

HOW plausible seem these attacks on the laissez faire principle which Mr. Flexner tells us is "forever closed." Yet when was it open? Free competition against which superficial writers fulminate, has never existed in the world. Monopoly of the natural resources has everywhere interfered with the normal law of competition, and thus against the law of cooperation, which is its complement and not its opposite. With government monopolies everywhere, how idle it is to attribute the ills of society to the exactly opposite policy!

AND speaking of "private fortunes" reminds us of the "share the wealth" slogan heard so frequently nowadays. But whose wealth? Granted that what is needed is a more equitable distribution, is there no ethical discrimination to be observed? Are we to ignore the origin of these fortunes which we propose so lightly to share among us? What right have we to them—how much greater right than the present possessors?

DICK TURPIN had a political economy like that. It made him quite popular for a time, but looking at him in retrospect his code of morals does not seem quite so inviting? Of course, his practices included one of the cardinal principles of Mr. Lippman and other thinkers when discussing taxation without any consideration at all of "the benefits received" theory. Of course, too, there are times when Dick Turpin's somewhat reprehensible conduct seems lily-white when compared to the practices of governments. Turpin seems a somewhat gallant figure when compared with the sneaking practices of our official representatives and their greedy snarls. "Share the wealth," indeed! That has been the cry of every highwayman and brigand from Robin Hood to Dillinger.

IT is impossible to imagine a greater robber than the government itself. It has "shared the wealth" with a vengeance. Every purchaser of a twenty cent article in many states is robbed of a part of his purchase. Even the mother who buys milk for her babes is robbed in New Jersey, so that the receiver of economic rent (the only public wealth) may escape his contribution to the cost of government which itself creates these values. Dick Turpin would not have done that!

THE great robbery of which these lesser robberies are but the sequels and consequences is the robbery of the earth. Against this robbery the great minds of all the ages have protested, Moses, Gregory the Great, Tom Paine, Carlyle, Rousseau, Tolstoy, Henry George and many others. Only the last offered a definite solution. But the robbery continues. With the earth closed, or open only on the terms of the lords of the earth, unem-

ployment, poverty and misery result. They are the ev results of the system which denies man a place to wor Not only is this a challenge to labor, it is equally a cha lenge to capital. It is time that capital and labor awok These stupid, snarling cries of "share the wealth" shou be a warning to capital, to the possessors of wealth, ar to labor. The remedy is theirs if they will but take i To the wealthy, the conservation of their fortunes, th security of their possessions; to labor, the freedom work—these call for the application of the only remed that is safe, sane and easily brought about. Publ wealth for public purposes, private wealth as the sacre property of those who create it. And all this to l effected by the mere shifting of the tax burden. Is not worth trying?

"What Are We Going to Do About It?"

WHEN the complete panorama of human justic reveals itself to the student of "Progress ar Poverty," he asks with an impetuosity born of knowled and conviction:

"What are we going to do about it?"

That question has confronted every teacher of Henr George. It is a question which bespeaks not only a understanding of the fundamental economics on whic the proposal to socialize ground rent is based, but als an earnest desire to see this reform enacted into law that involuntary poverty, that scourge of humanit shall be abolished from this earth. The riddle of th Sphinx has been solved. Why wait?

In attempting to answer that question every teach reaches back into memory for a satisfying reply. H thinks of the time when he, too, having closed the grea book with that ecstatic feeling that comes to one to who a great truth has been revealed, asked the same que tion. He recalls the many plans and campaigns, th speeches made, the pamphlets written and distribute the congresses held and the resolutions passed—every thing that has been done "about it" since the time of Henry George. He finds no adequate answer, becau he knows that every plan attempted has fallen far sho of the goal. He realizes that this failure to advance cause so grounded in reason and justice has not been du to any fallacy in its logic, nor yet to lack of ability c self-sacrifice on the part of many who have devoted the lives to it. The reason that the Single Tax reform ha not advanced must be due to lack of public demand fo it, which in turn must be ascribed to lack of publ knowledge of it.

The late Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry Georg School of Social Science, realized that widespread educ tion must be a prerequisite for any successful attemp to enact Single Tax legislation. He arrived at this cor

usion only after many years of active work in various single Tax endeavors. He was the kind of devotee who never failed to lend a helping hand in any effort to advance the cause. Yet, some years before he passed on he realized that this sporadic expounding of Henry George's philosophy could only arouse interest in a few listeners, and that complete conviction could come only with thorough knowledge. And he further realized that the short-cuts of political action in which he had taken so active a part did not succeed because there had not been a sufficient background of education.

