

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.”