

The further question arises, how can we succeed in changing the name, now world-wide, from Single Taxers and Single Tax, to Georgians and Georgism? What is to prevent our newspapers, magazines, writers and speakers from using the same methods which brought the present term into use, thus inducing the general public everywhere to gradually and often unconsciously accept the change as the proper thing? It will not be necessary to entirely drop the term Single Tax until the public become familiar with the better word, and perhaps not absolutely even then. An interchangeable use of the words for a time will be better. For illustration, the name of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW could be changed immediately by inserting the two words "or Georgian" just before the word "Review." It will thus be seen that the change can be accomplished by the most conservative methods. All that is required is the united action of Georgians themselves. Is not the time now ripe and most opportune to make this change, and is not the same advisable?

SOME VIEWS OF A RECENT PAMPHLET FROM GERMANY.

An Informal Talk with Single Taxers.

(For the Review.)

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

A little German pamphlet, sent over recently for consideration in Single Tax journals here, while of itself not too important, is calculated to arouse thoughts on the Importance of Being in Earnest. Whether it is better to be in earnest about economic affairs, with a lack of complete proportional understanding of them, than not to be interested at all, is a question. I think that on the whole the world is better for any serious dealing with serious subjects, however much harm a wrong conception of them may do for the time—may appear to do, rather, for a serious belief can never do real harm. Mr. Ernest Frankfurth, who writes a pamphlet on "Unearned Incomes," sets out with the apparent intention of proving certain important and far-reaching fallacies in the teachings of Henry George, with all due respect for Mr. George's intentions and achievements. Involuntarily his little pamphlet is an excellent Single Tax sermon, for where he is most lucid and logical he is refuting his own position by the facts and examples he gives, and at other times he is too contradictory to be of influence. Mr. Frankfurth is trying to show that land monopoly alone is responsible for but a small share of social evils. And also he is trying to prove that a tax on land values only is the tax most ardently desired by the possessing classes, as touching the smallest and least vital of their sources of income. His logic in proof of this rather remarkable assertion is hardly worth considering. He is evidently led to believe this by a fact outside the pale of pure economics, and then he tries to reason it out in terms of economics. The fact that influences his opinions (he betrays it in one sentence) is the make-up of the German Land Reform League, the Single Tax party in Germany. Mr. Frankfurth is not the only Single Taxer who doubts the efficiency of the Single Tax fiscal philosophy because of the elements in the German Single Tax party. He says: "Members of the League of Landed Proprietors, for instance, men whose only aim in life

is the achieving of an unearned living from the land, do not consider it a danger to their principles, or, more important, to their pocket-book, if they announce allegiance to the German Single Taxers." . . . This point is the only part of Mr. Frankfurth's book which would call for consideration here, and that only in that it would lead to a little discussion of foreign methods of propaganda in our work. Otherwise, I will say right here, that a serious radicalism, a sincere desire for justice permeates the little book and impresses itself very agreeably upon the reader in spite of economic fallacies and queer turns of logic.

As to the matter of European Single Tax work. There seems to be, in some countries, combined with a great personal respect and admiration for Mr. George, an inclination to belittle his theory, a desire to claim a previous or a better solution of the problem of just taxation and land ownership. In Denmark alone are the theories of Henry George accepted completely and solely as the keynote of the economic question. The sort of people that one finds in prominent positions in the German Land Reform League, for instance, would astonish an intelligent American Single Taxer. The most hopeless conservatives, wedded to things as they are and stanch supporters of Law and Order, seem to think Single Tax a pleasing sort of philanthropic philosophy, which deals in an interesting, patriotic manner with the old Teutonic land laws and makes them feel that they are The People. Still this, and similar conditions in other countries, need not discourage us. We can see a good deal of the same sort of thing at home here, particularly in women's Single Tax clubs. The women here and the men in Europe are none the less seriously trying to do right. Another reason for some of the queer elements in the German party is the German love for clubs, leagues, etc. It's always easy to win members for a "Verein" of some kind in Germany, even if they don't know what it's all about. As long as nothing is said against the Government they'll join and see what is doing. The German Single Tax leaders believe in the power of numbers and believe that the good the yearly dues can do in serious propaganda work will fully make up for a lack of understanding on the part of the members who have paid the dues. In France and Belgium there is a leader at the head of the land taxing party who asserts that he has a theory which quite supersedes Henry George's plan and is much better. Whether it is or not, time will show, and anyway, he and his followers make people think something about just taxation and land ownership.

