★ The Freeman ★

A MONTHLY CRITICAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Scientific Communism Disproved

FRANZ OPPENHEIMER

5

★

The Challenge to Georgism

RAYMOND HAMMOND

8

★

Patent Rights—Are There Any?

O. B. JOHANSEN

10

★

Vol. VI, No. 8 JUNE, 1943 Ten Cents

Abolish Taxes

* THE ONLY value of land is its variable value for use; the price of land is due only to someone who claims what no one created, the land.

This value does not reside in the land. It arises from the presence of the people, goes with the people, belongs to the people. The land of a permanently abandoned city or farm would have no value.

The community alone creates this value, and morally and even legally owns it, so that the annual collection of land value by the community is not in the nature of taxation.

Buying and selling the privilege of appropriating this value by individuals is wrong and anti-social because—

1. It robs the community of its one just revenue.
2. It destroys equality of opportunity by forcing the people to pay the land holders for the privilege of working or living at all anywhere.

This vicious plan is the sole cause of our having to levy taxes. Abandon this planless plan and we need not have a single tax.

—Bolton Hall

There's a Better Way

* WE ARE being flooded with plans for social security in a post-war world, each calling for a greater outlay of public funds than its predecessor. Whatever revenue the government spends must first be collected in the form of taxes, 90% of which, in all probability, come directly or indirectly out of the wages of labor. The greater the expenditure, therefore, the heavier the tax burden and, an inevitable consequence, the lower not only the wages of labor but also labor's standard of living.

The mass of people may be divided into three groups: the unemployable, who cannot earn enough to keep body and soul together, the large body of wage earners, and the relatively small high-income group.

As taxes mount, net wages fall, and more and more laborers are forced into the lowest bracket and become dependent upon social security and other charitable agencies.

So long as such plans, through higher taxes, make for lower net wages, they are doomed to failure, just as similar schemes in the past have proved unworkable, or at least highly extravagant since their cost was entirely out of line with benefits conferred. The present tax system, while purporting to afford some degree of "equality of sacrifice," actually promotes gross inequality, and this will continue to be the case as long as the great bulk of taxes comes out of the earnings of labor.

How different the result would be if taxes were taken from a source other than wages. That other source, at present largely tax free, is economic rent, or the site value of land. Let the government turn to that huge reservoir and it can take the greatest step of all in the direction of social security by lowering taxes on labor and labor products, increasing net wages, and ending unemployment. Those things accomplished, labor will be in a position to take care of its own social security problem, in self-respecting fashion and without any pap from a paternalistic bureaucracy calling itself the government.

—C. L. Huckabone

Still Baloney

* THE RATHER feeble pun to the effect that the new Congresswoman from Connecticut indulges at times in Luce thinking, loses even its modicum of humor and becomes something of a discouraging reality in the light of the lady's assertion that "I think we ought to collect taxes in accordance with ability to pay," and, "I would forgive taxes on incomes up to $25,000 in 1942, but not above that." Hailing from a conservative, Republican state where rugged individualism, personal initiative and equality of opportunity are household expressions, and herself author of some of the sharpest barbs that have been directed at the leftist tendencies observable in certain aspects of the national Administration, the lady confounds her friends by her open support of the pernicious principle which underlies so much of our class legislation.

The sentiments voiced by the distinguished speaker are, of course, but a thinly disguised version of the basic Marxist tenet, "From each according to his means; to each according to his needs." It would be interesting to know whether the smart wardrobe, which has contributed more than a little to the lady's fame, is paid for on such a basis, or on the principle of "benefits received."

—C. O. Steele

Apostles in Uniform

* WHAT WE NEED today, to save the world for Freedom tomorrow, is the apostle of Henry George in uniform.

I make it a point to pick up men in uniform in my car—when I have gas to drive it! I encourage them to talk about themselves, their viewpoint, the outlook toward the postwar period. This is the comment I hear oftenest: "The fellows that come back—those that do—are going to run this country. We'll have a right to."

One said, "All I want out of this war is a little farm and a tractor. And I'm going to get it, or know the reason why."

When they come back—"those that do"—they *are* going to run this country. There will be enough of them to do it. Consider the influence wielded by the American Legion. What will be the political power of the next returning Legion? Especially if united with the veterans of 1918? These men destined to run America tomorrow are the boys we need to reach today.

The April 3rd *Saturday Evening Post* printed an article dealing with the popularity of non-fiction books, particularly among service men. It asks, "Can our 'singing army' of 1918 be turning into a 'reading army' of 1943?"

Among books listed by the Modern Library Series as having largest sales to service men, were included Tolstoy's *War and Peace,* and *The Wisdom of Confucius.* Why not *Progress and Poverty?* Our service boys are sufficiently adult to take Henry George, to read our Georgist magazines. We should get our literature into their hands, our classes in their units.

We have many young Georgists going into the Army. I know some are prepared to organize classes or study groups among their associates. The experience of the war itself will arouse in many a zeal to make all this bloodshed and destruction mean something more than sorrow, horror, and disillusionment. For instance, there is a splendidly discerning letter from Sgt. Richard Sommer in the April FREEMAN. But I know, too, that many of the boys feel that all else is suspended "until it's over." "We've got a job to do over there. The folks at home will have to carry on for a better world after the war."

And yet—and yet, it's the fellows who come back—those who do—that are going to run this country after the war. *Now* is the time to sow the seed of a true understanding of a free world among those boys. AND CIVILIANS CAN'T REACH THEM. They are on the move too fast. The message must come through some one going along with them. Through young Georgists! This is the most important job we have on our hands, the biggest opportunity. And it belongs to the young drafted Georgist!

—BESSIE BEACH TRUEHART

Victory for Free Trade

* CONGRATULATIONS to the great department stores of New York for identifying their interests as truly with those of the lower-income groups and against the sales tax.

Mayor La Guardia was very convincing as a Congressman years ago when he brought in steaks and other food on plates to show how much the cost of such foodstuffs would be increased if the sales tax, then under consideration and opposed by him, was adopted. He was working for those least able to bear a consumer tax. Mr. La Gaurdia saw that a consumption tax is a production tax as indeed it is, for producers can be paid only in terms of what they can get for their consumption.

The New York department stores are keeping up his good work of those days and they show signs of learning by experience. Only one store was reported as appearing to fight the present sales tax when originally brought up for a hearing in New York. Costly experience has taught them how a sales tax can act as a tariff wall to induce buyers to buy outside the sales tax environs. The sales tax was a tariff which "protected" New Yorkers from lower prices; it also "protected" New York stores from non-New York buyers.

Seventy-one trade and civic organizations subscribed to the statement issued through the Retail Dry Goods Association in which it was written that "the perpetuation of the city sales tax was tantamount to economic suicide on the part of the city," and, furthermore, it would "continue to drive business away and thus further impair real estate values and the ability of real estate to carry its already-heavy burden."

The burdens on improvements has been heavy enough to induce owners to destroy the improvement and hope to make it up through a future rise in land values. The tax on land values has made land cheaper, but this lower price on the opportunity to produce has been more than nullified by the prospective increase in tax if any production or improvement is made.

The protective sales tariff was put on to protect real estate rents from greater burdens and it backfired and "protected" landlords by driving tenants elsewhere for business.

The protective sales tariff was proposed to protect the city revenues from ground rents and it helped to make necessary a $3,000,000,000 cut in municipal assessed values. This sales tax was an important influence in reducing the gross revenue to landlords in New York City by over $300,000,000 of which the city might be getting about $80,000,000. Real estate interests had advocated a sales tax as a way of relieving real estate.

As Mr. La Guardia once won a round for free trade in Congress, so the department stores have won a round for free trade in our State Legislature. May the free trade envisioned by Mr. Jefferson and his associates in making our Constitution win many a round more for production and common sense. —LANCASTER M. GREENE

A skeptic once rose in an audience addressed by Henry George and said (in effect):

"Mr. George, you say that land is more important than money; but suppose we put you to a test. We will suppose that you have all the land and I have all the money. Now tell me what could you do without money?"

To which Henry George replied (in effect):

"I would order you off my land and tell you to take your money with you. And, as I would have all the land, that would mean that you would have to get off the earth. Of course, if you begged hard enough, I might let you stay, if you paid me enough. I might take half your money as the price of my permission—I might take all.

"Money would have no particular interest for me, because, having all the land, I would have the source from which labor extracts all wealth. I could produce all the wealth I might need, and I could trade it for money if anyone had any money to trade."

A Declaration

★ WE ASSERT as our fundamental principles the self-evident truth enunciated in the Declaration of American Independence, that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights.

We hold that all men are equally entitled to the use and enjoyment of what God has created and of what is gained by the general growth and improvement of the community of which they are a part.

Therefore, no one should be permitted to hold land or natural opportunities in any form without a fair return to all for any special privilege thus accorded to him, and that that value which the growth and improvement of the community attaches to land should be taken for the use of the community; that each is entitled to all that his labor produces; therefore no tax should be levied upon the products of labor.

To carry out these principles, we are in favor of raising all public revenues for national, state, county and municipal purposes by collection of economic rent (annual site value of land) irrespective of improvements, in lieu of all forms of direct and indirect taxation.

We hold further that all tariffs and trade barriers of every kind, both within our own borders and between our own and other nations should be abolished in order that men everywhere may be free to follow their natural instinct to improve their condition by trading.

★ The Freeman ★

A Monthly Critical Journal of Social and Economic Affairs

Published monthly at 10th and Scull Streets, Lebanon, Pennsylvania, by The Freeman Corporation, a non-profit corporation, at 30 East 29th Street, New York, N. Y. Officers and Directors: Lancaster M. Greene, Chairman; Anna George de Mille, President; Otto K. Dorn, Secretary-Treasurer; William H. Quasha, Counsel; Ezra Cohen, John C. Lincoln, Leonard T. Recker.

C. O. STEELE, *Editor*

GEORGE B. BRINGMANN, *Assistant Editor* — FRIEDA WEHNES, *Book Editor*

The Freeman Corporation does not necessarily endorse opinions expressed in editorials, signed or initialed contributions, or statements in news reports, assuring the widest freedom of expression to its writers. Contributions consistent with the policy of THE FREEMAN are welcomed; no payment is made, for the writers contribute their services as a living endowment to the cause for which THE FREEMAN stands.

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office at Lebanon, Pennsylvania, under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1897. Single subscription, one dollar a year; five or more, eighty cents each. Title registered U. S. Patent Office.

Scientific Communism Disproved

The following searching examination into Marxism is by a writer who is recognized both in Europe and America as eminently qualified to deal with the subject: DR. FRANZ OPPENHEIMER, *former Professor of Sociology at the University of Frankfort, Honorary Member of the American Sociological Society, Author and Lecturer.*

Dr. Oppenheimer, now retired and living in Hollywood, is both an M.D. and a Ph.D. He is the author of a dozen or more books, the best known of which in this country is The State, as well as hundreds of magazine articles and essays. His most important work perhaps is his "System of Sociology," in four parts (1) General Sociology (2) The State (3) The Economic Society (4) Socio-Economic History of Europe. Containing the Psychological, the national, the economic and the historic aspects of the social problem, this work was published in eight volumes between 1922 and 1937.

★KARL MARX proposed, to use his own words, "to raise socialism from utopia to science." He called "utopian" the attempt to solve the social question by "*inventing* the coming order out of the brain" instead of "*discovering* it with the aid of the brain in the tendency of development of capitalistic society itself." Utopian socialism rested on the assumption that society is a mechanism, a badly constructed contraption which must be repaired or replaced by an entirely new kind of machine. Marx knew this to be wrong; he had imbibed Hegel's conception of society as an organism, grown and developed according to natural law in the "dialectics of evolution," but not shaped by dictum of a political wizard. The new society could not be "constructed"; it could come into being only through organic development out of the capitalist order. Socialists could alleviate and accelerate the birth of the new order; they could not build it like a machine.

Marx aimed to prove by deduction, the method of Hegel and Ricardo, that capitalist society tends to evolve into communism. His "Das Kapital" divides into two main parts, the first containing the analysis of capitalist economy in the chapters on value and plus-value; the second containing his arguments as to the tendency of capitalist evolution in the theory that communism is, first, possible, and, second, necessary by natural law.

