

HENRY GEORGE NEWS

VOL. 15—No. 2

DECEMBER, 1951

10¢ A COPY—\$1.00 A YEAR

The Dog in the Manger By WINSTON CHURCHILL

IT IS quite true that land monopoly is not the only monopoly which exists, but it is by far the greatest of monopolies—it is a perpetual monopoly; and it is the mother of all other forms of monopoly. It is quite true that unearned increments in land are not the only form of unearned or undeserved profit which individuals are able to secure; but it is the principal form of unearned increment which is derived from processes which are not merely not beneficial, but which are positively detrimental to the general public.

If a rise in stocks and shares confers profits on the fortunate holders far beyond what they expected or indeed deserved, nevertheless that profit has not been reaped by withholding from the community the land which it needs, but, on the contrary, apart from mere gambling, it has been reaped by supplying industry with the capital without which it could not be carried on.

If a doctor or a lawyer enjoys a better practice, it is because the doctor attends more patients and more exacting patients, and because the lawyer pleads more suits in the courts and more important suits. At every stage the doctor or the lawyer is giving service in return for his fees, and if the service is too poor or the fees too high other doctors and other lawyers can come freely into competition. There is constant service, there is constant competition; there is no monopoly, there is no injury to the public interest, there is no impediment to the general progress.

Fancy comparing these healthy processes with the enrichment which comes to the landlord who happens to own a plot of land on the outskirts or at the center of one of our great cities, who watches the busy population around him making the city larger, richer, more convenient, more famous every day, and all the while sits still and does nothing.

Roads are made, streets are made, railway services are improved, electric light turns night into day, electric trams glide swiftly to and fro, water is brought from reservoirs a hundred miles off in the mountains—and all the while the landlord sits still. Every one of those improvements is effected by the labor and cost of other people. Many of the most important are effected at the cost of the municipality and of the ratepayers. To not one of those improvements does the land monopolist, as a land monopolist, contribute, and yet by every one of them the value of his land is sensibly enhanced.

If the land were occupied by shops or by dwellings, the municipality at least would secure the rates upon them in aid of the general fund; but the land may be unoccupied, undeveloped, it may be what is called "ripening"—ripening at the expense of the whole city, of the whole country for the unearned increment of its owner. Roads perhaps have to be diverted to avoid this forbidden area. The merchant going to his office, the artisan going to his work, have to make a detour or pay a tram fare to avoid it.

The citizens are losing their chance of developing the land, the city is losing its rates, the



The Hon. Winston S. Churchill
Prime Minister of Great Britain.

State is losing its taxes which would have accrued if the natural development had taken place; and that share has to be replaced at the expense of the other ratepayers and taxpayers; and the nation as a whole is losing in the competition of the world—both in time and money.

See how this evil process strikes at every form of industrial activity. The municipality, wishing for broader streets, better houses, more healthy, decent, scientifically planned towns, is made to pay, and is made to pay in exact proportion, or to a very great extent in proportion, as it has exerted itself in the past to make improvements. The more it has improved the town, the more it has increased the land value, and the

These remarks are taken from an address in King's Theatre, Edinburgh, July 17, 1909, when Churchill was a Member of Parliament. An equally stirring speech was made by him two months earlier in the House of Commons. On July 30, 1909, David Lloyd George, a Liberal, then Prime Minister, startled England with the now famous budget appeal calling for taxation of land.

"Land reform," George R. Geiger stated in *The Philosophy of Henry George*, was "an integral part of English liberal thought throughout the nineteenth century," and it was introduced "for social, and not for fiscal reasons."

But in 1928, wrote Professor Geiger, the Conservative budget of Winston Churchill "turned its back upon the whole theory of land value taxation and free trade; and ultimately precipitated the fall of the Government."

In 1929 Philip Snowden, a Labor candidate, reopened this controversial subject, and two years later he introduced a budget, simpler than the earlier Lloyd George version, with provisions for taxing unimproved land. This reform, said Chancellor Snowden, had long been advocated "not only by the Labor and Liberal parties, but also by a large number of Conservatives."

American readers will undoubtedly be surprised to know that references to Henry George were so frequent in the House of Commons in the thirties, that speakers were sometimes chided for failure to comprehend or state his propositions accurately.

Land reform, now a world problem, is perhaps still the only one on which three parties could agree. Will the Prime Minister remember 1909 when he called land monopoly a "dog-in-the-manger game"?

more it will have to pay for any land it may wish to acquire.

The manufacturer proposing to start a new industry, proposing to erect a great factory offering employment to thousands of hands, is made to pay such a price for his land that the purchase price hangs round the neck of his whole business, hampering his competitive power in every market, clogging him far more than any foreign tariff for his export competition, and the land values strike down through the profits of the manufacturer on to the wages of the workman.

The railway company wishing to build a new line finds that the price of land which yesterday was only rated at its agricultural value has risen to a prohibitive figure the moment it was known that the new line was projected, and either the railway is not built, or, if it is, is built only on terms which largely transfer to the landowner the profits which are due to the shareholders and the advantages which should have accrued to the traveling public.

It does not matter where you look or what examples you select, you will see that every form of enterprise, every step in material progress, is only undertaken after the land monopolist has skimmed the cream off for himself, and everywhere today the man or the public body that wishes to put land to its highest use is forced to pay a preliminary fine in land values to the man who is putting it to an inferior use, and in some cases to no use at all. All comes back to the land value, and its owner for the time being is able to levy his toll upon all other forms of wealth.

I hope you will understand that, when I speak of the land monopolist, I am dealing more with the process than with the individual landowner. I have no wish to hold any class up to public disapprobation. I do not think that the man who makes money by unearned increment in land is morally a worse man than anyone else who gathers his profit where he finds it in this hard world under the law and according to common usage. It is not the individual I attack, it is the system. It is not the man who is bad, it is the law which is bad. It is not the man who is blameworthy for doing what the law allows and what other men do; it is the State which would be blameworthy were it not to endeavor to reform the law and correct the practice. We do not want to punish the landlord. We want to alter the law.

Sixty years ago our system of national taxation was effectively reformed, and immense and undisputed advantages accrued therefrom to all classes, the richest as well as the poorest. The system of local taxation today is just as vicious and wasteful, just as great an impediment to enterprise and progress, just as harsh a burden upon the poor, as the thousand taxes and Corn Law sliding scales of the "hungry forties."

We are met in an hour of tremendous opportunity. "You who shall liberate the land," said Mr. Cobden, "will do more for your country than we have done in the liberation of its commerce."

A Word With You

By ROBERT CLANCY

In Mark Twain's *A Connecticut Yankee*, there is an instructive chapter on "Sixth-Century Political Economy." Sir Boss, in discussing with the folks of Abblasoure, finds that monetary wages there are higher than in Camelot, but prices in Camelot are less than half of what they are in Abblasoure. In vain Sir Boss tries to argue that the people of Camelot are better off. Finally he sadly concludes, "What those people valued was *high wages*; it didn't seem to be a matter of any consequence to them whether the high wages would buy anything or not."

