

poor and redistribute to the rich; others to confiscate from the poor and distribute to other poor; and others to confiscate from the rich and redistribute to the poor.

Single Taxers, on the contrary, believe that prosperity and wealth, individual and national, can result only from work and production; that the worker is entitled to the full return from his labor; and that the government has no right to confiscate any of his earnings and redistribute them to either rich or poor.

Ground rent is a social product which belongs to all the people and should be taken by the government for the payment of all public expenses, and this automatically would leave earnings untaxed in the hands of those who earn.

When Single Taxers speak of workers, earners, and producers, they mean not only the laboring man who works with his hands but the white collar worker, the professional man, and the proprietor as well. They believe that it is respectable for the individual to work and earn money with his own hands, or his own head, and that it is equally respectable for those who have saved a little money to combine their savings and engage in public enterprise for profit and that those profits are as fully entitled to protection from confiscation by government as are the earnings of the daily wage worker.

The Single Tax idea is the last stronghold and, in fact, the only bulwark remaining to protect the American Institutions of Enterprise, Prosperity, and Freedom.

Colonel Victor A. Rule at the Henry George Congress

IN 1933 the Henry George Convention, held at Chicago, did me the honor of appointing me, along with others on a committee to study organization. That committee has long since expired having failed, even among its members, to come to any sort of agreement as to a basis for report.

However, the desire, arising out of need, has not expired and the intervening years, with their wealth of missed opportunities, have added to both the desire and the need.

The Single Tax movement—the No-Tax movement, the Georgeist movement—sadly needs organization and on the lack of it, not on any fundamental error or any lack of ability on the part of the general public to understand, I repeat, on the lack of organization this movement wrecks its opportunities.

I am not insensible to the modicum of truth in the ancient quib that the way to kill a thing is to organize it, but, with all the earnestness of my mind which is intellectually persuaded of the correctness of our position, with all fervor of my emotions which erupt at the continuance of social injustice, I wish to insist—*We Must Organize*:

Let us come to the record. With one shining exception our movement is a motly aggregation of sporadic, diversified, uncoordinated, divergent, individualistic efforts having but one basic element in common, namely, a desire to bring about a better social state founded on economic justice. And it has always been so. You can read its history—a sad story of stullified effort checkmating itself

and doing the work of its enemies because of a lack of organized effort. From the earliest records of man—on to the birth and work of Henry George himself through Johnson, Shearman, Brown, Ingersoll, Monroe and down until today, with the exception of Geiger, it has been a lack of organization which has brought defeat, not the lack of brainy leaders, gifted disciples, fervent appeals, adequate finance, but lack of organization and programme continuity.

I am supposed to speak on the proposition “Shall We Try to Concentrate All The Single Tax Activities in One State?” But what are these activities? Concentrate our internecine wordy wars, our individualistic efforts? Even if you concentrate them you’ll do no good without organization and plan.

The military man says “do not deploy in front but deploy in depth,” or as the man in the street says, “don’t spread yourself out too thin.” But this is no argument against, rather it is for the proposition that our next step must be National Organization and the development of a directive plan for this Movement. My answer to the question then must be no. Not because I do not think that this is what we will ultimately come to but because I believe there is a prior act necessary. Someday we will have to do just what this question suggests, but that day has not yet arrived.

The military maxim quoted has to do with a principle of attack—it is not at all related to the prior question of training, of getting ready for the attack. Now it would seem abundantly evident that before we attack the privilege which we believe to be at the basis of most, if not all our major social ills, we must educate the people on whose lack of information or social lethargy this privilege so largely endures. It might be objected that this question which I am called upon to discuss relates only to an attack upon such ignorance or lethargy. Possibly that is so although I doubt that as the interpretation most people would place on it. But even if it were the only interpretation my answer would still be as it is. *A prior step must be taken!*

I make this answer because were we to do as is suggested by this question, or rather by such an interpretation of this question, we would be doing an injustice to every other state. There are two principles involved in our Movement of which political action is just one. Political action arises more soundly from education rather than education flowing from political action. Let others play the “if at first you don’t succeed, try, try again” game. We have already been enlightened about the inexorable inevitability of right action following right thought. No state in this union can hope to isolate itself from the thought and education of other states while each state can assert its own sovereignty in political affairs.