WE MUST EDUCATE

But why, it may be asked, is education so necessary to this movement? Many reform movements have been attempted, and some successfully brought about, with mere propaganda—speeches and literature. The Abolitionists of the middle of last century, and the Prohibitionists at the beginning of this one, both saw their proposals put into law without any educational campaign, depending entirely upon propaganda literature and extensive speech-making. The reason for this is that they had nothing to teach. Their reforms were based entirely upon sentiment. It is a far cry from "Uncle Tom's Cabin" to "Progress and Poverty." And then emagoguery has a quicker appeal than reason.

Why, then, cannot the Single Tax be advocated in the same way? Surely, we can appeal to the hearts of men with our proposal to abolish poverty, with all the social readjustments that arise from it. The very beauty of "Progress and Poverty" is in its ethical approach to economics. The desire to destroy the cruel system of landlordism that is gnawing at the vitals of civilization is a human impulse, not confined to the erudite. And so on.

Quite true. But it so happens that in order for us to reach the hearts of men we must dislodge from their minds certain erroneous conceptions which have been accepted as true and necessary for many centuries. The iniquity of landlordism is apparent only to those who have some idea of the function of economic rent. The populace looks upon landlordism not as a necessary evil, but as a beneficial system. A tax on land values is to the average citizen no different in effect from a tax on labor products; and the farmer, even the tenant farmer, is quite sure we single Taxers (if he has ever heard of us) want to "take his land away from him." When we speak of wealth as one thing, and of land, money and bonds as another thing, we are running contrary not only to what seems obvious to the man in the street, but also to what he has been taught to believe since the beginning of time. Nay, we are speaking a language that is foreign even to the student of "economics" in our universities. To him our differentiation between land and capital is as ungrounded as it is bewildering.

Our problem is, therefore, primarily educational. It

would be foolhardy to venture an opinion as to just how the Single Tax will be written into our statute books. That eventually we must enter the political arena with our proposal is quite evident; for we ask for a change in our fiscal laws, and that can only be brought about by a counting of ballots. Whether we shall gain our end by separate party action, or through referenda or initiative petitions, it is almost useless to speculate. What the precedent political conditions will be is also speculative. Some there are who claim that a social upheaval, even communism, will precede the Single Tax, and it is plausible to assume that a land value tax will be part of a general reform movement which will include many things foreign and antagonistic to our philosophy. In any event, it is certain that no matter what form of political action we engage in, or what political situation arises that will make possible the enactment of land value taxation, the extent of our influence or success will depend on the number of citizens who are thoroughly familiar with the philosophy of Henry George. Even if through some subterfuge or freakish political situation we should be able to have the Single Tax written into the fundamental law of a political subdivision of the country it is questionable whether the result would be desirable; for, without the intelligent vigilance of a reasonable number of informed citizens, the landlords could make such a law appear ineffective and even harmful, so that our reform would seem to be a "failure," would be discredited, and would be retarded for many years, perhaps centuries. The price of liberty is intelligent, no less than eternal, vigilance.

But, though only through widespread education can we hope to inaugurate and maintain our reform, it must not be assumed that our problem is to teach "Progress and Poverty" to fifty-one per cent of the people. That would be an impossible task. It is a fact that an organized minority that knows what it wants can dominate a large crowd; but the minority must be of sufficient size to make its voice heard. Neither the Abolitionists nor the Prohibitionists ever approached the proportions of a majority in their successful campaigns. Just how many Single Taxers we should have to assure permanent success is very difficult to say. It has been estimated that one hundred thousand is the number we need in this country. This is not an insuperable goal. In a comparatively few years, the concerted efforts of all those who now believe in our philosophy can achieve this result.

THE PLAN

The plan evolved by the trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science is as follows: To organize as quickly as possible One Thousand Classes in "Progress and Poverty" in various parts of the country, wherever teachers can be located. Experience has shown that between ten to twenty students make an ideal class.