How does twentieth-century political economy stack up on this question? Not too much better. *High wages* are pointed to with pride. 'Tis a pity that prices are so very high—somebody ought to do something about that—but it's so nice to have all those dollars on payday at least.

Right now, we are told that the average wage in the United States is the highest in history—\$48 a week. Of course, total taxes take at least 25 per cent of the average person's income (a conservative estimate), but you have to have taxes, don't you? So that's \$12 off, leaving a wage of \$36.

If we want to be fundamental about it we can further look into the division of the produce between rent and wages. Before the wage is paid, rent has taken its share—and also after. The average person is said to pay one-fourth of his income for shelter (\$48 a month). If half of this is land rent (also a conservative estimate), then it's \$24 a month, or \$6 a week, leaving a net wage of \$30.

The "fifty-cent dollar" is a commonplace today. Latest estimates are that it's skidding down to one-third of its 1939 value (that dear standard year, 1939!). But we're being conservative—so let's say that today's net wage, then, adds up to fifteen 1939 dollars for Mr. and Mrs. Average to splurge on any blessed thing they want.

And don't go complaining. We're at the highest peak of prosperity and progress in all history. We have television, haven't we?

When Mark Twain wrote his book, the nineteenth century probably looked pretty good to him compared to the sixth century. Yet in those halcyon days, Henry George asked, why must there be a constant tendency for wages to be forced downward in spite of increase in productive power? Is it very different in our twentieth century?

Gems for Georgists

By NOAH D. ALPER

George and Marx—Poles Apart

"Marx and Henry George are the opposite poles of their era." This statement occurred in a review of *Henry George, Citizen of the World* in The London Times of June 29, 1951. A copy of this review entitled "Back to the Land" was handed to members of the "Invitation To Learning" panel in New York at the Columbia Broadcasting Company.

Second Thoughts

David V. Felts wrote in the East St. Louis Journal on October 11, 1951: "The most recent 'Invitation to Learning' radio program was a panel discussion of *Progress and Poverty* by Henry George, a welcome review for those who read the classic years ago as assigned reading."

"Really," he continued, "it's too bad that so many classics, in fiction as well as in history, economics and philosophy, are wasted on the young."

Horatio Alger and Henry George

"Today every freshman is required to take the new course in the main moral and intellectual currents of U. S. thought, reading such odd combinations as a novel of Horatio Alger and Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* in the same week. Says White: 'We're trying to turn out the kind of citizens who can read between the lines and listen between words.'—From a Time Magazine article, "For Happier Housewives," about President Lynn White, Jr., of Mills College, October 8, 1951.

Cows, Pigs and Government Red Tape

Ag A. P. item from Tallahassee, Florida, October 8, said Florida "is threatened with loss of federal funds because a new state law would let a welfare client have a garden, one cow, one pig and 10 chickens . . . Washington is waiting for Florida to furnish figures to prove that such back yard farming doesn't give a welfare recipient a net profit."

Millions upon millions of points where government friction occurs and thousands of off-shoots at each point indicate the waste of "mental power" due to a powerful, controlling government.

Ghost Town Haunts Chicago City Officials

"There is a city within the City of Chicago. Most cities have one; but in size and tax expense Chicago's Ghost Town surpasses all others."

"Ghost Town is an appropriate name for this area which has no people, homes, stores, factories, buildings or any of the characteristics—except one—which economically classifies and differentiates a city from a desert."

The ghost town referred to is the vacant land serviced by the City of Chicago. The story is told in an article (South End Gazette, October 20, 1951) by Wilbur Johnson, Chicago extension graduate. Mr. Johnson completes his article with the following:

"We would immediately recognize the absurdity of assuming the tax burden for providing city services for an area forty-six square miles out in the center of a desert. Why can't we recognize the absurdity when it appears at the end of our nose? Our present tax system penalizes the vertical expansion of a city but it is the horizontal expansion which is the cause of tax expense."

Tax Pinnacle?

"Let us survey a few facts," states a Globe Democrat editorial of October 11, 1951. "The new federal tax rise means, according to a research study of the U.S. News and World Report, that \$84,000,000,000 a year will go to tax collectors, federal, state and local. It will be higher in 1952. It means that approximately \$1 out of every \$3 of American income goes to taxes."

Some experts have placed the peril point at 25 per cent of national income. America's tax bill now will be approximately 30 per cent of income."

Are we near a point of diminishing returns?

Must People Fight for Resources?

A Paris news item (CIPS) October 22, 1951, states: "A government bulletin announced today a 20 per cent increase in the cost of gasoline to 82 cents a gallon. It blamed the rise on national defense needs."

"The state takes 67 cents from every gallon of gas sold. It will allot about 30 cents to the arms effort."

The people of France can buy gasoline in world markets at a few cents a gallon. The cost of transport to France is but a few cents—but the end price to consumers is astronomical. Suppose people everywhere could buy gasoline at its untaxed (in the fullest sense) natural market price. Could they be sold on the idea that war was necessary to secure access to natural resources? Wrong taxes breed crises. Crises breed a need for extreme taxes to finance war. High prices tend to sell people on the necessity to fight other people for access to resources. So it goes!

Econo-quiz

By HENRY L. T. TIDEMAN

Question. In the July issue of The Henry George News we were told that the land holders collect the surplus wealth. Are we developing a theory of surplus value? If so, define surplus value.

Answer. Value is something that exists only in the heads of the valuers. It is never in the thing valued. It is opinion. In the market it is mutual opinion. When the opinion is not mutual the possessor finds himself "stuck" with the thing he overvalues. In political economy it is not possible to form a theory of surplus value. That would be something in the nature of, and as difficult as, a theory of surplus opinion.

The real thing, wealth, is quite different. All wealth is the result of union labor and land. Both these are of varying qualities. Some skilled labor is very productive, and skills range from the most able down to those required for work on which we can all freely engage. In so far as products arise solely from the applied skill of the laborers, all such products are wages. They can be nothing else.

Where the land to which the labor is applied is of superior yielding potential, this superior quality of the lands adds a surplus to the wages produced, which, aside from the labor performed, would not exist except for the superiority of the land.

Wherever a system of land tenure exists, the competition of producers for the superior lands makes them offer an increasing share of this surplus product until, for practical consideration, they offer it all.

Except in instances when rent is paid in kind, it is true that landlords collect rent in terms of value; that is, money. What is money? It is the command of wealth in the market.

The only function of the landlords is to collect the surplus as it appears in rent and to turn it over to the nearest public treasury, being allowed a commission for so doing. Landlords have no ownership of land. They have only tenure granted by society.

If we will frame our institutions on the principle implied in the paragraph above, it will not be long until the taxes which penalize production will be abolished.

It is easier to believe a lie that one has heard a thousand times than to believe a fact that one has never heard before.

—ROBERT LYND

Radio Moscow

By MARSHALL CRANE

WHAT a magic carpet the short wave radio is! A twist of the thumb evokes its genie, and one is transported at will to the ends of the earth, where men of all shades of opinion and pigmentation ask only the privilege of entertaining him.

