

meetings mark the beginning of our Winter indoor session's platform work and do it well by recalling to us the great work of our guide and teacher, Henry George. Here in Glasgow we have arranged a second special series of free lectures on Political Economy (as per enclosed card). In view of the coming general election the politicians are busy placing candidates, and the new candidates of the Liberal party in Scotland are, so far, strong advocates of the taxation of land values; all of them refer to the question as one of pressing urgency in their opening speeches to the electors. The candidate for the Town of Greenock makes the question the first plank in his platform and further suggests it as an alternative to the protectionist proposals of Mr. Chamberlain. The candidate for Dumbartonshire, Dr. J. Dundas White, is an out and out Single Taxer. He is the author of a small book entitled "Economic Ideals," the opening sentences of which run, "The first object of practical economics should be to promote the development of all the natural resources of the country. . . . All men have equal rights to the earth, and the air, and to the other gifts of nature. On that, and on no narrower foundation, can a just land system be built." To secure these rights to natural agencies Dr. White advocates freeing industry from taxation and substituting taxation of land values. The Dumbartonshire Liberals who heard Dr. White ably expound his views the other night for the first time are delighted at the prospect of the fight with such a thorough-going radical to lead them. Dr. White's adoption as Liberal candidate for Dumbartonshire marks progress in Scotland for our ideas. We have had two bye-elections recently—Argylshire and St. Andrews Burgh. The land question and the taxation of land values figured largely in both contests as of primary importance. The candidates were made to feel and acknowledge this at almost every meeting. The Liberals won both seats.

In an unsigned article in your Summer number the view is expressed that the issue of Protection raised in Great Britain by Mr. Chamberlain seems to have come to naught, and that for the time the movement has come to a halt. The friend that penned that statement I am afraid did not know the facts of the case, nor is he acquainted with our pushful politician, Joseph Chamberlain. We are fairly launched into a sea of tariff discussion promoted by Mr. Chamberlain. Since that time he has resigned the position he held in the Government as Colonial Secretary in order to secure greater freedom in his propaganda efforts. Undoubtedly the issue now is protection versus free imports. So far the Government agrees with Mr. Chamberlain regarding the policy of retaliation, while the opposition continue to offer a mere negation. What is wanted on this side at this time is a Richard Cobden, or a Tom L. Johnson to point to the true remedy and to make the pace on the

lines of extending our present policy of freedom to exchange in the direction of taxing land values. The *Daily News*, the leading Liberal organ, in an able leader the other day said, "The Liberal party had something to do besides standing by Cobden's great achievement, it must carry out Cobden's great legacy, the taxation of land values. This is the reply," the *News* says, "we have to make to Mr. Chamberlain's attack on free trade. Let our reply be to complete Richard Cobden's work and to add free land to free trade. Liberalism can never have a greater cause." In reply to a correspondent, the Liberal leader, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman affirms his belief in the statistics formed by Mr. Rowntree and Mr. Charles Booth regarding the 12 millions of our people on the verge of starvation and points out that in his (Sir Henry's) opinion the remedy is not to be found in Protection, but rather in the direction of altering our present system of land tenure by the taxation of land values. This so far is the only indication we have from the high places of liberalism of any appreciation of the logic and strength of our contention. Meanwhile the Liberal Association, the Free Trade Union formed for the special purpose of opposing Protection, and the Cobden Club are spending thousands of pounds in the publication and distribution of literature and by public lectures and conferences to show by statistics the abounding prosperity (!) that Great Britain has enjoyed since the adoption of our free trade policy so-called. But in the face of the struggle for a living among the great mass of the people, this is so much beating of the air. Mr. Chamberlain formally opened his campaign in Glasgow last night. He proposes a readjustment of the present taxes upon food. There can only be one genuine liberal reply to this position and that is to take all taxation off food, and to relieve industry as much as possible of the burden of taxation. In the long run taxation must either come from the earnings of industry or from the earnings of the community, land values. We anticipate that the Liberals will be slowly driven to take up this position, either that or sooner or later Mr. Chamberlain will win. Our organizations and Single Taxers throughout the country are pushing the sale of the cheap edition of "Protection or Free Trade." So far 20,000 copies have been put into circulation. On the platform and in the press our friends are also active in pushing the true issue to the front.

