

# The Public

A National Journal of Fundamental Democracy &  
A Weekly Narrative of History in the Making

LOUIS F. POST, EDITOR  
ALICE THACHER POST, MANAGING EDITOR

## ADVISORY AND CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES H. DILLARD, Louisiana  
LINCOLN STEFFENS, Connecticut  
L. F. C. GARVIN, Rhode Island  
HENRY F. RING, Texas  
HERBERT S. BIGELOW, Ohio  
FREDERIC C. HOWE, Ohio  
MRS. HARRIET TAYLOR UPTON, Ohio  
BRAND WHITLOCK, Ohio

HENRY GEORGE, JR., New York  
ROBERT BAKER, New York  
BOLTON HALL, New York  
FRANCIS I. DU PONT, Delaware  
HERBERT QUICK, Wisconsin  
MRS. LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, Iowa  
S. A. STOCKWELL, Minnesota  
WILLIAM P. HILL, Missouri  
C. E. S. WOOD, Oregon

JOHN Z. WHITE, Illinois  
R. F. PETTIGREW, South Dakota  
W. G. EGGLESTON, Oregon  
LEWIS H. BERENS, England  
J. W. S. CALLIE, England  
JOSEPH FELS, England  
JOHN PAUL, Scotland  
GEORGE FOWLDS, New Zealand

Vol. XIV.

CHICAGO, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1911.

No. 700

Published by Louis F. Post  
Elsworth Building, 537 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

Single Copy, Five Cents      Yearly Subscription, One Dollar

Entered as Second-Class Matter April 18, 1893, at the Post Office at  
Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

## EDITORIAL

### A Singletax Anniversary.

In honor of the twenty-first anniversary of the first national conference of Singletaxers in the United States, we are devoting much space this week to historical material appropriate to that occasion.

+

This is not because we regard Singletax organization as at all important in itself, or very important to the Singletax movement, either as help or hindrance. In that respect as in many other respects we hold with Henry George, who regarded distinctive formal organization as perhaps a little worse than useless except as on occasion it might spring spontaneously out of large popular demands.

+

Even then there comes a tendency among members to exalt their organization above their cause. But this is to be borne in such circumstances, as an incident of the larger good or the actual necessity; whereas small organizations made to order by a few persons are fatuous invitations to restrictive creeds, petty authority, unnecessary controversies and obstruction. The first Singletax conference, however, had a legitimate even if temporary reason for being. It gave a common, practical impulse to men and women of like purpose but widely scattered over a large country, and at a time when diverting controversies were rife.

## CONTENTS.

EDITORIAL:	
A Singletax Anniversary.....	889
The Singletax in New Zealand.....	891
The Singletax in Australia.....	891
The Singletax in Great Britain.....	891
The Singletax in Germany.....	891
The Singletax in France and Spain.....	891
The Singletax in Denmark.....	891
The Singletax in Canada.....	892
The Singletax in the United States.....	892
The Singletax and the Fels Fund.....	892
Hostile Testimony to Singletax Progress.....	893
William Thomas Croasdale (with portrait). (Edward N. Vallandigham).....	893
"We Sell the Earth." (Charles Howard Shinn).....	896
EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE:	
The Singletax in Great Britain. (John Orr).....	897
Suggestions by Joseph Fels.....	898
INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS:	
The Grand Hailing Sign of Triumph. (H. W. Allen).....	899
NEWS NARRATIVE:	
The Socialist Platform of Los Angeles.....	899
Death of Henry George's Brother.....	899
The Anti-Imperialist League Honors Gamaliel Bradford.....	900
Constitutional Convention in Ohio.....	900
De Arriaga Elected President of Portugal.....	900
News Notes.....	901
Press Opinions.....	901
RELATED THINGS:	
Thy People Pray. (George M. P. Baird).....	902
George and Croasdale. (E. N. Vallandigham).....	902
First American Singletax Conference (illustrated). (L. F. P.).....	903
The Singletax Platform.....	912
Roll of First Singletax Conference.....	913
Tactics of the Singletax Movement. (Henry George, Jr.).....	914
BOOKS:	
Economic History.....	917
Pamphlets.....	917
Periodicals.....	918

That fact, and probably that fact alone, together with the model platform it adopted, entitles it to a permanent place in the history of the Singletax movement.

+

The ephemeral career of the organization launched by the first national conference does not prove the organization useless in its inception, nor any decline of the cause. Having a function that was in fact soon fulfilled, the organization soon died. For the cause it represented it was doubtless better so, though this the promoters of the organization could not foresee. But the cause itself, so far from dying with the organization, as so many long supposed—some with grief and others with gratitude,—went on growing in other and better ways than through a narrowing organization. Its seeds have consequently begun now to sprout in the social mind of civilized peoples the world over. Other causes may boast of large membership, and point justly and hopefully to a wide and broadening recognition of the evils they denounce; but the Singletax cause, without membership rolls and without efforts to make any, can point not alone to common recognition of those evils, which it likewise denounces, but also to common tendencies, marked and progressive, toward the actual adoption of its constructive principles and plans.

