

which would furnish most valuable arguments in its favor, particularly with the farmers,) has twice passed the lower House, and the second time it received a majority of the vote cast in the Senate, but lacked one vote of the needed majority of the whole body. Two more votes could have been secured for it had we had the money to put some one in Dover to lobby for the Bill, so it failed for the lack of a trifling sum. In the last Legislature, a "local option in Taxation" Bill passed the lower House, but was defeated in the Senate. The Democratic State platforms, year by year, have been broadening on the question of taxation, and this year's is notably good, being as follows:

"We favor abolishing all State taxes on merchants and manufacturers and similar licenses, and abolishing the local taxes on the live stock of farmers, and we declare our desire to be that our representatives in the Legislature shall enact suitable Statutes to this effect. We favor a permanent system of registration, and the abolishing of the registration fee of \$1.00 as a prerequisite to voting."

Bills designed to do these things have, in the past, been introduced in the Legislature by Single Taxers, and have been defeated. The fact that the Democrats are now taking them up is an evidence that the seed sown is germinating.

And the future seems hopeful. One of the recent converts is Francis I. duPont, a member of the well known family of Delaware powder makers. He has instilled into the work renewed vigor, and is now carrying on in Wilmington a very active campaign along the lines of the Initiative and Referendum. Under his guidance some fruits, in the shape of enactments which will make the Single Tax a possibility, on a small scale at least, should soon be reaped, for there is in the State a strong underlying Single Tax sentiment which we have not yet been able to avail ourselves of.

And it is the opinion of the writer, that Mr. Ralston made no mistake when he pointed to Delaware as being the shortest pathway to the Single Tax. But we underestimated the difficulties in the way and expected a too early victory. Only those who participated actively in the campaign can know the intense bitterness of the opposition we had to face. But this is gradually weakening, and when success does come (as come it will) we shall know that we were too easily discouraged by seeming failure, and that active work was stopped too soon.



## REVOLUTION vs. EVOLUTION.

### Karl Marx Socialism or Henry George's Single Tax—Which?

(For the Review.)

By L. P. CUSTER.

Few students of human progress but will agree that State Socialism in politics, with its declared revolutionary programme, is a menace to social order and renders insecure popular rights. We may differ from one another on the soundness or unsoundness of philosophical socialism, but when we look back over the pages of history and see how all violent revolutions have been brought on by political intrigue and strife, we know beyond cavil that, if the present day socialist party gains sufficient strength to alarm property interests and those in control of governmental affairs, those whose interests are thus affected will not hesitate to set in motion agencies for the thwarting of such a movement without regard to constitutional mandate or popular rights. Such a state

of affairs means violence, sanguinary and merciless, and the probable reorganization of our civil institutions under a more drastic system, with individual rights greatly abridged. The leaders of the Marx school of socialism must be aware of the danger of projecting such a revolutionary programme into the political field, and it behooves Single Taxers, who, of all others, are better equipped to meet the socialist party agitation, to be alert in laying bare the dangers these men would lead the people into, and to set forth the Single Tax programme as better calculated to accomplish lasting results, without disturbing the peaceful growth and expansion of popular institutions.

The Single Taxers are the conservators of evolutionary progress, accepting any measure of reform offered, no matter how slight, if it is founded on the principle of justice to all and privileges to none. We would take a step at a time, rather than attempt the overthrow of the present established order by hurried processes, peacefully or otherwise, even if it were possible. Some people, ignorant of scientific economics, call US socialists, but they mistake epithet for argument.

The followers of Henry George are not socialists, at least those who comprehend the meaning of the George philosophy are not. There are those among us who believe that the Single Tax will ultimately lead to a state of voluntary co-operative production and exchange, but we are not attempting to build on any such theoretical possibility, but are content to let the future take care of itself, trusting we may be able to make progress with the matters in hand, *i. e.*, the bringing about of a general knowledge of the iniquity embodied in the present system of land tenure and the bearing of taxation thereupon, with some measure of advance for the better, all along the line.

That socialism means revolution, the utterances of those who are its recognized exponents can be quoted to prove. For instance, E. T. Behrens, candidate for Governor of Missouri on the Socialist ticket, in his letter of acceptance, published in the *Appeal to Reason* of recent date, says: "What differentiates the Socialist party from all other existing political parties is its revolutionary class character. Its mission is the overthrow of capitalistic class rule, the enthronement of labor, and to make the workers the rulers of their own destiny."