Reform work everywhere must move along the lines of least resistance. Conditions in European countries render an active participation in politics a dangerous thing. Therefore, on the continent at least, the leaders of Single Tax parties believe it possible to do their best work by keeping out of politics altogether. This is not so serious a defect as it might be, when it is remembered that in most European countries municipal affairs are not matters of politics at all, and that home rule in communities exists to an extent undreamed of in this land of the free. Therefore, foreign Single Tax leaders can do some excellent and far-reaching work in the matter of land value taxation, while openly announcing that they are absolutely non-politic, and can accept members of any party and any creed. Of course, a great many well-meaning people who like to be there where there is anything doing, will join the clubs, thinking that Single Tax is some sort of a mildly harmless philanthropic scheme that will make them feel awfully virtuous and very much up-to-date. Personally, at one time I disliked that sort of thing very much, and would have rather preferred that such people get out of the movement altogether. But when one studies Single Tax and what it stands for (I mean the principles of true democracy and true ethical and economic reform which Henry George preached), one comes to understand that these principles are so broad and true, so fundamental,

that there is room for many points of view within their walls, as in all true religion.

Let it be treated from what point of view it may, there is a movement all over the world now that has for its base the realization that land cannot be an article of commerce or a something that man can claim for his own to the exclusion of his fellowmen. Also there is a growing realization that in this question of the ownership of the land, or rather of the enjoyment of the revenues from the ownership of land, lies the heart of the economic problem. That it was Henry George who awoke this new thought into life no one denies. His call for justice awoke all serious minds to a realization of the fact that this great truth of land values and land ownership has been at the base of all movements for justice throughout the centuries. The land belongs to all, and the value it bears belongs to the community, because created by the community; this first article of faith, and the second, which follows it close, that the use of the land is the only thing for which the community has a right to levy a tax—these two truths are now recognized widely as axiomatic.

Different conditions in different countries necessitate a different method of teaching self-evident truths. But the Truths remain.

Now, there has been no organized international discussion of Single Tax principles as yet, and it would be a very interesting work to bring some such discussion about. Speakers in various places have told of what was being done in their country, but usually without knowledge of conditions in the country to whose representatives they were talking. Also, they have told of Single Tax work pure and simple, without either time or chance to go into details as to what sort of national conditions require just the methods of propaganda they are advocating. To bring about some sort of an international discussion would, of course, require a sharper organizing and labelling of the movement here than the best minds believe at present to be either useful or wise. But, for the purpose of fraternization only, it might be done. It would be interesting to hear suggestions in the columns of the Review as to what method would be the best to get Single Taxers everywhere into touch with one another, that they might reach hands of fellowship across the seas and across the greater barrier of alien tongues. Besides, much could be said of the practical use of such a movement for propaganda work among the alien population in the United States.

Does not the situation in San Francisco offer an excellent opportunity to make practical application of the Henry George proposition to restrict the assessment for taxation of real estate to so much of its value as inheres in the land only, exempting altogether the buildings and other improvements? Would not this exemption encourage and accelerate the rebuilding of that unfortunate city and be in large part a solution of the difficulties which seem to forbid its rehabilitation? If not, why not?—*John R. Waters, in New York Times.*

Single Tax means putting the burdens of government off the workers and on to the shirkers; off the toilers and on to the spoilers; off industry and on to monopoly; off those who use land and develop the country, and on to those who hold land idle, keep neighbors apart, prevent settlement, furnish hiding places for wolves, and rob the bread winners of their crop.—*Plumas (Manitoba) Standard.*

“The expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production.”—*Karl Marx, final chapter of Capital.*