+

If Great Britain, Germany, Australia, New Zealand and Canada may be cited as engaged in experimenting along Singletax lines, and two States of our own country, Oregon and Missouri, as preparing to begin the experiment here, while in most of the other States public opinion is likewise ripening, all this is because the Singletax movement has everywhere given less energy to organizing itself than to thoughtful activities in other organizations. Personal promotion of the cause itself, without responsibility to conferences and conventions and committees, has gone on everywhere. In political parties, in churches and clubs and fraternal societies, in tax offices and legislatures and Congress and parliaments and newspaper sanctums, unlabeled Singletaxers have been intelligently industrious, planting seed in their several ways; and those that have resorted to organization have made organization an instrument and not a master, a working committee rather than a seat of power, a broad, co-operative influence and not a segregated band. This has not indeed fattened the membership rolls of any Singletax cult, nor put Singletax

labels upon the men it has influenced. It has done more than that and better than that. In thousands of thought centers it has set thought a-flowing unobstructedly in the direction of the great industrial revolution which the Singletax contemplates and which nothing short of the Singletax in its fullness can accomplish.

+

One of the landmarks of such a movement is worth commemorating. It is worth while not alone to those Singletaxers who may incline to look back to these historic beginnings somewhat worshipfully, but also to whoever aspires to the same social goal as Singletaxers, albeit in different and it may be in various forms, and by other methods; and it is worth while to "the man in the street" who, his "nine days of blindness" over, has begun to see truths crudely, even as men were seen by the blind man of Bethsaida "like trees walking." And what better supplement to The Public could we offer in this connection than the portrait of Henry George as he appeared in the fullness of his physical and mental powers at the time, or not long before it, of the meeting of the Conference whose twenty-first birthday we commemorate? Every copy of The Public of this issue must contain this portrait supplement to be complete. It was made by Schaidner, a well-known photographer of Harlem (one of the annexed villages of New York), in the eighties, and was put on sale by The Standard, while William T. Crossdale was the editor, in photogravure form at about the time of the Conference. Another highly appropriate feature of this edition of The Public is a condensation of the Singletax speech of Henry George, Jr., in Congress. Hardly more than a youth at the time of the first Singletax conference, Henry George, Jr., was one of its members. His portrait appears in the Conference group of which we reproduce the middle section. He was elected to Congress as a Democrat nearly a year ago, from an unusually large and overwhelming Republican district, defeating the sitting member—and as a Democrat of the democratic, free trade and Singletax variety. Beyond all cavil he has won his spurs in the national legislature. The speech we quote from was in every way worthy the son of Henry George, alike for its high order of political tact, its sound and unreserved exposition and application of principle, and its thoughtful and convincing answers to questions. We hope that the full speech may be widely read. Congressman George is about to set out upon a trans-continental lecturing tour, going to the Pacific early in September by northern routes, and return-

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

ing by southern routes in time for the regular session of Congress.\*

+ +

### The Singletax in New Zealand.

When the first Singletax conference met in New York, twenty-one years ago, New Zealand had just begun experimenting with the Singletax for municipalities. This tendency had been already created by land legislation, some of it fiscal, with a view to breaking up large holdings; but the distinctive Singletax method came in with the local option tax law, under which nearly a hundred municipalities, both urban and agricultural, have adopted for local purposes land value taxation exclusively. All that its advocates have predicted for it as a superior fiscal measure has been realized in these New Zealand municipalities. Its industrial advantages also have been demonstrated; but the tax rate is as yet too low to accomplish the great desideratum of abolishing landlordism.

+ +

### The Singletax in Australia.

Both in the Australian Commonwealth and in its States, Singletax experimentation has moved rapidly in the past ten years. As to municipal taxation the example of New Zealand has been followed, with variations calculated to make it more mandatory. In every respect it has proved its superiority as a method of raising public revenues; and in many respects, notwithstanding the low tax rate, it has demonstrated its possibilities as an industrial or social reform.

+ +

### The Singletax in Great Britain.

More important than anything actually accomplished in Great Britain has been the general agitation against landlordism which the land value taxes of the Lloyd-George budget of 1910 aroused throughout the United Kingdom. All vacant land (formerly exempt) must pay one cent in taxes on every five dollars of capital value. This is a small tax. Land values in the United States pay from two to four or five times as much—in our real estate tax, which falls upon land and improvements indiscriminately. But it is to be remembered that vacant land has paid no appreciable tax in Great Britain in modern times, from which it follows that even one cent in five dollars—about 2 mills

\*Arrangements for Congressman George's lectures are in the hands of the Henry George Lecture Association (Frederick H. Monroe, manager), which has authority to make appointments for him en route. The address of this Association is room 802, No. 538 S. Dearborn Street, Chicago. Copies of his Congressional speech may be had of Daniel Kiefer, Chairman of the Fels Fund, Cincinnati, Ohio.

in the dollar—will tend to force valuable holdings into the market and thereby stimulate improvement and employment. It will have a greater effect in that respect in Great Britain, where land values are more stable, than 2 mills extra would have in this country where values rise so readily as to encourage much speculative holding. Besides the taxes on vacant land in Great Britain, there are a variety of other land value taxes, including 20 per cent on "unearned increment"—on the difference, that is, between the capital value of a holding at one period and its larger capital value at a later period. These periods are variously determined.

+ +

### The Singletax in Germany.

Germany made a crude Singletax experiment in the German colony of Kiaouchou, China, as long ago as 1898 or 1899, and with such satisfactory results that the idea has a grip now in the home country. During a period of eight or ten years German cities have been collecting "unearned increment" taxes for local purposes, and the Imperial government has within a year or two also turned to this source of revenue. The method is crude, but the purpose is manifest. And the effect is inevitable—a strong tendency, not so strong as in Great Britain perhaps, but very strong and growing stronger, in the direction of the total abolition of German landlordism.