A. M. Simons, Editor of the *International Socialist Review*, an exponent of the Marx cult, of recognized standing, says, ("Philosophy of Socialism," page 21,) "Let us now in one sentence recapitulate the philosophy we have been discussing: Our present society is to be transformed through a class-conscious revolt of the workers having as its object the capture of the machinery of social control that the productive forces of society may collectively organize in the interest of all producers.

"I would ask the reader to study the above sentence carefully. It is the fundamental position of the socialist philosophy."

Nowhere is it made manifest that socialism recognizes moral philosophy as one of the determining factors in shaping the destinies of men, much less THE determining factor. The Henry George school of thinkers build upon the moral law as the foundation of their economic philosophy.

Again we differ from the socialists in their theory of "class-consciousness" among the working people. Material conditions do not mark the line of differentiation. Mind action governs in shaping the course followed by the people, dividing them along the lines of thought rather than along lines of condition. In both these great divisions into which the masses are divided, we find all conditions of men, high and low, rich and poor, and of all degrees of mental make-up. A man may be personally upright, moral and agreeable, one who would not do an unjust act knowingly, yet who, in his political opinions is absolutely autocratic. I have in mind such an individual, a worker, with no property, except a few personal effects, yet who has unalterable convictions

that the rich and what he calls the intelligent, (intelligence being, in his mind, simply the complement of riches) should be in control of the government. This man is a splendid type of geniality, whose personality is noted for a remarkable sort of obsequiousness and amiability. On the other hand I know a capitalist—a number of them, who are the opposite of autocratic, men with large property interests who are ready to accept the truth wherever it may lead; men who have faith in the wisdom of all the people acting together as a civic whole, and who would be glad to see conditions so changed as to bring about a state of affairs wherein it might be said that no one was riding on other people's backs. But the privileged classes, backed by individuals like the propertyless fellow described above, will not agree to the transition, and the socialists propose to bring it about by capturing the government. What our sanguinary friends imagine the people in possession of the government are going to do when the changed conditions threaten, none of them tell out of school, but hosts of them have no hesitancy in saying they anticipate strife and bloodshed.

Reverting to the subject of classes, I know again some men who are immoral and degenerate in their habits, yet who are imbued with the very loftiest political principles. I have two such individuals in mind, and neither, in my judgment, would barter his vote in opposition to his ideas. The cases in point are but types. Yet those who constitute the leadership of the socialist movement harp on class-consciousness along industrial lines. There is no such line of demarkation, neither can one be forged by selfish appeals to the cupidity and material instinct of the workers of the world.

The longer I am in the movement for the overthrow of social privilege, the more certain I am that Henry George has outlined and made clear to those who are capable of thinking straight and who can reason analytically to some extent, the only true and natural method for bringing about the end desired. Socialism may be able to upset social order and disturb commercial and industrial progress, *and that is just what socialism as a distinctive political movement is calculated to do*, but it cannot eliminate privilege nor rectify the evils inherent in materialistic social life, for the reason that socialism, itself, is theoretically materialistic, and depends upon revolutionary procedure, peaceable or otherwise, for the installing of a better order of society.

Just government and the rights of individuals can be maintained only through the exercise of righteous principles based on Moral Philosophy, the root tenet of which shall be the Golden Rule.

The mental conditions of mankind are such as to render futile any attempt at the revolutionary overthrow of property rights, especially in the products of labor and exchange, and those who proclaim such a political purpose menace the best interests of our republican institutions.

Materialism is rampant to-day. It reaches down into the depths, where the "mudsill" of society wallows, and up into the palace of the plutocrat, and to talk of overthrowing it by pitting against it another form of materialism, is teaching of the most dangerous kind. The hearts of men must be changed before we can hope for such conditions as those pictured by either socialists or Single Taxers, but those of the latter persuasion only advocate evolutionary progress through reform measures acceptable from any source, without distinction as to party or political creed, the measure of such reform, whether far-reaching or but a step, being only an incident to the great purpose in view, namely, progress in bringing about justice in the conditions of social life, and full opportunity for every man to develop the best that is in him.

Man is a composite of physical and mental energies, controlled by two fundamental principles of human life, namely, Animal and Spiritual. The animal in man asserts itself instinctively, while the spiritual forces, latent in every human breast, must be summoned from without.

Materialism is selfishness in the concrete. It results from instinctive mind-action begetting the baser thoughts which lead to conduct likening the human to the less intelligent animals of the brute creation, the desire to live by the least expenditure of mental and physical exertion acting as the animating cause for the assumption of such marked characteristics as those peculiar to the hog, the wolf and the fox, characteristics as well defined in the human make-up as in those of the beasts named. Who ever saw a hog divide his provender with another hog, or refrain from taking possession of the whole supply if possible, even to the exclusion of the smaller and weaker? So it is with the human type allied to the porcine creature, the man who has never been "born again;" who has never had his latent spiritual qualities quickened and brought into play.

If one will but glance back over the few intervening years since the advent of our late lamented leader and his great work, how manifest it becomes that the latent spiritual forces of man are summoned from outward influences. George appealed to the spiritual in man, and the response has been marvellous. The work of breaking down the malevolent forces of brutishness in humanity is going on with accelerating momentum as the years roll by, and eventually social righteousness with all of its glorious possibilities must prevail.

Morals pertain to the individual. Morals cannot be pooled and a trust formed, nor can the quantity be multiplied by combination and co-operation. On the other hand those things which relate to the animal needs of man flourish best where men combine and co-operate. Production is multiplied and the earth gives up her bounty more liberally to two working together than to three working separately. From these facts we learn that there are two distinct spheres of action in which man finds his earthly being, neither of which must be ignored in working out the problems of civilization and the best forms for the preservation of the rights of the people.

Man is the keeper of his own conscience. He is born into the world with higher purposes than the mere catering to his physical wants. What those purposes are is an individual matter. Every soul has within its keeping the secret of higher ideals, and once the spiritual nature is awakened, the individual mind is in possession of all that is necessary to rise out of the brutal stage of human development and become possessed of a keener cognizance of his brothers' rights and a determination to conserve them. Socialism fails to recognize man's individual sphere of action. Everything is made subordinate to the one idea of collective control for the collective good. Collective control of the entire machinery of production and exchange means control of the individual worker and the loss of individuality. It would be swallowed up in one vast mechanism. This would circumscribe independence of thought and thwart initiative. Individuality can only flourish in an atmosphere of complete freedom, and individual freedom cannot be ensured under conditions wherein a central authority would have it in its power to forbid agitation for the righting of wrongs and curtailment of abuses. Socialism would render the power of the spiritual man over the animal propensities more difficult to exercise, for men would not be as free to appeal to the better natures and arouse them into activity. The outward influences over the dormant spiritual forces would be curtailed and materialistic savagery would become supreme.

In a few closing sentences, I desire to add a few reflections for those who may read this article, having had no previous knowledge of the philosophy of Single Tax. Henry George, early in life, saw the evils of land monopoly, particularly the monopoly of unused land, of which there are, even now, hundreds of millions of acres.

"Fenced 'round with paper against God and man," and are, to all intents and purposes, as Nature gave them, devoid of all improvements and wholly



vacant. The riddle which confronted George was how to preserve the rights of the people in unused lands against the gambling instincts of men who seize upon them for speculative purposes, holding them indefinitely and depriving the landless people of their right to its use save at a price fixed by a scarcity artificially created by a class who thus contrive to live without work. Mr. George solved the riddle when he wrote "Progress and Poverty." The solution was named the Single Tax, a handy expression which was adopted because nothing else could be hit upon that served the purpose so well. George's solution consisted of a simple proposition to shift taxation from all forms of property to site-values of land, taking cognizance of nothing in the form of improvements—in other words, the taxation of all land, improved and unimproved, according to its location value, making no distinction between two pieces of equal value, one of which should have a structure upon it, the other being vacant. This policy would be favorable to the people who invest money in building up a community by expenditure for labor and material for improvements, and hard on the speculator who stands idly and reaps where he has not sown, after others have built up and made the locality habitable. Taxes on land values must be paid by the holder of the title to the land, and a tax on such land, which would absorb a large percentage of all it was worth, would force the owner either to let go or put it to use by building. If he should choose to do this he might rent his property to another, who would pay the tax on the land value to the owner, but he would have to pay it into the public treasury. He could not increase the rent on this account, because there would be plenty of vacant land for tenants to flee to if oppression was attempted. Improvements being exempt, the owner could charge a fair rental for them, and keep it all, with no tax into the public treasury from this source. Everything would be cheaper because of the exemption from taxation of all forms of wealth, including personal property and money, and there would be lots of land that could be had free of charge. So it will be seen that the single tax cuts both ways for the benefit of those who are the bone and sinew of the country, but against the parasites, who without return gather so large a portion of the products of the labor of those who are its useful citizens. Mr. George never advanced this great idea as a panacea for industrial troubles alone. He advanced it for the purpose of showing the way the earth could be preserved against the encroachments of land sharks, and thus enable every soul to have its opportunity in the race of life. There are other things to be done—many things—but all else beside the single tax might be done, and the doing would avail but little; the owners of land would absorb most of the benefits, and little children would still fester and rot in noisome alleys and unclean hovels. The single tax is really not a tax. It is a reversion from the iniquitous system under which we now live and labor, to a method of meeting public expenses at once unique and far-reaching in its social consequences.

Land-values are social or collective values. Public expense is a social or collective expense. Where one individual lives in a wilderness with no one else near, there is no land value, nor are there any public expenses. But when others join him, and a little community is built up, the land thereabouts becomes more valuable, the social life concentrated at that point making the location more desirable. At the same time there will appear a necessity for some collective or community expenses; a public school house will have to be erected, a road cut through the forest, etc., and as the little community expands and assumes the pretensions of a village, then a town, and finally a city, both social values and social expenses will keep pace. All of these three—the community, the values and the expenses grow together, hence the only just and proper method would be the conversion of land values into public revenues paid into the public treasury to meet public and social wants. If our country had known

of and had adopted this method in its beginning there would now be ample unused soil for a home for every family in the United States, and vacant territory enough to house several hundred millions more. As the Government, at its inception, did not know enough to adopt such a policy, there is no other alternative than to seek a reversion from this great and overshadowing evil, and through a policy of moderation convince a large proportion of the intelligent and thoughtful people of the efficacy of our doctrine, and to gradually force it into the political policies of established organizations claiming to have the welfare of the people uppermost.

One final word: The Single Tax does not destroy land value. It simply destroys the power of a private person to set a price on land, and transfers the prerogative to the public taxing power. The privilege to speculate in land being thus eliminated from our commercial system, and production released from the burden of taxation now weighing upon it, would give enormous impetus to labor in every channel. It would increase the demand for everything produced by man, and wages would be increased to the equivalent of what the worker could produce for himself on land free to him, without the payment of taxes, or, in other words, on land having no taxable value. There are twenty square miles of vacant land inside the city limits of St. Louis to-day, or enough to supply a lot 50 feet front by 150 deep to 70,497 families and still leave 28,800,000 square feet, or more than a mile square, for streets, alleys, public institutions and play-grounds for the children.

Did our readers ever think of what a stupendous business scheme the power of land-ownership fosters? Why, as long ago as 1890, the United States Census gave the percentage of home-ownership in St. Louis as nineteen out of each one hundred families, and but fifteen free of debt. To-day, if the same proportion holds good, and it must be obvious that the percentage is less, more than 500,000 of the 650,000 people here are homeless and must pay rent, and in many cases to people who never see St. Louis, but who live in luxury and idleness on their rental incomes from the workers and business men who make St. Louis what it is.

ST. LOUIS, MO., Sept 30, 1904.



### SENATOR HOAR'S ADVICE TO YOUNG MEN.

At the Vine Street Congregational Church, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, made reference to the life of Senator Hoar as follows :

There would be some compensation in the death of the great man if the youth of the land would do him the reverence to reflect upon his advice : "Remember that there is something more to live for than money. Turn from the race after the world's goods, the mad fight for greed, to the love of higher things."

What shall a young man read? Senator Hoar said : "Read the lives of Thomas Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln, Wendell Phillips, John Bright, Henry George and other men that have stood for something and meant something."

In the larger sense of the term, Senator Hoar was a democrat. Senator Hanna was an ideal representation of the gross commercialism of the day. Senator Hoar was great enough to rise above party to plead for the oppressed. Senator Hanna, on one continent, like Cecil Rhodes on the other, was the idol of a generation that thinks only of new markets and more trade.