I.

a. Value, or "static price," is the price paid in the long run and on the average for exchangeable things in contradistinction to "current prices," which need no consideration. Exchangeable things, which he called commodities or wares, consist of material goods, power of work, pieces of land, and pieces of capital, the last named meaning not instruments of production, which are "goods," but legal titles, such as shares, bonds, etc. Each of these four commodities can be bought or sold, lent or borrowed. To use a common denominator, either their substance or their use can be bought and sold. This gives us eight saleable things: four substances and four uses. For each of the eight there are two static prices, according to whether competition is free or fettered—the competitive or natural price, and the monopoly price. The theory of value, therefore, deals with sixteen different kinds of static prices.

b. Marx investigated only one of these sixteen static prices, the competitive value of tangible goods, ignoring the correct general law known to Malthus half a century earlier: "Value is proportionate to the obstacles opposed to production either by nature or by monopolies." This shortsightedness involved him in difficulties in the matter of plus-value. Obviously the laborer in a capitalist society is compelled to exchange his labor under a monopoly relationship, and, therefore, to sell it below its competitive price or natural wage, for where there is monopoly there is plus-value for the monopolist and minus-value for his contracting party. Marx, however, ignoring monopoly prices, attempted the impossible in insisting upon deducing plus-value from exchange under completely free competition. He boasted of his solution, as did his pupils, until the present writer unmasked it as resting on the most vicious of all fallacies, equivocation, the use of an ambiguous word, combined with an erroneous theory of wages which he would have avoided, had he considered all sixteen of the different kinds of static prices instead of but one.

Each price consists of two components, one the replacement of the producer's outlay, the other his reward. Out of this reward, his income, every producer included the laborer who produces his services, must pay his living costs. Marx, however, considered the whole amount to be replacement of personal outlay for living costs. Labor appears as a commodity, with its value determined by the working time its "production" costs in the prices paid for food, clothing, shelter, etc.

On this utterly erroneous doctrine, Marx founded his theory of plus-value. Whoever buys a commodity, he says, at its value in exchange, is entitled to consume its full value in use, eat the bread to the last crumb, wear the coat until it falls to rags. The value-in-use of working power is its capacity of adding value-in-exchange to raw materials. Consequently the capitalist who paid the workman the full value in exchange of his working power may keep him working up to the point where his working power would be damaged. He must not be satisfied with less, nor extort more.

Suppose now, the natural wage is the price of commodities which can be produced in six hours of average working time, whereas the laborer works twelve hours without damage to his working power. Thus in six hours he covers his living costs; in the second six he adds an equal value in exchange to the raw materials on which he has exerted his labor. This is the origin of plus-value.

The solution is untenable. It rests on an equivocation with the term "working power," which is employed now as substance, and now as its use. The entrepreneur, by hiring the power of work, buys a service for a certain duration, say forty hours a week, for so many dollars and cents. If he pockets, as Marx contends, an additional equal amount as plus-value, it is clear that he does not pay the full value in exchange but only half of it.

The problem of plus-value cannot be solved "by the alchemy of buying and selling," as Henry George, who recognized the situation as one of monopoly, wrote long ago.

II.

a. Is communism possible?

In our exceedingly complicated capitalist society, agriculture, industry, banking and transportation are carried on by countless independent entrepreneurs, and customs and fashions vary radically not only between countries but between even the smaller divisions of a single nation. Utopian communism believed that it could substitute at one blow a totalitarian economy for this amazingly diversified activity of millions of undertakings, the operations of which depend upon an intricate system of money, credit and banking. This obviously is impossible, and Marx realized the fact. He, therefore, developed the theory that the tendency of capitalism is toward simplification of production and unification of consumption.

Cutthroat competition, "by cheapening the ware," leads to the elimination of the smaller producers by the bigger ones, until all middle class existences are proletarized, while all the means of production pass to a very small minority of over-wealthy capitalists. Thereupon simplification and unification will have attained to the highest possible degree. Production is concentrated in a few gigantic undertakings, and consumption is unified, with the proletarians the chief consumers. With the whole wealth of society in the hands of a few families, the sensitive structure of credit and banking, having virtually vanished, no longer offers complications.

Thus, with production, consumption, transportation and circulation completely socialized, communism has become possible. The holy child may be delivered, if need be, "by mid-wife violence." In principle, however, no violent revolution is contemplated. The proletarians merely take over the machinery; they work under the same officials, producing the same commodities, which are distributed to them in the same quantity and in the same manner as before. The only difference is that plus-work is no longer rendered and plus-value no longer extorted.

This prognosis, dubious for industry as a whole, is clearly wrong for agriculture and, therefore, for the totality of capitalist economy. In agriculture "expropriation" by underbidding is impossible because of the law of "diminishing returns" and consequent tendency of prices to rise. Marx was mislead by the concentration of agricultural holdings in Britain in fewer hands at that time. Actually, however, the small landholders who disappeared in Britain were not peasant-owners but *tenants*. They were expropriated not by underbidding but by ejection, with the use of soldiers and the police were needed, in a time as Marx himself reports, of *sharply rising prices*, for the simple reason that the landlords saw an opportunity to get higher rent from capitalist farmers than the proletarian tenant was able to pay.

b. Is communism necessary?

Thus far, while claiming that communism is possible, Marx has failed to prove that it is necessary by natural law. We come now to the famous "law of capitalist accumulation," which "chains the laborer more tightly to capital than Prometheus was chained to the rock. . . It occasions accumulation of misery corresponding to that of wealth. Accumulation of wealth at the one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, drudgery, enslavement, ignorance, brutalization and degradation at the other pole." The proletariat when the time is ripe, will have the *will* to throw off the yoke, as "it has nothing to lose but its chains." It will also have the *power* by having been merged into one body with one common undivided class-consciousness, and having been, moreover, "drilled, assembled and organized by the capital itself."

The proof offered by Marx is that it is the machine which throws men out of work, thereby creating an "industrial army of reserve" which overcrowds the labor market and keeps wages down. If this were true, the number of working laborers would sink continuously, if not absolutely in numbers at least relatively, i.e. in proportion to population. The opposite is the case. Marx himself writes, "In the centers of modern industry—mills, manufactures, mines, foundaries, etc.—laborers are now repelled, now attracted to a greater extent, so that the number of those occupied increases in the long run." Eduard Bernstein, endorsing my criticism of this sentence, points out "that the explanation that it is the capital that continues creating the reserve army is untenable."

Marx's premise is a variant of the "wage fund theory," that a certain fixed part of the total capital is earmarked for paying wages; it is the fund to be divided among the laborers. Obviously the greater the number of laborers, the smaller the wage. The idea has been abandoned since it was denounced as utterly wrong by John Stuart Mill in 1870, and Marx himself in another chapter of the same volume discarded it by principle.

So much for the premise; the deduction is still worse. It holds that no imaginable growth of the fund, the "variable capital," can possibly lead to destroying the "capital-relationship" resulting from the fact that all the means of production are accumulated at the one pole of the social scale, owned by a small minority, with

the remainder of the population at the other pole as "free laborers." They are "free" in the bitter double meaning of being neither serfs nor slaves, and at the same time being divested of all the means of production which would enable them to work for themselves instead of being exploited by capital.

Marx holds that wages can never rise to the level where laborers can save enough to provide themselves with the needed instruments of production. If capital is growing more rapidly than is the number of laborers available, he says, wages must rise. Then, however, this alternative is offered: "either the capital continues growing because the rise does not disturb accumulation—in this case capitalist domination is evidently not at all impaired—or accumulation lags because the sting of gain is dulled by the rising price of labor. Accumulation decreases but therewith disappears also the cause of its decrease, the disproportion between capital and exploitable power of work," because the proletariat continues growing until wages are "lowered again to the level consistent with the desires of profiteering capital."

Nothing in this deduction proves that wages cannot rise beyond the point where the capital-relationship disappears, because the laborers cease to be "free" in the meaning of "dispossessed." Therefore there are possible not only two but three cases; hence this alleged "alternative" is no alternative at all, and hence the whole reasoning rests on what logic calls a "petitio principii," a "begging the question," assuming as proved what has to be proved.

* * *

Communism is a danger because it paralyzes the defenders and strengthens and heartens the enemies of peace and freedom. It cleaves the nations into fighting groups, disturbs economy by useless quarrels and senseless feuds and disturbs unity at a time when the highest solidarity alone can safeguard us. It gives to aggressors the arguments, or better, the pretexts for their reactionary policy, following that famous prescription: "You must wave the red rag till the philistine believes he sees the blaze of burning cities." Italy and Germany owe their fascism and nazism to the scare occasioned by the bolshevization of Russia, and France her breakdown mainly to the fratricidal struggle among her leftist parties. The present author wrote in his volume on the State, page 763, "that the imperialistic Fascism will conquer the whole of Europe, if this feud does not cease." That forecast was written in 1925 and published in 1926, when Nazism was still a small and despised sect.

History proves that violent repression is powerless against movements of this semi-religious kind. They pass away only with the faith which is their soul and principle of life. It is almost impossible to annihilate a creed founded on supernatural revelation, but it is relatively easy to uproot a creed founded on scientific errors. The great example is Ptolemaic cosmology. Instead of proscribing the creed and lynching its adherents, I propose serious discussion of arguments and counter-arguments. Why not submit the controversy to a jury of twelve good men and true, picked experts in logic all of them? Invite the communistic groups and institutions of the United States to nominate seven, or if they insist, even ten of the number, the only condition being that, if unanimity should not be attained, majority and minority are pledged to draft, and sign their names to, their substantiated judgment.

This blessed country is the last one where thought is not muzzled, and where the great problems of the time may yet be discussed by free men in undisguised language. The public spirit of her citizens has given to her many institutions for the promotion of science, general enlightenment, economic welfare, social concord and external peace. Every one of them is highly interested in the decision we aim at; one of them should take the initiative.

Change the World—or Ourselves

I've read some books and magazines and papers through and through
Which tell me that the state of man is fixed, what e'er we do;
'T is vain to hope for better things, 't is vain to pray for peace,
Because our interests are diverse and conflicts cannot cease.

These books are false. I'll throw the lot of lies into the fire;
They're worthy of no better fate than trampling in the mire.
God never made this beauteous world on such satanic plan.
'T is we ourselves have made it so! Let's change ourselves—we can!

—Stephen Bell

The Challenge to Georgism

The author of this inspiring article, RAYMOND HAMMOND, *of Jackson, Tennessee, has furnished the following thumbnail autobiography at our request:*

"My economics professor in college introduced me to Georgism. He gave me the announcement of the free course in fundamental economics when I showed some interest in Progress and Poverty, *which was mentioned briefly in the textbook we used. With much skepticism (I refused to buy a book from the school thinking you were just trying to sell books) I took the course; argued with the instructor on every lesson; was converted on the tenth lesson. Since then (1938) I have been constantly reexamining George's philosophy in the light of present day events and still consider his analysis to be correct; his solution, sound.*

"I live and work in a typical Southern town. As an employee of a cotton buyer and shipper, I aid Southern landlords collect rent. (Ninety per cent of the checks we write to farmers for cotton are divided, one-third to landlord, two-thirds to tenant.)

"I am twenty-six, married, have a small boy and girl. Wanted to name the boy Henry George but was overruled by wife. She says she hears the name often enough as it is."

✶ IN 1812, DURING THE violent earthquakes which formed Reelfoot Lake in the northeast corner of Tennessee, it is said that the Mississippi River ran backwards for twenty-four hours. Where one day a virgin forest flourished, almost overnight a good sized lake appeared as a result of the quake.

Today our American economy is undergoing something not unlike that earthquake. The steady flow of goods and services has been stopped by the heavy hand of government and sent plunging into uncharted paths. It is futile, for the purposes of this discussion, to point out that this is a man-made earthquake and therefore preventable. The point is: the quake is here. We can hear the rumbling. We can feel the trembling. The stream of American economy which surged at flood stage in 1928 and dwindled to a trickle in 1932 is leaving the old channel.

What significance has this for Georgism? Let us carry the analogy a little further.

Georgists have always respected the force and strength of the river; they recognized its power. But they disliked the narrow man-made channel which hampered the free flow, producing floods during some years and allowing only a feeble stream in other years. They believed that the dykes of law and custom should be removed so that the river would flow back into its natural channel. However, the fear of the inhabitants of any change and the vested interest in the dykes prevented any real action.

So much for the analogy. Its meaning suggests itself at once. Now, if this is a true picture, what can we do about it?

The social upheaval, which we call World War II, is in itself destructive and productive of no good thing. To say that it is a terrific jolt to our economy is putting it mildly. However, as a by-product of this war, there comes an upsetting of the status quo out of which it is possible that great good may come. It is important that we bear in mind that this opportunity for good does not flow from the war itself. We cannot expect the good society to arise Phoenix-like out of the ashes of a military victory. Nor can we expect the peace treaty which terminates this struggle to be the instrument which will write finis to war for all time.

This may seem discouraging but there are compensations. For, it follows that we need not wait on a military victory to work for a program of free land and free trade; we can start now. Furthermore, and this is the point of this article, we can start with the assurance that the mind of the people is prepared. The old taboos and conventions are being broken down and public opinion is receptive to ideas which only a year or two ago would have been ignored or shouted down.

In view of this, it seems to me that it would be a wise move on the part of those charged with presenting the principles of Georgism to reexamine our program and adjust its message to the needs and temper of the time.