+ +

### The Singletax in France and Spain.

While no general movement of a Singletax character distinctively has as yet developed in either France or Spain, tendencies in that direction are affecting the public mind. In Spain this has found expression in efforts to substitute land value taxes for octroi tariffs, and Antonio Albendin (Calle Mendez Nunez 21, Ronda, Andalucia, Spain) has found encouragement in utilizing this reform as a leverage for promoting Singletax progress. Mr. Albendin is also in the effort to form a Spanish League for the Singletax. In France there are individual indications of a tendency toward recognition of the Singletax idea, which Georges Darien (3, Rue de Furstenberg, Paris, France) has undertaken to stimulate through his able and brilliant monthly magazine, *La Revue de l'Impot Unique*, and by means of a French League for the Singletax.

+ +

### The Singletax in Denmark.

Most notable of all the countries of Continental Europe for Singletax progress is Denmark, where

the small farmers have united with workmen to secure exemptions of industry and the substitution of exclusive taxation of land values. The "Cottagers'" organization—the "Grange" as we perhaps should call it here; the organized farmers, that is, who farm farms instead of farming farmers—is, in co-operation with trade unions, effectively moving on toward the Singletax. Not only are they moving toward it, but they know what it is and are working earnestly and with good hope to get it.

\* \*

#### The Singletax in Canada.

A trend toward the Singletax in Canadian municipalities has been visible for several years, but only recently has it advanced so far as to attract general attention. For this the city of Vancouver is responsible. About a year and a half ago, Vancouver, taking advantage of a statute of the Province of British Columbia, of which Vancouver is one of the large cities, abolished taxes on improvements. There was an instant forward leap in local prosperity, and Victoria and New Westminster lost no time in following Vancouver's example. Similar tendencies had already begun in municipalities of the newer Provinces of Canada, notably at Edmonton, Province of Alberta; and these derived fresh impetus from the experience of Vancouver. Since then the idea of exempting improvements and taxing land values exclusively, has made its way eastward across Canada, until it has found official expression in the City Council of St. John, New Brunswick. The low rate on land values still exposes Canadian municipalities to the ravages of landlordism; but this danger may now be easily averted by raising valuations or increasing rates.

\* \*

#### The Singletax in the United States.

In most of the States where Singletax sentiment is influential, State constitutions stand in the way of adopting this reform, and until the election of last fall the laws of every State prevented its adoption by municipalities. Thomas G. Shearman started a movement in New York as long ago as 1889 for permitting counties to adopt it, but over this entire period, no legislature of that State has yielded to the pleas of Mr. Shearman or of his associates and successors. But in Oregon last fall, thanks to the People's Power Constitution of that State, the people secured this local option right for their counties, by means of an Initiative petition. Efforts are making in behalf of landlordism, from outside the State as well as within it, to reverse that vote at the next election; but a

movement is nevertheless under way to bring the question of exempting improvements and taxing only land values, to a vote next year in every Oregon county. A similar movement is reported from Seattle. In Missouri a Constitutional amendment progressively abolishing all taxes on improvements, business, etc., and taxing land values alone, is to be brought to vote next year under the Initiative and Referendum powers of the people of that State. In other parts of the Union, although very important preparatory work is under way, the practical movement is either confined to indirect activities, or awaiting results in Missouri and Oregon; or else it is devoting its energies to secure that electoral mechanism the possession of which makes the Missouri and Oregon campaigns possible.

\* \*

#### The Singletax and the Fels Fund.

It is no empty compliment to an individual to credit Joseph Fels with having contributed in extraordinary degree and with extraordinary success to the leap forward which the Singletax movement has taken in the past three years. In the receipt of a large income, much of which he attributes to predatory economic institutions, he is financing campaigns for putting an end to incomes so acquired. To this mission he devotes money that others devote to plutocratic pleasures or ineffective philanthropies. Nor is it money alone that he gives; the man himself goes with his money. In Great Britain, Germany, Denmark, Australia, New Zealand and Canada, Joseph Fels (with the full sympathy and co-operation of his wife, and as a substitute for expensive personal pleasures and whims) finances and personally promotes the Singletax movement, visiting these spheres of his activities once a year—except Australia and New Zealand, which are too far away. And results are what he asks for. So also of the United States.

\*

Nearly three years ago Mr. Fels endowed the Fels Fund here with the object of securing the Singletax somewhere in this country in five years. His terms were merely that competent men should be appointed on the executive commission, and that every dollar contributed by him be matched with another contributed by the people here. An ideal commission was chosen: Daniel Kiefer (chairman) of Cincinnati, and Lincoln Steffens of Connecticut, Frederic C. Howe of Ohio, Jackson H. Ralston of Washington (D. C.), and George A. Briggs of Indiana. Mr. Fels offers \$25,000 a year—\$50,000 if so much is matched with other

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

contributions—in order to enable the executive commission to do its work. Although his endowment has not yet been fully doubled, contributions besides his own have far exceeded in number and amount any ever before made to the Singletax cause in the United States. As a result, the people of this country are moving rapidly on to the point of realizing Mr. Fels' original object of putting the Singletax in operation somewhere in the United States by 1914.\*