The course is completed in ten weeks. Therefore, allowing for unforeseen delays and vocation periods, each teacher can complete three classes in a year, accounting for approximately forty graduates. Thus, forty thousand will have been added to our number in one year. It must be born in mind, however, that the increasing momentum of this campaign is a factor that makes any estimate of numbers impractical. Every graduate becomes a potential teacher, or at any rate a solicitor of students. Every class in a larger community becomes the nucleus for a full-time school. Among our students are many who come in contact with large groups in their daily work—such as school teachers, labor leaders, social workers, newspaper men. In proportion as we have more of this type of student the greater will be the acceleration of our campaign. Nor must it be forgotten that numbers attract attention, and that activity arrests public notice; as we progress in our educational work the public press, even where it is antagonistic, will aid in filling up our class rooms.

When a well-conceived and fundamentally sound plan is determined upon it is futile to attempt to foresee every eventuality and to outline every detail of procedure in advance. It is quite possible that educational avenues other than the class method will be available, such as the radio, correspondence courses, and the use of newspaper and magazine space. This will be dependent upon our financial resources, which, of course, will be enhanced with the increase in our numbers. Nor must we overlook the possibility of our own classes being augmented by classes in established educational institutions, for not only will our own teacher students carry the message of economic justice to their schools, but the increase in our numbers will compel the professional teachers of economics to at least explain Henry George's theory in their class rooms. Nay, the very problem of increasing poverty, the inadequacy of the nostrums that are being offered, the clamor for a real cure will force public interest to our fundamental reform as the increasing number of our graduates call attention to it. It is inevitable, also, that the impatience of Single Taxers with the slow and steady progress of education will result in attempting political action; while such action cannot possibly be successful at this time, or even in the immediate future, it cannot but be helpful to the school movement because of the very publicity which political action always attracts.

So, as we embark on this great educational venture, we cannot foresee what storms we shall encounter or what favorable winds will help us on our course. We know that our bark has a sound keel and that it will get us to our port if only we are steadfast in our purpose. Anchors aweigh. Let's go.

WHAT "I" MUST DO

For the individual who, having absorbed the full truth of "Progress and Poverty," asks himself, "What am I

going to do about it?" The answer must be found primarily in his own resources, his abilities and his limitations, his spiritual make-up. Genius should not, cannot, be harnessed. Men of strength and vision make their own plans. But, it is not amiss to suggest to every graduate some thoughts on how he can cooperate with the general campaign of the school, as well as some avenues of individual expression which will advance the cause.

First, and foremost, every believer in the philosophy of Henry George should appoint himself a committee of one to see that his school or class is never lacking in students. No matter what kind of propaganda work he engages in, the thought uppermost in his mind should be to persuade everyone he comes in contact with to study "Progress and Poverty." No Single Taxer is true to his principles who does not enroll at least five students a year. With that first item in our credo faithfully adhered to the educational campaign cannot possibly fail.

Secondly, he should try to increase the number of classes in his community. Small classes are most effective because they encourage discussion. Therefore, when a class numbers more than twenty, possibly fifteen is a better number, a new class should be formed. And in larger cities, where the inconvenience of travel is a consideration, it is desirable to organize classes in various parts of the town. Sometimes it is possible to persuade a group of friends to attend a class in some home, while it might be impossible to have them travel downtown to a classroom. Business and professional people can be induced to join a class of their own, meeting in a convenient office, while the thought of attending a school at their ages may seem puerile. Groups of serious minded women, their appetites for social gatherings somewhat jaded by the vacuity of their previous endeavors, can be appealed to on the ground of personal enlightenment and greater public service. Men's clubs and church groups offer opportunity for classes. Nor should we overlook adult educational schools, vocational schools, business colleges, giving them an opportunity to widen their scope by offering their students a course in fundamental economics.

Thirdly, every student of the Single Tax should prepare himself to teach. As the number of classes increases the demand for teachers will be a strain on our forces. It is of prime importance, therefore, that every follower of Henry George consider himself a possible teacher and be prepared to be called or to call himself into service. While it is true that many effective teachers have been men whose only acquaintance with our philosophy has been gained from a thorough understanding of "Progress and Poverty," it is always helpful if the teacher has studied all of George's books, especially the "Science of Political Economy" and "Protection or Free Trade." Such books as Professor Geiger's "Philosophy of Henry George," Louis F. Post's "Prophet of San Francisco," Patrick Dove's "Theory of Human Progression," and

others, all help to broaden the teacher's knowledge and thus enable him to bring to the class an erudition that is impressive, and a mental experience that enables him to cope with class-room questions. But, such wider study is only helpful, not necessary. Perhaps an ability to interpret political and economic affairs of the day in the light of Henry George's philosophy is more important, for the average class-room question is based on current events. The Henry George School of Social Science publishes a "Teachers' Manual," with questions, answers, and suggestions on how to conduct classes, that is an invaluable pedagogical help to every teacher. For purposes of uniformity the trustees of the Henry George School of Social Science require authorized teachers to use this manual as a guide.