I think that a good start would be to drop the phrase "Single Tax" entirely. It is a subterfuge to which we need no longer resort. Let us state boldly the sweeping assertion which George said was the "true remedy" for social maladjustment: "We must make land common property." The single tax idea was appended only because, to quote George, "this truth in the present state of society, will arouse the most bitter antagonism and must fight its way, inch by inch."

But that "present state of society" is crumbling and George's axiom of statesmanship is subject to qualification. There are many straws in the wind which indicate that the people of America, and of the world, want something new and radically different from the old order. The popularity of post-war plans for World Federation points toward a willingness on the part of the people to venture out in new paths. When society is solidified in its customs and laws, it can best be changed by the

chisel of reason; when it is in its present fluid state it can best be remade by the mould of faith.

The people want broad, inclusive, optimistic plans for a "New World Order." (Sometimes it seems the broader and "foggier" they are the better they are received.) They also want as the next President (according to a recent Gallup Poll) the leading exponent of broad and hopeful assertions, Vice-President Wallace. Even the well-known contract bridge authority, Ely Culbertson, is thinking along the lines of a future world order.

And what are Georgists doing? Are we thinking and talking in terms of revolutionary principles? Or are we plodding along in the rut of scholastic economics, hair-splitting on the subject of interest; writing logical and correct but futile, and easily misunderstood, articles on the $25,000 salary limitation? We have the best and simplest plan ever devised for World Federation—free trade. Let's present it in present-day terms as the answer to World Federation. In the national arena the people want security and the Beveridge plan becomes popular. Here, too, we have the answer but it must be presented in its true radical nature to achieve popularity.

What I am advocating is not a change in principles but a change in emphasis. Instead of hiding the radical nature of our program behind a "tax reform" let us glorify it. Especially let us emphasize its moral justification and its Christian basis. The type of reasoning that George employs in the following quotation is what fits the popular mood: "The equal right of all men to the use of land is as clear as their equal right to breathe the air—it is a right proclaimed by the fact of their existence. For we cannot suppose that some men have a right to be in this world and others no right."

Above all let us not become identified with the forces of reaction. While we may well continue to regard Socialism as unworkable, let us have done with a contemptuous attitude toward Socialists, who, like us, are working toward a better world. We would do much better to emphasize our points of likeness. Henry George recognized our common goal. He said, "The ideal of Socialism is grand and noble; and it is, I am convinced, possible of realization. . ."

I can still remember with a wince the taunt of a friend of mine, a German refugee who taught political science. He referred to me with a slight curl of the lip as a "capitalist," (a word, I am convinced, that cannot be retrieved from its evil, though improper, connotation.) To him I represented the forces of reaction trying to salvage the pieces of a wrecked and bankrupt economic order while he and the dreamers of a brave new world built a totally new structure in which humanity would live in eternal peace, prosperity and happiness.

Granted that this is a misconception based on ignorance, it is by no means an uncommon opinion of Georgism. It is small comfort to know in our secret heart that the picture is false. We can change this picture and ally ourselves with all those groups working toward a better world without doing violence to our beliefs. A change of emphasis will accomplish it.

I still believe in clear and incisive argument. I still think that education is the safest and in the long run the best way to advance Georgism. I still believe that, during war and after war, the ill-will and intolerance generated by the struggle make it difficult for a philosophy based on education to spread and flourish.

But, on the other hand, I see an unexpected opportunity for political action opening here and now. I see a need and a desire on the part of the people for a new world order making itself felt. I see a willingness to adopt radical and revolutionary schemes. I see a good chance for at least one Georgist ideal—free trade—to be realized.

Georgism can meet the challenge and supply the need if we will gear ourselves to the present mood of the public.

TEN POINTS . . . . . .

They COST *so little* . . . . . .

They are WORTH *so much!*

1. *You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.*
2. *You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.*
3. *You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.*
4. *You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.*
5. *You cannot lift the wage-earner by pulling down the wage-payer.*
6. *You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.*
7. *You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.*
8. *You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money*
9. *You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence.*
10. *You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.*

Patent Rights—Are There Any?

This interesting view on the much-discussed matter of patents, by O. B. JOHANSEN, *appeared as a letter to the editor in The Wall Street Journal of April 24, 1943. The editor of the Journal considered it of sufficient importance to warrant an editorial rejoinder in the same issue of the paper. Both articles are reprinted here by permission.*

Of himself the author writes: "To keep my stomach full, I work for a large steel corporation. To satisfy my creative instincts, I write articles for magazines and letters to newspapers. The articles have the homing instinct —they always come back. . . I don't know the first thing about writing but write as I please. I don't know when to use shall or will, should or would, and don't intend to find out. I wouldn't know a split infinitive if I met one face to face. . . As with most Americans the subject I studied I don't work at—that's engineering. The work I really care about is teaching the philosophy of freedom. As a member of the faculty of the Jersey school, I have taught Progress and Poverty in various communities. . . I am a monopolist, having the sole and exclusive possession of approximately one acre of God's good earth for which I do not pay society its full annual rental value and don't intend to if I can help it. . . Though skeptical of hero worship, I admire profoundly Henry George and Thomas Paine. My real hero, of course, is the King of Kings—the common man."

★ IT IS RATHER discouraging to note that as eminent a newspaper as The Wall Street Journal, which is well in the forefront in the fight to maintain economic freedom and property rights, should fall into the error of considering patents as private property. It occurred to the writer, who is a layman in this matter, that a perusal of some of the fundamentals involved might be of interest.

In the first place, all inventions are common inventions. No one man, or group of men, ever actually invented anything. Inventions are the logical developments resulting from an advancing civilization acquiring a greater knowledge of the laws of Nature. Every invention requires previous inventions—every invention is the result of men working on the particular problem or related problems for many years. The man finally recognized as the creator actually is the man who has put the finishing touches on the work of those before him. With no intention to detract from the important contribution the so-called inventor may have made, it nevertheless cannot be claimed that he was the sole creator. Why, therefore, render to him a monopoly prohibiting all others from producing that invention, including, mind you, men who may have contributed to his success by their own attempts and failures? The fact that often the same invention occurs in different parts of the world at about the same time by different men is an indication of the fact that inventions are really the product of society's advancing knowledge. When the gasoline engine was produced, it was inevitable that the airplane would result, and as a matter of fact, it was invented almost simultaneously in America and in Europe.

Second: Men constantly improve, that is, invent, not because there is a patent law in existence; on the contrary, probably in spite of the law. Men invent because they are motivated by the desire to produce wealth with the least effort, and as long as they are so constituted they will continually try to produce things the easiest way—that is, to invent. Therefore, to state that a patent law encourages inventions is to ascribe credit to a restrictive act for something which is the result of man's natural instincts.

Third: Economic freedom, if it means anything, is the freedom of men to produce wealth qualified only to the extent that they do not interfere with the equal freedom of other men to produce wealth. A patent obviously violates this concept of freedom and on the erroneous assumption of encouraging men to do things which they can't help but do. If the highest type of society men can develop is one in which the greatest degree of economic freedom prevails, a view which I believe your newspaper would support, then patents as well as other monopolies are obstructions to man's progress, and the sooner removed the better.

Fourth: Paradoxically, a system of patent rights which is designed to "encourage invention" actually results in practically forcing inventors to work behind sealed doors, as though they were engaged in some nefarious enterprise, with their fellow man knowing little or nothing of what they are doing. Is it not reasonable to assume that if men work freely and openly, that the advice and aid of their contemporaries is more likely to assist them and add to rather than detract from the sum total of inventions?

Fifth: When reviewing the history of the patent law, one is hardly to be overwhelmed by its just and equitable working. Rather, as the public is beginning to learn, it has given rise to all forms of abuses from such crude forms of skullduggery as the stealing of inventions to the more subtle form of extortion known as the international patent cartels, designed certainly not to "encourage invention" but rather to extract from all men throughout the world the highest price possible for

a particular invention. And The Wall Street Journal raises the fine point as to whether patents fit a strained definition of monopoly!

Sixth: It has been stated that justice and wisdom are two aspects of the same thing. That which is just is wisest, and that which is wisest is just. Has the patent law given rise to harmonious relationships among men such as a just law would, or has it not been the basis of many incredible forms of injustice? If it is not just, and certainly it does not accord with the principles of economic freedom, nor the rights of society to its inventions, then clearly it is not good, and therefore not wise for society.

Seventh: Is a patent private property? This is vital for unless men clearly determine what is and what is not private property, eventually the abuses arising from lumping common property rights with private property rights, tend to make men assume that all things are common property, with the consequent social, moral and political degradation which follows when private property is outlawed. A privilege never has been and never can be justly private property, no matter how many courts may have attempted to so state. The final arbitrament of this question is not a court of law composed of a few men, but the precepts of justice as understood by all men. If a privilege is justly private property, then anything can be justly private property, whether it be men's bodies, the earth, the air, the waters of the seas, and the like. Society recognizes today that private property in men is an injustice which will ultimately destroy any civilization built on that basis—some day it may recognize that a society which permits other privileges as patents and the earth to be considered private property will also eventually bring that civilization to ruin.

A man is entitled to the things he produces. The inventor is entitled to the machine he made, but not the privilege society would give him of prohibiting other men from making similar machines. Private property derives from the fact that men are entitled to their own bodies. To maintain their bodies they need sustenance, i.e., wealth. Therefore, wealth is private property with the same force as a man's body is his own. But wealth is something tangible produced by human labor. A franchise, as a patent, is nothing but an act of law prohibiting all but certain individuals from producing wealth. If this be private property, then all restrictions and prohibitions are private property to be bought and sold as wealth, and the richest nation will be the one which has the greatest number of prohibitions on the production of wealth and buys and sells these restrictions. If that is so, then The Wall Street Journal's fight for economic freedom is based on a faulty premise, and the planners' ideas of regimentation are correct. All we have to do is to make all their restrictive acts on production private property to be bought and sold, and America will be in Utopia, and rich beyond her wildest dreams.

In the last analysis the problem comes down to the question, not of how to improve the patent law, but whether there should be one at all. Far better to have the law as at present with all its obvious evils and absurdities than some botched up job which will pass as correcting the abuses and lull people into thinking the problem has been solved. If the law is unjust there is but one possible solution, and only one, the complete eradication of the law from the statue books. Anything less than that cannot and will not work.

Following is The Wall Street Journal's reply to Mr. Johansen's article:

In another column on this page appears a letter in which the writer comments on an editorial in The Wall Street Journal of April 13 discussing a survey of the present legal position of patent rights made by a committee of the National Association of Manufacturers. In the editorial this newspaper expressed its own agreement with a line of court decisions holding that patent rights are property.

Our correspondent, not content to reject the concept of patents as property, asserts that there is no such thing as invention. "Inventions," he writes, "are the logical developments resulting from an advancing civilization acquiring a greater knowledge of the laws of nature." It follows, then, that Eli Whitney, Alexander Graham Bell, Edison, Westinghouse, Marconi, Pupin, Houdry and their ilk never did anything but stand on the curbstone and watch advancing civilization march by, gathering such knowledge of mechanics, chemistry and electrodynamics as they had merely by seeing the procession moving under its own power. Just what "advancing civilization" consists of Mr. Johansen does not say, but evidently individuals have no essential part in it. They only purloin from it what they need to make out a patent application.

It is true that inventors have usually profited by the labors of those who have preceded them in their field but that is only to say that no one man ever by himself developed a science. If some knowledge of the action of electric currents had not existed before his time, neither Bell nor Edison nor Marconi could have done what he did. Mr. Johansen in effect says that no one of them ever did do more than some manual or clerical work in or around the laboratory of advancing civilization; he then proceeds to contradict this inference by asserting that inventors invent because they cannot help but invent by instinct. So, they should be rewarded for inventing—something they do by instinct and don't do, either—no more than for eating bread or drinking water. But men who invent or "improve" must eat and without reward they cannot.

Contrary to the argument of our correspondent's third point, patents are not "as well as other monopolies." The previous editorial quoted Mr. Justice Roberts' clear distinction between the true monopoly, which deprives the public of something it has freely enjoyed, and an invention covered by a patent, which confers on society a benefit it has not previously had. A patent gives the inventor the exclusive right to make or use his invention *for a limited time*. It is of no value to him unless he puts it at the disposal of the public for a fee, which fee must be reasonable if the value of the patent is to be exploited to the full. Patent rights have been abused,

Paving Stones of the Slavery Road

The author of the following pointed comment on the proposals of a certain distinguished public servant for the post-war world is JESSIE TREDWAY MATTESON, *former Registrar of the Henry George School of Social Science in New York and recently appointed to the same official position in the Chicago extension of the school. Further interesting details of Mrs. Matteson's activities in the educational work of the Georgist movement will be found in the news columns of this issue of* THE FREEMAN.

✶ FREEDOM OR SLAVERY—which shall it be? No creature on the face of this earth—not even Hitler himself—will admit that he wants slavery for himself or others. Man yearns for freedom—yet the goal seems ever to recede. We watch humanity through the ages, moving down the road toward slavery—"vaporing about liberty with a whip in one hand and a chain in the other."