+ +

### Hostile Testimony to Singletax Progress.

One of the interesting evidences of Singletax progress is that which some of its more thoughtful but imprudent adversaries unwittingly furnish. Take, for instance, the movement for the relief of congestion in New York City, under the leadership of Benjamin C. Marsh† as executive secretary of the Committee on Congestion of Population in New York. This movement has before the legislature of New York a bill that would reduce taxes on buildings, relatively to sites, in New York City by one-half. That is, a building would be taxed only half as much as its site, their values being the same, or of a vacant lot of equal value. It is essentially the Vancouver plan, as far as it goes; and the exemption is to be progressive—a reduction of taxes on buildings in such equal amounts annually as to bring about the complete 50 per cent exemption of improvements with the fifth year. No one attempts to argue against this congestion reform. Every one of any intelligence at all admits that it would be better than the present system; and nearly everybody admits that it would tend to reduce congestion, as of course it would. But the bill was bitterly fought, and was postponed until the reassembling of the legislature on the 6th of September, and it may be defeated, because—because what, do you suppose? *Because it would be an entering wedge for the Singletax!*

+

If that is the best kind of fight that New York landlordism can put up, New York landlordism had better quit fighting. A better system of taxation; but don't adopt it, for it would let in the Singletax! A good method for getting rid of congestion in a crowded city; but don't adopt it.

\*Persons wishing to know more about this phase of the Singletax movement should write for information to Daniel Kiefer, Chairman Fels Fund Commission, Cincinnati, Ohio.

†Mr. Marsh may be addressed for information as follows: Benjamin C. Marsh, Executive Secretary, The Committee on Congestion of Population in New York, Room 506, 320 Broadway, New York City.

for it would let in the Singletax! If the Singletax has indeed reached the point of popularity in New York at which it must be guarded against to the extent of opposing improvements in taxation and of clinging to disease-breeding and death-dealing hives for the homes of the poor, there is no use in fighting the Singletax any longer. If a mere halving of taxes on buildings, throwing only that much of their present burden over upon the monopolists of building sites, would open the way for the full Singletax, then the full Singletax is already upon the threshold,—then the feet of the young men are at the door, for the dying body of landlordism lies within. We hope that these fears of land monopolists are well founded; but we should suppose that even so, they themselves would be ashamed to make such an appeal. Think of it! In the face of congested conditions which enrich them at the expense of the labor and the lives of their brethren, they oppose an ameliorative measure because it would be an entering wedge for the Singletax!

+ + +

### WILLIAM THOMAS CROASDALE.\*

William Thomas Croasdale has been dead twenty years, yet those who knew and loved the man can hardly think of him as other than alive. So vigorous was his personality, so strong the impact of his mind and character upon those with whom he came in daily contact, that all such must remember him to their dying day as one of the most vivid incidents of their experience.

His life was comparatively short, without striking incident or startling adventure; and measured by merely material standards, without considerable success. Judged, however, by the impress he made upon those about him, by his practical usefulness to the Singletax movement and other public causes, by the energy with which he thought and wrought, Croasdale's life was one of distin-

\*This editorial is by a Boston newspaper man and publicist, Edward N. Vallandigham, who was an editorial associate of Mr. Croasdale's on the Wilmington Every Evening in the early eighties, and an editorial writer for The Standard at the time of Mr. Croasdale's death. The medallion of Mr. Croasdale, of which a photograph appears in the body of the article, is by Mr. Croasdale's friend, E. Stuart Hinton, now of Chicago, the sculptor who modeled a bust of Mr. Croasdale for the Reform Club of New York City in 1892, a plaster replica of which is owned by the Manhattan Single Tax Club. Mr. Hinton's medallion is an excellent likeness and full of character. For the fine photograph of it we are indebted to Alfred Cox (935 McClurg Building, Chicago), a photographer of many distinguished persons, who is justly famous for the painter-like quality of his photographic portraits. Platinum copies, 7 inches by 9 inches (loose-mounted on rough gray paper sheets), may be had of him for two dollars each, postpaid.

guished success and even more distinguished promise.

His life was of unvarying usefulness, steady personal growth, perfect probity, and enduring fortitude, crowned with the respect of all who knew him, with the enthusiastic love, loyalty and admiration of his friends.

+

Croasdale was a Delawarean by birth and a Quaker by inheritance, employing upon occasion the "plain language" throughout his whole life. His father, a man of small means, died in the son's youth, and seems to have left little or no impress upon his character. His mother, a woman of high character, native force, and quick intelligence, owed the comfort of a beautiful old age to the son, and undoubtedly endowed him with an inheritance of her own vigorous qualities.

+

He was all his life an active journalist. In the early 70's of the last century, when less than 30 years old, he founded at Wilmington a newspaper to which he gave the happily distinctive name of *Every Evening*. From the first he edited this paper with a vigor that made it a power in that small community, and won its editorial page respectful consideration all over the country.

His Quaker up-bringing and his loyalty to the Union at the time of the Civil War naturally placed Croasdale in the Republican party. But the scandals of Grant's second administration excited his disgust, and the contested election of 1876 found him in earnest sympathy with the Democratic party, though his editorial page still maintained an attitude of great independence. He finally became the steady advocate of Thomas F. Bayard for the Presidency.

Brilliant and enterprising as *Every Evening* was, it did not at this time prove a financial success, and Croasdale in 1883 became the editor and titular owner of the *Baltimore Day*, founded upon the ruins of the *Gazette*, and backed by the capital of men who had faith in him, and who, I fancy, hoped with him for Mr. Bayard's nomination by the Democratic national convention of 1884.

