

not far to seek, for it is safe to say that the taxpayers are greatly outnumbered at the polls by those who pay no taxes." Any school boy could have told the professor that everybody except the thief and the beggar pays taxes, that those who never see the tax collector pay most of the public revenue, city, state and national, and that the real taxpayers are the masses who do the labor of the world and vastly outnumber the other kind who go to the polls—those who do not labor and are therefore not taxpayers but taxgatherers.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE in addressing the Association of Real Estate Boards which met in Washington, said: "You are in a very literal sense the sellers of America. You have sold it so well that it is recognized as the best buy in the world."

There lie in France the bodies of more than fifty thousand boys who died for this America that is being bought and sold. Few of them probably ever stopped to reflect that the land they fought for was an object of barter, that men were making money by dealing in parcels of this land for the security of which they were offering their young lives on the altar of sacrifice. How grim is the irony of it! Future and more enlightened generations will comment on the speech of the President as a curiosity of history. "Sellers of America, indeed!"—the land of the free and the home of the brave at so much per front foot! Hasn't the President any imagination?

A VALUED correspondent writes us that we are unjust to re-elected governor Donahey, of Ohio, in permitting our correspondent in that state to term him "incompetent." He defends the governor by saying: "Donahey is modest; he knows his limitations; he made no platform speeches during the campaign, and yet, although the Republicans swept the state with 700,000 majority, he was re-elected by nearly 150,000. There must be something to the man. His campaign was marked by the absence of money and bunk; the Democratic state organization is weak; it was not very friendly to him. Several Democratic county organizations were almost openly hostile. In this state the governor is cruelly hampered by the laws and system if he really wishes to conduct the state's business efficiently. But there has been an absence of scandals; he has shown commonsense in the conduct of affairs and humaneness in the treatment of prisoners. He vetoed 76 bills, and reading these veto messages I have been struck by their commonsense. As governors go, Donahey is pretty good." If we have done an injustice to the governor, as apparently we have, we apologize.

IN a speech delivered by Mr. La Follette in Brooklyn during the campaign that gentleman, with his usual recklessness of assertion, spoke as follows:

As long ago as 1908, according to John Moody, the greatest living authority on corporations, there were ten thousand trusts in the country, with a capitalization of \$31,000,000,000. Each of these trusts is a criminal trust.

It may be of interest to readers of LAND AND FREEDOM to know that Mr. Moody took occasion at that time to point out that the trusts he enumerated could be divided into two classes: those that had some sort of special privilege (ownership of natural resources, tariff advantage, patent monopoly) and those that did not have such advantages. And Mr. Moody further pointed out, that only those which had some such privilege could permanently charge the public more than actual competitive costs, and that all other trusts would either have to sell as cheaply as small competitors or go out of business. The history of the trusts formed during the craze twenty years ago has fully justified Mr. Moody's prediction. In none of the subsequent utterances of Mr. La Follette was there any recognition of the fundamental economic distinction between mere aggregations of capital and capital plus privilege.

The Passing of the La Follette Movement

IT needs little political acumen to predict the collapse of a party which has as its candidate for President a Republican (La Follette) and for Vice-President a Democrat (Wheeler) leading the Socialist Party and others of many persuasions (including a variety of unattached voters and Single Taxers whose philosophy is that of the natural order if they be really followers of Henry George) on a platform which is neither Republican, Democratic, nor Socialistic!

Perhaps there are analogies to this in the realm of comic opera. A Swift, a Samuel Butler, a Gilbert or an Anstey alone could do it justice but it has no place in practical politics. It is true that this Gilbertian party appears to have polled four million votes, but that would make no difference save to the undiscerning to whom mere numbers are curiously appealing symbols even when they stand for nothing. If it were ten million it would mean but little more.

Third parties have accomplished much in American politics. But only when they stood for some definite principle. The La Follette party stood for a lot of things—no two things alike. There was nowhere a cohesive principle. It was not even audible for the thing it was suspected of—government-owned railroads. It had no tariff policy, no land policy, no taxation policy, matters which are the elementary household affairs of government.