There is less excuse for Americans to lose sight of the goal than for most peoples of the earth, for circumstances have permitted us to enjoy a greater degree of individual liberty. Instead of making use of this knowledge to obtain more freedom, we seem only to become more smug each day. Losing sight of the ultimate goal of complete human freedom bounded only by the equal freedom of every other individual, we congratulate ourselves because we are approaching slavery at a slightly slower pace than our benighted neighbors.

Prominent among those writing on post-war planning is New York's Park Commissioner Robert Moses, whose program is outlined in two articles in recent issues of *The Reader's Digest*. Mr. Moses is unquestionably sincere in his desire to see the brotherhood of man an accomplished fact, and for that deserves all credit.

Yet, throughout his articles, written in protest against the emotionalism of idealists and other impractical people, one finds mention of the "unspeakable Japs," and of a "decent existence for *all who merit it*." (Italics mine.) "Does any sane person contend" something with which Mr. Moses is not in agreement?

Leaving aside all claims to sanity, I should like seriously to contend that freedom, by definition, can be attained only by the *removal* and never by the multiplication of restrictions.

The specific restrictions which seem important to Mr. Moses are tariff and immigration laws, and the control of certain geographical areas by chosen people in other geographical areas. He does not present these as new ideas, nor does he go to the extremes advocated by certain other publicists and politicians today. He merely accepts some "moderate" restrictions along these lines as being necessary for the welfare of America. The absence of such restrictions he sees as mistaken generosity toward other countries, generosity which will be rewarded by economic and social disaster.

Mr. Moses' conclusions are based on solid fact. He has studied history and statistics which bear out every point he makes. He has seen the figures on the millions of immigrants who have come to this country since its founding. His experience has shown him closed factories, race riots, slums—the logical result, he claims, of too much immigration.

He has studied the history of the tariff in this country and has observed the comparative prosperity of Americans. Obviously, lowering of tariff barriers, then, involves the lowering of the American standard of living. He takes time here to criticize the "shallow thinkers" who claim that good will is fostered by free trade, and asks "is there anything in past human experience to support this oratory?"

He makes a special plea for imperialism, saying that its virtues have been overlooked recently. In particular he praises the "stronger-than-iron" bonds of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and the "honorable" government of the East Indies by the Dutch. All of these opinions can be buttressed by hard facts in many books.

But there are other books—books which show just as clearly that there is living space on this earth for many more millions than inhabit it today, and that greater population logically means greater production—not starvation and slum living. There are books which show people of differing religions, cultures and political beliefs freely exchanging their labor products and believing (insanely?) that *each* has reaped a profit. And then there are more books which claim that the stronger-than-iron bonds of the British family are indeed strong, because they rest on military force—and others which say that the Dutch, so moderate, kindly and liberal at home, in the colonies have been rapacious, perfidious, infamously cruel, surpassing even the Inquisition in the tortures conceived for their victims.

(*Continued on page* 14)

---

though not on such a scale as ambitious politicians have often pictured. As with all law and all government, the task here is to prevent the abuse without destroying the use.

Mr. Johansen says: "A franchise, as a patent, is nothing but an act of law prohibiting all but certain individuals from producing wealth. If this be private property, then all restrictions and prohibitions are private property, to be bought and sold as wealth and the richest nation will be the one which has the greatest number of prohibitions on the production of wealth and buys and sells these restrictions." This is plain nonsense. Such reasoning, if it were true, would destroy every form of private property. A man's home is his property because of the restriction of law which prevents others from invading and appropriating it to their own use. Mr. Johansen would call a man's use of his own home a privilege; we prefer to call it a property right.

Not a Ghost Town—Yet

This study of the causes behind certain social phenomena now manifesting themselves in the New York metropolitan area is by FRANCES I. BUCKLEY, *young English teacher in the Dickinson High School, Jersey City. Miss Buckley's minor in college was Social Studies and there was a time, she says, when she knew too much about economics even to consider Henry George. A post graduate course at Montclair State College started her furiously to think on the land question. A course in Progress and Poverty in Jersey City did the rest, and advanced study in the Henry George School in New York is at present applying the polishing off process.*

★ "TAXATION which lessens the reward of the producer necessarily lessens the incentive to production; taxation which is conditioned upon the act of production, or the use of any of the three factors of production (land, labor and capital) necessarily discourages production. Thus taxation which diminishes the earnings of laborer or the returns of the capitalist tends to render the one less industrious and intelligent and the other less disposed to save and invest."

These words of Henry George, significant in 1879, are a hundredfold more so today as two recent developments well illustrated. First: beneath the din of oratory and drum-beating of the Second War Loan Drive can be heard a still, small voice and this voice resembles that of the child in Andersen's fairy tale who said of the emperor's imaginary new clothes, "But he hasn't got any clothes on at all." The voice belongs to the millions of people who are saying, "But I haven't got any money to buy war bonds with, because I have spent it all in taxation."

The second development is the report of the committee appointed by Governor Dewey to ascertain why industrial plants and other business enterprises have been moving away from New York City in recent years. The reason, according to the committee, is clear: high taxes, high labor costs and lack of industrial space at reasonable rentals. Thus we have the astonishing spectacle of the greatest city in the land being confronted with an unemployment problem and forced to economise in these fat years of war.

For the first of these problems, no solution has been offered except the proposal for more taxes, but for the second a number of panaceas have been advanced. The "New York Post" lays the plot to impoverish Our Nell (New York City) to the nefarious up-state Republican legislature which has seized the revenues of the city and used them to build up a $69,000,000 surplus in the state treasury. It cites especially the stock-transfer tax which has driven much of the brokerage trade to Montreal and other cities. This particular tax produces $7,000,000 a year for the state while the city, which has sustained the injury, must resort to higher taxes and perhaps an increased subway fare.

Taxes, of course, can be as harmful in the mode as in the amount. They should be levied not upon production but upon monopolies, the profits of which are in themselves a tax upon production. The value of land, representing as it does a monopoly of the purest and simplest kind, is the only logical basis for taxation. That value has been created by the community and not by the individual who holds title; the community, therefore, can levy a tax and collect it in the form of economic rent without any such untoward results as are apparent in New York City. Land monopoly in New York was the cause of the city's financial troubles long before the state legislature ever thought of the stock-transfer tax. Industrial development in the city is retarded because of land held out of use or used as slum sites until it can be sold at a speculative profit. Some of the most valuable land within the city is to be found in Harlem and other slum areas. Crime and disease are the only return to the community for the use of this land under the present system of taxation.

Obviously the prevailing system of land monopoly greatly retards the city's educational and cultural development. School and library facilities have been shabbily curtailed in these last few years because of declining revenues. The rental of theatres in the Broadway area is so high that many worth-while dramatic projects have been stifled. A play must be a "hit" capable of playing to capacity every night in order to meet expenses. When the Provincetown Players tried to reach a larger audience uptown they were unable to do so because of high theatre rentals. The type of drama which might attract a steady audience from the modest income class, is therefore completely ruled out. Playwrights are thus not encouraged to write, nor producers to produce. In the world of music, the high rental of concert halls discourages low-priced concerts and deprives music-lovers of their enjoyment, leaving most musical events to the tender mercies of privileged classes.

And so, the circle continues until the city becomes, if not the ghost-town which some of the gloomier critics have prophesied, a faded, shabby place losing its population steadily while dreaming nostalgically of the good old days. Let us hope that this circle will never be completed and that the gloomy picture painted by the Governor's Committee may lead to public demand for a new deal in taxation.

How It All Began

One of the country's outstanding crusaders for economic freedom is JOSEPH S. THOMPSON *of San Francisco, who tells here how, through the instrumentality of Joseph Fels, he became acquainted with Progress and Poverty more than thirty years ago. Something of an introduction to Mr. Thompson himself may be had in excerpts from the foreword to his recent highly successful book,* More Progress and Less Poverty, *written by his sister, the distinguished American novelist, Kathleen Norris. In this foreword Mrs. Norris writes:*

"My pleasant duty here is to introduce, as the compiler of this volume, my own oldest friend—my brother. He speaks for himself as a business man, and that he is indeed. Starting work at eighteen and two years later finding himself the head of a suddenly orphaned family of six, his is the American story of early responsibility, hard work, hard times. With a capital of about one thousand dollars and with no patrons or backers, he rented a country shed for ten dollars a month and established what is today a million dollar manufacturing plant ranking among the first four of its class in the country. His firm employs hundreds of men and in its thirty years has never had a strike or failed to discount its bills . . . is one who through poverty, hard work and responsibility has become a Fellow of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers . . . for four years a director of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce . . . an Honorary Life Member and one time President of San Francisco's greatest club; prominent in musical circles in the west, and one of his own native city's favorite toastmasters and speakers . . . a well-rounded character who loves life and people and has thoroughly enjoyed his more than sixty years of crowded living."

✶ IN 1912, WHEN I was a young man looking out on a badly distorted world, I wondered what it was that prevented a smoother, human progress and a wider distribution of America's wealth.

I wish that I could remember how it was that I happened to hear of Joseph Fels—perhaps it was in the daily paper that Joseph Fels, donor of the Joseph Fels Fund, was to speak in a church in Oakland.

How it was that my brother and I crossed the ferry to San Francisco and then the ferry to Oakland, before the days of automobiles, to hear Joseph Fels, I will never know—but we did, and attending the church we found that Mr. Fels was limited to but 15 minutes, and in that 15 minutes he exhorted us four or five times to read, *Progress and Poverty.*

He may have thought his talk was wasted, but in that 15 minutes he launched a worker who has been deeply concerned with the subject ever since I bought *Progress and Poverty.* I did not finish reading it until I took it up again some 30 years later. I was so full of the idea that I did not feel it was necessary to read any further after I had absorbed the main subject.

Everything that we do, no matter how little we see of the results, is likely to be productive of long consequences.

Paving Stones—from page 12

Which books are right? Certainly the books which a man of Mr. Moses' distinction would choose should be wise selections. Yet the factual evidence on the other side suggests that the opinion of authority, no matter how great, must bear critical inspection.

There is another criterion, more reliable than hard fact, by which to test the recommendations of our leaders—the criterion of simple, fundamental principles.

For instance, if one's study of human nature indicates that people are burdened with excess energy and therefore do things the hard way to work off some of the surplus—then trade barriers, which increase the amount of labor necessary for the satisfaction of desire, are good, regardless of what the book says.

Or again, one might observe the generosity of nature and man's increasing adaptability in using it to create vast stores of wealth, and speculate on the prevalence of poverty and war. Then, one can either blame the Lord for putting too many people in the world, or look to see if there has been any human interference with production and distribution.

And as for the ownership of one group of men by another, one might ask: If some men are subject to ownership by others, then are not all men, even I, subject to enslavement? If those inferior people on the other side of the earth are not "ready for freedom" yet, will prolonging the waiting period by restrictions make them any more ready?

And so the paving stones of the Slavery Road are easily recognized by one who keeps principles always in mind—even while snatching a few minutes' reading on a crowded subway. He does not have to decide which are "good" and which are "bad" restrictions; it is enough for him to know that restrictions restrict, and therefore carry mankind in the direction of slavery.

Slavery has been tried and found wanting. Freedom waits.

Truer Than Ever

It was more than ten years ago—September 23, 1932, to be exact—that GILBERT SELDES, *well-known literary figure and at the time a special writer for the Hearst newspapers, devoted his column to a discussion of the "Single Tax," as it was commonly referred to in those days. Mr. Seldes' observations, timely and to the point in 1932, take on added interest today when the cumbersome tax structure against which he railed has become vastly more irksome and unwieldy, while the imperviousness to enlightenment on the part of taxing "experts," who decree how the long-suffering public shall be plucked, and the obtuseness of the public itself toward measures aiming at its own relief are in no whit changed.*

★ "AS TO MR. FORD," writes Mrs. B. W. Burger, "he has a great many admirable viewpoints, and he, like many others, is advocating a 'back to the land' movement as a panacea in our present depressing times. I am wondering if this is an answer to the problem, 'In times of stress, why not in times of prosperity?' Is it not an accepted fact that the savage, who had access to the land, was able to feed, clothe and house himself? Civilized man, in a world of plenty, suffers want." If you are familiar with economic argument you will recognize the key word in Mrs. Burger's remarks; it is "land." Mrs. Burger is inviting me to think about the Single Tax, that phenomenon in the economic world, a theory totally radical, and approved by conservatives; one which has never been tried on a grand scale, but which evokes the enthusiasm of practical men as often as that of fanatics. In admiration of Henry George you find Nicholas Murray Butler and Bernard Shaw and Leo Tolstoi and Mayor Gaynor and Justice Brandeis and Poultney Bigelow, all joined. And the first Single Taxer I ever knew was also the first great manufacturer I ever knew.

