

campaigns in several states, among them Oregon, California, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New York. Prof. Dudden is rather sketchy about these campaigns and it would be instructive to know more about them other than that they failed.

Fels' money was not enough to overcome opposition—indeed it often exacerbated opposition. His generosity to the single tax colony of Fairhope, Alabama also precipitated controversy there. And staff members of the Fels fund wanted more and more money for less and less work—a familiar phenomenon in the world today! Yet his largesse enabled much to be done that might not have been done otherwise.

Returning to Britain, Fels found that the Budget was in trouble. He proposed closer cooperation with the Labour Party, which the United Committee declined—but he continued his support. He also visited and contributed to Georgist movements in France, Germany, Denmark Italy and Spain, and backed an international conference in Ronda, Spain in 1913.

In February 1914 Joseph Fels, worn out with his toils, died at the age of 60 in his home city of Philadelphia. He entrusted the carrying on of his work to his wife Mary. But she had other ideas. Although she followed her husband while he was alive, she soon discontinued support to the Georgists—the work of the United Committee was set back by this defection—and turned her attention and support to Zionism.

In the fateful year of 1914 the "guns of August" silenced many reform movements including the single tax. Prof. Dudden goes too far, however, when he concludes, "The worldwide single-tax movement founded on the doctrines of Henry George and nourished by Fels-Naphtha's profits ended with



his death as well." The argument goes on in many forms, and so does the work.

Letters to the Editor

HENRY GEORGE AND THE POPE

SIR, — In claiming that I am wrong when stating that the Papal Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* was a counter to Georgeist ideas, Mrs. Marie McCrone seems to be unaware of the conflicts caused by the writings of Henry George among Catholic clergy well before 1891, as shown in my book *Henry George und Europa*.

To begin with, Father Edward McGlynn of St. Stephen's in New York was excommunicated because of his Georgeist engagement in 1887. After that, George's books were submitted to the Holy Office at Rome and were condemned. However, the Cardinals Manning and Gibbons who disapproved of this, succeeded in preventing their being listed as forbidden literature.

As for the Papal Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of 1891, it almost exclusively tries to justify the private ownership of land as it exists today. Henry George himself regarded the Encyclical as aimed at him, and so did Cardinal Manning (cf. Henry George jr., *The Life of Henry George*, New York 1901, p. 565).

I am very sorry to disappoint your correspondent, but these are the sad facts.

Yours faithfully,

MICHAEL SILAGI

Munich,
West Germany.

CHINA'S LAND VALUE TAXATION?

SIR, — When a recent Labour Party Political Broadcast began with the "Land Song" it made me sit up and listen, but when it continued by outlining Labour proposals for "solving the land question once and for all," I realised again how the powerful arguments for land reform are bent to attempt to justify more government interference in the economy. It also greatly interested me to hear that Sun Yat-sen, the founding father of the first Chinese Republic, and the founder of the Kuomintang political party was supposed to have believed in the principles of

Henry George (Fred Harrison's letter, Nov.-Dec. issue), and I had to find out what happened to such auspicious beginnings of China's first attempt at a modern democratic society.

On further examination, it turned out the basis for this suggestion was that Sun Yat-sen had privately told an American journalist at about the time of the first Chinese revolution of 1911, that he intended to found a state based on the principles of Henry George, but this was the only recorded instance of his actually mentioning a belief in H.G.'s principles, and furthermore that the journalist was known by Sun Yat-sen to be an advocate of H.G.'s land value taxation.

Unfortunately, Sun Yat-sen was only President of China for a very short period before the republic disintegrated into Civil War and the rule of Warlords and died before the Kuomintang regained power in 1926, and so the truth of this statement could never be put to the test, but before his death, he did produce a lengthy political statement in the book *San min Chu-i (The Three Principles of the People)* and the third principle, "the people's livelihood" contained his economic proposals. The book subsequently has gained lip-service approval of both the Chinese Communist Party and the Kuomintang.

The part of "the people's livelihood" relating to land does indeed advocate a land tax, but it is a tax on "unearned increment" similar to that advocated by J. S. Mill, which ignores historic land values and only seeks to tax increases in land value. Experience has shown that such proposals easily degenerate into mere taxes on development of land. Furthermore Sun Yat-sen regarded this source of revenue as a means of financing state capitalism—or state development of industry, and with his Marxist interpretation of history he thus hoped to by-pass the evils of *laissez-faire* capitalism.

Apparently, the successors to Sun Yat-sen in the Kuomintang never clearly understood Sun's land proposals, and although land reform has remained a slogan in the con-