

every increase of population the value of land rises; with every decrease it falls." This statement by Henry George does not prove that his other statement is unsound; but it does at least show—as might be shown by many other quotations—that the Prophet of San Francisco, like other great leaders, was not always and wholly consistent.

One need not insist on the verbal inspiration of "Progress and Poverty" to believe, as I do, that it is one of the noblest of books ever written. Nor need the Single Taxers fear that the fundamental thesis of their great leader will be weakened by constructive attempts to re-study and re-state it for the world of 1935.

Wanted:

One Thousand Teachers

SCHWARTZ, a Minneapolis lawyer, said to me after he had completed his first class in "Progress and Poverty:" "In ten weeks I made fifteen Single Taxers. That is more than I made in the twenty years I have been talking Single Tax." His second class, recruited mainly by "graduates," has an enrollment of twenty-five.

Other teachers of Extension Courses with whom I have come in contact report the same result. The teaching of "Progress and Poverty" according to the Teacher's Manual published by the Henry George School of Social Science is the most effective and quickest method of making converts to the Single Tax cause.

Let us consider the other tried methods of making Single Taxers. That these methods have been found wanting is manifest by the smallness of our numbers, by the public rejection of our point of view as indicated by increased taxes on labor products and reduced taxes on land values, by the definite and outspoken programmes of governments to further safeguard the privileges of landlords. These methods consist of two kinds: making speeches and distributing literature. The speeches are ineffective, as far as making converts is concerned, not because of lack of oratorical ability, but because such audiences as are available primarily seek entertainment. Serious education is very far from the minds of lunch clubs when they listen to a speaker; street corner crowds are notorious for their heckling proclivities; church groups class speakers with bridge tournaments as a diversion. I have tried talking economics to all kinds of audiences. After losing a few audiences I learned that the way to hold them was to tell stories, hoping that these stories might carry home some significant fact of economics. Because I entertained my audiences I held them. But, did I make Single Taxers?

It must be remembered that we are not only trying to uproot the greatest and most strongly entrenched vested interest of all times, but that in attempting to do this we must destroy ideas so deeply imbedded in the

minds of men, so bulwarked by law, so thoroughly accepted as right and necessary through centuries of practice and precedent, that the fragmentary character of a short speech is quite apt to create in the minds of the audience a doubt as to the sanity of a Single Tax speaker. When we speak of wealth as only the product of labor and land, and deny that land, bonds, mortgages and even money are wealth, we are asking people to believe something as foreign from their experience and thinking as that two and two are five. To tell a worker that a tax on land values will create jobs, where for a hundred years he has been convinced that only the wickedness of a "boss" prevents his going to work, is to request him to re-orientate his entire thinking processes; that cannot be done successfully in an hour's talk.

The only possible beneficial effect of a speech on Single Tax is to arouse curiosity in the minds of some of the more thoughtful in our audiences, hoping that such curiosity will result in their study of the subject. No doubt many who have read "Progress and Poverty" and have become followers of Henry George were first interested in the subject by some speaker. But that this result must of necessity be very spasmodic, uncertain and rare is quite evident.

The distribution of literature (which includes letter-writing to the Vox Populi columns of newspapers) would be valuable propaganda if the literature were always read. I venture to say, and my estimate is the result of my own experience and the opinions of others, that not one-tenth of the literature we Single Taxers have distributed was ever read. It is evident, also, that only the briefest and simplest pamphlets are read; so that the distribution of literature becomes, like speaking, a haphazard searching for a few thoughtful minds who will be stimulated to further investigation.

Both public speaking and the distribution of literature are of necessity uncertain in their effect and nebulous in results. If we could have a hundred speakers making daily talks all over the country, and could unload ten million pamphlets on the public in a year, it is quite likely that a sufficiently large number of susceptible minds could be reached, so that in a comparatively short time our numbers would be considerably augmented. Obviously, this is a physical and financial impossibility.

The object of a speaking or literature campaign is to interest people in a study of our philosophy. More specifically, we would like to have a wider knowledge and understanding of "Progress and Poverty." Now, the class method is much more direct, concise, certain, and the results are immediately known. Take a group of fifteen students through the book in ten weekly lessons and you are almost sure of fifteen Single Taxers. I do now wish to depreciate the value of Single Tax talks, or of distributing literature. I rather think these talks and the literature should be used as a means of advertising classes. Experience has shown that as between the

teaching and the propaganda methods, the former is much more satisfactory. Certainly, it is much less nebulous in results.

