

was a time when the Progressive Party of that state, under the leadership of Messrs. Record and Colby and others, seemed on the point of making certain important advances in our direction. Evidently, there was something wrong with the method, for not only did the movement come to naught, but the Progressives ceased to be a functioning body.

WE are glad to have Mr. Record declare for the full reform without compromise in the field of propaganda. Evidently he is not in favor of minimizing the doctrine in our educational methods, or teaching it piecemeal as a mere fiscal reform. So far we are in agreement. Nor are we opposed to accepting legislative measures going in our direction. The plain commonsense of the matter is to accept what we can get with a polite "Thank you for so much." But that it lessens the efficiency of political leaders to be known as thoroughgoing Single Tax men we do not believe. And to imagine that the idea can be put over by attacks on the minor forms of monopoly without enlightening the voter upon the relation these bear to the major monopoly, that of the land and all natural resources, is to cherish a delusion.

WE submit, too, that the analogy Mr. Record draws of the Single Tax and anti-slavery movements will not bear examination. Seward told Emerson, "You make history and we profit by it." We cannot say what the result would have been had Lincoln ranged himself on the side of Phillips and Garrison, and demanded the abolition of slavery. Perhaps he might never have been president. But as it was, despite Mr. Lincoln's somewhat timorous treatment of the question, the attack on slavery and Lincoln's own attitude, did help to precipitate the Civil War. And we do not know, and never can know, if the political programme of Abraham Lincoln would have succeeded or not, since the war came, utterly wrecking all these nicely laid plans, and abolition came, not as a successful outcome of Lincoln's policy, but as a war measure forced upon a half reluctant North.

WE wonder where Mr. Record has been all these years when he says, "I have never been able to talk to a miscellaneous audience upon the Single Tax with any feeling that I put it over at all, and I say that I have never seen anybody that could take a miscellaneous, untrained audience, and put over the Single Tax." Did he never hear Henry George do it? Or Father McGlynn? Or John S. Crosby? Or the hundreds of others who in halls or from cart tails were able to make converts? Where then did most of our converts come from? If we have failed to make them, "the fault is in ourselves"—for others have done it. All will bear witness that they have seen it done. It is true it cannot be done by fiscal appeals

alone, and Henry George did not rely exclusively on such appeals when he sent men away from his meetings convinced crusaders for the great truth which some of them heard for the first time. It is precisely because Mr. Record—and we say it in no unkindness—has minimized the truth he knows, in accordance with the policy he has declared that when we speak as an economist we can say one thing, and when we speak as a politician we can say another, that he has failed to "put it over."

Far-Fetched Objections to Conscription of Wealth

SENATOR JAMES A. REED'S statement assailing the recommendation by President Coolidge for conscription of wealth and labor in event of another war exhibits either a complete misunderstanding of the President's proposal, or a willingness to misrepresent the conditions that may reasonably be expected to result from their adoption. Coming from one who has opposed American entrance into the League of Nations and the World Court because of his alleged fears that the United States would be drawn into armed conflicts that might arise between other nations, this objection against a practicable method for equitable distribution of the cost of conducting war is enlightening, as showing how thoroughly mistaken are the opponents of all-inclusive conscription in their opinions as to the operation of that policy. It is possible that the danger of such conscription might not operate to create a sentiment strong enough to prevent a declaration of war. It is impossible that the alarming results of universal business paralysis, and industrial chaos, should follow the taking over for public purpose of the machinery and labor necessary for the production of all war material.

"At the mere approach of war every dollar would go into hiding," asserts Senator Reed. This is merely his guess, but suppose it were true, what of it? The factories and all the vast equipment for producing munitions and clothing for the army would remain. The labor necessary for their operation would all be in the United States. Under the direction of the Chief Executive a currency system for the payment of the workers would take the place of the money hidden away. The expenditures for the late war were paid for by government promises to pay, called bonds. If the owners of money withdrew it from the banks a perfectly satisfactory substitute could be supplied in the shape of a government-managed currency. Instead of being used to make excessive profits out of war-material contracts, the industries needed would be operated under government direction, with elimination of profits for the duration of the war.

