

nor the extra fertility of the best land. At first the difference may seem trivial, but extended reasoning always shows the increasing evil of the error. An opponent, truthfully urging that population does not create rent, may seem to prevail in argument.

"The Abolition of Inheritance," by Harlan Eugene Read, said to be a Single Taxer, is based on economic fallacies. So many errors appear in the prospectus, that paying \$1.50 for the book cannot be worth while.

"Until enormous estates are limited no other sort of reform can hope for success." Meaning that confiscation of large estates must precede Single Tax.

"All workers are entitled to all reward; and any transfer of money without service, in whatsoever form such transfer is made, is in violation of that right."

The producer's title is not sound enough to enable him to give to his children.

In *The Louis Mirror* "Every thirty-five years all the power of the world is passed by inheritance to those who toil not."

Mr. Read's remedy would leave exploiters free to act for thirty-five years. The State will then claim the plunder, and this is called an economic remedy. Many ways would be devised to convey title before death, or stock-shares could pass in a way to avoid confiscation. Single Tax will take the unearned plunder yearly, and large fortunes could not be accumulated. Prevention each year is better than confiscation every 35 years.

What is it that is passed by inheritance? Mr. Read, though a Single Taxer, states, and reiterates against evidence, that it is the exploiting power of capital. Henry George denied that capital has such power.

Progress and Poverty, page 198: "Labor and capital are but different forms of the same thing—human exertion. Capital is produced by labor. . . . labor stored up in matter. The use of capital in production is, therefore, but a mode of labor.

"The State could properly claim land titles, by which the people are really exploited, but this can better be done yearly for revenue, then present capitalists will be unable to exploit by paying low wages."

Child labor advocates need Mr. Read: "The Maker sends all babes into the world equally poor, and declared that each should earn his bread by the sweat of his own face."

Children have no right to food and education for twenty years, and the parents have no right to furnish such help. The babe must, at birth, obey the divine command, and look for a job; for Mr. Read says: "No one has a right to receive what he does not earn."

However, it is not true that all babes are born equally poor; some find downy beds, others lie in a rickety clothes basket.

The Equitist W. E. Brokaw, editor, teaches that exchanges must be for equal time worked; "Exchange value" of products may be abolished.

August 2, 1918: "Ownership of land will confer no advantage when we exchange nothing but work for work. . . If I get 100 bushels of wheat from one location with the

same exertion that I get 50 from another, and sell at the same price per bushel, half of what I get for the former is what Henry George called economic rent. But if I sold it all at the same price per total result of each hour's work, the ultimate consumer would get that much more wheat, and I no rent."

Trouble would follow, because wheat is not sold to the consumer. Before it reached the baker, the 100 would get mixed with the 50 bushels and no one could know which he was eating. Keeping track of the hours of production would be difficult, and all output would need to be tagged with the time spent, and these tags would become lost at the flour mill or factory.

Mr. Brokaw gives Henry George much credit, but his economic system needs improving, as did the phonograph and typewriter.

The time system gets a jolt from Political Economy by Henry George, page 499: "While exertion is always the real measure of value, . . . yet to get a common measure of value. . . . we must take some result of exertion."

Wheat must be of the same price even when 100 bushels cost the same as another 50 bushels. C. F. HUNT.

A Farce of Democracy

WHY THE NEW YORK STATE SINGLE TAX PARTY IS NOT ON THE BALLOT

TO those who maintain that Republican or Democratic politicians, acting merely from considerations for the public welfare, will some day write the Single Tax into our fundamental law, the experience of the New York State Single Tax Party with our election laws this year should prove a rude awakening. The particular statutes with which we had to deal are those relating to the securing of a place for our ticket on the official ballot. These statutes were ostensibly designed for the purpose of giving to minority groups of citizens, with political programmes different from those offered by the dominant parties, the opportunity of voting for their programmes through their own nominees for office. As a matter of fact, no set of laws could be more cunningly devised to defeat that very purpose. Chairman Cocks, of the Whitman Campaign Committee, frankly admitted to one of our members that the law governing new political parties was written with the intention of keeping such parties off the ballot.

To secure a place on the official ballot of the State of New York, a new political party must obtain at least twelve thousand signatures to a nominating petition. That is a fair enough requirement. But of these twelve thousand, at least fifty must be obtained in each of the sixty-one counties of the State. If a new party should secure a hundred thousand signatures to its nominating petition in other parts of the State, but of these only forty-nine are of citizens of Wayne County, then the will of the hundred thousand citizens is defeated. Surely, this law is not consistent with the ideals of democracy. Why should the citizens of Buffalo or of New York City be limited in their

political ideals by those of the citizens of Sundown? Merely because such limitations make opposition to the Republican and Democratic parties more difficult.