I have no text-book or authority on the Single Tax at the moment, but I know what has stood in its way: it is too simple, too logical, and even too just. The taxes people clamor for are complicated and vicious. Witness our adherence to the customs duties, which cause infinite difficulties in collection, are iniquitous to some and far too favorable to others, and are so complex that few of us take the faintest trouble to understand them. Or our inheritance and income taxes. They brought into being a whole new classification of lawyers and thousands of ways of escape. These are the taxes we ask for and get, with the help of Congresses we painfully elect for that very purpose. What is more, these taxes are uncertain; they are always failing to bring in the required or expected revenue; and while a new tariff is being discussed business folds up in despair, not knowing what the verdict of the jury will be. We have seen our Congress discussing a tax bill for nearly a year—and that year happened to be one in which our industrial and commercial activities had all gone to pot —as the result of another tax bill, among other things.

So it is no wonder we reject the Single Tax. The very idea that one tax will be enough to keep the government running offends our taste, which has grown used to multiplication of everything. Furthermore, the Single Tax is levied, roughly, on land, and we no longer think of ourselves as a country primarily agricultural. Mrs. Burger quotes: "Rent of land belongs to the people, and it is the first duty of government to collect it," which I take to be a fundamental tenet of Single Taxation and which suggests that the Single Taxers do not propose to run our government on the proceeds of a tax on abandoned farms in Vermont.

The basic idea, as it has been explained to me, is that when the State of New York built, at public expense, a highway through the Bronx or Hutchinson River valley the enormous increase in the value of all the land nearby was not due to anything the owners of the land had done. It was due to something you and I had done, acting through the State. Therefore you and I—as the State—were entitled to the profit, or a good share of it. And, on the other side, if I proposed to keep as a private garden four square blocks along the Lake Front in Chicago I ought to be made to pay as much rent as the owners of hotels in the same district. In effect, none of us would own land individually, because all of us would own all the land and take the profits of land in rent; but we would own the improvements made on land, and there would be no amusement tax and no income tax and no bad Ides of March and no lobbies in Congress.

One trouble with the Single Tax is that it has a sound moral basis which no one is quite willing to admit. In the Wendel estate were slatternly tenements and even lumber yards left in the midst of great business houses and skyscrapers. In good times the value of the lots on which the tenements and yards stood would be a thousand times the price paid by the original Wendel owner; and no Wendel and no Wendel heir had ever contributed anything to make those lots more valuable. The growth of the city had done that. Yet the Wendel heirs could take the profit. The moral argument is that this isn't right.

We all think so until we possess just that kind of parcel of land. Then we talk of our own sagacity in holding on or the sacred rights of property—or anything to change the subject. For we know we aren't really in danger of the Single Tax. Because, as someone has said, there isn't a valid argument against it and there isn't a chance in the world it will be adopted. Brand Whitlock added that the Single Tax will have to wait because it is so fundamental, "and mankind never attacks fundamental problems until it has exhausted all the superficial ones." Quite a few of the latter are coming up right now. Turn on the radio.

The BOOK TRAIL

IT'S A SMALL WORLD, AFTER ALL

"One World," by Wendell L. Willkie. Simon and Schuster, New York, 1943. Paper, 85 pp., $1.00. Cloth, $2.00.

[Wendell Willkie's "One World" is proving to be a sensation—no less. It is fitting, therefore, that THE FREEMAN offer its readers not one but TWO reviews on so important a book. It is equally important that the reviews be capably done. The biographical sketches of the writers we have been fortunate enough to secure for the task will suggest their competence; the reviews themselves will confirm it.—The Editors]

MORGAN HARRIS teaches economics at the University of California at Los Angeles. Before taking his present position he was an educational director for consumer co-operative societies both in New York City and San Jose, California. He is interested in the Student Christian Association work and had been directly connected with the conference at Asilomar as Publicity director. He is a member of the Society of Friends. Mr. Harris is deeply concerned in the possibilities for a post war amity between nations. He has been speaking and writing for the Federal Union organization of which he is an active member. He writes: "People who struggle 'against' this or that situation usually do so under the illusion that there is only one alternative. We sometimes think that if we can defeat fascism we will thereby establish democracy; if we can destroy the existing evil, the good-we-have-in-mind will automatically take its place. But the number of things that may take its place are unlimited. It is therefore a waste of time to 'attack' this or that evil; it is a more effective use of time to work 'for' the superior alternative which we envision. Many people in this war know what they are fighting 'against'; but how many know what they are fighting 'for'?"

If you can't take an airplane trip around the world yourself this season, the next best thing is to read this book in which Wendell Willkie tells in vivid and dramatic writing what he did and saw and heard in his 49-day, 31,000-mile globe-encircling tour. The importance of this report grows out of his ability to understand the people he met, and the meaning of what he saw, and in his ability to share this understanding with us in such compact language.

In seven weeks en route, they spent only 160 hours—less than one week—in the air. The balance of the time was spent talking with all sorts of people—many of whom we would not get to talk with if we made the trip ourselves—Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, kings, prime ministers, pashas, soldiers, workers—in all sorts of out-of-the-way places from Brazil to El Alamein, from Kuibishev to Tashkent, from Sinkiang (which is twice as big as France) to Yakutsk (which is twice as big as Alaska).

Willkie does not try to tell us all about Russia after only two weeks there. He tells us only of what he saw and heard, and what that means to him. He is impressed by the dynamic character of the country—in some ways similar to our own country in its early days. Its survival ability, demonstrated by its resistance to Hitler, its size and its power make it a nation to be reckoned with, not overlooked, in the post war world. While Willkie sets forth unequivocally his opposition to Communist doctrines, he believes that our free economic and political institutions are so superior to anything Communism has to offer that we have nothing to fear from contact with Russia. That "the freedom of our economic and political institutions" is going to depend on who owns and controls and gets the income from our natural resources is a point, however, that has apparently escaped him.

Three big ideas, which we have often heard, are made vividly real by this book; they are: that the world is small, that its people are interdependent, and that the world is a unit.

The world is so small, and has become so easy to get around in, that Mr. Willkie made a date with the president of a central Siberian republic to fly back some week-end in 1945 for a day's hunting—and he intends to keep the date!

We may live in ignorance of the people of Sinkiang and Yakutsk and Iraq, but nevertheless what they think and do is already affecting our lives, and will continue to do so increasingly. Spengler warned us of the decline of the West; Willkie has given us a preview of the rise of the East.

The millions of the near and far east are becoming conscious of their power. Of every four people in the world, only one has (that questionable asset) a light skin. The other millions are learning that they are a majority in this "one world." Willkie reports, "Men and women all over the world are on the march, physically, intellectually, and spiritually. After centuries of ignorance and dull compliance, hundreds of millions of people in eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be slaves for Western profits. They are beginning to know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent."

Of Egypt and the Middle East, Iraq, the Lebanon, and Iran, he says, ". . . one senses a ferment in these lands, a groping of the long-inert masses. . . Their lives will change more in the next ten years than they have in the last ten centuries."

We have brought to these people technological knowledge and machinery; we have given them the concepts of freedom and democracy. They know that they have the right and the power to determine their own lives. We cannot take these things away again. We must now learn to treat these neighbors of ours as human beings and equals.

"One of the finest problems in legislation is what the State ought to take upon itself to direct by the public wisdom, and what it ought to leave, with as little interference as possible, to individual discretion."

—EDMUND BURKE

Mr. Willkie did not get into India. President Roosevelt, who authorized the journey as an official mission, forbade this—which hardly seems strange when one reflects on Mr. Willkie's forthright, outspoken character, and the trouble our administration has been put to in keeping quiet public criticism of Britain's treatment of India.

This book gives us clear and meaningful pictures of the world we are living in but know so woefully little about. Of even greater interest to many people in this country, however, is the insight it gives us into the mind of Mr. Willkie. One gets a glimpse of his understanding from this paragraph:

"It is all very well to say, as some people did say to me in Cairo and Jerusalem, that 'the natives don't want anything better than what they have.' That is the argument that has been used everywhere for centuries against the advancement of the underprivileged, by those whose condition makes them satisfied with the *status quo*. Yet the history of civilization shows that the creation of economic conditions under which those who have little or nothing can improve their lot, is not a dividing process but a multiplying one, by which the well-being of all society is advanced."

In arguing for free trade, he says, "There will be no peace, there will be no real development, there will be no economic stability, unless we find the method by which we can begin to break down the unnecessary trade barriers hampering the flow of goods. . .

"It is also inescapably true that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man everywhere in the world."

This book is snappy, first-hand reporting about the places, things, and people in which we are all interested. It sparkles. Mr. Willkie's bouyant humor is incisive. When he was in Turkey, the Axis radio complained about his presence, so he suggested that the Turkish government should invite Hitler to send to Turkey, as a representative of Germany, his opposition candidate.

The major importance of this book is in the solid foundation it establishes under the idea expressed in its title. We may be grossly ignorant of the other people who inhabit this world, nevertheless we are sharing it with them and if we want to enjoy it we will have to learn to get along with them. Physically, biologically, spiritually, economically the world is united; politically it is still divided.

The world has become a community, and this book calls to our attention certain common problems which its people share. Like any other community, the world must have a government to deal with its problems. "One world" establishes the premises which make this conclusion obvious. To those who are afraid that if we enter a world government, the peoples about whom Mr. Willkie writes will outvote us, one would put the question: Would you rather have them outvote us in a world congress, or outshoot us on the battlefields of the next world war?

Mr. Willkie is more realistic than "post war" reconstructionists, in that he realizes that now—before the peace treaty is written—is the time to influence what shall go into that treaty. He says, "A war won without a purpose is a war won without victory. We must know that we shall win in the future peace only what we are now winning in the war—no more and no less. . . What we must win now, during the war, are the principles."

Mr. Willkie's faith in democracy is evidenced by the fact that he calls on the people themselves to win the peace. He says, "Agreement on principles must exist, not just among the leaders . . . it must be established among the allied peoples themselves." However, "neither the proclamations of leaders nor the opinion of the people of the world, can accomplish anything unless we plan while we fight and unless we give our plans reality . . . the United Nations must become a common council, not only for the winning of the war but for the future welfare of mankind."

The book closes with the statement that the peoples of the east, "and other peoples, not yet fighting, are waiting eagerly for us to accept the most challenging opportunity of all history—the chance to help create a new society in which men and women the world around can live and grow invigorated by independence and freedom."

In meeting this challenge, which Mr. Willkie puts to us as individuals, we may well keep in mind the Russian general who was asked by Mr. Willkie how large a section of Russia's 2000-mile front he was defending. Somewhat offended, the general replied, "Sir, I am not defending. I am attacking." —MORGAN HARRIS

MARION WHITE is a figure of importance in contemporary American letters. She began her writing career as European correspondent for a number of American trade papers. Subsequently she blossomed out as a successful writer of mystery stories. For ten years she conducted the cooking institute of a national magazine. At present she is Managing Editor of "Woman," one of the larger-circulation monthlies in its field. Among Miss White's recent books is "If We Should Fail," a series of stories in which the author has transferred some of Hitler's choicer atrocities to American communities in an imagined Hun invasion of the United States. If that book doesn't keep you awake nights, no reading matter will. Her latest is "Sweets Without Sugar," a war-time cook book which is one of the current best sellers in its group. This one, also, will keep you awake, *with indigestion*, if your wife turns you loose on a supply of the good things it tells how to make, and your resistance fails you.

It is more than political curiosity which has prompted a million people to purchase this very splendid report of an American's trip around a war-torn world. It is far more than that. For here, in 200 pages of simple and pleasant reading, is the answer to that hope which has been fired in millions of hearts during the past few years —the hope of a new world in which war will have no place.

Mr. Willkie had the opportunity to see and talk with big people and with little people in the most legendary corners of the earth—on the streets of ancient Baghdad, on cooperative farms in Soviet Russia, in the guerilla strongholds of China. But his report is neither fantastic nor legendary. Indeed, when awards are being given for concise, clear-thinking journalism, first considera-

tion in 1943 must surely go to this man who has been a Presidential candidate but never a news reporter. He presents these people he met as simple neighbors in a world of diminishing size, and in their own words he offers us their friendship and their desire for better understanding.

His experience, Mr. Willkie writes in his introduction, "gave me some new and urgent convictions and strengthened some of my old ones. These convictions are not mere humanitarian hopes . . . they are based on things I saw and learned at first hand, and upon the views of men and women, important and anonymous, whose heroism and sacrifices give meaning and life to their beliefs."

We are living in a new world, a world whose very dimensions have changed. At the end of the last war, as Mr. Willkie reminds us, not a single plane had flown across the Atlantic. Today that ocean is a mere ribbon, with airplanes making regular scheduled flights. The Pacific is only a slightly wider ribbon in the new air ocean, with Asia at our very doorstep. Far off countries are our present outposts of security; their peoples are our allies in a common cause. And when our boys come home from war, the people with whom they mingled in China and Africa and Australia will be as well-known to them as the people of other states in their own country. More so, perhaps, for they will have shared a common suffering.