In Baltimore Croasdale tried to make his paper an accredited Democratic organ. The vigorous character of his editorial writing was instantly recognized, and the *Day* for a time rapidly grew in circulation. But his strong sense of right and his unquenchable public spirit soon led him into advocating movements in opposition to the corrupt local Democracy. He fought valiantly also

for the interests of organized labor, and rattled the dry bones of Baltimore journalism in a fashion to scandalize that staid community.

By this time he had begun to be interested in the *Singletax*, as it has since come to be known, and soon after his removal to Baltimore he made the acquaintance of Henry George. The *Day* failed at length because those who were furnishing the capital felt unable to wait for success, and Croasdale in 1885 went to New York to become associate editor of the *Star* with William Dorseimer, who had recently been Lieutenant Governor of that State, as editor-in-chief.

+

On the *Star*, which traced its lineage back to the *Sun*, Croasdale's native vigor shone in his editorial work, and he was extremely happy in his new connection until he discovered that the paper was the subsidized organ of a railway company then striving to evade its lawful obligations to the Federal government. This was enough for him, even had not his growing interest in Henry George and the *Singletax* idea made him eager to be freed of trammels. He resigned from the *Star*, and after a vain attempt to reconcile himself to the editorial service of the *Evening Post*, he joined Mr. George in the editorship of the *Standard*, of which he became editor-in-chief when Mr. George gave up active connection with the paper. He was its editor when he died.

Croasdale was active with Mr. George in the United Labor party movement of 1886-87, having contributed editorially to the *Leader*, the *George* daily in the mayoral contest of 1886, and been a political leader of the party in the election of 1887. But, like Mr. George, he hailed with joy Cleveland's tariff reform message of 1887, and therefore threw himself eagerly into the Democratic campaign of 1888. In the latter year he organized the *Singletaxers* of the United States in support of Cleveland on the ground of their being freetraders and of Cleveland's representing the political tendency toward free trade. Out of this nucleus he afterward organized the first *Singletax* conference.

Croasdale's five years in New York were the happiest and most active of his strenuous life. There in the growing group of *Singletaxers* and among the active tariff reformers in the *Reform Club* he enjoyed intellectual companionship, while in the great issues of the day he found scope for his aggressive and energetic spirit.

He threw himself not only into the *Singletax* movement, but into the movement for ballot re-

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

form, and for tariff reform. He ran for Congress in 1890 as an independent Democrat in a strongly Tammany district, and developed unexpected effectiveness as a public speaker. Harper's Weekly, then under the editorship of George William Curtis, gave him generous newspaper support, while



*W. T. Croasdale*

Thomas G. Shearman, Richard Watson Gilder (of the Century) and other such men financed his campaign; and he had a group of enthusiastic workers among tariff reformers, Singletaxers and workingmen. But the Tammany machine triumphed.

In less than a year after that Croasdale died at Merriewold Park, of which he was one of the originators, at the age of 48. His funeral was at the rooms of the Manhattan Singletax Club, 73 Lexington Avenue, New York, where Father Huntington conducted the Episcopal burial service and Henry George made the address. His body was cremated at Fresh Pond on Long Island, and the ashes were buried in his mother's grave at the Friends' burial ground in Prospect Park, Brooklyn.

+

Croasdale the man, is a personality that those

who knew him despair of communicating to those who did not. In youth he was slender, nervous, a bit choleric, with red-brown hair, red-brown eyes, and a light curling red mustache. Ten or twelve years before his death he took on flesh, though, in spite of an old malady that made him careful of his movements, and in spite of increasing weight, he was still active. The power of the man was carried in his ample brow and speaking eyes.

He wrote admirably well, but never half so well as he talked. His talk, indeed, accentuated by a quaint impediment of speech, was deliciously vivid, brilliant, witty. With Croasdale, however, wit was never a mere decoration of speech. It was, so to speak, like the soundest architectural ornamentation, strictly structural, and one with the essence of what he had to say.

Brilliant and sustained talker though he was, he was also an excellent listener if anyone had aught to the purpose to say, and his own gift of wit did not prevent his according the most generous appreciation to the wit of others, even when it was directed against himself.

He was a most delightful man to work with, for while he had a volcanic impatience that sometimes expressed itself in hasty words, he was never ungenerous, never inappreciative, never arrogant toward his subordinates. Those who worked with Croasdale, even upon failing ventures, caught something of his magnificent courage, shared his often unjustified optimism, and sympathized with his enthusiasms. One felt that defeat was better under such a commander than victory with one less generous and less courageous.

His friendly smile was like an illumination, and the dimple oddly set in his rough cheek and reserved for the many good women who gave him their confidence and friendship, was a delightful thing to see. Strangers often hated him, for his speech was frequently loud and more than occasionally rough and frank; but he soon conquered the affection and enlisted the undying loyalty of those who could read beneath the surface. He and Tom L. Johnson were as chummy as two boys. But toward Henry George, who held him in high respect and trusted friendship, he had more the reserve of a pupil, though one addicted to taking liberties, than their intimacy might have seemed to warrant.

Night after night Croasdale held forth at the Reform Club to a group of delighted listeners, pouring out witticisms that kept the company in a roar, listening with prompt appreciation to any good thing from those about him, taking his full

share of drink, laughing at and with his friends, and leaving upon the minds of strangers who were often fetched in for the express purpose of hearing him talk, an indelible impression of vigor, generosity and sincerity.