It would not be proper for me to advocate merely a

negative position. You have given me of your time and attention, graciously given. Must I not also give and that not of my doubts but of my beliefs? Most people have enough doubts of their own without being burdened with mine. It is a good thing to believe your beliefs and to doubt your doubts but it is a dangerous thing to talk yourself or others into believing your doubts and doubting your beliefs.

Last year, at Cincinnati, a Committee gave me the honor of representing them in the matter of discovering what Single Taxers thought ought to be done about organization and plan. This Committee consisted of Mr. Gilbert Tucker, as Chairman, our beloved Anna George deMille, together with Otto Cullman, George Strachan, and Mr. Merrell as members. They gave me a year in which to do this, confining me to a survey of what is now being done and what might be done in the future.

In carrying out this task I have had great pleasure and there is submitted to you, as the affirmative belief on the question raised by this topic, that which has resulted from this activity.

First: The greatest single present need of the Single Tax Movement is national organization and directive programme. This work must have at least four and possibly more major divisions.

A. There must be national organization for propaganda.

B. There must be national organization for education of a more formal nature.

C. There must be national organization for financing.

D. There must be national organization for future political action.

Second: This organization can be accomplished regionally without disturbing any present activity and without increasing the burden at present borne by those interested in the Movement.

Such conclusions backed as they are by adequate survey and considerable discussion call for a suggested modus operandi. I make the following suggestions as a basis for discussion and should it be acceptable, for action.

First: That this Congress authorize the appointment of a temporary National Committee and instruct them to proceed with a national organization as follows:

Region or Area 1. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Area 2. New York, New Jersey and Delaware.

Area 3. Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and Washington, D. C.

Area 4. North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi and Louisiana.

Area 5. West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana and Kentucky.

Area 6. Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin.

Area 7. Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, North and South Dakota.

Area 8. Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma and Texas.

Area 9. Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada and California.

A view of these areas will reveal that there is a territorial coherence in them and that in each area there is at present operative some fairly virile effort, some tested leaders.

The question of organization must always be one of evolution and it is not possible to give birth to any scheme which will be entirely satisfactory at birth.

Second: That the temporary National Committee be instructed to draw up plans for representation by areas in a National Committee and the terms of office therein.

Third: That the temporary National Committee be instructed to draw up plans for representation in future Congresses so that the action of such Congresses shall be the expression of representative rather than individual judgments.

Fourth: That the temporary National Committee be instructed to draw up plans for organization operation in at least the four categories herein suggested and submit such plans, together with other reports, to the next Single Tax Congress.

It would not be proper for any of us to attempt at this time to restrict or define the work of this suggested temporary National Committee, but there are a few things which might be touched on. By that I mean we may give direction if not content to their deliberations.

Perhaps this can best be done by considering the objectives which might be accomplished through such a scheme or organization. Here again but the first few silver arrows of a rising sun which bespeak the advent of a brighter, happier day of justice for humanity, can be observed.

In such organization we may hope for ultimates, and the first of these is a united voice backed by an informed constituency. Not that differences of opinion could or should be forever silenced, nor that they are always and everywhere bad. This is not so. We are disciples of liberty and seekers after justice. Differences of opinion are often evidences of growing pains, the birth pangs of discovered truth. But it is a tragic thing for us to be the trustees of a significant truth and the legatees of such great leaders as the past has blessed us with and in our day of need not to be able to give one voice to a distracted world. It is little wonder that those who frantically seek for a solution for the present world condition regard us so lightly and turn to nostrums instead of the truth which we have to present.