It was just a party against the two old parties! But why a third party? What mysterious healing forces for the ills of a nation lie in merely multiplying its political agencies—making them three instead of two? It is true

that Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins and his Committee of 48—which was the unrecognized and “submerged tenth” of the motley aggregation which went to its destruction on November 4—seemed for a time to cherish the delusion that a Third Party (in large caps) was a long felt want. So they kept modifying a platform to admit of everybody, like the man who constructed a dog house with two openings, one to admit the large dogs and another smaller one to admit the little puppies—anything to oblige and everybody accommodated! It seemed a fine thing to construct a platform for everybody to stand upon, but in 1920 this theory ran against a few stubborn facts, as theories sometimes will, at the Chicago Conference of the Committee of 48, and the amiable theorists got a few hard knocks, going back to New York sadder if not wiser men, for apparently it is not possible for them to learn wisdom.

As those familiar with the circumstances will recall, that attempt four years ago to be all things to all men resulted in the extremists going off by themselves to another part of the city and leaving the sponsors of the affair in their lonesome headquarters to muse upon the frailty of human nature and the tenuity of political theories based on wind!

All this is history. But when the La Follette movement came along they were again swept off their feet in the same crazy current that pointed nowhere. Again they hailed the advent of the new movement as promising a revolution in American politics. A goodly number of the followers of Henry George joined them. They at least should have known that there can be no real revolution in political thought that is not founded upon fundamentals. Mingled with the curious delusions of this motley aggregation was a sort of Messianic faith in La Follette, though an examination of that gentleman's career should have shown them that little could be hoped for him. It was the same unreasoning and almost reverential attitude that Bryan, famous jawsmith, once elicited from the same followers or the same kind of followers. Hero worship, doubtless, has its place, but the hero should have courage and a vision. No one, least of all the disciples of Henry George, will attribute vision to either of these very capable opportunists.

This makes the support of La Follette by Single Taxers so inexplicable a thing. We could have pardoned the support of Davis by those who found it impossible to vote for Wallace, the Commonwealth Land Party candidate, the only one standing in this campaign for the principles which followers of Henry George avow. Davis at least was a Jeffersonian Democrat; his campaign was conducted on a high plane. As far as speech went his appeal was to the verities; he is said to know our doctrine and is not hostile. Whether this be so or not, he came out of the campaign a bigger man than he went into it. It was not his fault that he led a party which itself is without a vision and as steeped in privilege as the party against which he was so valiant a crusader.

Who Are The Real Georgians?

A VALUED correspondent, John Hosey, of Brooklyn, writes us: “You are entirely right in your critique of Post's letter but to say that if there were no taxes there would still be many reasons for taking the economic rent of land, is not saying enough; doesn't *show* the reasons, which never have been shown enough. Only the 33rd degree initiated (not even a majority of Single Taxers, I'm afraid) will understand you.”

Is this true? Is it possible for one to come to our principles save by the way of perceiving that the values that are publicly created belong of right to the public? It may be true that many who call themselves Single Taxers have other reasons for doing so, but only those who are convinced that economic rent should be taken by the community for community purposes have a right to claim the name.

It may be that many who call themselves Single Taxers are influenced by considerations of expediency, or regard the Single Tax as a desirable substitute for more objectionable methods of raising revenue. It may be that they see in the taking of economic rent merely a reform in taxation.

Such men are not true Georgians. If men have a right to the use of the earth they have a right to the whole of the economic rent. Men must be wholly free, not partially free. No partial collection of the economic rent of land can make men wholly free. To the extent that economic rent remains uncollected opportunities for the exploitation of labor remain.

Work of Cleveland's County Auditor

COUNTY Auditor John A. Zangerle has undertaken the re-appraisal of all the land in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, which includes the city of Cleveland. The last appraisal was four years ago. Mr. Zangerle, whose excellent work in assessment of real estate is known favorably to officials throughout the country, says: (and this point is frequently overlooked): “Re-appraisal does not necessarily mean increased taxes. Re-appraisals deal only with equalization of burden. Tax-spending bodies only are responsible for the amount of taxes. . . . When real estate values change, with the growth or decline of sections of a city, or where the value of the dollar is reduced, the base of valuation becomes less than 100 per cent. Property-owners then find it difficult to make comparisons with neighboring assessments. Behind such inequalities and false base lurk favoritism and discrimination.”