Thus, the answer to "What am I going to do about it" is quite definite. First, get students; second, organize classes; third, be a teacher. If every follower of Henry George will follow this personal programme faithfully the success of the educational campaign is assured. And upon the success of this campaign depends the success of any political endeavor that the movement may eventually decide to engage in.

WHAT "I" MIGHT DO

To those who feel inclined to enlarge upon their personal activities, there is ever so much work that can be done. For the orator these are unbounded opportunities. In these days of stress, when the minds of men, oppressed by the ever-increasing problems of poverty, bewildered by the confusion of illogical nostrums that are offered for their solution, and faith in long-established concepts of government shaken by innovations which run contrary to reason, are open to any proposal which might appear to be more in harmony with logic and experience, the orator who can effectively demonstrate a natural order in our politico-economic life would indeed be given a hearing. There are ever so many audiences that are prepared to listen.

And while we are on this topic of platform-teaching of the Single Tax, there is a thought that should be considered by the organized groups in our movement. Speakers' bureaus should be established in every city for the purpose of conducting regular campaigns for securing opportunities to speak. It is easier for a secretary to "sell" the services of the orator than for the latter to solicit engagements for himself.

For those who are literarily inclined, for the research student, for those who can wield the pen effectively, there are limitless opportunities. Such work must perforce be purely personal in character; no organization can foster creative thinking.

The Single Tax movie scenario has not yet been written. Nor the novel that shall popularize the land question as "Uncle Tom's Cabin" popularized the slavery question. We need editorial writers who will apply the acid

test of Natural Law to the news events of the day. No one has yet written a book showing how landlordism and its corollary, restrictive tariffs, caused that crazy conflagration, "The World War." History needs to be re-written in the light of Henry George's philosophy.

In the field of economics we need a comparative study of all the schools, demonstrating their fallacies as well as their conflicting ideas, so as to further enhance the grandeur, simplicity and cogency of the system taught by Henry George. We need graphic charts, based upon factual findings, to determine the irrefutable deductions of Henry George. For instance, a chart showing how wages and interest rise as rent falls, and vice versa. Or, a chart showing the relation between the volume of charity dispensed in the city of New York and the rise in land value. The ratio of bankruptcies to increased land values, in number and in dollar volume; the increase of farm tenantry; the concentration of mineral land ownership and the consequent rise of monopolies; a comparison of land values and mortgages; land booms that preceded panics; one could go on almost indefinitely naming subject matter to which the research student could well apply himself in the effort to prove factually and by charts the effect of private land ownership on economic and social phenomena.

The legalistic and political aspects of land ownership open a wide field for the lawyer-authors in our movement. We really should have definite knowledge of the legal hurdles it will some day be necessary to overcome so that land valuation laws may stand the test of court action. The legal history of private land ownership would make interesting and intelligent material.

It is not necessary to speculate further into the fields of inquiry for subjects on which the student and the literary-minded could engage with profit. Enough has been indicated to show the vastness of the intellectual mine in which these minds can explore for more than one answer to the question, "What am I going to do about it."

IT'S UP TO YOU

The task is yours. It is not a question of "what are *we* going to do about it?" but "what am *I* going to do about it?" The problem is an individual one, and its solution is directly dependent upon, and in exact ratio to, the effort and ability of every one who has acquired a knowledge of Henry George to spread this knowledge. Do not wait for somebody else. Do not waste time in praying for a leader. "Progress and Poverty" is your guide, Henry George is your inspiration, and you are the disciple, on whom the mantle has fallen. Go forth into the highways and the by-ways and teach the gospel of economic liberty.—FRANK CHODOROV.

TO accommodate the report of the Congress and other matter which should find place, this issue comprises forty pages instead of the usual thirty-two.