

vacant) property, which is equivalent to a gambler asking the public to recoup him for his losses.

Pull these slackers and land gamblers out on their "idle acres," where they can show what they produce.
San Francisco, Calif.

WALDO J. WERNICKE.

PERHAPS DOES NOT SEE THE WHOLE QUESTION

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I was very much shocked to read the article on "International Free Trade" in your last issue, and to find it was editorial in character, and called for a referendum on two points about which there need not, in my opinion, be any controversy.

Free trade is a natural right of free men, and if internal taxes be ever so heavily levied upon home industry, foreign trade, when it can be carried on at all, simply must mean that the foreign consumers of our own taxed goods must pay the taxes. What objection can there be to this?

Whatever sentimental reasons there may be to lead to discouragement of the purchase of foreign goods, surely there is no basis for requiring our government after the war to interfere with our foreign trade with the citizens of any country, even Germany and Austria.

As soon as may be, after the war is over, it is my idea that Congress should remove absolutely all barriers to foreign trade, abolishing the tariff, root and branch, as unnecessary, as in principle economically unsound, and as not to be thought of by one partner in world enterprises against any other.

Long Branch, N. J.

GEORGE WHITE.

CONCEDES OUR MAIN CONTENTION

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

The question that you put to your readers in the May-June number under the head of "International Free Trade," is a political rather than an economic one. In your implication that there should be an equalizing of taxes to compensate our industries for the domestic burdens they must bear, it seems to me you come perilously close to the heresy of protectionism. In the first place all excise taxes are entirely abnormal and foreign to our bungling system in normal times, so that it is not conceivable that these should be maintained after the war, except the traditional imposts on liquor and tobacco. But if they are, the most we should do would be to lay exactly similar duties on imported articles (income, inheritance and excess profits taxes, of course, come under an entirely different heading), but having no relation to a real or fancied difference in cost of production—a basis which means burden on home industries, not a help to them. Even the threatened "dumping" of goods below cost ought not to be considered, principally because it is a phantasm, but almost equally because any such gift to us, at the temporary expense of some industries perhaps, could only be to the benefit of our industries as a whole, because such "dumping" would mean simply increased demand for our goods to pay for those "dumped," at inflated values. The idea that we would sell nothing for the "dumped" goods, is a mere bogie. If it were true, it would amount to nothing, for we could well afford to part with gold to get cheap or practically free goods. But as a matter of fact there is not enough gold in existence to do the trick, the entire amount in the world being less than a single day's transactions at the New York Clearing House, and far less than a few months imports and exports, even with the obstacle of a protective tariff imposed.

But when we come to the political question of whether we should have any dealings at all with a nation that has become a race of criminals, or whether we should not throw off all possible obstacles in the way of such dealings, that is another question. The probabilities are that German costs of production after the war will be so greatly increased, their productive power so diminished that no such problem will confront us. If it should, we would be economically foolish if we did not take advantage of their lower cost, not for their benefit but for our own. Yet from a political standpoint we would be fully justified in exercising the sacred principle of boycott, at least until such time as they may show fruits meet for repentance, even if this does mean an economic loss to ourselves.

New Brighton, S. I., N. Y.

E. J. SHRIVER.

INSISTS UPON TRADING WITH HIS GERMAN FRIENDS

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

You say "nations have a right to moral discrimination in trade relations." This makes it necessary to remind you that trade is carried on between individuals and not nations, a few occasional transactions excepted. If I should see fit to exchange money I have earned for goods manufactured in Germany or anywhere else it is strictly my own affair. A government that would interfere is in no position to discuss "morals." Your position leads logically to that of the American Protective Tariff League.

Still I cannot say that I am surprised. "The descent to Avernus is easy." Having endorsed all interferences with individual rights resulting from entrance of the United States into war, you are going on. Since you hold that we must repudiate pacifism lest the opposition to the Single Tax raise the cry of "disloyalty" against us you probably realize that mere repudiation of pacifism is not enough. Nothing short of complete renunciation of every truth feared by plutocracy can save us from that false charge, or any other that an unscrupulous opposition may find convenient, as Bigelow's experience is alone enough to show. Apparently you have learned this lesson and are prepared to make concessions. But what does it profit a movement to avoid a charge of "disloyalty" if it must sacrifice its principles?