In order to have peace in this world all peoples must be free, and this great march toward freedom has already started. Nothing can stop it, least of all Hitler. Nothing can fool the men and women on the march, least of all the big talk of the Western world. The Russians and the Chinese understand the importance of the fight which they have been waging alone. Age-old fears and superstitions are discarded as their sinews throb with a new international strength. These peoples know full well that they deserve the right to make some of the decisions concerning the post-war world.

Fortunately, the United States has a preferred position in this new world. We have developed, to use Mr. Willkie's popular phrase, "a reservoir of friendship" which is more heart-warming than any treaty ever written. This friendship is not new or short-lived. It has a sound base. Years ago our missionaries, doctors and teachers laid the foundation for it. Motion pictures followed, to introduce us in livelier substance. And today, in hundreds of far-flung outposts, American soldiers are arriving in the flesh, to cement the last bonds of understanding.

The future of the world will depend largely upon how we use this friendship. We can no longer shrug our shoulders at the plight of less fortunate peoples and console ourselves with the idea that they want nothing better because they know nothing better. By our own exploitation, we have made them aware of a better life. To follow up our teaching and help to improve living standards of other people would be little more than practical economy, because this very establishment of a higher standard of living would provide a greater market for our industrial goods and services.

Two of the most important chapters in Mr. Willkie's book are concerned with Russia, probably because he wants us to realize that in any post-war planning the United States must be concerned with Russia. He does not hesitate to report that he was tremendously impressed by what he saw in that vast country; he does not want us to overlook the facts.

"Many among the democracies," he writes, "fear and mistrust Soviet Russia. They dread the inroads of an economic order that would be destructive of their own. Such fear is weakness. Russia is neither going to eat us nor seduce us. That is—and this is something for us to think about—that is, unless our democratic institutions and our free economy become so frail through abuse and failure in practice as to make us soft and vulnerable. The best answer to Communism is a living, vibrant, fearless democracy. . . All we need to do is to stand up and perform according to our professed ideals. Then those ideals will be safe."

He saw much in Russia that reminded him of his own Middle West, when he was a boy in Indiana. The houses had the "neat buttoned-up look" of homes in Elwood, the pavements along the main streets were boardwalks, like those he remembered. Even the character of the towns was the same, with the "hearty, simple tastes, the not too subtle attitudes of mind, the tremendous vitality." Many of the leaders were curiously like the rough, energetic men who created industrial America.

Wherever he went, he felt the surge of the new spirit which holds its promise for peace. In China, a young student whom he never met sent him a letter enclosing a draft plan for the establishment of a permanent peace after the war. He might have been an American boy at one of our own colleges, save for the quaint phrasing of his letter.

"Dear Mr. Wendell Willkie," the young man wrote, "let me assure you that China, one of the bravest and most faithful among the allied countries, has never been daunted or changed her mind while confronting all sorts of hardships; for we perfectly understand that we are fighting for the holy cause of liberty and righteousness, and we firmly believe that a bright future is waiting us ahead, and that God will give us the victory that we ache to get at."

The boy's plan was an interesting one, one that every American can well understand. He proposed setting up monuments to make people hate war instead of praising it; and he proposed that the last day of this war should be made a day for public sacrifices all over the world, and be named "Peace, Free, Pleasure Day." One of his propositions was "to increase the affection among human beings," toward which purpose he suggested that each nation raise peace funds with which to endow scholarships.

There are only three courses open to America after the war, Mr. Willkie declares. We may choose narrow nationalism, which inevitably means the ultimate loss of our own liberty; we may choose international imperialism, which means the sacrifice of some other nation's liberty, and which has never been the American way; or we may help to create a world in which there

shall be an equality of opportunity for every race and every nation. He is confident that America will choose the third course, but to make this choice effective we must not only win the war, but we must win the peace also, and we must start winning it now.

—MARION WHITE

EDUCATION IN DEMOCRACY

"The Freedom to be Free," by James Marshall. The John Day Co., New York, 1943. 277 pp. $2.50

If that earnest apostle of verbal obfuscation, Gertrude Stein, had written this book, she would probably have called it, "The Freedom to be Free, to be Free, to be Free, to be Free," and so on until she ran out of breath or out of ink. The author is less prolix; he is content with "The Freedom to be Free," and even that he claims as not his own but Gandhi's. He tells us that Louis Fischer quotes Gandhi as inquiring whether President Roosevelt's four freedoms include "the freedom to be free."

Now the mahatma is generally considered by the critics to belong in the first ten if not to deserve top ranking when it comes to knowing what freedom means, even though he has spent a lot of time in jail, and certainly the author himself, former president and present member of the New York City Board of Education, is no slouch on the subject, as the present volume abundantly proves. None the less, and these weighty authorities to the contrary notwithstanding, this humble reviewer ventures to opine that freedom means freedom —just that and nothing more—and that if it doesn't include the freedom to be free and all other freedoms, then it isn't freedom. It means the right to do as you please. Obviously in a civilized society that right must be conditioned upon the equal rights of others, but that is the only limitation.

Thomas Jefferson did a pretty good job when he wrote that all men have equal rights to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," and his present day emulators, when specifying the *particular* freedoms which must be preserved—such, for instance, as freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion and freedom of assembly—are by that very token eliminating a lot of others. Moreover it seems passing strange that the more we *hear* of those four freedoms, the less we *have* of them.

The foregoing observations are offered not in a spirit of carping cantankerousness or even good mean fun, but only because the slight irk occasioned by the title of the book is but one of several that the reader will experience before he reaches the end of the excellent final chapter, "Men Cannot Live By Words Alone." It is a little to be regretted that the author, who scores repeatedly with telling effect, is occasionally guilty of the most agregrious misses without, apparently, realizing in the slightest that he *has* missed.

The bullseyes begin even in the warming-up shots. On the very first page of the foreword we read: "It is easier for the mathematician to abandon the Euclidean hypothesis that two parallel lines will remain parallel into infinite space than it is for men in power to concede that power which is concentrated becomes corrupt."

That's swell, but when a little later we are told that "State planning is here to be with us for a long time because unplanned private finance milked new capital investment, and because industry could not plan either for world markets or internally," we begin to wonder a little.

It would be interesting to know who the culprit, "unplanned private finance," is, and who, the victim, "new capital investment." Who, too, is the industry that "could not plan?" These terms, of course, stand for human beings, business men with thousands of diversities of character and temperament, each trying his best to get along, to gratify his desires with the least effort, as every man has done since time began. The groups are largely interchangeable and overlapping. To imagine that one group ganged up on another and that a third fell down on a mission which was peculiarly its own, is to indulge in fanciful thinking.

Though capitalism has developed more productive power than any other system, we are told, "for years before this present war the competitive system had to be insulated against international competition through tariffs . . . . and capital invested at home had to be supported by grants in aid to build railroads and ships, to open up new resources and to establish banking and credit facilities."

It is not correct to say that the competitive system *had to be* insulated by tariffs, or that capital *had to be* aided by grants. It could be said in truth that they *were* "insulated" and "aided," and this at the behest of individuals and groups seeking to further their own interests at the expense of the public at large.

The author says with apparent approval: "Even before the war program necessitated priorities and price regulation, we were moving toward a planned economy; we were acknowledging that free competition was meaningless in situations involving monopoly and was a free pass to suicide to agricultural and other small producers."

Free competition, instead of being meaningless in the case of monopoly, is the one cure for monopoly, while a planned economy is by its very nature the greatest monopoly of all, the monopoly of power and authority in the hands of the State. Instead of free competition leading to the suicide of the small producer, that is the only condition under which he can survive. Without arguing the exigencies of the present situation it is evident that trade and production are more circumscribed, more hedged about by laws and restrictions than ever before in the history of our country. Never has free competition been so curtailed. And what is the effect on small business? You have only to pick up your daily paper to read that the little fellows are going out of business by the hundreds of thousands.

We like the author when he says in his interesting chapter on cooperatives that "running to the government is not the way to develop a self-reliant democracy." In another place he assures us that "The institutions

of men can be developed with an eye to encouraging rather than discouraging independence, cooperation and creativity." That, he holds, is what we mean when we say "that we want to develop a democractic world; we want to develop institutions founded on attitudes congenial to the survival and enrichment of human integrity."

He is everlastingly right, too, when he warns us that "the British Tories and most of the southern democrats represent an anachronism in democratic society, a vermiform appendix, inflamed with a chronic irritation at the thought of equality between peoples of different color." He says that "those bigotry-infected members threaten to impede the effectiveness and welfare of democratic society." And he adds, truly: "For the failure to take an equalitarian attitude toward those races which are not white, and which have been subject races, will be the measure of the failure to appraise the current world-wide revolution and to recognize that the colored peoples are struggling to attain their maturity by freeing themselves of the paternalism of the white peoples."

All in all, this is a distinctly worthwhile book, even though I wish the author had shown a keener perception of the part land plays in the economic structure.

—C. O. STEELE

Sample Shots

★ WHEN JOHN KIERAN, walking encyclopedia of "Information, Please," writer of the widely-syndicated newspaper column, "One Small Voice," and author of the foreword to the recently-published Classics Club edition of Progress and Poverty, proposed in his column a few weeks ago a kind of "single tax" which was about as different from Henry George's idea as could possibly be imagined, he brought upon himself an avalanche of letters which, according to his later columns, continues with but little abatement.

It has been the privilege of the editors of THE FREEMAN to read copies of many of these letters to Mr. Kieran. They are so numerous that to publish them all in THE FREEMAN is out of the question; space has been found for two, however, which will serve to convey the idea that Mr. Kieran's mail of late has been anything but dull and uninteresting.

My Dear Mr. Kieran:

As a long-time disciple of Henry George, I want to thank you for your kind words in regard to him in your recent "One Small Voice" article on taxation.

I am in agreement with you as to any one tax, unless of the worst possible kind, being better than the multitude of imposts which we now levy. Not only would it save a lot of trouble to the taxpayers but, since every separate tax must be assessed and collected, the boiling them down to one tax would save an immense sum which is now spent in doing this work many times over. That was one of the good points about Henry George's plan.

But the thing which most appealed to me in the taxation of land values was the fact that, unlike all other taxes, it imposed no burden on the production of wealth, and that while all other taxes, to a greater or less extent, checked and hindered wealth production, Henry George's plan positively encouraged it.

But, today, with our need for a tremendous revenue, the rent of land would fall far short of yielding enough, so resort would have to be made to something else. So there is your chance, but *first* we should collect the whole of land rent. Justice and common sense both demand this.

Yours sincerely,

Philadelphia HAROLD SUDELL

Dear John:

I will admit that any system of Single Tax might be better than this stupid, voluminous, time-consuming, aggravating bookkeeping, certified public accounting system and records, with snoopers, semi-snoopers, blackmailers, etc., tax system we now have, not to mention tariff walls between nations, instead of free trade, with their tendency to make wars between nations, etc.

Do come across, John, and state openly:

Is there any reason why the land values created by the community should not be taken by the community for community purposes?

Tell us, John, why, when a man improves his land, whether farm land or city land, by putting a house or a barn or a factory upon it, giving people jobs, he should be punished by increased taxes as long as the improvement stands. Is there any sense in that, John?

Even a criminal, when caught and punished, is told to go and sin no more. But the man who makes an improvement on his land is punished by a tax each and every year, until he pulls the improvement down and leaves an empty lot or an abandoned farm. Is that not true, John?

John, you have seen the building skeleton at Broadway and Murray Street looking into the Mayor's office, just a few blocks from your office. It has been standing, grinning for years at the Mayor and passersby, waiting for someone to pay the owner of the land a tremendous price for its use. Have you thought about that, John? What have you to say, John? Many of the plots of land throughout the city stand empty, the buildings pulled down to save taxes, and the plots look like abandoned ghost towns—what have you to say about that, John?

No, John, no one can convict you of treason to the Single Tax or anything else. Take that from me as a lawyer, John.

Your admirer,

New York HARRY WEINBERGER

"The utility, the vitality, the fruitage of life does not come from the top to the bottom; it comes like the natural growth of a great tree, from the soil, up through the trunk into the branches to the foliage and the fruit. The great struggling masses of the men who are at the base of everything, are the dynamic force that is lifting the levels of society. A nation is as great, and only as great, as her rank and file."

WOODROW WILSON, "The New Freedom."

NEWS *of the* Crusade *for* Economic Enlightenment

Toledo U. Sees the Light

NEW YORK—Prof. W. Lou Tandy. Economics Dept., University of Toledo, writes:

"I have just been able to arrange to teach my classes George's 'Progress and Poverty' this semester, using your materials. It will be necessary to use the shorter guide which covers the material in six lessons."