Sooner or later every dial spinning explorer lands at "Radio Moscow." The broadcasts from the Kremlin come in strong and clear, and their music is often excellent. Some Russians speak this universal language very well indeed. However, the "commercials" which accompany every Moscow program may confuse the American listener a little until he has become accustomed to them.

The obliging Muscovite presents his sales line in English, and he has a comfortable, low-brow American accent. The trouble is not with the words he uses, which are simple enough for anybody, but with his ideas, which frequently make one wonder if he has heard correctly. The commodity for sale is always the same—communism—and by American standards the sales technique is pretty poor. I heard a salesman say scornfully of it, "With a line like that you couldn't sell even a first rate product, let alone communism. Stalin must be slipping."

A friend who dropped in when I was playing another program was very much amused by it.

"Say, that's rich," he said, laughing. "I'll bet that burns 'em up over in Moscow."

"Why so?" I asked. "That was Moscow speaking."

"You mean—you mean that baloney was the real thing, their regular broadcast? Good night! I thought it was a parody."

Perhaps when one has listened to ten minutes of rather unimaginative, but sufficiently violent raving against American imperialism and militarism, Wall Street, capitalist plots and other assorted demons, it is a little hard for him to believe that anything so absurd could ever be dangerous. Its thick coating of childishly obvious falsehood and distortion of fact seem to sterilize it adequately. One may recall Milton's words:

"Who ever knew, truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? Her confuting is the best and surest suppressing."

The Moscow boys seem to have cut their throats with their own dagger.

But after a little reflection one may not be so sure. The disturbing thought presents itself that truth—the whole truth—may be a dangerous weapon to him who wields it unless his own hands are very clean. Apparently Radio Moscow condemns itself out of its own mouth. But in exactly the same manner any and every sort of injustice which we tolerate in our social order condemns us as well when we cast the light of truth upon it.

Then too, it is an undeniable fact that clear, cold logic is not always the most effective instrument with which to influence men's opinions. Even basic ideological points may appear irrelevant to one who has not had personal experience of what they can mean in his life. His rights to freedom of speech and of the press, his right to assemble with others may seem to be just empty phrases to the poor devil who is caught up fast in the net of financial necessity.

In fact, unless the American Way of Life offers him more than just the "right" to continue treading the mill of penury, more than

PLAIN TALK by Jerome Joachim

If Americans continue to submit to the theory that the government should have the right to appropriate as much of their earnings as it desires, it is inevitable that soon the majority will be able to retain so little of what they earn that they will be forced to seek the bare essentials needed for their existence from the government.

As government burdens crush the people to lower and lower levels, the need for assistance will rapidly increase. Not only will it be necessary to have socialized medicine, government housing, etc., but public feeding projects and federal relief for millions will be required to prevent actual starvation.

Unthinking Americans accepted the graduated income tax as a reasonable and just taxation measure, because at first it was reasonably applied and had little or no effect on incentives. It was accepted as correct in principle—despite the fact that it was always a fine levied against those who best served their fellow men and was sort of a bonus offered to those who failed to create useful and needed services.

Two world wars have served to demonstrate that unlimited taxation is within the power of government. Since World War II this realization has enabled government to employ millions of people and pay them from constantly increasing income tax revenues, the government's most substantial source of income.

In 1913, when the graduated income tax was first approved, a surtax of 6 per cent was levied on incomes in excess of \$500,000. By 1944 this had increased to 91 per cent of incomes in excess of \$200,000. Under the new tax now proposed, incomes in excess of \$80,000 would be subject to a tax of 94.5 per cent.

This proposal to take 94.5 per cent is not made because it will provide revenue which the government needs. This portion of the bill will produce only about \$73-\$85 million. But if it is established that the government has the right to take 94.5 per cent of one man's income, only a short step remains in convincing the public that the government should have the same right to take up to a similar amount of any man's income.

It was not difficult to lull unthinking people into believing that it was just to confiscate wealth from those who were more productive



than the average. Consequently our leaders met little opposition from the masses when they approved tax measures which tended to equalize income. While the majority was under the impression that only the rich paid the income taxes, no tax measure was ever opposed. Now suddenly the people discover that those making \$5,000 or less a year

are paying more than 70 per cent of the taxes and we have already reached the point where from 85 per cent to 95 per cent of all future tax increases must and will come from the low income groups. Thus have Marxism and communistic measures—such as the graduated income tax—brought us to the brink of totalitarianism in a few short years.

In the Communist Manifesto, published in 1868 one of the first steps recommended to destroy capitalism was the enactment of the graduated income tax. In 1913, this country took its first fatal step toward communism by a simple constitutional amendment which read:

"The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever sources derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or remuneration."

At the time, a tax of 2 per cent on income over \$5,000 and a tax of 6 per cent on incomes over \$50,000 was proposed. On the basis of this mild levy, few opposed the bill because few realized the extent to which this measure would be used to create a socialistic state.

In just a few short years, we are experiencing the deadly effect of this proposal and are fighting for our very existence against its insidious effects. Up to recently the incentive killing effects of the law have been only mildly apparent. Now even the least important workman remarks frequently, "Why work so hard and give it all to the government?"

But the real effects have only begun to manifest themselves in America, England, which is some years ahead of us, is already experiencing that ultimate weakness and despair which results from a system which penalizes men for being effective.

Capitalism and the graduated income tax are incompatible and cannot exist together. If it is retained a communistic and totalitarian economy for America is inevitable.

the title to token freedoms which apparently exist only in the pages of school books, we should not be surprised if the man at the bottom of the ladder finds a grain of sense here and there in even the most absurd Communist siren song.

For the name of the only really dangerous Communist agent in this country, the public enemy whom we must arrest first of all is—Poverty. When we have placed him behind bars, when we can guarantee the common man free and equal access to the land on which he lives, and a real opportunity to protect himself from want, we can throw open our gates to the Red propagandists and broadcast Radio Moscow as a comedy program.

Journal Anniversary

By LANCASTER M. GREENE

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation honored Will Lissner at a reception marking the tenth anniversary of his founding of the American Journal of Economics and Sociology, a scientific quarterly magazine, on Sunday, October 28.

Tributes were paid to the editor for the success which the periodical has achieved in academic circles by the Foundation president, Lawson Purdy, and by two of the directors, Otto K. Dorn and Roy Foulke.

Miss V. G. Peterson, executive secretary of the Foundation, and Mr. Lissner's associate on the journal, shared honors with him.

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS. *A report to President Truman by The International Development Advisory Board (Nelson A. Rockefeller, chairman), Simon & Schuster, 1951, 120 pp. paper, \$1.00.*

Reviewed by Bennett Challis

The authors of this treatise present a laudable, plausible and detailed plan for all "free nations" to improve economic and social conditions in the world's underdeveloped areas on a mutually cooperative basis. The alarming dependence of the United States and Western Europe upon the raw materials of underdeveloped areas is particularly stressed. It is reported that the U.S. with 6 per cent of the world's population and 7 per cent of its area, produces about half of the world's industrial output, but has to import virtually all rubber, manganese, chromium and tin, plus a large percentage of the zinc, copper, lead and aluminum—mostly from underdeveloped areas. In 1949, 57,000,000 tons of supplies passed through the Suez Canal to and from the North Atlantic Treaty countries. The loss of Middle Eastern oil would leave Western Europe with only 25 per cent of her regular supply—a serious blow to defense-potentialities of the above mentioned. The United States produces less than 4 per cent of the manganese requisite to her steel manufacture; so far she has depended almost entirely upon Russia for manganese and chromium; recently limitations of such shipments have served as a warning. Manganese and tungsten could be obtained from Latin America, Africa or Asia, and chromium from Turkey and the Philippines, but the deposits are still undeveloped, and at least two or three years would be required to make supply meet demand.