This requirement is unjust and undemocratic. But its injustice can be realized only when the attempt to meet it is made. There are counties in the Empire State that are quite distant from large centers, and therefore not readily accessible. These are sparsely settled, and to secure fifty signatures in one of them it is necessary to travel over great distances. In several counties there is no town with a population of more than two thousand, which means no more than three or four hundred voters. Radical ideas, and new parties built upon radical ideas, do not permeate these sections. The conservatism of rural communities makes it impossible for a new party to gain a hearing. That is why the Democratic and Republican politicians force new parties to secure a number of signatures to their nominative positions in rural counties.

For the Single Tax Party these counties were particularly difficult. With the growing ascendancy of the land owner, the slavery predicted by Henry George is rapidly becoming a fact in the rural sections of New York. Whole towns and large parts of counties are owned by individual land speculators. They dominate the local police, judicial and administrative body. Notaries, who, as will be seen, are indispensable to securing signatures, owe their business to the good will of the family or families that own the land of the community. Nothing can be done in these communities without the sanction of the land owning classes. It is evident that a party advocating that their rent-collecting privilege be taken away from them could not get their sanction. Mr. Robinson, who toured the State for the Single Tax Party, tells of an instance where a young notary who in the evening enthusiastically agreed to help him secure the signatures, shamefacedly declined the work the next morning because the big land owner had ordered him to drop it or forfeit his chance of going to the State legislature next year; he was the only notary in the biggest town in the county. We have reason to believe that other notaries who agreed to secure signatures but failed to do so were similarly intimidated by the land owners.

Another requirement for a nominating petition is that every signer must be a registered voter, registered for the coming election. Necessarily the work of securing signatures must be done long before registration day; the law requires it. Now, if one out of twelve thousand signers fails to register, the nominating petition can be thrown out.

But this is as nothing compared to another "joker" in this instrument of democracy. No voter who is enrolled in one of the other parties may sign the nominating petition of the new party. He or she must remain a loyal Democrat or Republican for at least another year. The insidiousness of this provision is realized when one considers that in some towns an overwhelming percentage of voters are enrolled. In one town Mr. Robinson found that every voter, except the newly enfranchised women, was enrolled.

Another requirement, one that seems reasonable, but which on closer examination reveals the extent to which

politicians can go to defeat the ends of democracy, is that no voter may sign the petitions of two parties. If by a determined effort the Single Tax Party should obtain fifty signatures in every county, the politicians could easily invalidate their petition, even though it be signed by the necessary twelve thousand voters, by merely instructing a county henchman to induce one of the signers to also sign the Prohibition Party petition; that would invalidate this signature on both petitions.

To obviate this possibility, and to discount the signatures that are thrown out because of non-registering, enrollment in other parties, death, migration from the county, false names, etc., it is really necessary for a new party to secure many more than the required number. Less than a hundred in any one county, and a total of less than twenty thousand signatures is not safe.

There is one requirement which makes those mentioned mere trifles. It is not only a most difficult handicap to overcome, but it is in fact an infraction of our suffrage rights. The petition, the wording of which is determined by statute, is to the effect that the voters who sign it solemnly swear, before notaries, that they will vote for the candidates named on the sheet. This is a violation of the secret ballot law, one of the fundamentals of democracy.

Most likely this section of the election laws could not stand the test of the courts; nevertheless, it is an almost insurmountable obstacle for new political faiths desiring to secure an official hearing. In the cities, where the voter is independent to a great degree, it is not very difficult to meet this requirement. Many voters resent the crookedness of the law and sign the petition for that very reason. Most of those approached do not even read the petition, signing it because your argument "sounds good," and because they believe you have a right to be on the ballot. But in rural communities political orthodoxy dies hard. Smith knows that Brown has voted the Republican ticket since the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. And when Smith sees a sworn statement of Brown's to the effect that Brown is going to change his vote this year, everybody in town is going to know it. These conscientious Democrats and Republicans in small towns have plenty of time, too, to read every word of the document before signing; they'll "be doggarned if they put their names to something that ain't just right." You must convince them, after they have read the affidavit, that it is just right, that nobody has a right to ask them how they are going to vote or have voted, etc. But it takes a long time to convince these voters, and you must convince a hundred of them in a county. The result of this law is that signatures to petitions, either of new parties or independent nominations, are of the undesirables in rural communities; men who will sign anything for a friend or a glass of beer.

These were the requirements the Single Tax Party of New York faced when they decided to carry out their plan of placing the Single Tax on the official ballot, the first time in history that the attempt was made. With a faith that removes mountains they determined to try it, raised twelve hundred dollars among themselves—not one of them a

man of means—and sent Mr. Robinson out. They themselves worked in New York City and surrounding counties. A number of up-state members secured signatures. Everything within the power of this group of idealists was tried.

