

presumably in trade and natural resource favors. This in the face of the original broaching of these economic questions by Sir Samuel Hoare last year. Here England is self-conscious—conscious of holding a position in relation to the necessities of all the people, with which the earth is stored, that provokes war and prevents peace. It has either played the ostrich or the game of hypocrisy consistently; but now apparently is going to be smoked out. France, Germany, and Russia may be the ones to do the forcing and the near future may see the first move.

* * *

Reverend Henry Sloane Coffin, President of the Union Theological Seminary, is reviewing events in Europe including the various wars and political conditions, including the various dictatorships; and from what he sees, he thinks a lot more of our American democracy and not much of the prevalent notion that democracy's day is done. This is fine, and every minister in the country should be preaching democracy; but they should not go very far in their preaching without defining democracy; because the word has been dragged in the mud, not only by the party that owns the name democracy, and its arch enemies who use the name Jefferson in denouncing new deal democracy, but also by Marxian state socialists.

* * *

The Carnegie Foundation is making a 182 page report on a problem that has been evident for some time. The millions of youth that are being educated and thrust into an over-crowded world—"all dressed up and nowhere to go!" I do not notice in this report any attempt at answering this problem. This foundation has the facilities for knowing that there are two solutions offered, one of which, only, is a real solution. Socialists would solve it by regulation and socialization of industry; but the scientific economic solution is to minimize regulation and limit socializing to social elements, such as franchises and natural resources; and so open limitless opportunities for properly educated youth.

* * *

Parties to the auto strike war are getting on very badly; and I am not surprised. The strikers are obsessed with their right to occupy the plants. This is either communism or anarchy. The proprietors are not only bound to resist this, but are not very guilty in other respects. The need is for something not in the minds of either side, which is a fundamental solution that will go to the foundation of wealth production, analyze the process scientifically, assign to each party its responsibilities and its share in the profits. This would immediately break the stalemate and dispel the tense atmosphere that means nothing but trouble—even bloodshed—proceeding as it now is.

THE British Section of the Henry George School of Social Science has been advancing by leaps and bounds since it was first launched here last September. Within three months classes have been established in eleven cities and the School is now accepted as an important part of the movement.

Four classes have completed the course and thirteen others are working away at the study of "Progress and Poverty," with the prospects for additional classes in new districts after the New Year.

There are Henry George organizations in some nine centers in Great Britain. A number of these have helped the School nobly, says Miss Frances Levy, Honorary Secretary of the British Section, and others have pledged their help in January.—HENRY GEORGE NEWS SERVICE.

Signs of Progress

A GREAT NEWSPAPER URGES THE SINGLE TAX

PASSAGE of the so-called Sanford Bill embodying the Single Tax idea is expected to be urged soon upon the 1937 Legislature at Trenton.

The measure has the enthusiastic backing today of the Progressive League of New Jersey, a non-partisan organization which claims a membership of more than 5,000 persons.

Its novelty, its demand for serious study and its implication of a whole new outlook upon the problem of taxation are some of the obstacles in the way of the Single Tax idea. It calls, in the first place, for implicit acceptance among its apostles of some plain but startling facts that few people ever realize—and which most reactionaries cannot seem to digest at all.

Foremost of these are (1) that the average wage in the United States today is between \$17 and \$18 a week and (2) that a third of these wages are absorbed in taxes imposed upon the necessities of life and included in the cost of shelter, food, clothing and other essential commodities.

Analysis indicates beyond dispute that average families with average incomes of \$1,240 a year in New Jersey (barring lay-offs) pay out about \$400 a year in taxes. The taxes are imposed on land, building and personalty—not of the average family but of the businesses and industries that supply the family's needs.

What the Sanford Bill purposes to do is to taper off the taxes on improvements and personalty over a period of five years until they vanish entirely, meanwhile raising the tax rate to a corresponding degree on land. Land, too, would be assessed at its true value and taxed at its true value, whereas there are instances in New Jersey today where land is paying taxes on 25 per cent or less of its market value.

Calculations show that 67 per cent of the taxes are collected on personalty and improvements in New Jersey today, while land bears only 33 per cent. The salutary effect of wiping out the levy on personal property and buildings and saddling the burden on true land values is easy to foresee. Land speculation is discouraged; it becomes profitable to build on it and put it to use.

It would permit the poor man to own his own home—to rent a land site by the year at a modest figure, and build his house on an installment scheme, knowing that his home, and his furnishings are to be tax free. Building would be encouraged, the consumers' buying power increased, unemployment would be lessened; slums and obsolescent buildings would be razed and the sites used for new construction.

The Sanford Bill can be passed without imposing any obligation upon anyone in the State of New Jersey. Yet it opens the way for those municipalities ready now to give the idea a try.

It is to be hoped that the Legislators are mindful of the fact that it is merely an enabling act and that whatever the majority in the Legislature may think of the Single Tax—the cities and towns should be afforded the opportunities for such experiments as the Sanford Bill holds out to them.—*Newark, N. J. Ledger, Jan. 20, 1937.*

CALIFORNIA LABOR HAS A TAX POLICY

When the California State Federation of Labor, at its thirty-fourth annual convention, held at Monterey in 1933, adopted a resolution favoring the proposition to remove all taxation from improvements and tangible personal products, the results of labor and industry, declared itself opposed to sales taxes, proposing to substitute for such taxes additional levies on the value of privileges granted by the state; and when at all subsequent and consecutive conventions, including the 1936 convention at Sacramento, it has reaffirmed this policy, it can be said that organized labor's tax policy is clearly and definitely established.