The dependence of the underdeveloped areas upon us is equally impressive. Few are self-sufficient even in food. All need machinery, spare parts and other equipment to prevent economic collapse. 31 per cent of their imports come from the United States, 40 per cent from Europe. As part of the relief project much attention is given to the urgent need of new land-developments. A 2000-mile strip of fertile valleys and plateaus east of the Andes in South America is pointed out, e.g., as a potential major source of food for the whole continent, and of homes for settlers from over-crowded Europe. The reclamation of the Tigris-Euphrates Valley in the Middle East is likewise recommended, several million acres of exceptionally fertile land when irrigated, would be sufficient to absorb the 750,000 Arab refugees from Palestine. No mention is made, however, of the system of land tenure to be introduced in these territories. This would seem to be a serious oversight. From Adam Smith down to the present day scores of accredited economists have advocated the collection of ground rent for adequate public revenue, with all other taxes abolished. It is also now in operation in many places on every continent with great success according to the extent of its application. In already established communities its adoption must necessarily be gradual. In the above-mentioned projects on practically virgin soil, however, an opportunity would be given to put it in operation from the very start.

The International Advisory Board has demonstrated that we of the most highly developed areas can only benefit by recognizing our dependence upon the underdeveloped and theirs upon us, and by launching a policy of free, reciprocal exchange. What is that but unconditional free trade?

JOHN STUART MILL AND HARRIET TAYLOR. By F. A. Hayek. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951. \$4.50.

Reviewed by Phillip Grant

This book is all that the author intended. That is, it "is no more than an attempt (to provide) material for a future biography . . ."

The volume provides such background material in the form of letters exchanged between English philosopher John Stuart Mill and Mrs. Taylor, the wife of a most understanding drug wholesaler who considerably absented himself from him home a few days each week in order to allow Harriet and John Stuart Mill to see each other regularly and privately. Finally, as a last gesture of thoughtfulness, he died so that his wife might marry John Stuart mill, the man she had always wanted. John Taylor is rarely referred to in this book, but he is by far the most interesting character we meet within the volume's 279 pages of letters and comment.

John Stuart Mill was considered the greatest mind of his day. Harriet Taylor was a woman of amazing intellect whose ideas were far in advance of her time. One might expect, then, that correspondence between the two would sparkle with wit and profound observation. But not so! From a literary standpoint, the letters exchanged by these two intellectual and consequently dull lovers aren't good at all. Beyond doubt, the best letter in the collection is one written to John Stuart Mill by his sister, Mary. The letter, intended to reprimand John, is rich with biting phrases that must have gnawed deeply into his conscience.

To the disciples of Henry George, John Stuart Mill is best known as a political-economist whose definitions weren't sufficiently consistent. To logicians and semanticists, he is known as the man who made the terribly illogical slip: "I apprehend, the sole evidence it is possible to produce that anything is desirable is that people do actually desire it." To Harriet Taylor, it would seem from the letters she exchanged with him, Mill was an intellectual parasite to whom she willfully offered herself as host. He confessed on numerous occasions that it was Harriet who fed him the brilliant ideas which he put into writing under his own name. She preferred to remain a silent influence and refused all credit for John's brilliance. This arrangement was necessary in those days—early nineteenth century—since the opinions of females on serious subjects were generally considered unworthy of sober consideration. So, in order to bring her socialistic economic and political ideas before the world, Harriet employed an evidently embroidered version of the way of a maid with a man—that is, she first thoroughly indoctrinated Mill with her ideas, and then inspired or, what is the same thing, nagged him into writing "his" ideas for the more respectable publications of that day.

To this reviewer, the book is interesting only when the contents are considered in conjunction with what we already know of Mill's background. First, he was the son of James Mill who seems to have had the greater mind of the two. Father James, trained for the ministry which he soon deserted, to become first a journalist, then a historian, and finally, as a close associate of Bentham and Ricardo, a highly respected philosopher—devoted himself to the task of fashioning son John Stuart into an intellectual giant. To make sure that his son would be properly educated he did the job himself, stuffing John's head with all sorts of knowledge. At three, son

John began to study Greek. He never wasted time in play, alone or with other children. When he was fourteen he went to France to learn the language and to attend scientific lectures. He became a published author at a very early age and before he was very far into his twenties was considered one of the foremost thinkers of his time. Son John, like his father, was a champion of Bentham's Utilitarianism. Father James must have died happily with the belief that he had fashioned his son more perfectly than God ordinarily fashions mortals. Unfortunately, James trained his son's mind but seems to have neglected to tell him about the birds and the bees. For, when John was twenty-four he appears to have been unaccountably stricken by the charms of a twenty-three-year-old not-at-all-pretty, married woman who was, when he first met her, the mother of two children and was carrying a third. It would seem that as soon as Harriet snared him with the old delicate-flower routine, John became a changed genius. He almost immediately renounced his belief in Utilitarianism, and replaced it with the peculiar, though acknowledged brilliant, philosophy of a frustrated, consumptive socialistic suffragette. All the meticulous training of father James was dissolved in almost no time at all by Mrs. Taylor's personality and mind.

John, always friendless, devoid of personal or physical charm, untalented in the social arts, holding down a dull job with the East India Company, under Harriet's influence, shook off his only remaining ties with society. For no sensible reason, he seems then to have deliberately picked a quarrel with his widowed mother, sisters and brother, in order to divorce himself from them. In his letters, we find no references to other scholars of his day that are not saturated with rancor. In short, he locked himself and his precious mind up in a world composed only of ideas and two people: Harriet and himself. It would be interesting to know what James Mill would have thought if he had lived to read the letters exchanged between John Stuart Mill and Mrs. Taylor—to see how little he had influenced his son, how little he had given John in giving him nothing more than the greatest mind of that era.

The Rose Knows

THE HERALD TRIBUNE of November 9 carried on the same page with its review of the giant spectacle "Quo Vadis," a report of something else which is too usual to be spectacular but which is not devoid of a moral. (Don't the members of hard-ridden tax committees in their ulcer-producing search for new forms of taxes ever read the papers?)

Billy Rose bought a 130-acre estate adjoining his 60-acre "Roseholm" near Mr. Kisco, New York, in 1946, to keep it from being used as a real estate development. The grounds require the service of forty gardeners and the forty-room house requires an additional staff of twenty servants. He has tried to sell it several times and now has a prospective client, but a zoning variance must be granted to make the sale possible. Mr. Rose's attorney has made an application to the Board of Appeals for a public hearing on this zoning variance.