Professor Tandy at the same time ordered 38 copies of "Progress and Poverty," 66 copies of Students' Guides for studying Economic Rent, and various pamphlets for use among the students.

Public Speaking Classes

NEW YORK—The initial session of the spring and summer term of the C. O. Steele Public Speaking Course was held May 12. Commencement exercises for the winter term, which began in late January, took place in the school auditorium on the evening of April 21, with some two hundred persons attending. At the class dinner, held earlier, the judges awarded William Horkins first honors in the speaking contest. Second place went to Frieda Wehnes.

Chicago Meets Its Budget

CHICAGO—On February 25, the Chicago trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science met and decided that the time was ripe for a vast expansion of the classwork in the Chicago area. The first step in their expansion program called for a 67½% increase in the budget—from $8,000 spent in 1942 to $13,400 for 1943.

Two months later, on April 26, the report of Treasurer Max M. Korshak, made at the annual banquet of the School, revealed that $13,592 had been subscribed or otherwise provided for by graduates and friends of the School who have as much confidence in the future as have the trustees.

Now Chicago is rolling up its sleeves for the job of producing 1,000 graduates in the new school year starting October 1. Four months of careful preparation of lists, advertising material, and classroom helps will go into the campaign before the printed announcements are released following a mass meeting of class sponsors on the 104th anniversary of the birth of Henry George, September 2.

Up to that date, class sponsoring groups will be mapping out their respective neighborhood campaigns involving the mailing of announcements, placing of posters, securing of newspaper publicity and radio flashes, as well as the personal interviewing of prospective students. Old line teachers and teachers-elect alike will undergo a period of intensive review and training with the aim of offering the people of Chicagoland a heretofore unparalleled educational opportunity in the School's chosen field of fundamental economics and social philosophy.

Local contributions of $7,502 already subscribed for the next year by 354 graduates and friends are more than double those of 1942 which were $3,634. Winter term graduates—111 of them—are making up $527 of this total, while 243 older graduates and other friends are in for $4,380. Two anonymous friends of the School, matching 70% of all funds not raised by themselves personally, are down for $2,595.

The support of the New York headquarters will come to approximately $4,500. Subscriptions anticipated from spring and fall graduates are $1,000 while the surplus on book sales is expected to reach $500.

Quashtralia

NEW YORK—Following are excerpts from a recent letter from Captain William H. Quasha, former teacher in the Henry George School and legal counsel for THE FREEMAN:

"It was swell to hear all the good news about the school. . . I received the February FREEMAN and was grieved to learn of the passing of Gus Wilson. I always felt that he was one of my best contributions to the school. . . I have written to Margaret Bateman asking that twenty additional copies of THE FREEMAN be sent to Mr. Dowe, and the bill sent to my wife; such will be my contribution. . . I like the flavor of THE FREEMAN and I particularly enjoyed Henry Ware Allen's article in the February issue. . .

"Yesterday (April 4) was my first anniversary in Australia. I am kept pretty busy over here. We are on a seven day schedule and I haven't had a day off in over two months. However, we are all getting a big kick out of this job and would like to finish it up as promptly as possible so that we can get back to our normal occupations. My particular job is extremely interesting and I am sure that the experience is one of the most valuable that I could get."

Worked in Reverse

NEWARK—The current issue of "Your School," sprightly bulletin of the New Jersey Extension of the Henry George School of Social Science, carries the following amusing episode:

"One of our Jersey instructors has been leading a class in a New York cafe during the noon hour every week. Recently he gave the proprietor a copy of "Economics Simplified." It must have had the opposite effect to that intended because the proprietor went out and bought a forty acre farm down in Connecticut."

The same issue of "Your School" quotes Irving Stone's biography, "Clarence Darrow for the Defense," as saying that Darrow got his first real start in Chicago the night he made a speech on a program for the Henry George Club.

Tell 'Em They're Missed

NEW YORK—According to Mrs. Teresa Witort, wife of Lieutenant William Witort, USN, and former secretary, as Miss Teresa McCarthy, of the Henry George School of Social Science, the men in the armed forces are hungry for letters from the folks at home. Mrs. Witort knows whereof she speaks. At Christmas time she sent short letters and Holiday cards to many of the boys in the service whom she used to know at the school. She reports that the response was nothing less than amazing. Some of those receiving such greetings answered in letters of four or five pages, and all without exception expressed their warm appreciation and their hope that more letters would be forthcoming.

Mrs. Witort offers the excellent suggestion that students, teachers and other friends of service men begin the practise of writing them cheery, informative and interesting letters at frequent intervals.

Letters should be sent in care of the Henry George School, 30 East 29th St., New York, whence they will be forwarded to correct present addresses. A partial list of men in various branches of the service whose present location is on file with the school follows:

Lieut. Mandel Adler
Pvt. F. M. Adrian
Pvt. Franklin R. Auchy
Pvt. Benoit L. Banville
Howard Clarence Boyd
Pvt. Richard Brennan
Pvt. Robert Clancy
Leo Cohen
Pvt. Frank Di Tore
Pvt. Alex Duris
Lieut. Albert M. Gants
Lieut. Ely Goldenberg
Gaston Haxo
Sgt. Geo. W. Hansen
Pvt. William Hansen
David Hyder
Pvt. Frank Kalmbach
Fred Karn
Pvt. Karl Loeb
Capt. R. J. Manfrini
Pvt. A. C. Matteson
Lieut. Walter Maybaum
Lieut. S. A. Mayers
Paul E. Mueller
Pvt. R. E. Packer
Capt. William Quasha
Lieut. Arnold Rubin
Corp. Warren E. Ryan
Pvt. Jacob Schwartzman
Capt. Henry George Simmonite
Sgt. Richard Sommer
Lewis Taylor
Lieut. Paul Weissman
Charles Winter
Pvt. Daniel Wollman
Pvt. Karl Zatz

City-Wide

CHICAGO—Spring term classes in fundamental economics are being held in the Chicago area as follows:

CITY

Suite 1304, 111 W. Jackson Blvd.: Monday, 6:30 p.m.; Wednesday, 6:30 p.m.; Friday, 6:30 p.m.; Saturday, 2:00 p.m.

Lincoln-Belmont Y.M.C.A., 3333 N. Marshfield Ave., Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

People's Church, 941 W. Lawrence, Thursday, 8:00 p.m.

Church of the Atonement, 5749 N. Kenmore, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Church of the Advent, 2610 N. Francisco, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Jefferson Park Congregational Church, 5318 W. Giddings, Wednesday, 8:00 p.m.

Austin: Pigott Residence, 5959 W. Midway Park, 1st Apt., Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Englewood Y.M.C.A., 6545 S. Union, Wednesday, 7:30 p.m.

Chicago Lawn Library, 6234 S. Kedzie, Monday, 7:00 p.m.

Bryn Mawr Community Church, 7000 S. Jeffery, Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

Temple Isaiah Israel, 5035 S. Greenwood Ave., Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

Blackstone Library, 4900 S. Lake Park, Wednesday, 7:00 p.m.

Church of the Redeemer, 56th and Blackstone, Friday, 7:30 p.m.

Woodlawn A.M.E. Church, 65th and Evans, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Parkway Community Center, 5120 South Parkway, Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

Hall Library, 4801 S. Michigan, Tuesday, 7:00 p.m.

Lincoln Centre, 700 E. Oakwood, Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

SUBURBAN

Berwyn: Office of Atty. Jas. J. Shepro, Berwyn State Bank Bldg., 6804 Windsor, Monday, 7:30 p.m.

Des Plaines Municipal Building, Friday, 7:30 p.m.

Elmhurst College—Old Hall, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Evanston Library, 1703 Orrington, Friday, 7:30 p.m.

Evanston: Nichols School, 800 Greenleaf, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Evanston: Emerson St. Y.M.C.A., 1014 Emerson St., Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

Glenview Civic Building, West Room, Monday, 7:30 p.m.

Hinsdale Community House, Thursday, 7:30 p.m.

La Grange: Repsold's Store, 306 W. Burlington St., Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Maywood Library, 121 S. 5th, Tuesday, 7:00 p.m.

Oak Park: Dole Library, 255 Augusta, Friday, 7:00 p.m.

Park Ridge: Mary Wilson House, Prospect and Crescent, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

Wilmette Baptist Church, 1020 Forest, Monday, 7:30 p.m.

Winnetka Community House, 620 Lincoln, Tuesday, 7:30 p.m.

All Classes Meet Once A Week

Toronto Celebration—Dinner, Election, Speeches

TORONTO—Margaret E. Bateman, Director of the Henry George School of Social Science in New York, and Toronto City Controller Duncan were the chief speakers at the annual dinner meeting of the Henry George Society of Toronto which was held the evening of April 28. Mr. Duncan, who spoke on housing problems in Toronto, was introduced by President Hogg of the Henry George Society. Miss Bateman's discourse dealt with post war problems; she was presented to the audience of some 75 persons by Miss Dorothy Coate, Vice President of the Society. A sizable group of Georgists from Hamilton attended.

The election of officers for the ensuing year resulted as follows:

President, Mr. Howard Hogg; *Vice-President*, Miss Dorothy Coate; *Secretary-Treasurer*, Mr. Ernest Farmer.

Executive Committee: Mrs. Howard Hogg, Mrs. Wear, Miss Laura Macdonald, Mr. David Farmer, Mr. J. McBride, Mr. Allen Cullingworth, Miss Evelyn Forbes.

Advisory Committee: Dr. S. T. Floyd, Mr. Arthur B. Farmer, Mrs. Florence Macdonald, Mr. J. A. Martin, Mr. Alan C. Thompson, Mrs. M. T. Ollerhead, Mr. L. B. Walling, Mr. W. R. Williams.

The Ladies, Bless 'Em

CHICAGO, ILL.—Sixty members of the Henry George Woman's Club attended the club's fourth Birthday Dinner at the Normandy Restaurant, Saturday, April 10.

Mrs. Gustave Carus, the speaker of the evening, chose as her subject "The Brotherhood of Man." Clyde Bassler was the soloist. Mrs. Albert Enders is President of the Club.

This indefatigable group of women has established an enviable four-year record of service in the work of the school. Affiliated with the 9th District Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, they are embellishing the fame of Henry George through their recipes contributed to the Federation's *Victory Cook Book*.

Plans are under way for the annual Smorgasbord dinner to be held at the School headquarters in June.

Faculty Meeting

NEW YORK—"The Beveridge Plan" was the topic of discussion at the April 29th meeting of the faculty of the Henry George School. Frieda Wehnes and George Bringmann were leading speakers and Josephine Billington presided. All three are advanced students in the C. O. Steele Public Speaking Course.

It's Very Nice Work If You Can Get It

NEW YORK—Lancaster M. Greene is conducting a class in International Trade at the Girls Service Club, Gramercy Park. The attending group is made up of nurses, recreation directors, designers, dietitians and portrait painters.

Commencement Dinner a Success

NEWARK—Both in the number of persons attending—considering traveling difficulties these days—and in the enthusiasm displayed, the spring term graduation dinner of the New Jersey Henry George School, held at the Simon Davis Restaurant, on the evening of May 7, was one of the most successful affairs of its kind yet staged by the live-wire organization of Jersey Georgists. Robert Tideman was chairman of the evening; principal speakers were George Rusby, Trustee of the Jersey school and co-author of "Economics Simplified," and Margaret E. Bateman, Director of the Henry George School in New York. Several student speakers gave brief talks.

The dinner committee was headed by Mrs. Hugh Duncan of Hackensack, assisted by Mrs. C. R. Clark of Montclair and Mrs. Virginia Harvery of Arlington.

The ladies of the committee should take a bow; they very definitely earned it.

Something New Has Been Added

CHICAGO—The annual banquet of the Henry George School of Social Science on April 26 was a welcoming party, though not all the 300 guests knew it, for the new registrar of the Chicago Extension. Arriving from New York on Sunday, April 25. Mrs. A. C. Matteson, Jr., got in in ample time to hear Mr. Neilson and Dr. Hutchins the next evening and to put in a week as a volunteer at headquarters, 111 West Jackson Boulevard, before taking up her duties officially on May 3.

Mrs. Matteson—or, Jessie, as her friends in New York and New Jersey know her—and her husband, Pvt. Matteson at Ft. Bragg, N.C., took the course in *Progress and Poverty* at the City Club in New York in 1937 under William Quasha. Jessie and Archie went on with *Protection or Free Trade* under Raymond V. McNally at the 79th street headquarters, following with *Science of Political Economy* and the teachers training course under Frank Chodorov.

Mrs. Matteson served as a volunteer at the new headquarters of the School on 29th street from 1938 to 1941, and as registrar of the School from March, 1941 to April, 1942. She was an active volunteer secretary and instructor in the New Jersey extension from 1940, when she and Mr. Matteson made their home in Westwood, until Archie went into the army last January. Both were associate editors of THE FREEMAN from August, 1939, through December, 1940.