We did our duty—but we failed! On September 12th, the last day for filing petitions, we took stock and found that we were considerably short of the requirements. The politicians (including the Democrats whom we Single Taxers have worshipped these many years) had beaten us. They did not want the Single Tax voted on, and they had their way. They will not want the Single Tax voted on until the Single Taxers of New York realize that the only way to make the land question an issue is to force it on them by means of a repeatedly large and uncompromising vote for the Single Tax. After our experience with the chicanery of politicians, we are justified in saying that any Single Taxer who maintains that we can induce the Democratic or the Republican party to write the Single Tax into its platform without a public opinion registered at the ballot box is a good subject for any political confidence game.

Although we have lost in this attempt, we are unflinching in our resolve to do our duty by our ideal and by our State. The campaign for 1920 is already being considered. All the obstacles can be overcome; ten thousand dollars will do it. We know how to get the Single Tax on the ballot; we will learn how to raise the money with which to do it.

But the law is not as undemocratic as it might be. It is still possible for New Yorkers to vote for the Single Tax this year. Every member of the party will do it; every member is pledged to vote for the candidates of the party, and what sincere Single Taxer will not do so? The law permits us to write in the names of candidates. That is what we propose to do.

After realizing how both Democratic and Republican parties have made laws to defeat democratic ideals, every Single Taxer owes it to his conscience never to vote for the candidates of these renegade parties. A vote for them is a vote thrown away. A vote for the following, even though it is necessary to write their names into the ballot, is a vote for real democracy:

For Governor	Joseph Dana Miller
For Lieutenant-Governor	Antonio Bastida
For Secretary of State	Horace Sague
For Attorney-General	Benjamin W. Burger
For Comptroller	L. Carl Seelbach
For State Treasurer	Ellen G. Lloyd
For State Engineer	James Dangerfield

—FRANK CHODOROV.

EXPERT POLITICAL ADVICE TO SINGLE TAXERS

No great political movement, no great reform.... has ever been inaugurated by the rulers.—Buckle's "History of Civilization."

A CONFERENCE of English Single Taxers and their co-workers is to be held at Ilkley, Yorkshire, on Oct. 4.

California

SINCE writing you in the last number of the REVIEW, Single Tax matters have moved rapidly in California.

Our measure got a place on the ballot by a surplus of 15,000 signatures. About 35,000 well-intentioned Single Taxers signed the petition only to have their names rejected for informalities, such as failure to register within a given time, wrong or defective residence address, signing by initials, etc. If three and one-quarter times as many people vote for the measure on Nov. 5 as signed the petition it will go over the top easily, and there will have been written into the fundamental law of a great Commonwealth the most beneficent measure for human welfare since the dawn of history.

At the last election about two and one-half times as many voted for No. 5 as signed the petition. Of the total vote cast two years ago when the total vote on the measure was 836,865, 31% was for Single Tax, or 260,332. To gain the other 20% to win or to get 51% of the same total cast two years ago it is only necessary for one Single Taxer out of three in the State to get one more vote for Single Tax to put our measure over.

With the enthusiasm manifest now in the rank and file of the workers for Single Tax, with organized opposition non-existent, with land reform on every one's lips and taxation reaching deep into every one's pockets, with the land hogs panic stricken and their apologists and retainers like the Todds, whom you can count on the fingers of one hand, shrieking hysterically in obscure papers like the *Western Empire*, it certainly looks now as if every one who voted for a half-way Single Tax measure two years ago will get at least one more vote this year for a clean-cut Single Tax amendment, that no legislature can stay or abate in its operation and no Court impair by any conceivable decree.

Improvements on land are now assessed separately from the land. All land in California is already listed and valued apart from the improvements thereon. Next March, when the annual assessment comes to be made under the law as it is now, no assessor will need to serve a day, thus saving at the outset a vast sum. The Boards of Equalization January 1, may take the list of lands as it is now and have it revised by experts to see that all lands in the State are therein accurately described. Then equalize the valuation to raise the revenue desired, make the levy and pass the roll to the tax collector. Nothing could be simpler. E.G.—A given block in Los Angeles which I personally know contains 6 lots, on 3 of which are 3 dwelling houses of like value. The other 3 lots are unimproved, are held and have been held for years by rich non-residents of California for speculation at \$3,000 each. Each lot in this typical block is assessed at \$1,000. The improvements on the improved lots are each assessed at \$2,000. The present rate of taxation is approximately 3%. Valuation and taxation are low. Nobody ought to complain about valuation or rates in California now. Let us see how it will work on this block under the Single Tax. Let us assume the