+

Such a man, so uncalculating in his devotion to the causes that appealed to his sense of right, so loyal to friends, so aggressive and indomitable, yet so nice of conscience, so unswervingly truthful, so transparently frank, so ready to give his time and energy without hesitation or stint, was a host in the Singletax battle.

His earnings were never large, yet he always maintained a comfortable home for his mother, and did his part in his ordinary social intercourse with men. Toward the end of his life he was left, by the death of his mother, without near relatives. After that his preoccupation with public affairs increased, though there never was a time when he did not indulge his natural and wholesome taste for human companionship.

+

There came a time when an acute condition of a chronic malady made it necessary that he undergo a surgical operation from which it seemed extremely problematical whether he could recover. He came through the operation well, however, and during his weeks of confinement at Bellevue Hospital was the most cheerful of patients, receiving callers with his accustomed good fellowship and lively banter, and eventually coming out with the reasonable expectation of being physically sounder than for at least twenty years.

He ought, in the natural order of things, to have lived to old age, if, indeed, anyone can imagine Croasdale as old; but early in August, 1891, he fell ill at Merriewood, out of reach of medical aid acquainted with his pathological history, of what was diagnosed at first as typhoid fever and may have been that, and in a few days the man to whom so many looked for inspiration, the loyal comrade, the valiant fighter in many a good cause, was dead.

At the news of his death there was a surprising expression of regret, admiration and affection from many different sources—from those who had gone with him the whole length as a Singletaxer unlimited; from active tariff reformers, who had a very incomplete sympathy with his more radical aims; from conservatives who valued him for the honest, vigorous, outspoken man he was. His death left his near friends fairly dazed and half incredulous.

As to the Singletax cause, it suffered in Croasdale's death a loss that those who knew him best cannot but feel has never yet been repaired. We miss him in every new struggle, and who shall say how often in the past 20 years the words have been on the lips of his old associates, "If Croasdale were only here!" or the thought in their hearts that one blast upon his bugle horn were worth a thousand men.

EDWARD N. VALLANDIGHAM.

+ + +

### "WE SELL THE EARTH."

Sometimes an every-day phrase illuminates whole centuries of history and epochs of human thought. It has often seemed to me that the little real estate advertising phrase which forms the subject of this article rivals in its cold unimaginative brutality that famous remark of the great French queen when she was told that the people had no bread. "And why do they not then eat cake?" she replied.

I remember that many years ago I came out of the mining camps of Trinity, and into a new and lively town. Stretched across the main street was a gorgeous banner, and it bore the motto in letters three feet long, "*We sell the Earth. John Jones & Co.*"

My companion on that long ride was a young school teacher named Roberts, a noted worker and student, a power for good in three counties. His early death was a distinct loss to the higher life of many a mountain community.

Roberts reined up, looked at the great sign overhead, and spoke to a member of the real estate firm who stood in his office doorway.

"My friend, you have a beautiful new sign," he said. "Will you let a mountaineer who does not know much, fasten a mild little comment upon it, down there, in the left-hand corner?"

Something about Roberts usually gave him his way with people. The real estate man laughed, and said, "You can't hurt our sign—go ahead, stranger."

Then Roberts crossed the street, obtained a large sheet of wrapping paper, and a huge crayon pencil. "*The Earth is the Lord's and the Fullness Thereof,*" he wrote, and riding up to the great canvas sign he fastened it on the corner. A little group of idlers gathered, and one or two religious-minded persons began to quote other apropos texts at the real-estate man.

"Didn't the Almighty give the earth to man to use as he pleased," said Jones a little stirred up by the situation.

"Man, my friend," replied Roberts very gently and sweetly, "seems to mean in Exodus all men and all women—the whole human race for all time to come."

"Then what in perdition do we sell if not the earth," exclaimed Jones. "That catchy real estate sign is used all over the United States. Never heard it criticised before."

Roberts thought a little. He was struggling to give a new thought its full expression. As I happen to know, he had never heard of "Progress and Poverty." "I suppose," he replied at last, "that if you had merely said you sold 'land' I should not have noticed anything wrong about it. But now it seems to me that you only transfer possession of land from one person to another. It's likely to be good possession for ages to come, but suppose that the great average mass of men—human society in general, I mean—were to change the plan and ordain that land-ownership should remain in the hands of the community. Really, my friend," Roberts closed with most charming gentleness, "I sometimes have thought that Bible doctrine runs that way, and your sign has quite convinced me."

We rode along the foothills and camped by a spring that night, long discussing the land question and the great sixty-thousand acre wheat ranches we were passing for days after that. Roberts went back to his Shasta pines, and I went on through the Sacramento Valley, which was practically controlled by less than a hundred men. Its vast silences, its tremendous and unutilized resources grew upon me hour by hour. I saw that it could feed, shelter and support millions of hungry people, the surplusage of over-crowded cities, and I thought many times of the great canvas sign swinging across the street, "We sell the Earth." Someone told me that Jones took it down in a few weeks and put up another which he said "did not worry the religious cranks." It read: "*We sell plain Dirt.*"

CHARLES HOWARD SHINN.

---

## EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

---

### THE SINGLETAX IN GREAT BRITAIN.

London, August 16.

The political revolution has been consummated. After many angry protests the Parliament Bill has passed. By it the House of Lords have been deprived of their power to reject measures passed by the House of Commons. They cannot interfere with a Budget or money bill; and, no matter how objectionable it may be to them, they can only suspend the most radical measure for a period of two years. Any policy, therefore, which the majority of the

British people approve, will be adopted without the unfair and irresponsible obstruction of a comparatively narrow oligarchy.