"Mr. Rose," states the newspaper report, "has notified the board that if the variance is disapproved he would tear down the mansion to save taxes."

"Go Home and Read This"

MR. BOWEN of Glenview, Illinois, recently won an award in the 75th anniversary contest conducted by the American Library Association. Monsignor Ligutti, who called attention to several Georgist items which we would otherwise have missed, sent a copy of the essay.

Mr. Bowen began with a word about the "Power of Books to influence the lives of men and women" and pointed out that there was no way to "get factual information for college debates" in his small town until he began to use the libraries. While gathering data in the John Crerar Research Library in Chicago, he wrote, a suggestion by one of the librarians resulted in the beginning of his real thinking about economic problems. The librarian asked if he had talked with Louis Post about the subject of the debate, and though he had never heard of Mr. Post he called on him at once.

"I found that his own views were favorable to the other side of the debate," wrote Mr. Bowen. "However, he helped me by suggesting arguments for my side, while expressing his own viewpoint, which, for the first time, awakened me to the realization that the real purpose of debating or of any other method of study ought to be to learn the facts about all sides and then weigh them to find the real truth.

"As I rose to leave, after expressing my appreciation, Mr. Post bade me goodbye with this word of advice which has been all important to me ever since: 'Young man, you will probably win your debate. You seem to have your material well in hand and your judges will be favorable.' Then, pausing for emphasis, he added, 'But don't let that set your slant in life! Go home and read this!' With that he handed me a copy of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* which I later read along with other books and, as a result, began to think my way through to the true solutions of our economic problems."

John C. Lincoln Says—

TAXES are going up—which will be news to practically no one at all. How far up? Who knows—to seventy billion, eighty billion, ninety? In 1939 federal taxes amounted to around \$3,700,000,000—and the year 1939, if you remember, was not exactly conspicuous for economy in government. We have come quite a distance since that not-distant date, quite a distance, indeed.

Are such crushing imposts necessary? For a certainty they are not. That statement would be true even if government affairs were managed with maximum efficiency and economy, with no single penny wasted and every disbursement a necessary one. No one in his right senses, of course, believes that such has ever been the case for one minute in all government history.

No such enormous tax bill is necessary for the simple reason that billions upon billions of new government revenue could be had by the public appropriation of the annual rental value of land. Were those billions taken for the public expense, then taxes now falling on the products of capital and labor could be scaled down by the same number of billions. And no man would be wronged. All that is necessary is that the community-created value of ground rent be taken by the community for the common expenses of the community.

By no widest stretch of the imagination can ground rent be called the product of individual effort. It cannot, then, belong of a right to individuals. What a man makes or earns belongs to him. So, too, does what somebody gives him, or what he acquires in fair trade. But he has no right to ground rent because ground rent is a value for which he is no more responsible than is any other member of the community.

Ground rent is payment for privilege. It is what individuals are willing to give for exclusive and continuous possession of sites to which special advantage has been given by government and society—government by its public services, society by its presence and activity. Now it must be evident, unless you believe the Creator plays favorites, that each member of the community has as good a claim to those superior sites as has any other member of the community. Not, to be sure, because any individual made the land constituting such sites but because the advantages pertaining to them is due to the presence and activity of all the members.

But under our present hocus-pocus system of land tenure and taxation those others who have surrendered their equal claims to the superior sites don't get the compensation. They still have to pay for government services in taxes on the products of their labor and capital. And, as is plain to be seen, when some people are not getting something to which they are entitled, it is a certainty that others are getting something to which they are not entitled.

—From the Nov. Lincoln Letter

The Rocky Road

By STANLEY SINCLAIR

ONCE AGAIN it is time to make our entry in what has been dubbed the "annual crystal ball derby."

From the strongly barred window of this ivory tower, 1952 looks like it might well be a rough year. No one is likely to be allowed to forget it is an election year. There will be the quadrennial political awakening of the American public when those who are "just wild about Harry" will quarrel with the mob for Bob, and there's always the possibility they'll all wind up liking Ike.

That this political fever will have an effect on the economy, there can be little doubt. For this reason, if for none other, prognostication now is heavily prone to error.

Retail trades are plodding along at a pace called "dull" by most businessmen. The significant point to remember, however, is that inventories are being reduced. Nevertheless, credit restrictions, the additional bite taken in everyone's pocketbook last month and the failure of the military to eat up as much production as had been forecast have served to forestall the promised inflationary pressures.

And yet, despite "dull" business, slackened residential construction and softness of sensitive commodity prices, we are not heading downhill. It would seem to be an error to interpret the continuing lull as assurance that the inflationary pressures are just Washingtonian bad dreams.

At year's end, annual defense expenditures will probably have reached roughly \$40 billion. If this rate climbs to \$65 billion next year as expected, there will be an additional demand of about \$25 billion in the market from this source. Furthermore, pay rises are expected to wipe out the reduction in personal spending power of the recent tax boost. Military needs for scarce materials may take some civilian goods out of production. With the chewing up of present inventories, this can lead to some shortages. Congress failed to meet the President's request for more taxes by some \$5 billion. There remains the possibility that this additional money will be met by deficit financing. These are the potential spurs to inflation.

Contrariwise, expanded military spending may be keeping pace with rather than running ahead of an expanded overall production machine. Increased payrolls will be offset by slightly higher prices in some fields and perhaps higher taxes (although the latter is unlikely in an election year). Also, there are many who should know of the opinion that military requirements have been exaggerated and shortages are a long way off. Continued credit restrictions might combat added deficit financing.

In short, the forces pulling upwards may balance those pulling down. No one would expect equatorial calm with the forces ideally balancing each other, but the arguments on one side would seem to cancel out those in opposition.

At this point, therefore, it would seem that the next several months will bump along the same rocky path we've been following. As the news from the Korean stalemate and other centers blows hot and cold, the economic thermometers will bounce up and down. But thus far, there would seem to be no major portent—barring such major catastrophe as the Russians uncorking an atom—that will take us far in either direction.



Where There's a Will There's a Way

By permission of NEA Service, Inc.

San Diego

Sidney Evans, acting director at the San Diego school, 1336 Seventh Avenue, expects to distribute copies of *The Henry George News* to all students when they reach the ninth lesson. This is a noble gesture and one we wish more of our friends could become excited about. Mr. Evans writes that the San Diego area includes such picturesque sounding towns as Chula Vista, La Mesa, El Cajon, La Jolla, Del Mar, Escondido, Descanso, and the more prosaic-named National City, Carlsbad, Ocean Beach and Pacific Beach.

Since the departure of Miss Ida Reeves, who served as director in the San Diego school after Mrs. Bessie Truehart resigned, the position has remained open, and Mr. Evans is searching for a man, woman or married couple who would like to take over these duties. The school's headquarters also serve as the residence of the director.

Los Angeles

The national conference of the Adult Education Association of the United States was held at the Alexandria Hotel in Los Angeles, October 22 through 25. This is the same hotel which entertained the Henry George School's annual conference in July. William Truehart and his mother, Bessie B. Truehart attended a number of the sessions and reported ideas which can be useful to those active in the work of the Henry George School.

Recent visitors at Los Angeles headquarters were Mr. and Mrs. Gustave Carus of Chicago. Mr. Carus is a member of the board of trustees in the Chicago school.

Through the cooperation of Professor Morgan Harris of Chapman College, a broadcast was made on Sunday, October 28, over radio station KFVD. It consisted of an interview of J. Rupert Mason of San Francisco by Professor Harris. The entire thirty-minute broadcast was devoted to the discussion of the principles of Henry George and their practical application.

San Francisco

The taxation of land values by California irrigation districts was discussed in a very helpful way by Mason Gaffney in a talk before East Bay friends of the school at the Melrose Library November 13. Mr. Gaffney, a graduate of the Henry George School in Chicago, is now studying for his Ph.D. in economics at the University of California. He acquired an intimate knowledge of irrigation district policies through supervision of the United States irrigation census in the area between Los Angeles and Sacramento.

Mr. Gaffney pointed out that the irrigation districts are sovereign arms of the state of California, analogous to cities and countries, and that many of these districts secure their entire operating revenue from land values exclusively.

The Henry George Free Speech Forum grew in attendance during November. Speakers heard were J. Rupert Mason on "The Importance of Georgism to Liberty," Albert B. Windt on "The Banks and the People," Charles T. Augustus on "Human Rights and Racial Prejudice," Edgar Pomeroy on "The Single Tax Campaign—1937-38," and Charles MacSwan on "War and the Henry George Movement." The Forum meets every Friday night in centrally located Commerce High School to cultivate the analytical and expressive powers of its members.

Enrollments reported to date in the twelve basic classes are 147.

Ohio

The Dayton extension committee, under the able direction of Mildred Jensen Loomis, held a recognition meeting for graduates of the recent fall term class, at the Young Women's League headquarters on November 20. The program consisted of brief talks by Ellis Jackson of Hamilton; Verlin Gordon of Lima; Walter Schutz, Jess Landis, Chuck Worley and E. R. Wells of Dayton. Mr. Wells, a former Britisher, took for his subject, "England Knows Henry George."

Ray Eichenberger, the Cleveland extension committee chairman, called a meeting recently at the Lakewood Public Library to plan for the winter term. Kathy Shoaf of Columbus is planning a "Henry George Free Discussion group" there to train future leaders and also to maintain interest of both new and former students.

Ellis R. Jackson, a certified public accountant at Hamilton, is an active member of the Middletown Toastmasters Club, and he is sure that his training in this group has improved his ability to lead the classes in basic economics. Mr. Jackson has found a wealth of material for speeches in *Progress and Poverty* and *The Science of Political Economy*.

St. Louis

The St. Louis extension will hold graduation exercises on December 3, at the First Unitarian Church. Bert H. Mann, Jr., past national director of the Toastmasters International, patent attorney of Carter Carburetor Company, and a Henry George graduate, will be the speaker.

The St. Louis Georgist is the name of a neat publication started in November by the St. Louis Women's Club with Mrs. Elizabeth Angell Sausele and Mrs. Ross H. Schachner as editors. November 16 was another auspicious day for this group, which has doubled its membership since its organization last summer. A Christmas gift sale and supper was held on that date with games, prizes, gifts, snacks and fun.

Henry J. Johnson, an engineer with the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and a fundamental economics teacher, was mentioned in Bob Goddard's column in the *Globe-Democrat* in September because he claims that "there are three very ancient problems which cannot be solved officially under the rules laid down by Plato." However, he has solved one of them himself—the trisecting of the random angle—without violating Plato's rules.

Chicago

Edwin O. Griffenhagen, senior partner of Griffenhagen and Associates, addressed the second Commerce and Industry luncheon of the season on "The Profession of Management." Sterling Morton, chairman of the board of Morton Salt Company, presided.

Edwin Hamilton, an attorney, traced the impact of controls and of competition on civilization when he gave the second address in the Freedom Lecture Series, November 20. These lectures are held the third Tuesday evening of each month at the John Marshall Law School. The speaker in December will be Professor Frank H. Knight of the University of Chicago. Ashley Mitchell, of Huddersfield, England, treasurer of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, will be guest speaker at the Christmas dinner, December 6, at 1015 North Rush Street.

The Albany Henry George School of Social Science under the leadership of Robert H. Ritchey, has changed its address to 31 Clinton Avenue, Albany 4, New York. This comes just in time for you to change your Christmas card list!

Detroit

At a speech class recently conducted by the University of Michigan, Walter Kaiser, one of the former Henry George students, gave a talk on "Wealth." Another member of the class was Warren Johnson, a stranger to Mr. Kaiser, who had also taken the Fundamental Economics Course and who had conducted classes in Ohio. Mr. Johnson recognized the speaker's material and the two became friends at once. Mr. Kaiser may be prevailed upon to act as a discussion leader soon.

Mr. Johnson, a supervisor for Sealtest, is conducting his first class in Detroit this fall at a YMCA, with nine interested students. This enrollment was achieved by the splendid cooperation of the "Y" secretary, William Haas, who circularized "Y" residents, displayed posters and wrote an article for the local newspaper. This voluntary help was greatly appreciated.

Robert Benton, the Detroit director, writes that four high schools plan to sponsor Fundamental Economics Courses in their adult education programs.

Boston

Friday evening lectures in Boston have the general theme of "Current Events and Basic Principles." Sanford Farkas inaugurated this new series and was followed on October 19 by John S. Codman who reported on the New York conference of the Henry George Foundation. M. S. Lurio next presented the current problem of housing giving pertinent illustrations of the economics behind it.

Lidia Alkalay, assistant to the school's director, opened the first discussion in November with "public and private law-breaking." Her conclusions were said to be "unorthodox" but "founded on basic principles." John R. Nichols was the next speaker in the series, reporting on the "physical aspect of our cities."

A group of interested (recent) graduates will meet each month to discuss advertising and teaching methods. Those present at the October meetings included Mrs. V. Bubiencic, Mrs. Isabel Strong, Norman H. Blake, Thomas H. deValcourt, Morris Feldman, Edward B. Flaherty, Herbert Lurio and Allston K. Thorndike.

The fall term enrollment in fundamental classes reached a round one hundred. This, considering that the notices were not delivered by the post office, is considered an excellent record. The Boston faculty is glad to welcome a new member, Mrs. Harry Seigel, from Maldon, who is teaching a course in international trade.

New Jersey

A bronze plaque in memory of Dr. E. E. Bowen and George Rusby, which has been placed in the foyer of the New Jersey headquarters, will be dedicated at the completion exercises on December 16 at 3 P. M. This will be a welcome opportunity for many friends to pay their affectionate respects to the founders of this fine school. George Rusby and Dr. Bowen, his wife, virtually dedicated their lives to the cause so ably articulated by Henry George.

At a recent meeting of the board of trustees, Howard Mearns Thomson was elected to fill the unexpired term of George C. Winne, one of the original incorporators of the school and a trustee since its inception. Mr. Winnie's death in October was mourned by all who knew him, and he will long be remembered in the New Jersey school. Mr. Thomson lives in Plainfield and is a member of the technical staff of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., at Murray Hill, New Jersey.