Some Single Taxers have objected to the teaching method as too slow. They advocate political action. No one denies that eventually the Single Tax must enter the arena of politics. We advocate a change in our fiscal law, and surely such a change must be brought about by a counting of ballots. I am a firm believer in political action, not only because that is an eventual necessity, but because there is no better form of propaganda. But there are not enough Single Taxers in the country, or in any one State or city, to warrant undertaking the job. In the City of New York, where there are more Single Taxers than elsewhere in the country, I do not believe there are more than a thousand people who understand our philosophy and believe in it thoroughly enough to undertake a political campaign. And, more important, political action entails very much more expense than our meagre numbers could sustain. Even if a successful campaign could be conducted, so that by some fortunate circumstance we should be able to write the Single Tax into the statutes of any one State, let us say, the results might be quite disastrous; for, unless there is a very considerable number of citizens who understand what we aim to do, the landlords could so twist our plans out of shape as to discredit the Single Tax in the minds of the electorate, and make it so dismal a "failure" as to delay this great reform for many more years, perhaps centuries. I do not mean that we must be an actual majority to inaugurate and maintain Single Tax laws, but surely we must be a much larger minority than we are now.

If every Single Taxer in the country will do his or her part in furthering the educational campaign of the Henry George School of Social Science, within at most ten years we shall have a sufficiently large body of Single Taxers to make possible successful political campaigns. Fifty-six years have elapsed since "Progress and Poverty" was given to the world. None of us is proud of the progress we have made. Ten years is a short time to devote to a plan which, judging by our experience with it during the past two years, gives so much promise of definite, certain results.

The aim is to start one thousand classes in "Progress and Poverty." Let us take an average of ten students to a class. The course is completed in ten weeks, which makes it possible to repeat the course four times in one year. Each teacher will have "graduated" forty in a year—and a thousand times forty is a large number. If this is continued for ten years, is my prediction of a sufficiently large minority to make its voice heard too sanguine? It must be remembered that every "graduate" is a potential teacher of a class, or a propagandist, or a possible leader. What the result of such an educational campaign can be must be left to one's imagination. It

is quite evident that the teaching campaign has possibilities of developing so progressively as to make our fondest hopes seem conservative.

All this campaign requires is *your* willingness to do something to further the cause you so ardently believe in. It entails no expense, except one dollar for a copy of the Teacher's Manual. Each student supplies himself with a copy of "Progress and Poverty," and even if you can afford to furnish these books it is better to require the students to purchase them; they then have an investment in the course and for that reason are more likely to attend regularly and to prepare their lessons.

You can teach "Progress and Poverty." Even if you lack confidence in your own pedagogical ability, remember that you have Henry George to help you. Your object is not to sell yourself, but to encourage your students to read the great book. With the Teacher's Manual to guide you there is really no teaching problem at all. And, of course, after you have completed one class, the teaching of the ensuing classes will become simpler and more interesting.

Your only problem is the recruiting of students for your first class. In several cases ministers have been helpful in this by advertising the course among their parishioners, in their Men's Clubs, etc. I know of one class that was started by the Single Taxer's daughter; she and her "boy friend" enlisted their friends. One man told his stenographer that he was going to have a class, and she did the rest. Another man who runs a large plant organized a class among his employees. A public official, who is a Single Taxer, induced the men in his office to join. It is in the organizing of your first class that you must exercise ingenuity. The second class organizes itself.

Where to hold the class? In your office, your living room, the basement of your church, in a public building. That should present no problem.

Be one of The Ten Thousand Teachers. Start now. One night a week devoted to this great work will not be a sacrifice. It will be a pleasure and an inspiration. You will enjoy the work, for what greater enjoyment can a Single Taxer have than teaching the great truth he so fervently believes?

I told an old-time Single Taxer about this work. He is a man in the seventies. "Yes," he said, "We have to do this thing. Our death rate is greater than our birth rate." That remark is a worthy text for a Single Tax sermon. Unless you and I and all Single Taxers get busy right now teaching the gospel of freedom as preached by our great prophet, where will the Single Taxers of the next generation come from?—FRANK CHODOROV.

EDITORIAL NOTE

There are some statements in this article with which we must disagree. One is Mr. Chodorov's contention that the number of our believers is decreasing. We believe on the contrary that our doc-

trines are penetrating, if slowly, the minds of increasing numbers. And we are in a position to know.

We are prone to look back to the old Anti-Poverty days and to the wonderful campaign of 1886 when a vote of 68,000 was counted for Henry George in what is now the Borough of Manhattan. But there were few believers in those years. Men followed Henry George as an almost inspired leader. But as far as any knowledge of his philosophy was concerned it is doubtful if more than a few hundred really comprehended it.

