

class, who form the base of the social structure, would secure a double advantage, instead of being under a double disadvantage, as we hold is the position to-day. Critics of this theory are ready enough to speak of the "vested rights" of the comparatively few landowners. If our claim is founded on justice, what is to be said of the "vested wrongs" of the many?

But faith in these economic or fiscal results—all-important as they are—does not by any means account for the fire which burns in the breast of every true Georgian, or for the tenacity with which, through good or ill report, he holds to his creed—a tenacity which has impressed the lecturer as peculiarly like that of the Jew to his creed. The inspiration behind the single-tax movement resides in the profound conviction that, through this economic amelioration, through this widening of opportunity, by the juster distribution of wealth and the greater diffusion of population throughout this and every other country—and by these agencies alone—can the hydra-headed social problem be hopefully and successfully attacked, and the road be cleared for that higher and happier civilisation of which the Prophets have sung, and for which ministers of religion, statesmen, and philanthropists are labouring so painfully. The soil must be sweet if the plant is to flourish and bloom. *The physical basis must be sound if the moral and spiritual life is to issue from it.*

Henry George's followers, Mr. Jacobs continued, were encouraged by the growing favour with which their basic principle is being adopted throughout the civilised world. Be that, however, as it may, the call to hasten the reign of social justice should be an inspiring and compelling one to every man and woman with a true Jewish heart.

It was because he felt this to be so that he hoped to arouse the interest of the Jewish Association of Arts and Sciences in the single-tax movement and to invite them to investigate its validity and merit. The question he wished to ask his audience was this: Could any sincere Jew who looked around at the moral degradation in modern life say that all this was inevitable in a world created by a wise and beneficent God? To do so would be surely to blaspheme the Creator, whom they—the People of the Book—have held up through the ages as a just and beneficent God. What, then, is the solution of this riddle of riddles? Is it Socialism? Is it Protection? Is it Free Trade? If not, what school of political or social science is showing the way to "The Promised Land"? And if none, what were the Jews doing towards helping to find it and enforce it?

Professor Huxley, in two of his essays, wrote thus:—

In the eighth century B.C., in the heart of a world of idolatrous polytheists, the Hebrew prophets put forth a conception of religion which appears to me to be as wonderful an inspiration of genius as the art of Phidias or the science of Aristotle. "And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God"? If any so-called religion takes away from this great saying of Micah (ch. vi. v. 8), I think it wantonly mutilates, while if it adds thereto I think it obscures the perfect ideal of religion."

"To do justly" was the dominant note of Judaism, Mr. Jacobs declared. Monotheism was not enough in itself to compel his allegiance to Judaism, indeed were it not that Judaism stands for social justice as a basic principle, he doubted very much if he could still remain loyal to the Jewish faith. He was in entire agreement with Henry George when he said:—

"That justice is the highest quality in the moral hierarchy I do not say; but that it is the first. That which is above justice must be based on justice, and include justice, and be reached through justice. It is not by accident that, in the Hebraic religious development which through Christianity we have inherited, the

declaration, "The Lord thy God is a just God," preceded the sweeter revelation of a God of Love. Until the eternal justice is perceived, the eternal love must be hidden. As the individual must be just before he can be truly generous, so must human society be based upon justice before it can be based on benevolence."

Concluding, Mr. Jacobs appealed to every Jew to take his place in the ranks of the Georgians, there to work for real uplifting of human-kind. After this war men in every country shall be prepared for bold action in the reforming of their respective laws. Here is the opportunity to re-echo the principles laid down by our fathers and sustained in the economic proposals of Henry George. In this work, he assured them, they would be following the noble example of other Jews, who not only worked for these principles, but died for them. Max Hirsch and Joseph Fels, who, after long years of labour, bore final testimony with their lives. In this they followed their leader, who said:—

"The truth I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be, it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be, die for it. This is the power of truth."

An interesting discussion followed in which Messrs Lithwitch Winer, Verinder, Frank Smith, and Miss Lapin took part.

The Chairman, in moving the vote of thanks, said that he had gained much from the lecture and discussion. It made him feel that the artist had, after all, an interest in economics.

"THE PANACEA FOR POVERTY IS FREEDOM"

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON ON HENRY GEORGE'S
TEACHING (Boston, May 15th, 1907)

It is the custom of the world to discredit reformers by the epithet of "visionary," a term freely applied to Henry George. That these disturbers of the established order are men of vision is undoubted; else posterity would not populate the pedestals of Christendom with their statues. But that they were possessed with a baseless hallucination is untrue. Because of their practical forecast their historic preservation has been secured.

Henry George was a seer, not an idle dreamer. When the doubters and opponents of his theories assumed that he believed the single tax to be the complete solvent for poverty, and that its adoption would mark the arrival of the millennium, they failed to understand the thinker and the facts. In recently arranging my accumulated letters I came upon the first one written to me by the author of PROGRESS AND POVERTY. In writing to him of my new-born interest in the land question and THE STANDARD, I was led to use the common qualification that I failed to see how the single tax could be a panacea for poverty.

I have often quoted from memory his noble reply, and am sure that his exact words will be of interest now to all who cherish his memory and faith:—

New York, Jan. 14, 1888.

Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

My Dear Sir,—I am glad to get your words of sympathy and cheer. If I can have your permission I would like to publish them in THE STANDARD. If not, can you send me a few lines for publication?

With our people yours is a name to conjure by, and it would please them even to know that William Lloyd Garrison was a reader of THE STANDARD.

I fully agree with what you say of my proper place. I went into politics reluctantly, and only because circumstances seemed to point to that as the best way, for the moment, that attention could be drawn to principle. It seems to me now that circumstances have changed. **You say that you do not see in the single tax a panacea for poverty. Nor yet do I. The panacea for poverty is freedom. What I see in the single tax is the means of securing that industrial freedom which will make possible other triumphs of freedom.**

It is the old, old battle we are fighting—the same battle of which your father in his day led the van. It is this that makes the sympathy of his son so cheering. And let him be brave as he may, one cannot but feel faint sometimes with the burden and heat of the day, and, hardest of all, the opposition of those who ought to aid. It is then that words like yours are so deeply grateful.

With much respect and with best wishes,

I am,

Yours sincerely,

HENRY GEORGE.

It is plain that, instead of finality, Henry George viewed the liberation of the land but as a great and essential step towards freedom, which is, indeed, as he declares, the true panacea for poverty. And I recall his reflective comment in a conversation regarding the possibility of communication with the spirit world. I had quoted the remark of Wendell Phillips (addressed to one inclined to ridicule the idea): "It may be the refraction of some great truth yet below the horizon." "That is fine," said Mr. George, "I wonder, when the single-tax movement triumphs, what next great struggle for humanity will follow."

Certainly this expressed no conceit that his realised ideas would make needless other efforts for human progress. He expressed his grateful appreciation of the anti-slavery struggle, and added that without the abolition of slavery the single-tax movement in this country would have been impossible. I was impressed at the time with the candour and modest simplicity of the man and his impersonal consideration of the subject.

What a difference the lapse of a few years makes in the current thought! When Henry George declared the same conviction which is expressed in a recent number of the London NATION, it was derided by the wise men of that period. Now it passes as a truism, and creates no adverse comment. This is the expression:—

The land question has become the centre not only of the social controversies, but of the political issues of the time. It is here that the will of the nation and the love of power of a class meet in direct conflict. It is here, too, that the wants and necessities of every class of social reformer find common ground.

If not an indication of immediate triumph, it is an evidence that once excluded ideas have possessed thoughtful minds and reached the stage of practical application. How cheered and strengthened would the great-hearted leader be, were he alive, to see the imperial progress of his conquering cause!

CAN THE TAX BE SHIFTED

The Editor of LAND VALUES

SIR,—According to the May issue of LAND VALUES, when Mr. Outhwaite was asked at Harlesden whether the proposed tax on land values can be shifted, he replied as follows:—

"The land value tax is the only tax that cannot be passed on. It will compel the owner to take less for the land instead of enabling him to get more. That is why every owner of land denounces this tax as confiscation and robbery—because they know that they cannot pass it on."

Though this is not a verbatim account of Mr. Outhwaite's extempore reply we may take it as a fairly complete summary of his remarks. Further, it indicates quite accurately the line adopted by a great many other speakers, when tackled on this particular point. But is it an adequate reply? Does it even suggest to a hostile critic the proper method of approaching the question? To declare rhetorically that the opposition shown to our proposals by the landlords proves that they know they cannot evade the incidence of the tax may be effective enough in a public meeting but when the man who has propounded his difficulty goes home and thinks over the answer will it not appear rather threadbare and unsatisfactory?

We must look at the question from the point of view of the man who asks it. No one who has really grasped the basic ideas of the taxation of land values even puts such a question. The very asking of it indicates a fogged or illogical mind. It is the stock problem of those who are prejudiced against the movement, those who have never made any mental effort to understand it—those, for instance, who have no idea about land beyond nationalising it and who therefore cannot understand why we should bother about such a slow, roundabout method as taxation. These are the men we have to convince, and we will never convince them by simply asserting roundly that the land value tax is the only tax that cannot be passed on. Proof, not assertion, is required.

It is extremely difficult to answer the question satisfactorily in a short space just because it involves fundamentals. We will go back to the beginning. We must try and make the interrogator understand what rent is, and we must explain how land differs from every other commodity with which the economist has to deal. When a man appreciates how land differs from tea it will at once become obvious how a tax on land values differs from a tax on tea.

But here is the pitfall. No one can safely give a résumé of the theory of the taxation of land values when asked to show that the tax cannot be passed on. There are too many chances of being side-tracked. What we require, therefore, is some way of answering the question which will be a *via media* between a dissertation and a couple of unsupported statements. Will you or some of your friends show us how it can best be done?

Yours, &c.,

FREDERICK SCOPES.

Glasgow, May, 1917.

[It is freely admitted that a tax on tea can be passed on. Consumers of tea know by experience that when the tax on tea is increased, the price is advanced accordingly. This view is as a rule accepted by the man who puts the question at our meetings, but does he follow closely or grasp clearly the full explanation given him as to how this is so?

Let us assume that he does not and call on our imagination to help us out of the difficulty.

Suppose a tax on tea would bring more tea into the market, what would happen? The price of tea would fall and the tea dealer could not pass on the tax. Not only could he not pass on the tax in such circumstances, but he