The second in the Random Lecture series

Letters

To the Editor:

I would like to nominate for the "70-Plus Club" mentioned in Stanley Sinclair's conference report last month, Alfred E. Chandler, author of *Land Title Origins* (age over 70), Robert M. Hayward, assistant director of the Henry George School in New Jersey (age 80), and Amalia E. Du Bois (92) who has been a Georgist working for the movement here for more than 75 years.

—JOHN B. TETLEY
Newark, New Jersey

To the Editor:

I would like to express my sincere appreciation of a number of thoughts that have recently been expressed in the News. First, the very timely article by Robert Clancy on "Justice in the Bible," giving so much food for thought that every hide-bound religionist could be jacked up to a realization of the ever-present and ever-operative "divine law" which the confusion of our time ignores.

Then there was the statement of John S. Codman that taxation should not be stressed as the foremost presentation of our Great Idea. It is true that justice requires a base for its maintenance as does injustice. The base should be stressed. With the establishment of the proper base, taxation will fade away—economic rent will take its place.

And the makeshift "welfare state," upon which so many are leaning, was admirably brought to the fore for consideration by your two able contributors—Bob Clancy and H. R. Fuchs, in the last number of the News. It is clear that Georgists, at least, are not backsliding into the dictator-pressured stream of life, which has engulfed so many.

—KATHERINE F. ROSS
Arden, Delaware

[Sorry, the last named author is Judge John R. Fuchs, of Braunfels, Texas, not H. R., as incorrectly printed. The article "Justice in the Bible" will be reproduced by offset soon for distribution, in response to many requests. Ed.]

gave those present an opportunity to hear Max Shetover, president and founder of the Lingua-phone Institute, and a director of the New York Society for General Semantics, on the subject "Can We Live in 1951 with an 1851 Mentality?" Dr. Geoffrey W. Esty, also a director of the Society for General Semantics, presided.

New York

Professor Ludwig von Mises was a guest of the director, Robert Clancy, for an informal evening in November. A number of faculty members welcomed the opportunity to meet this well-known author and hear his views on Henry George's works. Professor von Mises agreed that he would like to see an increased levy on land, but he cited historical reasons why he does not favor confiscation of land—a term which he holds is concomitant with the taking of the full economic rent. Though his views did not go unchallenged, they were well taken.

Completion exercises will be held on December 11 for headquarters' students, and on December 18 for regional class students. The programs begin at 8 P. M.

Dorothy Sara, faculty member and a vice-president of the American Graphology Society, Inc., will give a short talk at the school on December 14 at 8 P. M. on "How to Analyze Handwriting."

To the Editor:

Grover B. Foster of Dallas has objected to my statement that "the socialization of ground rent can do very little good unless the economy in general is comparatively free to react to its influence." I did not think when I wrote this that it needed any amplification or explanation, but apparently I was wrong, so here goes:

Henry George proposed to collect for public use the rent of land rather than any part of the product of labor. He argued rightly that a man's labor and its product are truly his own, whereas, land belongs essentially to the community, its private "ownership" being actually something like a trusteeship. Primitive peoples all over the world recognize this difference, as does the "right of eminent domain" in our common law.

But George was not only a great idealist. I can think of no more realistic and practical economist than he was. He promised no miracles. He carefully warned his readers that his remedy was "not a panacea."

The Georgist must not forget that a large part of the benefits we may expect from the "single tax" must necessarily be in the form of reduced prices on land and goods, as the elements of private land rent and indirect taxation are removed, and a fairer share of production for labor and for capital, the tools of labor, as all three of these react to the natural law of supply and demand in a free, open, competitive market.

How can many of these benefits fail to be lost to us unless, as I said, "the economy in general is comparatively free?" Free, that is, from external interference, price regulation, and artificial controls, which make such a free market impossible?

History is full of examples of peoples who have forgotten to their cost that no social, political, or economic reform can ever relieve us from the responsibility and necessity of eternally guarding our rights and liberties.

—MARSHALL CRANE
Bedford, New York

To the Editor:

I wish to congratulate Ernest Bloomfield Zeisler on his article "Justice and Benevolence" in the September issue. With rare insight he projects in this masterly piece of logic a vivid light on the very important and difficult question of justice, and derives from its analysis a fundamental argument against the "welfare state" that I think cannot be answered.

Unfortunately the deleterious benevolence of the state must be maintained as long as the reform of economic land policy, that is the fulfillment of economic justice, remains delayed.

—C. VILLALBOS-DOMINGUEZ
Buenos Aires

More than 15 regional classes are being planned by David Goldstein for the winter term. The speakers' bureau, also under the directorship of David Goldstein, regional secretary, filled five speaking assignments during November.

A recent issue of Vogue Magazine suggested ways in which people can give themselves this Christmas—to the blood bank, to hospital aid, etc. A good way for Georgists to "give themselves" would be around the busy headquarters building all during December, when there will be two large mailings to be prepared by a woefully inadequate staff.

To the Editor:

In reference to Mr. Joachim's "Plain Talk" in November, it is fashionable in certain quarters to say that human rights take precedence over private property rights—the inference being that human rights are one thing and private property rights another.

Were we to ask ourselves the meaning of the word "slave," would not our answer be: (a) A man whose body is not his own but belongs to a master; (b) A man who has no human rights; (c) A man who has no property rights.

If we ask, what is a "free man," would not our answer be: (a) A man who has a right to his own body; (b) Having a right to his own body, he has a right to the mind in that body; (c) Having a right to his own body and his own mind, he has a right to the results of the labor of that body and that mind: property; (d) This, being his, is private property.

Therefore, man, a human being, not a slave, possessing human rights, has a right to his private property. Without the right to private property there cannot be freedom, and without freedom there cannot be human rights. It follows therefore, that human rights and private property rights are one and inseparable.

—H. ELLENOFF
Los Angeles, California

To the Editor:

R. E. Fleischman of Montreal, who seems worried lest we deviate from Henry George's principles by collecting the rental value of underground resources through severance taxes, should be reminded that land includes the whole of nature outside of humanity and that succeeding generations have rights in nature that we are bound to respect.

Perhaps he is not cognizant of the practical difficulty arising from the fact that the values of hidden natural resources cannot be appraised until they have been brought out of hiding. It is necessary to have a measure of their amount and quality, and to know the market price and the costs of extraction and marketing, in order to determine their fair rental value.

Competition at the market determines the natural price. When prices are fixed the rental value in the ground is affected by the prices being fixed. A severance tax is the just means of appraising and assessing, because it permits making reasonable adjustments to relatively rapid variations in prices and costs. Taxation of non-reproductive natural resources that do not produce recurrent rentals, and which can be taxed, but once justly (if the taxes are levied prior to exploitation), tends to promote waste.

A severance tax even slightly in excess of the rental value of hidden and exhaustible resources might do little harm, even if the excess were passed on to consumers. It would encourage people to salvage materials produced from such exhaustible resources, so that they might be re-utilized instead of letting them go to waste, and, thus to delay the day when the limited supplies would become exhausted.