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

ONLY AN UNREASONING PREJUDICE AGAINST GERMANY

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Accepting your invitation for a declaration of views upon the issue of international free trade after the war, I would refer you to "Protection or Free Trade," for the answer to your query.

But since you have already read out of the Single Tax movement all who take seriously the arguments advanced in the last chapter of that book, you may feel the same way about the rest of it.

Not so many years ago, protectionists appealed to a prejudice against England to bolster up their predatory privileges. Now Germany will make an acceptable substitute. They too said that "nations have a right to moral discrimination in trade relations," and based thereon a defense of the morality of tariff laws. In those days we used to say that trade is carried on by individuals, not by nations. But since that argument logically led Henry George to take the pacifist position he did, I don't wonder that you want to repudiate it. You must consider it "disloyal." I have no doubt that that ultra loyal organization, the American Protective Tariff League, will welcome you with open arms to its fraternity.

DANIEL KIEFER.

REPLY

These men will never learn, and it is a waste of time to argue with them. We demand the retention of the tariff weapon against a morally unrepentant Germany after the war, not because the operations of such a tariff may not be to our disadvantage, but because it may be necessary for our security. This is not a time-serving concession to the principle of "loyalty," at which Mr. Danziger sneers, but is involved in the necessity of visiting upon a people guilty of cruel and evil deeds such punishment as a refusal of trade intercourse entails.

When Messrs. Danziger and Kiefer go to heaven—which we hope they will in due time, though of course not too soon—they will perhaps insist upon establishing immediate trade relations with the infernal regions. The exchange of golden harps for sulphur and brimstone will be insisted upon as a "natural right" of the denizens of the Jasper City. This proposition for friendly commercial intercourse will meet with immediate favorable response from Belzebub and all his hosts.

Of course, we endorse all that Mr. George has written in "Protection or Free Trade." We too are pacifists; we are for peace. That is what Americans are fighting for. But Mr. George did not foresee that a monstrous government would incite a servile people to murdering their neighbors, and it is an insult to his memory to say that he would have been a pacifist up to that point.

There will be more genuine pacifism, in which all of us believe, when the Germans cease from troubling and the Teutons are at rest—

mostly under ground. And, in the meantime, the most useful work that can be done, in which the whole world is co-operating with a more than German efficiency, is that of making fewer and better Germans, so that the world may be made safe for pacificism, and for the women and children who are to come after us.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

FROM JACKSON H. RALSTON

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Will you kindly permit a brief dissent from some of the positions apparently taken by the SINGLE TAX REVIEW?

The wisest thing, in my judgment, that the Fels Fund Commission ever did, was to assist, when the opportunity existed, the movement for the Initiative and Referendum. The little money it spent in this direction was a very direct aid to getting the Single Tax as a living issue in a number of States. If today there are active campaigns for some form of the Single Tax in Michigan, Missouri and California, it is because the door was opened through the Initiative. In Maryland it has so happened that without this reform we may proceed, and some other States, doubtless, are in like case. Any criticism of money spent to aid the Initiative is quite erroneous.

It seems that each generation must learn for itself the error of particular methods of procedure. Those who thirty-one years ago looked to the adoption of the Single Tax through an independent party and espoused the United Labor Party, learned at that time the error of their ways. The committee which, so far as the national organization was concerned, had charge of the Delaware campaign in 1895 and 1896, profiting from the experience of the United Labor Party, did their utmost to prevent the inauguration of a third party movement in Delaware. They lost out because of the impetuosity of the local leaders, and from that time to the present no appreciable Single Tax progress has been made in that State. If there had been no third party movement, I have little doubt that the Single Tax would have prevailed in Delaware many years ago.

The necessary brevity of this letter prevents a discussion of the many reasons why the third party movement is doomed to failure, but an enumeration of them would, perhaps, not convince those of a different opinion. The regretful feature of it all is that failure will retard the cause they are seeking to advance.

The SINGLE TAX REVIEW does not enumerate Maryland as among the States where any real Single Tax work is being performed, but the fact remains that the Single Taxers of Maryland have made concrete advances of real moment within the past few years. Two years ago the legislature passed an act by virtue of which municipalities were placed upon the same plane with the State and county authorities in so far as the classification of property and partial or total exemption of improvements and personal property was concerned. Already one-half dozen towns, for the most part in the neighborhood of Washington, have partially, or to the utmost, availed themselves of this right, and, in several instances, by a popular vote, usually about 3 to 1, in favor of the Single Tax.

