

or agree with them, while state after state and counties by the dozen have been won over to no-license by non-partisan action. Do you suppose for a moment that those who put those sections under no-license could have been persuaded to drop all their other political activities and spend years in trying to build up a new party? It is unthinkable and history proves the contrary. If then the temperance men having such a tremendous following in every state of the Union have failed to establish a new party, what could we hope to do? Other vital reforms are making progress without separate party action—temperance reform, primary reform, direct legislation, etc.—and so will our cause go forward if we do not make this fatal mistake. My views were exactly expressed in a paragraph which you kindly printed in a recent number of *THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW* under the title "Wanted! Three Names!" Let us have a plan like that and our cause will prosper far beyond what it has done yet, and then if ever a real occasion for a new party arises—an event hardly to be expected—the machinery will be ready at hand. Third party action now will arouse much hostility and alienate many Republican and Democratic friends of the cause.—LEWIS H. CLARK, Sodus, N. Y.

BELIEVES HENRY GEORGE WOULD HAVE APPROVED AT THIS TIME

Editor *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*.

It is asked—"Should the Single Taxers form an organization"? It may not be advisable to put a full ticket in the field for 1912, but the Single Taxers should be in a position to make themselves felt in the matter of issues and policy. We have seen Revenue from Land Values put on trial and triumphantly win against the combined influence of England's "special interests" and exploiters of labor; we have seen the grandest men England ever produced rally to the "George Standard," and with a statesmanship worthy of the name, with a courage and patriotism worthy a Spartan, stand in bold unflinching purpose and compel a complete recognition of their

demands for political and economic justice. Then why should we falter? Rather should we blush that our democracy found first a fruition in a foreign land. The fact that so many answered the call for a Single Tax party who had previously absented themselves, proves that apathy has set our cause back—we know not for how long—and bids us now get in position to become a factor in the making of platforms and the advocacy of true principles in government. But it is said that many of our strongest and best known men do not favor organization and much weight is given to the fact that Tom. L. Johnson is not in favor of it and his policy in the administration of Cleveland's government is mentioned. But Tom. L. Johnson never pretended to be the whole thing. No one more than he recognizes that there are other pebbles on the beach and he is the last man, in my opinion, who will stand idly by when a Single Tax organization has its shoulder to the wheel for a move forward, and proves its reason for being.

Organize? Why of course, we have already delayed too long and were our martyred hero, the grandest man of all the race with us today, he would be in the van of this new movement with Johnson and Post at his side.—E. C. CLARK, Bernhards Bay, N. Y.

LAY STRESS UPON THE MATERIAL BENEFITS.

EDITOR *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*:

I have read the pros and cons in the *REVIEW* on Independent Political Action, and there seem to be plausible and valid arguments on both sides.

All Single Taxers want the cause to grow as far and fast as possible. The question of tactics is therefore important. As a general thing, self-interest governs us. Everybody is engaged in earning a living or accumulating money. There is a good deal of truth in the doctrine of "economic determinism." Henry George in *Progress and Poverty* recognized its existence.

I do not argue that Single Taxers should discard the ethical features of our argument, but we should emphasize the mater-

ial and financial benefits to the people in the adoption of the Single Tax. Especially should we pay attention to the hard-worked, over-worked and worried merchants and business men who under competition on the one hand and monopoly on the other, have a hard time to keep their heads above the water.

Let us leave alone all fine distinctions as to abstract things. Let us swim with the current, not against the current. People think and talk about material things, and formulate and express their thoughts in terms of wages, profits, dividends, symbolized and measured in dollars and cents. Let us adjust our arguments to these desires and modes of reasoning.

It will be time enough for us to show, or attempt to prove in any elaborate and profound way the justice of our cause, until we are attacked on that very point, which we need not fear as likely to occur in the near future. For as a matter of fact, the abstract justice of our contention is generally conceded. It is simply lack of knowledge among the people as to the financial, material benefits to be derived from the application of our reform.—F. G. ANDERSON, Jamestown, N. Y.

WHAT SHALL OUR BANNER BEAR?

Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

Mr. William Ryan, in your issue of Jan.-Feb., 1910, is right on the nail when he asks for a more appropriate name than "Single Tax."

My gospel has, for a long time past, been "No Tax," "The Abolition of all Taxation and the Substitution of Rent of Land as a source of public Revenue."

I can promise him that he will find all the "psychology" in "No Tax" that he can ask for in a title.

Most of the Georgian propagandists introduce their subject with "The Single Tax is Not a Tax;" then, in the name of common sense, cease to miscall it one; folk want *not* to be taxed, want to be *untaxed*.

Let us show the consumers of goods and services, that *they* are the payers of all the rent which is levied on growing, manu-

facturing, carrying, trading and distributing, as parts of the price they pay for their goods and services, the other part of the price being made up of wages of labor (which includes all hire of machinery and premises) and taxes and profits on taxes and profits on monopoly, and the last three items will disappear when we make the landlord pass on to the public treasury, the community-made rent of land, which he now retains for his own private use, giving in return nothing but permission to occupy, which permission is not his to grant or deny.

We must never forget that the grower, maker, carrier and distributor does not pay the rents incurred in producing goods; they are passed on, as are all other costs of production, to the ultimate consumer, who pays all costs.

Those who use land for purposes other than producing profit by manufacture or trade—use it for residence, pleasure or sport—bear the whole cost of the rent; are, in fact, the consumers of the value.

This fact shows that it is not so much a land question, as it is a wage question; if we let the landlord retain the rent, high rents, taxes and profits on taxes make goods dear and wages low; if we make the landlord pass the rent on to public revenue, rent of land will be much reduced, taxes and profits on taxes will disappear, so that, if the price of goods is the wages, plus the rent and taxes, etc., we see that the price of goods and services must be much less, and therefore the worker's wage will buy more of them, making the wage a higher one.

But, as the money wage will also rise as well as buying power of money, the wage earner will see that this is a question of great and vital importance to him.

We must keep in view that it is the annual rental value of land, and not its selling price, with which we must deal; to state it as a selling price has many disadvantages. The price paid for estate in land is a price paid for the privilege of drawing and retaining a definite annual rent, and when the holder has to pass on, for public uses, a proportion of that rent, then the selling price is reduced in that proportion, so that selling price is not a