The principles of Henry George were not made to abet spendthrift methods of natural resource utilization. They apply not only to the corner lot on Main Street but to the administration of large areas of land, including both exhaustible natural deposits and rentable surface and water rights.

—JOSEPH L. RICHARDS
(forester)
Harvard, Mass.

World Problems of Land Tenure in Review

Written for The Henry George News At the University of Wisconsin

By PHIL TICHENOR

FROM the pasture lands of Holland, the mountains of Chile, and the rice fields of Burma to the University of Wisconsin is a long way. But that's how far some of the delegates came, to study land tenure problems and land policies in the conference which ended on November 17.

Nearly forty nations were represented at the five-week conference which was sponsored by the University of Wisconsin in cooperation with the Economic Cooperation Administration, the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the U. S. State Department.

Five trips were made into Wisconsin's rural areas to study farm life first hand. One such trip followed a typical American farmer through his daily routine and another took the specialists into a large farm machinery factory.

The delegates met in conferences at which each presented his nation's problems. One of the first speakers was Theb Semthithi, chief cooperative officer in Thailand, who told of agricultural progress in his country. Thailand is a land of rice, teakwood and rubber—one of the most rural countries in the world. Ninety-nine of every 100 people live in rural areas.

From Japan came Setsuro Hyodo, secretary of the Japanese Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Hyodo said that the basic land distribution problems necessary to establish economic security in Japan has been mastered.

A German land economist, Constantin von Dietze, outlined land tenure issues in Europe since the French Revolution. He said the European continent needs several different forms of land holding policies.

Lack of sufficient labor, large concentrations of land among a few owners, and the small size of farms among those who do own land, are major land reform problems of Latin America, several South American specialists agreed.

For instance, in Chile only one-fourth of the farmers own or rent their land. The rest of the two million farm people work for wages or are share-croppers.

Scarcity of labor is the big problem in Uruguay. Only 15 per cent of the total population are farmers.

A land reform program that could completely revamp the Venezuelan economy was reported by Armando Tamayo, president of the Venezuelan National Agrarian Institute. This nation

has been creating agricultural settlements under a program described as "a modern system of farming assisted by supervised credit."

A Russian specialist and representatives from Germany and The Netherlands discussed problems of tractor and machinery use on the small land holdings in Europe.

In countries such as Holland, the economists are worried about an excess of labor. The farmers there are afraid to raise their expenses by mechanization without being able to find productive employment for the time that will be freed if machines are used.

The difference between "cooperative farming" and "collective farming" was explained by S. M. Akhtar, economist from the University of Punjab in Pakistan. Akhtar said membership in a cooperative organization must be voluntary, and the decisions of such a society must be arrived at democratically.

He compared these practices with the Russian system, in which the government appoints, dismisses and transfers officers from one farm to another. In Russian collective farming, Akhtar pointed out, all assets are pooled and no individual rights are recognized.

The challenge of Soviet state-controlled farming against agrarian democracy is less formidable than it appears, according to a United States Department of Agriculture official who addressed the conference. He told the delegates that the Russian system has not improved the peasants' standard of living nor fulfilled their age-long desire for land and independence.

Dr. Henry G. Bennett, head of the Technical Cooperation Administration, which carries on the Point Four program, contrasted American agrarian problems with those of older countries. Speaking of political philosophers at different stages of history, he referred to Thomas Jefferson who said, "The small land holders are the most precious part of a state."

Referring to Henry George, who a hundred years later championed the single tax on land in a time of increasing industrialization and pressure of population, he quoted from *Progress and Poverty*: "What is necessary for the use of land is not its private ownership, but the security of improvements. It is not necessary to say to a man 'this land is yours,' in order to induce him to cultivate or improve it. It is only necessary to say to him, 'whatever your labor or capital produces on this land shall be yours'."

Colonel E. C. Harwood Becomes Member of Henry George Board

E. C. HARWOOD, director and founder of the American Institute for Economic Research at Great Barrington, Massachusetts, is the newest trustee to be welcomed to the board of the Henry George School in New York.



"I suppose that ours is one of the very few economic research organizations in the world that can be said to have arisen almost directly from Henry George's teachings," said Colonel Harwood recently, addressing informally a small group of Georgists. "It so happened that a quarter of a century ago, for reasons that I won't bore you with, I became very much interested in economics. I was in a position where I had to get what I could find for myself, and I had at my disposal practically all of the economic text books that had been written in the last 100 years.

"I happened to see on the shelves of the library a set of books by a man named Henry George. I picked up the first one, *Progress and Poverty*, and dipped into it a little. I found that it dealt with some fundamental definitions. So, I thought, I wonder if by any chance this man has laid the foundation work of definitions that would enable one to get somewhere in the field of economics. I started reading that book, and as far as I recall now, I didn't put it down until I had finished it. Then I went through all the rest that he had written, and discovered, to my great pleasure, that here at last was someone who had provided a foundation for a study of economics, through careful definition of words and through a scientific approach to the subject.

"Given that, I was able to find out, through further study, where many of these other writers seem to have gone astray, and was given an incentive and a further drive that enabled me to go further in the field. Well the Institute is the outgrowth of the subsequent work. We started it when I was at MIT, and we have the distinction of not only having grown out of Henry George's work but also of being greatly interested in John Dewey's work. We feel that John Dewey has contributed most of any man who ever lived to an understanding of the scientific method and its application to social problems, and, as you know, John Dewey is one of the relatively few philosophers who seems to have fully appreciated Henry George's work, and his place among the philosophers on this earth.

"To make a long story short, we are trying to use the fundamental relationships described so well by Henry George and the fundamental principles outlined by him, and we are using the modern application of the scientific method as described by John Dewey, and putting the two together, and we are trying to go on and explore the vast unknown in the field of economics."



"Death of a Prophet"

Herbert S. Bigelow, who presided over Ohio's constitutional convention in 1912, died in Cincinnati, his home, at the age of eighty-one. In The Cincinnati Post he was referred to as a prophet, the "gentlest of souls," who was "at times honored, at other times despised." He was a long time advocate of municipal ownership of public utilities, and a sponsor of the state's \$90 a month old-age pension law.

For 54 years he was pastor of the People's church, where he ministered to a congregation made up of all religious denominations. He was a consistent liberal preaching "the more abundant life" not only for the favored few but for the inhabitants of skid row as well. He was well known as an adherent to the principles of Henry George, and he won admiration, even from his enemies, for devotion to his ideals.

Voice from Israel

"Israel has doubled her population in 2 1/2 years . . ." writes David B. Ascher of Haifa to H. G. Pearce, editor of The Standard, the Australian Monthly Review published in Sydney, under auspices of the Free Trade and Land Values League. "We shall double our population again within the next few years; and if thereafter, again and again, poor people will ask us for shelter and food, we shall give it heartily, whatever it may cost us. We know that the Lord demands and approves such behavior. We also know that we must and shall, in order to go this way, treat the Holy Ground of the Holy Land still more in the manner provided for by Henry George. There is only one alternative—that taught by Stalin—may God forbid its application!"

Dr. Ascher is Registrar of Lands in Haifa.