Before long, and by this I mean two or three years at the outside, we may expect these municipalities will be so numerous that an attempt may be made, and successfully, to put the more important matter (in Maryland) of county taxation upon a like basis. Maryland already has the only towns in the country on a Single Tax basis, and this fact should not be forgotten by the SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

Washington, D. C.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

REPLY

In our editorial in which we criticized the expenditure of Single Tax money by the Fels Fund Commission—a sum amounting in nine years to nearly half a million dollars—we did not specifically refer to what had been contributed to the Initiative and Referendum movement. Our criticism expressed at the time to contributions to this cause was not based on opposition to the Initiative and Referendum *per se*, but to the fact that Single Tax money was needed for Single Tax work, and the Initiative and Referendum appeared to be doing very well without our help. Twelve States were at this period in the enjoyment of this right, and others were wheeling into line. So it seemed to us—and

today Single Taxers generally will endorse the position we took at the time—that Single Taxers, and such money as they had to contribute, should be exclusively devoted to their own cause.

Judge Ralston should be better able to state what actually occurred in Delaware, as he was one of the leading spirits in that memorable campaign. There were several contributory causes for the failure of the Single Tax party campaign in that State. One of these was that it presented itself to the people of Delaware as an invasion of their State and was therefore resented by local pride. But primarily the failure of the party movement in Delaware was due to the old vice of Single Taxers in following after will-o-the-wisps, which in this case were the Democratic Party, Bryan and the Free Coinage of Silver, which alliance split the party into two factions, disrupted the movement and alienated Republicans and gold Democrats from support of the Single Tax.

Yet in spite of this, ten per cent. of the voters of Delaware cast their votes for the Single Tax—a result which could it be approximated in the coming election in this State would be hailed as a real victory for the Single Tax, furnishing a good ground for future contests. Certainly it would not be considered as a failure of Single Tax Party activity.

As this movement proceeds we are certain to be told that Single Tax party methods have been tried and failed. The truth is, they have been tried and have succeeded. Single Tax party activity has been abandoned, not because its futility has been proven, but because other considerations, and in some cases temptations too strong to resist, have led its leaders to desert this method for others which have promised more, or better, or immediate results. These results not having materialized it is now up to the Single Taxers of the country to revert to the older and tried methods.

The Single Tax is a political question. It must come through political action. It must be borne to the forefront by men and women who have no other aim than the triumph of our principles, and who in the work they propose to do know neither friend nor foe. This is the day of the great awakening. Again is lifted the standard raised by our great leader, Henry George, in three campaigns, borne aloft in Delaware by that little heroic group of fighters, and raised by devoted hands this year in the distant State of California. With kindness but with firmness, may we not say to the old leaders: "Your methods have been tried and have largely failed; we are through with all counsels of caution and timidity; help us if you can, but if you cannot, then stand aside and hold your peace while we march on. For again the standard is lifted!"—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

AFRAID OF OFFENDING

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

It seems to me that the Single Tax movement is too much in the hands of intellectuals who are very much afraid of offending the feelings of the landlords. When the fight is carried home to them, and a spade is called a spade, and the landlords, instead of sleeping, get out in the open and fight the Single Tax, then I will think the Single Tax is moving. San Antonio, Texas.

M. W. CONNOR.

SINGLE TAX YEAR BOOK IN CAPE TOWN

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Permit me to congratulate you on the contents and appearance of your January-February number. Enclosed is subscription.

I obtained a copy of the YEAR BOOK via London and must compliment you on its production too. A new Land Values League has just been started in Cape Town and we find the contents of this book most useful.

Cape Town, Africa.

CHAS. H. LAMB.

WHAT A SOLDIER THINKS OF THE NEW AWAKENING

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

The new form and new policy of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW reflects the great movement of Single Taxers the world over from thought to action. Now that all peoples are beginning to realize that Kaiserism, special privilege and monopoly are supported principally by the control of land by the few, in every country men will spring up to preach and put into effect the democratic doctrine of the Single Tax.