JOHN PAUL.

#### ECHOES OF THE SYMPOSIUM ON INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION.

Following are some additional letters on the question of Independent Political Action, continued from our last number. It will be remembered that Mr. Weeks put the

following questions, to which the subjoined letters are replies, more or less explicitly in answer:

1st.—Where Single Taxers are free to organize politically, can they vote with parties which favor the ownership of land, without themselves incurring moral guilt?

2nd.—Should our political work be governed by moral principle, or by mere seeming expediency?

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

Replying to Mr. Weeks' first question, there is no moral guilt in voting for a party which favors ownership of land when that is not an issue and all parties support it as they do other established institutions; nor even though a small party opposes it when that party has no chance of success and those which have are divided on important, though minor, issues. Those who believe it is better to let things get as bad as possible and then they will be righted may refuse to change a small wrong because a greater wrong cannot be changed. But men driven to despair strike blindly and without thought. Permanent improvement along political lines results only from hopeful and thoughtful enlightenment, and there is no moral guilt in helping those to right one wrong who have not yet seen the greater wrong.

The answer to the second question is much the same. Moral principles are not always applicable to political work. While all of one's work should be governed by what seems to him moral principles, it is in the nature of things that he cannot apply these principles absolutely in actions which involve association with his neighbors who do not agree with him. Political work is but a form of association with our neighbors. A man who thinks he has a truth is certain to retard and not to advance its acceptance by absolutely cutting himself off from all his fellows. This is not an argument for conformity, but for toleration. If people do not agree with us it is simply because they do not see things as we do, and if our way is right they only need the education we have had to come to our way of thinking. To set ourselves apart is to assume that we are different from them when the only difference is that we heard the truth first.

Politics is the art of obtaining results through legislation. Political parties exist for the purpose of securing a majority of legislators favoring certain desired results. The party in control of legislation is of course satisfied with it, as a party. The only way in which the party out of power can obtain control is by winning over some of the supporters of the party in power. In order to do this certain concessions must be made to their opinions and desires, and the party platform must be so drawn as to hold out the greatest possible inducements to those out of the party without going as far as to drive away the most determined of

those within the party. No small "one idea" party can obtain control of legislation without pursuing this policy unless its one idea becomes so dominant in the public mind as to utterly minimize all other public questions.

The so called Prohibition and Socialist parties are not political parties at all, except in those localities where they have a fighting chance of success within a reasonable time. In other places they are nothing but educational organizations under a political form.

There is certainly not such a popular demand for abolition of land ownership as to afford reasonable foundation for believing that a Single Tax party would have any chance of success in any state, let alone as a national party. In proof of this are the small votes that have been polled in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago; and, even after the tremendous work done, in Delaware. Of course those who believe that in their neighborhood there is a demand and chance of success for a Single Tax party have no way of testing their belief except by starting one. That is a matter of expediency.

To forestall a possible criticism I will admit that I have advocated a separate party as a matter of principle even when hopeless. But now, for the reasons above given, I believe political action to be only a question of expediency.

NEW YORK.

A. C. PLEYDELL.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

Henry George in *The Land Question*, says, that the Single Tax will never enter politics as a direct issue, but indirectly, and he cites as an example the question of chattel slavery entering politics indirectly on the question of union or disunion.

By "entering politics directly" I take it, that he meant, by independent political action, through a Single Tax party.

At the time of Grover Cleveland's second election the Single Tax came near entering politics indirectly on the question of "tariff for revenue only."

But it was side-tracked, and perhaps it was well, for the country was not then ready to vote upon the land question.

It looks now as if the Single Tax had already entered politics in Ohio on the question of home rule, and equality in taxation, and that it may enter the next presidential campaign on the issue of "taxation a remedy for trusts;" but before this remedy can be largely acceptable to the people they must more clearly understand the difference between capital and privilege, and also between a corporation and a trust. Our work, therefore, is still to agitate, and educate.

To organize now a Single Tax party for independent action would do little but disclose our weakness, and create dissensions among ourselves.