The notion that industry and trade in general would stop because certain productive agencies were taken over

for the public service, is akin to the suggestion, seriously put forward when the income-tax proposal was pending in the Congress, that if incomes were taxed the rich would emigrate, taking their wealth with them. They might have taken money, currency or securities, but all the real wealth of the nation would have remained. Senator Reed need not worry over the danger that in a time of national peril the citizens controlling the nation's wealth are suddenly going to lose their patriotism, merely because they will make less profits in time of war.

Australians' New Capital Profiting by Mistakes

SPECULATOR IN REALTY HAS BEEN ELIMINATED.

THE following is from a news article which appeared in the *Washington Post* of October 31. In a letter to the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM Mr. Louis F. Post writes: "It is the first fair account of Canberra that I have seen in any news press. You may remember that the location was chosen by a legislative Commission appointed several years ago, under a law which provided that the compensation for the site taken should be no more than its value at a stated period prior to the enactment of the law (or the appointment of the Commission, I forget which.) William Burley Griffin was assisted by his wife in the plans drawn for the city. Both were well known Single Taxers of Chicago at the time. It is a comprehensive and ideal design."

The *Washington Post* says:

"How Canberra, the new capital of Australia, conceived with this city as its ideal, is now facing the identical problems Washington grappled with and solved more than a century ago, was recounted yesterday by Joseph A. Alexander, of the *Melbourne Herald and Sun Pictorial*, who is in Washington collecting biographical material for a book he is to publish.

"In May, the Duke of York will formally inaugurate Canberra as the Australian seat of government, 25 years after his father, King George, then the Duke of York, also inaugurated the Australian commonwealth. On that day parliament will sit in Canberra for the first time and the scepter of power will pass from Melbourne.

"Following the precedent set by Washington, Canberra is being erected on a grant of unpopulated land ceded to the commonwealth by one of its states. Like Washington also, according to Alexander, the selection of the site was forced by rivalry between states, each seeking to have the capital situated within its boundaries.

COMPROMISE ON SITE.

"Residents of Victoria demanded that the seat of government continue in Melbourne, while citizens of the state of New South Wales were just as positive to have it removed to Sydney. Following the American analogy, a compromise was finally effected in the present site of Canberra, situated in New South Wales territory, between Sydney and Melbourne.

"As in America, provincialism died hard," said Alexander. "Now that it has been vanquished, a truly national capital is arising. As Washington typifies the national spirit of the United States, Australians hope that Canberra will ultimately represent, politically and architecturally, the highest development of Australian genius."

"In the same manner that Canberra will profit by this city's example, Alexander points out, it will also profit by what are often considered Washington's early mistakes. He holds the opportunities this city has offered to land speculators is one of the most serious of these. In Canberra, all land is owned by the government, and leased at auction to individuals for 99 years. As reappraisal of values is provided for, every dollar spent in improving the city accrues to the profit of Canberra, instead of the speculator.

"Another disadvantage is safeguarded against through stringent building regulations contained in the leases. One will not see in Canberra, as they may to this day in Washington, a shanty and a mansion within the same city block.

"However, Washington is the great architectural and spiritual ideal to which the Australians have set themselves, Alexander insisted. All information concerning Washington is eagerly seized upon and studied. Then, again, Canberra is essentially an American conception. The plans for the city were drawn by Walter Griffin, of Chicago, whose design was selected in an international competition."

Bob Davis Recalls

A WINTER NIGHT'S ADVENTURE WITH THE SOUL OF HENRY GEORGE

(Reprinted by permission of Robert H. Davis)

STEADY readers of this column, if there be such, may have observed that in previous references to my father I pointed out his catholicity with all sorts and conditions of men. He was an omnivorous reader, a student of political conditions, a subscriber to most of the magazines that pretended to present the best thought of the period, and a staunch advocate of the Single Tax theory. In the remote fastnesses of the Sierra Nevada, where he conducted his Episcopalian parish, he found time to develop a very considerable correspondence with men of the outside world. Among them was Henry George, whose tax doctrines had begun to attract the attention of economists. The friendship that grew up between them resulted in the great expounder of the dangers of the "unearned increment" paying a visit to my sire at Carson, Nev., in the early '80's.

Mr. George arrived at our house in a blinding snowstorm. My father, who had met him at the train, was carrying the guest's carpetbag, while the Single Taxer clung tightly to a small leather grip in which was concealed, as I learned later, his whole existence.

I valeted the visitor to the extent of removing his galoshes and his heavy overcoat. To this very day, although