There has been a good deal of unreal feeling in the declamations against the Bill. But at the same time members of our privileged classes have felt genuine alarm at being stripped of their ancient and privileged defenses, and at having their position exposed to the attack of policies reasoned out and accepted by the people. Among the schemes that will present themselves for passage through this newly opened door are Home Rule, Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, Educational Reform, Electoral Reform, and, most far-reaching of all, Land and Taxation Reform.

Intelligent men on both sides of politics recognize that we are only at the beginning of things. The last five years have been a time of continuous and often intense struggle. The next five years are likely to see even more strenuous activities.

+

Of all the policies to which legislative shape has been given or promised, the most popular is the Taxation of Land Values.

The success of the Budget in winning the support of the country for the Government has impressed Ministers. This policy underlies and permeates the whole work of the Government. Preparations are being made for another step in the direction of the Singletax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has appointed a committee to inquire into the relations between Imperial and local taxation, "and to make recommendations on the subject for the consideration of His Majesty's Government with a view to the introduction of legislation at an early date."

Mr. Edgar Harper has been appointed a member of this committee. His long experience under the London County Council has given him a thorough knowledge of our local taxation, while his complete and sympathetic understanding of the Singletax qualifies him to deal with the problem adequately from this point of view. Mr. Harper gave evidence on the subject before the Royal Commission in 1901 and again before the special committee on the Scottish Land Values Bill of 1906.

In reply to the deputation from the Land Values Group in Parliament which presented a signed memorial in favor of the Taxation of Land Values, the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer invited them to present evidence to the committee; and in this connection Mr. Crompton Ll. Davies is acting as adviser to the group. Like Mr. Harper, he has had unique experience of the subject, having been intimately connected with the inquiry of the 1901 Commission. It is hoped that the evidence submitted to this committee may enable the Government to proceed in a short time with a radical scheme for the Taxation of Land Values for local purposes.

+

The Parliamentary session has not passed without serious discussion of the Land Question. The Scottish Small Landholders' Bill, rejected by the Lords on two occasions, was re-introduced on June 2nd and passed the second reading of the House of Commons without a division. It has been in Committee of the

House until today, when that stage was finished. The principle of the bill is that of the Crofters' Act of 1886 and carries with it a large installment of the Singletax. It provides for the leasing of land at a fair rent and with absolute security of tenure. The fixing of the rent and of the other conditions of tenure rests with a Land Court, and neither rent nor local taxation can be raised against the tenant on the value of his improvements. The Conservatives and the landlord section of the Liberal party did their utmost to introduce provisions for the purchase of land on lines similar to those in the Irish Land Act of 1903. This move was defeated by the Radicals and the Lord Advocate, Mr. Ure, who had charge of the Bill.

This Bill, which is almost certain to become law in the autumn session, will apply to tenants of 50 acres, or those who pay not more than \$250 rent. It will serve as a precedent or model form of tenure for all farming land. Its significance is fully appreciated by the landowners, and may be appreciated by others from remarks of Lord Rosebery, in his speech opposing the Bill in the House of Lords four years ago.

"Some of your Lordships," he said, "in early youth on the 5th of November may have followed a small but melancholy procession, carrying a grotesque effigy amidst the plaudits of those who should have known better, which was destined after a brief and melancholy existence to be burned at a common bonfire. I am reminded of the procession of Guy Fawkes when I am so constantly told that the existence of the landlord is necessary as the keystone of the Bill; because it seems to me that under the provisions of the Bill I see the landlord paraded like that effigy, applauded by the Singletaxers of the west of Scotland, borne on his way to his melancholy annihilation at the hands of some supplementary Bill."

This is a faithful, if unfriendly, representation of the effect of the Bill.

+

These are the more prominent activities in our political world. By their side there proceeds the steady educational work made possible on such a large scale by the support of Mr. Joseph Fels. The Conference to be held in Glasgow next month, and a new campaign among the agriculturists in the east of England, will prepare the ground for future progress. Mr. Fels intends to have a special effort made to present the Singletax to the agricultural laborers of England. He has addressed meetings of these men in Norfolk and has got the co-operation of their organized leaders insofar as they are organized. All these things promise well for the future of our political and economic life.

JOHN ORR.

+ + +

### SUGGESTIONS BY JOSEPH FELS.

39 Wilson Street, London, E. C.

18th August, 1911.

The Singletax (or Taxation of Land Values) movement is spreading so fast throughout the world that the time has now arrived when every League, Association or Society should receive copies of all important printed matter on the subject issued or

published by every other organization having the same object in view.

The exchange of information about the Henry George movement between all these associations in the many countries where the movement has taken root will be of great value in pushing on the reform.

The headquarters of the movement in the different countries should be kept informed of all matter of Singletax interest in all other countries. Such news will have great value in arousing interest, and will give a sense of co-operation and momentum. Will not every such association, therefore, send weekly or monthly news, letters, clippings or other matter to the following Singletax headquarters:

United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values,  
20 Tothill Street, London, S. W., England.

Fels Fund Commission, 530 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, U. S. A.

Women's National Singletax League, Mrs. John S. Crosby, president, 125 West 82nd street, New York City, U. S. A.

Manhattan Singletax Club, 125th street and 8th avenue, New York City, U. S. A.