Mrs. Matteson's letters-to-the-editor in the metropolitan papers have attracted wide attention and will be represented in *We, the People, the Yearbook of Public Opinion*, soon to be published.

As registrar of the Chicago extension, Mrs. Matteson takes the place of Mrs. Laura B. Whipple who resigned to take a place in private industry.

Speakers Bureau Reports

NEW YORK—Miss Dorothy Sara, Secretary of the Speakers Bureau, reports the following talks given in recent months:

March 25—A. P. Christianson at the Readers Association of N. Y. Public Library, Bronx, N. Y., on "Problem of Peace."

April 3—M. B. Thomson at Blake's Little Studio Group, New York City, on "Problem of Peace."

April 5—Dorothy Sara on Radio Station WBNX, New York, on "Functions of the Henry George School of Social Science."

April 12—C. O. Steele, Editor of THE FREEMAN, on Radio Station WBNX, New York, on "Progress and Poverty."

April 27—Philip Kodner at New York Society of Accountants, New York, on "International Trade Relations."

May 12—A. P. Christianson at Young Men's Hebrew Association, Brooklyn, on "Youth's Hope."

Journalist Speaks

MONTREAL—Jean Charles Harvey, editor of Le Jour, was the principal speaker at the monthly dinner, May 21, of the students and graduates of the Montreal Extension of the Henry George School of Social Science. Miss Margaret E. Bateman of New York addressed the April 30 meeting, which was called to consider changes in planning made necessary by the passing of the late John Anderson.

Soldiers Get Rich

NEW YORK—Wishing to focus the attention of the bull sessions of his company on fundamental economics, Pvt. James P. Rich, Panama Canal Zone, recently wrote school headquarters for a Teacher's Manual. In addition to the cost of the manual, Pvt. Rich laid out $1.08 in postage. Such evidence of zeal, to say nothing of Mr. Rich's ability as a talker and writer—*The Reader's Digest* has published his material—indicates that the Panama doughboys are going to receive a large and efficiently-administered dose of economic enlightenment at no distant date.

Mr. Snyder on the Job

HUDSON, N. Y.—Willis A. Snyder, veteran Georgist of this city, though compelled to discontinue his classes in Fundamental Economics during the past winter because of the oil and gas situation, plans to resume his teaching activities following the customary summer vacation. In the meantime Mr. Snyder is carrying on the campaign for economic enlightenment through speeches from time to time before the Masonic Lodge, the Lion's Club and similar organizations.

Pvt. Berkowitz Reporting

NEW YORK—From a desk in a pup tent somewhere in faraway Africa comes the following from Pvt. Jay J. Berkowitz, former student at the Henry George School in New York:

"I am well and enjoying a bit of history in the making. What little I have seen of Africa proves many of the principles of Henry George. One is enriched by being able to see conditions with the discerning eye of a student of fundamental economics and knowing what lies behind many outward appearances. Restrictions prevent details but I am noting much evidence for future FREEMAN articles."

30th Term Commencement

CHICAGO, ILL.—New and old graduates of the Chicago extension celebrated the 30th commencement exercises at the Hamilton Hotel, Monday, April 5. The 213 new graduates represented the second largest graduating class in the school's history.

The Hon. Max M. Korshak, Treasurer, was the chairman of the evening. Mr. Hiram B. Loomis, President of the Board of Trustees, gave the address of welcome. Student speakers responding to the welcome were Margaret Samson, Herman F. Mann, Gertrude Walker and Ben Jackson. Henry L. T. Tideman, Dean, presented the certificates.

The principal speaker of the evening was the Hon. Francis Neilson.

Members of the Commencement Committee were Cora M. Gettys, Effie Gettys, Lucy Duncan Hall, Robert Martin, Harry W. Trout and Gertrude Walker.

Banquet Opens Tenth Year

CHICAGO, ILL.—The long-talked-of "Tenth Year of Classes in Chicago" opened officially on Monday evening, April 26, when 248 graduates and friends of the Chicago extension gathered in the Walnut Room of the Hotel Bismarck for the Annual Banquet.

The Hon. Francis Neilson, trustee of the Henry George School of Social Science, was toastmaster and the speaker of the evening was Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago.

Before presenting the guest of the evening, Mr. Neilson delighted his audience with a tribute to the Henry George School of Social Science, the "largest university in the world . . . the only university which exists today that promotes intellectual contacts in lieu of social and business acquaintanceships." His words of welcome to Dr. Hutchins mentioned the definite ideas of education which he had brought to the University of Chicago, the old-fashioned idea of making the university an institution of reflection and study rather than a "turmoil of inconsequential studies, mere routine affairs which were formerly taught in the home: the chores of the kitchen and the scullery; the fripperies of commercial and domestic life, such as cosmetology. . ."

The audience responded warmly to these welcoming words and added its own enthusiastic greeting. Dr. Hutchins spoke then on "The Outlook for Civilization,"* proving himself a man of courage and a lover of freedom. Quoting frequently from Henry George, he pleaded for the application of the principles of democracy and the recognition of the dignity of all men and the sanctity of human rights—now—as the best "post-war planning."

(* Mimeographed copies may be obtained by writing The Henry George School of Social Science, 111 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.)

Norman Markland, Teacher

MONTREAL—Following the death of John Anderson, the Henry George School of Montreal has sustained another heavy loss in the passing, in late April, of Norman Markland, for several years a teacher and active worker in the school.

Mr. Foley Explains

NEW YORK—Following are excerpts from a letter written by Henry J. Foley of Jamaica, Long Island, to the president of the University of Texas, in reply to a speech by the latter on The Importance of a Liberal Education.

"The most striking part of your speech is the statement that while less than one per cent of our youth are 'radical,' at least eighty per cent are characterized by sheer apathy and indifference toward the social and political problems that are confronting us, a large part of them going over to the point of real cynicism. You ascribe this condition to loss of faith in our leadership.

"I believe this loss of faith is only what the leadership has brought upon itself because it is largely guesswork when not pure demagoguery.

"You speak of the difference between science subjects and the liberal arts, the necessary difference of approach, and the error of placing any branch of education in the wrong class. Now, if the social sciences are to be placed in the category of the liberal arts and not among the sciences, there is no standard by which we can decide any question of government, of taxes, of the distribution of wealth or any other phase of men's dealings with one another and with their government. When vital questions are settled only by a showing of hands, by trial and error, by demands of pressure groups, it is no wonder that eighty per cent of American youth have lost faith in our leadership.

"Placing political economy in the class with literature would be a devastating error. If there are no natural laws governing the dealings of men, if given causes do not produce predictable consequences, if there are no fixed standards to guide the lawmakers, then all government must be founded upon guesswork and opinion. If there are natural laws in political economy, it would seem that the greatest service which the universities could render the nation would be a serious effort to discover these laws, and to show their application to the questions of today. No one disputes the maxim that 'the power to tax is the power to destroy,' but no effort is apparent to lessen, much less to stop, the torrent of taxes now impoverishing the citizen. Again, the sacredness of private property is preached, but the citizen is entitled only to such property as government does not decide to take from him.

"Current textbooks on political econo-

my are by no stretch of courtesy entitled to be called textbooks on economics. They are treatises on banking and manufacturing and transportation (farming is strangely omitted) with no principles upon which to construct plans for men's dealings with one another, or with their government. I have asked teachers of economics their cure for depressions; the answers were not encouraging. Henry George made an exhaustive study of the subject, and pointed out natural laws founded upon eternal attributes of human nature, laws which cannot be violated without devastating consequences. For some strange reason, the subject of these laws seems to be taboo among the colleges and universities of the land."

New View on an Old Matter

As a newcomer to the Henry George School and THE FREEMAN, it is with not a little hesitancy that I voice disagreement with the part of Mr. Post's article reprinted in your January issue which, after showing that monopoly of the earth stands morally condemned, says that Mr. Johnson's awakened conscience "looked out upon an iniquitous social institution" as "not from the machinations of bad men but from the development of a bad institution."

All social institutions are the development of man and the retention of this particularly "iniquitous institution" has been fought for by men throughout history. I don't think they may be called good men. The most that may be said for them is that they are ignorant and weak. But, under the law that protects them, ignorance is no excuse, no cognizance is taken of weakness, and under natural laws someone must pay the penalty. Thus far, it is those who suffer under it who pay the penalty.

Mr. Johnson's greatness lay in the fact that he acknowledged the iniquity and used his gains to try to abolish it, while lesser men hope to achieve and retain riches and power through this institution, and attempt to hide its fundamental injustice and immorality by confusing mankind with palliatives. If Henry George was right, then those men are the real enemies of mankind.

If Mr. Johnson, while denouncing monopoly, excused monopolists, he made what seems to me, a fundamental error which sapped strength from his cause. Who stood in a stronger position to dissuade the monopolists from their immoral course, and induce them to wipe out the institution than Mr. Johnson, after he saw the light, rather than to have devoted his efforts on those dependent upon them, unless he wanted to stir up a revolution. If Mr. Johnson couldn't convince the monopolists, let us not call them good men and excuse their iniquity.

I started this letter with great hesitance and finish, worried that Mr. Johnson's questioner at the public meeting in New York in 1891 may have become a capitalistic monopolist, or, if not, then a communist instead of a Georgist.

New York — LEON CAMINEZ

Letters to the Editor

Buckshot

Of all the men to quote, Mr. C. O. Steele chose a second Lindbergh Fresh Off The Raft! Captain Eddie Rickenbacker does not want the soldiers, these war, mass-produced, will-less and regimented men to come back to a (civil) planned economy!

According to *his speeches*, he does want them to come back to longer work weeks, no overtime and double-time pay, no closed shop, no check off, no political contributions by unions, etc. These, plus freezing of wages and no incentive for workers, are some of the things he wants them to come back to! But he protests the limiting of salaries to $25,000 a year as "killing" incentive. His privileged group bands into trusts, monopolies, associations, etc., so that millions are made easily. What chance have the workers against controlled business, press, radio, etc.?

The war produced a scarcity of laborers; true, an artificial and unnatural one, but a scarcity nevertheless. So, according to natural law and George, wages should rise high. But what does Mr. Rickenbacker and his crowd do? They wave the flag and coin a word: "pirating." Any one offering workers higher wages is guilty of "pirating." They lobby to get a law passed to prevent "pirating" and make Congress "threaten" workers with the draft if they change jobs—or if they don't take jobs at $0.58 and $0.60 an hour.

So these "privilegeers," if *I* may coin a word, smash natural law and higher wages. Workers are "frozen" to jobs, and must have Private Privilege's "release" before getting another one. Then they blow the "salary limitation" sky high! And are more firmly entrenched in power than ever, behind a bulwark of laws and servants (Congressmen and politicians and some union leaders) created by and existing for them as groups alone.

Raritan, N. J. — NORMAN GHINGER

Let's Be Consistent

I have just finished the article on patents by William G. Leon, in which he advocates curing a disease by shooting the patient. I have never been able to see the logic of Henry George or other writers who deny the right of an inventor to remuneration for his efforts, while at the same time they seek to justify copyrights.

To me the two, copyrights and patents are analogous if not identical. An author produces more than a manuscript, he produces something which can be duplicated so as to give satisfaction or benefit to others—at a price. The same is true for an inventor. An author benefits by the invention of the alphabet, the printing press, and all the ideas, written and spoken of other men, past and present, just as the inventor bases his gadget or process on the wheel, lever, inclined plane plus discoveries of physicists and chemists, past and present. Books or inventions which are of real importance are rare and originality is even more rare.

It is argued that nothing prevents the writing of two books on the same subject, but here the likeness between copyright and patent still holds true. If someone should combine bath tub gin and sawdust so as to produce rubber he could obtain a patent despite the fact that previous patents for producing rubber exist. A substitute or improvement may be patented.

The fact that monopolistic abuses have been established on the present system of patent rights does not prove that all rights of an inventor to remuneration should be abolished. If that argument holds good, we must abolish copyrights also—and the right to organize.

I still believe that man has a right to what he produces, be it books, gadgets, grain, or anything else. Any argument that any one product should be socialized applies with equal force to any other. Let's be consistent.

Springfield, Mo. — PAUL R. NOLTING

Suggestion from Mr. Bell

I have an idea which I would like to propose as a topic for discussion, particularly by any who might lay claim to being more or less informed on monetary policies as a means of price stabilization or of control of speculation.

If a man has enough behind him he can write out a note and take it to his bank and get either money or bank credit for it. If the amount is large enough it might not be convenient or possible for that particular bank to furnish either the money or credit because of reserve requirements. So it rediscounts the note at the Federal Reserve Bank who will if desired issue currency in that amount.

Now the point is this—if the note represents goods produced, in the course of production, or materials for the production of wealth the issue of currency is economically sound. But where that note represents in whole or in part land value (not wealth and hence not produced) can subsequent issue of currency be unsound and inflationary?

Ramsey, N. J. — EDWARD W. BELL