norfolk, Conn., and is a merchant of that city.

THE *Henry George Fellowship News* (Number 4) is received from Chicago and we congratulate the editor, Nathan Hillman, on its contents. A movement is on foot to provide a permanent headquarters for the Henry George School and this is being urged by the Chicago Fellowship.

THE *Sacramento Valley Labor Union Bulletin* is among the labor papers fighting for the Ralston Amendment in California and its arguments are sound and follow correct economic reasoning.

CHARLES R. ZACHARIAS, a member of the Allenhurst, N. J. Board of Commissioners, is dead at the age of 79 of heart attack. He was an old Single Taxer.

MARTIN GAY of this city who died last month was a civil engineer for the City of New York and a Henry George man for many years. He retired about fifteen years ago. Mr. Gay was born in Staten Island and graduated from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1877. He was at one time in charge of the bridges over the Harlem River, designing several of them himself. He was a subscriber to this paper from the beginning. He was 81 years old and is survived by his wife and two daughters.

AN active and useful life closed with the death of Frederick W. Hinrichs of Brooklyn late in December last, at the age of 84. He was a believer in the doctrines of Henry George and attended many Single Tax gatherings. He began the practice of law in 1876 with his cousin Alfred E. Hinrichs, now dean of the New York Law School. He ran for Attorney General, Governor and Lieutenant Governor at different periods, but was defeated each time. He was Registrar of

Arrears and for a time a member of the Brooklyn Board of Education. He was during a part of his life interested in theosophy and became attorney for Madame Blavetsky. He is survived by a son and two daughters.

ON her return from California Mrs. Anna George de Mille was interviewed by the *New York Times*. She expressed her approval of the Ralston amendment, saying "It will stimulate industry and decrease the profiteering in land values. The laboring man and the merchants and manufacturers, who realize that a tax (on production) is a fine, are behind it."

THE Institute of Adult Education connected with the Evander Childs High School has entered upon its fourth term. Its classes of Social Science under the direction of Mr. Max Berkowitz, and the outline of the course as printed in the announcement before us, seems singularly inclusive. Nothing is omitted from the subject matter of the lectures if we can judge by the titles. "Progress and Poverty" is the reference book of the course. Congratulations to Mr. Berkowitz, long a member of the faculty, and to the progressive minds in authority. A registration fee of \$1. is charged and this applies to all the courses.

"HENRY GEORGE, Land Economics and the New Deal," is the title of a speech delivered by Congressman Charles R. Eckert of Pennsylvania, and is all that can be desired by disciples of the faith. Send to Congressman Eckert for a copy.

JOHN H. ALLEN gave an address on the Single Tax on Jan. 31, to a gathering of the civic societies at Long Branch. About eighty persons were present and Mr. Allen answered questions for half an hour at the conclusion.

ON Jan. 26 there was a notable gathering and dinner in Philadelphia of the students and alumni of the Henry George School. Julian P. Hickok acted as chairman. Mr. Benjamin W. Burger delivered his address made at the Henry George Congress in September last. Miss Helen Denbigh, told of the Henry George Fellowship and John Lawrence Monroe also spoke. George Lloyd was among the visitors from New York and William J. Fee of Philadelphia had charge of the arrangements. Those in attendance numbered nearly a hundred.

THE marriage of Miss Antoinette Kaufmann of the Schalkenbach Foundation to Mr. John Howard Wambourg on Feb. 1, is announced. The ceremony was performed by Rev. Howard V. Yergin at the Church of the Covenant (Presbyterian) 310 East 42d Street, this city. All over the land there will go forth good wishes to the young couple.

HARRY WEINBERGER took the negative side in a debate on: "Should We Have Social Security Controlled by the Government?" held under the auspices of the Association of Advertising Men, an advertising club, on Thursday evening, Jan. 23, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York. His opponent, who took the affirmative side was Dr. Abraham Epstein, Executive Secretary, American Association for Social Security. Dr. Epstein's address might be summed up as favoring government insurance for unemployment, old age and health. Mr. Weinberger developed his address along straight Single Tax lines and ended by the statement to the effect that, with sufficient wages, and unemployment removed, Americans could do the things of life themselves as they did in pioneer times—instead of running to the "great white father" at Washington for help. He advised his listeners to read "Progress and Poverty." A vote taken after the debate showed that most of those present favored the negative speaker.

For your business friends who need to know about  
land value taxation

## SAFEGUARD PRODUCTIVE CAPITAL

This little book shows how productive industry is crushed between the upper millstone of high taxes and the lower millstone of ground rent,—and the only way in which business can possibly find relief. Don't argue with your business friend. Give him a copy.

"Will be read by many who have not the intellectual capacity, nor perhaps the leisure, to examine what Henry George really taught."—Joseph Dana Miller, in *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

"A sensible suggestion at a time when big business and small business as well is crying for relief from heavy taxation. . . . Seems to fit the picture of what industry needs today."—*Minneapolis Tribune*.

"Non-technical and should interest anyone who is concerned with reducing taxes on industry."—*New York Investment News*.

The book is by LOUIS WALLIS, author of "The Struggle for Justice" and other volumes dealing with economic forces in world history.

All booksellers, 75 cents

**DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & CO.**

Garden City, Long Island, N. Y.

## A TIMELY BOOK PROSPERITY

By HENRY WARE ALLEN

The Christopher Publishing Co., Boston, Mass.

Presenting prosperity as an accomplishment in the year 2000 A.D. and the steps which led to it. A challenge to State Socialism.

Consisting of a series of conversations between Justin Waterson and his grandson Charles in the year 2000 A.D.

Including chapters of The Old Order, The Old System of Taxation, Democracy versus Socialism, Government, Public Utilities, Crime, Charity, Natural Resources, The Church, Emancipation of Women, Early Progress of the Movement, Prosperity Achieved, Philosophy of Henry George.

Together with eighty-seven carefully selected quotations from Earnest Crosby's *The Earth For All* Calendar, presenting the thought of eminent political economists, philosophers and statesmen concerning the right to the use of the earth.

**Price handsomely bound \$1.50**

Orders may be sent to HENRY WARE ALLEN  
121 N. Roosevelt Ave., Wichita, Kansas

## A Combination of Intellect and Heart in Every Page

The Books of Henry George  
**\$1.00 each**

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY," unabridged

By HENRY GEORGE

50th Anniversary edition, 8th printing since 1929

"PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?"

By HENRY GEORGE

Best textbook on the tariff ever written

"SOCIAL PROBLEMS"

By HENRY GEORGE

Short, readable article on "Overproduction," "Public Debt," "Machine Age," etc.

"THE LAND QUESTION"

By HENRY GEORGE

Contains three separate books in one:—

1. The Irish Land Question.
2. Property in Land (Debate with the Duke of Argyll).
3. Condition of Labor—An Answer to the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII.

THE LIFE OF HENRY GEORGE"

By HENRY GEORGE, JR.

"THE PHILOSOPHY OF HENRY GEORGE"

By DR. GEORGE R. GEIGER

Only up-to-date history of the Single Tax movement. Contains excellent chapter on the differences between Georgeism and Socialism.

\$2.50 postpaid.

These and many other important books and pamphlets are kept in print and available at

## The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

11 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK

Special discounts on quantities only.  
Full price on all orders less than ten.

## The Road to Prosperity

By GILBERT M. TUCKER

"The Book of a Decade"

A Brilliant Defense of Democracy and the Philosophy of Henry George

Published at \$2.50

By special arrangement with the publishers we are able to offer this book and a year's subscription to this paper for \$3.00

LAND AND FREEDOM

150 Nassau Street

N. Y. City