Let us recall to Mr. Chodorov a matter of history. From the platform of the Anti-Poverty Society we heard one speaker declare that he always broke the ginger ale bottles in order to provide work for the bottle-makers! We heard another ask in the event of prohibition what all those at work in breweries and elsewhere would do when they were thrown out of employment. It never seems to have occurred to him that the liquor addicts might spend their money for candy. Now remember that these speakers appeared on a Henry George platform and were accredited spokesmen of the Anti-Poverty Society!

We say confidently that this could not happen today in any gathering of men calling themselves Georgists.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

He Was My Friend

EARLY in the World War I wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Sun regarding a tariff article it had published in which I pointed out the absurdity of choking trade in order to encourage industry, since industry and trade were not separate things, but merely separable parts of the same thing, the supplying of human needs and wants. Great was my surprise to get a letter from Theodore H. Price, the "Cotton King," who had been but a name to me, with a clipping of my letter to the editor enclosed, asking me to amplify my views for *Commerce and Finance*. I did so, got a very satisfactory check in return, and an invitation to join him at luncheon at some convenient time, which I soon did. Soon after we entered the war I was persuaded to join him.

How he so long put up with my propensity to "preach" has often puzzled me, though I know that in his heart he sympathized with it to a degree. "Bell," he said to me many years ago, "I thoroughly agree with you that the Georgian economic philosophy is ideal. It affords the only ethically sound and equitable basis for a real civilization, and eventually the world must come to it if civilization is to endure. But I see obstacles in the way of its adoption which you know not of and cannot now realize, and at my time of life I do not feel equal to undertaking a crusade for it."

On another occasion, in objecting to publishing something I had written, he suddenly asked me if my father were a preacher, and on my admitting that both my grandfather and great-grandfather had been clergymen, he exclaimed:

"I knew it! You're a born preacher—it's in your blood!"

Nevertheless, with all the many-sidedness of his genius, sometimes contradictory, he was one of Nature's princes, and my grief at his passing is tempered with a sense of exaltation and thankfulness that I was privileged to know him and can say: "He was my friend."

STEPHEN BELL in *Commerce and Finance*.

NOAH WEBSTER wrote in 1787: "The present generation have no right to say what the next generation shall deem a privilege . . . If our posterity are bound by our constitutions, and can neither alter nor amend them, they are to all intents and purposes slaves."—*An Answer to the Dissenting Members of the Pennsylvania Convention*.

Robert Schalkenbach Report

INTERESTING PUBLICITY

AMONG the interesting clippings that have been sent to us by our News Bureau, should be mentioned a series by Mr. Leslie Eichel of the Central Press Association. Several years ago Mr. Eichel visited the Foundation Office in search of information and material on the gold question, and he asked whether Henry George had written anything on this subject. The late Arthur Pleydell, who happened to be in the office at the time, looked up several references in George's writings for Mr. Eichel. Later Mr. Eichel quoted in syndicated articles from these references. He received material from this office from time to time, including the book, "Social Problems," and our prepared review which mentions Public Debt. Recently we were glad to note a series of four articles written by Mr. Eichel for the Central Press Association, widely syndicated in newspapers throughout the middle west, and east. In the first article, Mr. Eichel says:

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Some students of economics are going back to a book written fifty-years ago to find a way out of present difficulties.

The book is "Social Problems," by the same Henry George who wrote the classic "Progress and Poverty" (which some of our readers would have us re-read).

Henry George bulks larger and larger as the years pass. He may go down into history as the major American prophet—and his words of more than half a century ago still may lead to a new social order.

Among the most striking words in Henry George's "Social Problems" are these (and they might have been written this very hour):

"Upon the assumption that ascendants may bind descendants, that one generation may legislate for another generation, rests the assumed validity of our land titles and public debts.

"If it were possible for the present to borrow of the future, for those now living to draw upon wealth to be created by those who are yet to come, there could be no more dangerous power, none more certain to be abused; and none that would involve in its exercise a more flagrant contempt for the natural and inalienable rights of man.

"But we have no such power, and there is no possible invention by which we can obtain it. When we talk about calling upon future generations to bear their part of the costs and burdens of the present, about imposing upon them a share in expenditures, we take the liberty of assuming they will consider such expenditures to have been made for their benefit as well as for ours—which is an absurdity."

Henry George strikes directly at the present situation with:

"Public debts are not a device for borrowing from the future, for compelling those yet to be, to bear a share in the expenses which a present generation may choose to incur. That is, of course, a physical impossibility. They are merely a device for obtaining control of wealth in the present by promising that a certain distribution of wealth in the future shall be made—a device by which the owners of existing wealth are induced to give it up under promise, not merely that other people shall be taxed to pay them, but that other people's children shall be taxed for the benefit of their children or the children of their assigns."

and he continues to quote at considerable length from George.

The second article reads in part as follows: