

just system of taxation into municipal affairs. Before the opportunity offered itself, however, I heard that he had joined the "silent majority."

His name certainly deserves remembrance as that of one of the advance scouts and pickets of our army.

IMPRESSIONS OF THE MOVEMENT IN ENGLAND,

(*For the Review.*)

By WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

A month in London, while all too short a time to estimate the progress of the Single Tax movement in Great Britain, afforded me an opportunity of meeting many friends of the cause and of comparing views. Last year, in reading Trevelyan's admirable address, the intelligent statements of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman during the election excitements, and the repeated enunciation of Henry George's views in editorials of the Liberal press, it was impossible not to indulge high hopes of speedy practical steps in Parliamentary legislation.

After a close range observation I am less expectant on the score of speed. Fervor of speech on the hustings loses heat when the orators are landed in the place of power. The plea of limited possibility and party expediency supersedes the vigorous pre-election promises. Every prominent issue which aroused the interest of the voters is now in the keeping of a responsible ministry rapidly acquiring a conservative crust.

However disappointing this immediate result, it is the normal development of party reform. Caution is a fruit of political success and timid counsels lower the average temper of every Cabinet. Prominent as the land issue was in addresses of Liberal candidates, word now goes forth from the seats of the mighty that so delicate is the question and so great are the interests to be disturbed postponement of action is necessary. If the choice lies between hasty, unconsidered legislation and later but more effective handling of the subject patience is becoming.

I found a multitude of protestants against land monopoly. I heard the formulated expressions of Henry George fall from lips unconscious of their authorship. I met few who, professing to see the underlying evil of our legislation, had any intelligent surmise as to its cure. My first experience in a public meeting in London was at the annual gathering of the Land Nationalization Society, over which Franklin Thomasson, the Editor of *The Daily Tribune*, presided. The audience was reasonably large and enthusiastic. The chairman's address was excellent, and the speakers, mostly members of Parliament, were radical and earnest. Will Crooks, one of the Labor members, in a speech of mingled pathos, argument and humor, was especially cheered.

Yet, with the uniform denunciation of land monopoly and harsher language concerning the monopolists than is common in purely Single Tax meetings, the anticlimax of the speakers was never missing. The robbers who had despoiled the people, who were responsible for the non-employment and suffering of the wage earners, were to be punished by ample compensation, on surrendering their ill gotten gains.

One honest but illogical speaker declared that, in spite of unjust monopoly, the moral sentiment of Great Britain would never countenance the confiscation

of land values, and the government should buy back the land from the spoliators with long-time bonds. Penalty was to be replaced by reward and the over-taxed people of the country and their children were to be still further burdened by taxation to recover their own belongings. Futile and pitiful conclusion!

The real hope of making a substantial advance lies in the able management of the Glasgow Single Taxers, of whom John Paul is the moving spirit. I know no organization so effective as the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values. Without abating the just demands for taxing land values at the rate of 20 shillings in the pound, it has been instrumental in sending to Parliament a staunch delegation pledged to the cause, ably led by Mr. Dundas White.

The Scottish bill, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons, February 22, 1906, is now awaiting due legislative consideration.

"A bill to provide for the taxation for local purposes of land values in Scotland and for the compulsory acquisition of land by local authorities in Scotland, and for other purposes," is its comprehensive title. It aims, in brief, to legislate that land and improvements shall be separately valued and assessed; that the rate of the annual tax on land values shall not exceed 2 shillings in the pound, and to give power to local authorities to acquire land by compulsion, the price presumably to be based on the owner's estimate in his tax return.

The real point at issue is to establish the practice of separate land valuation and taxation, the rate being of minor importance, as any measure in the direction indicated is sure of immediate rejection in the House of Lords. Vacant land in Great Britain is untaxed, and when improved the land and buildings are taxed as a unit, thus concealing the value of the land. The Scottish bill will give scope for a full discussion of the principle at stake and will familiarize the public with the subject.

The immense advantage of Great Britain in obtaining the land reform lies in the fact that the obstructive House of Lords is powerless to interfere in revenue measures of the government. Any Chancellor of the Exchequer who decides to include the taxing of land values in his budget is beyond the veto of the Lords. It is only necessary to create a public sentiment, strong enough to support the demand, to have it granted. The rate on land values will naturally tend to increase, while the inequitable devices which burden the people and interfere with the normal distribution of wealth, will be abolished. Consequently the Single Taxers are buoyant with hope for the near future.

Aside from the compact body of genuine Single Taxers pledged to vote on every progressive measure in the House of Commons, there are the Land Naturalizers, Labor members and many Liberal members unidentified with organizations who can be counted upon, when the division is called. What the Prime Minister needs is the popular support which Lincoln watched for when considering the Emancipation Proclamation. Indeed, the parallel favors Great Britain, for, while Lincoln himself was reluctant to perform the act and was forced to it by military necessity, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is a stalwart advocate of the taxation of land values. His Chancellor of the Exchequer will need no urging to frame a proper budget when the people make clear their desire.

I had many conversations with leaders of English sentiment, trained and cultivated men, with influential pens and seeking the noblest ends. On general subjects of vital interest their grasp of principles is masterly, but, as regards the Single Tax philosophy, the crux of all present social progress, they see through a glass darkly. They concede the wrongfulness of land monopoly, the present misappropriation of land values and the expediency of taxing them as an immediate source of revenue.

So far they are our helpers and allies, but they are possessed with the socialistic idea that it is as essential for government to control the tools of in-

dustry as to control free access to the land. They seem unable to separate in thought the product of labor from its source, and have an honest difficulty in seeing that their aim can be accomplished by the law of equal freedom.

One of the most acute and courageous of these thinkers argued for a whole evening that great fortunes can be perpetuated just the same when the land monopoly privilege is destroyed. He is blind to the universal fact that without privilege swollen fortunes everywhere tend to disintegration. Another unselfish reformer and distinguished writer on economic subjects contended that free access to land would not prevent capital from monopolizing opportunity and making self employment difficult. The habit of thought which treats capital and privilege as identical is hard to change, yet to simple minds, unbiassed by academic instruction, a bare statement of the distinction rarely needs the reinforcement of argument.

The cheering consolation of Single Taxers is the obvious fact that no social reform of value can advance until the obstruction of land monopoly is removed. Every worker in the various fields of human advancement sooner or later meets this barrier, and must reckon with it. The sad thing is that so much wasted energy must be expended on palliatives before the cause of the disease is recognized and eradicated.

DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN SINGLE TAX AND SOCIALISM.

(For the Review.)

By JOHN Z. WHITE.

Some of our friends think the tenor of our arguments is too emphatically individualistic, and that a socialistic flavor would render them more acceptable.

Things are known by their differences, not by their likenesses. A horse has four legs, so has a cow. If I wished to sell my horse to another I should not be at pains to explain the similarity of the horse to a cow. It would seem good policy to reveal the superiority of the horse by emphasizing the differences.

Advocates of individualism are not to be confused with socialists, because each member of the two groups agrees that twice two make four, nor because they are agreed that the State is the proper agency to administer the police power.

The distinctive doctrine of socialism is common ownership of productive property. The distinctive doctrine of individualism is equal opportunity to produce property.

Is the common use (common ownership, if you choose) of the highway an example of socialism? Not at all. It is the only disposition of the highway whereby it is possible to maintain "equal opportunity to produce property." It is therefore an example of individualism.

If one shall urge that it as well expresses socialism, we reply that it is a feature wherein the horse and cow are alike. And historically how was the common highway acquired? Did not the feudal lord hold the bridge and charge his dues for its use? Was not the toll road a privilege? Was not the overthrow of these private monopolies the occasion for establishing the free highway? Or was it achieved through an effort to publicly own "all the means of production and distribution," or to verify the "materialistic interpretation of history?"