We might hope for programme; for programme formulated in discussion, adopted by a recognized congress

for delegates and backed by a united consistency. Almost any voice can be raised and any scheme proposed and the name of Single Tax tacked on to it. Then those in the Movement have to take it, for what can they do about it? They can support it with fears and under the duress of loyalty, all the while cursed by the regret that this thing was not more fully discussed before launching and tormented by the probability of failure. It is a serious and grave fallacy which possesses some Single Taxers, that *any* publicity is better than *no* publicity. The publicity of failure is of doubtful worth when the failure is produced by a lack of common sense. They can fight about it. How the enemies of the germatic idea love this! What a travesty that our energies should be dissipated in this manner. This has been the age old strategy of landlordism. Make Capital and Labor fight while landlords devour their substance—make Single Taxers fight Single Taxers and let the public know them as cranks. Even cranks don't like cranks if they recognize them.

We might hope for standing. At present the Single Tax advocate gets before audiences on personality. It is intensely difficult to get a hearing on the bare idea and yet the idea is greater than any personality. Why should we have to beg for a hearing? Why should we have to camouflage our subject? Take your Universities, your Social and Service Clubs, your myriad of other organizations having group meetings and discussions, why cannot Single Taxers get before such groups on the basis of a great idea? I know, if you do not. I will tell you if you do not have the courage to phrase it. We have no standing as an organization, we are individuals advocating an ideal in the light of our own personalities and unsupported by concerted Movement.

Bear with me in my last point. We may hope for a better financed programme where the money spent will accomplish more. There are arguments to the contrary but experience in every major reform and in all potential organizations has just one message on this point. With adequate organization, with directive programme, with supervised activity you can raise more money, you can spend it more wisely, you can accomplish greater things than you can do by a multitude of individual efforts. Take it for what it is worth but many people are not willing to be known as Single Taxers lest a swarm of sincere people descent on them to obtain financial support for the "only way to make the people see our reform." If you control the purse strings you can direct almost anyone, you can win elections, you can silence internal dissensions, you can brand mavericks or make them bellow at the moon.

TO take a tree from the forest, a salmon from the river, a deer from the hill, or a cow from lowland strath, is what no Highlander need ever think shame upon.—SIR WALTER SCOTT, *Waverley*, ch. 18.

The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation Report

TO those watching its progress, there is no doubt of the growth of the Henry George movement. In a recent survey to determine how the forty-eight states were represented in this increase, we developed some interesting statistics. We took nine thousand names from the list we have built. These did not include students of the School, college professors or bookdealers. New York, we found, was most largely represented, with Illinois, Pennsylvania, California, Ohio and New Jersey following in the order named. Nevada had the smallest number of names in the group analyzed.

Among the "trade" we now have four hundred and sixty dealers carrying our books, twenty-nine new stores having been added in our recent campaign.

The Foundation sent several volumes to the Book Fair, where they were placed on the shelves of the Modern Book Shop. Visitors to the Fair report that the books are receiving considerable attention from the throngs passing through.

During its early years the Foundation printed a special edition of "Progress and Poverty" which it distributed free to libraries throughout the country. Since then new libraries have been opened, worn copies have been discarded. It is time to check again. This time our work will have a double objective. The Henry George School of Social Science is circulating a poster announcing its correspondence course. To those libraries which agree to display it, the Foundation will donate a copy of "Progress and Poverty." Thus new shelves will be stocked, worn copies replaced and students secured for the course.

Through a special service open to publishers, we circulate a list of our pamphlets to librarians throughout the country. The pamphlets thus sold are included in reference and research divisions. It is interesting to note that the title most frequently selected by librarians is "A Defense of the Single Tax Principle," by Professor Harry Gunnison Brown.

In 1933, in response to our advertisements, Roy A. Foulke, Manager of the Analytical Report Department of Dun and Bradstreet's, came to this office and purchased "Progress and Poverty." He read—he studied—George conquered. The result was a vigorous article in the *Dun and Bradstreet Monthly Review*. For a time we carried reprints. Lately these have been exhausted, but still the requests for them come in. Now we have a new reprint of the article—an old friend in a new and most attractive garb. It is a two-page folder on colored paper with the title, "Three Important Balance Sheet Ratios," set in modern type. Those who want these folders may have them at cost. A package of fifty will be fifty cents postpaid.