Women's Singletax Club, Mrs. Gertrude Mackenzie, secretary, 31 T street, N. W., Washington, D. C., U. S. A.

Women's Singletax Club, Fairhope, Ala., U. S. A.

Women's Singletax Club, Dr. Mary D. Hussey, president, East Orange, N. J., U. S. A.

Land Value Tax Party, 3 East 22nd street, New York City, U. S. A.

Chicago Singletax Club, 508 Schiller Bldg., Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.

Singletax League, 75 Yonge street, Toronto, Canada.  
A. G. Huie, Box 797, G. P. O., Sydney, N. S. W., Australia.

F. T. Hodgkiss, 312 Flinders street, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Singletax League, 30 Pirie Chambers, Pirie street, Adelaide, Australia.

L. Daw, Box 5, G. P. O., Boulder, West Australia.

Land Values League, Albert street, Auckland, New Zealand.

"Bodenreform," Lessing Str. 11, Berlin, N. W. 32, Germany.

Georges Darien, 3 Rue de Furstenberg, Paris, France.

J. L. Bjorner, Fredericiagade 25, Copenhagen, Denmark.

"Ret" (S. Berthelsen, editor), Hong, Denmark.  
Johan Hansson, Tunnelgatan 19, Stockholm Sweden.

Antonio Albendin, Calle Mendez, Nunez 21, Ronda, Andalucia, Spain.

Gustav Buscher, Limmat strasse 77, Zurich iii, Switzerland.

I am addressing this appeal to all those bodies whose names and addresses occur to me. There are doubtless many others, and I should appreciate all information as to additional ones that may be sent to me.

In every country, press bureaus should be established for the purpose of permeating the papers and other publications, daily, weekly or monthly, with news of the movement, and articles written with a

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

view to arousing public sentiment in favor of the Singletax.

I am quite sure that the secretaries of all these associations will be glad to answer inquiries and give information regarding their respective countries, and I therefore beg that full advantage be taken of my suggestions, if they be approved.

JOSEPH FELS.

---

## INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

---

### THE GRAND HAILING SIGN OF TRIUMPH.

Wichita, Kansas, August 25, 1911.

Some years ago I prepared a Henry George calendar with quotations for every day in the year from his writings and speeches. This was examined and approved by Mr. George before he died, but afterwards I wrote to Mrs. George asking her to kindly suggest a quotation that would be particularly appropriate for September 2, Mr. George's birthday; and in view of the approaching anniversary it occurs to me that it would be of interest to you and possibly to the readers of *The Public* to know that Mrs. George selected the following from a speech by Mr. George in Sydney, Australia, in March, 1890, as being the most appropriate:

"If I knew this night that go where I may over the civilized world, I would find men who would gladly clasp hands with me—if it has been given to me to help forward a great movement—it is through no merit of mine; it is not from my energy; it is not from my learning; it is not from my ability—it is from the simple fact that, seeing a great truth, I swore to follow it."

H. W. ALLEN.

---

## NEWS NARRATIVE

---

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, August 29, 1911.

### The Socialist Platform of Los Angeles.

At the Socialist Convention of Los Angeles, which on August 6th nominated Job Harriman as the party candidate for Mayor, the platform, as reported in the *Los Angeles Social-Democrat* of August 19, after declaring the party's creed that "all the sources of production and all natural opportunities belong to the people as a whole," proceeds:

Believing that the enormous unearned increments that attach to land are a social creation and belong of right to the people who create them, we declare that these social values should be taken into the public treasuries by taxation or otherwise and that the burdens of taxation should correspondingly be reduced from the products of labor and the small homes and savings of the class on whom these burdens now fall with unjust and crushing weight. No

progressive policy for the socialization of our public utilities, or the extension of any public service, is safe, or indeed possible, unless accompanied by a sound and scientific policy of municipal taxation. It is one thing to buy and build. It is another to pay. It is one thing to issue bonds for public improvements; it is quite another, and more vitally important element of city administration to secure city revenue without piling up a heavy public debt upon the tax payers, and pouring out a perpetual tribute of interest to the money-lenders. We are opposed to any city administration heaping upon us heavy bond issues without coming forward with a municipal budget that will take the burdens of taxation off the backs of the common people. In our campaign we shall unceasingly place before the electors that most sure, most scientific, and most just source of city revenue, viz: the unearned increment of land values in its two forms of (1) site values, and (2) franchise values. The city itself is the greatest creator of wealth in its own domain. There is a veritable gold mine, ever increasing, under the city. The city itself creates values annually, more than ample for all improvements and expenditures in that continually unsleeping increase which the normal growth of the city adds (1) to all the land values over which it stands, and (2) to all the public franchises within its limits. No individual creates these values by labor, foresight, capital, or skill. They are socially created by the presence and activities of the whole community. And the values which the whole community thus socially creates should naturally become the source of the city's treasure. But our present method of real estate taxation and of dealing with franchise values is unjust and disastrous. It punishes the man who improves real estate and rewards the owner of land kept vacant. It leaves the value which the city creates to fall into private hands which never earned it, while it collects taxes out of the people's earnings and values which the city did not create. Therefore, along with our program for the municipalization of public utilities, thus saving to the city and to the citizens the enormous values of public franchises, we demand an increase in the assessment of all land values of the city, and a uniformity of assessment according to location and site value, whether improved or unimproved. We favor a decrease in the assessment of improvements. We further propose to agitate for a charter amendment to come before the people at the next election providing for the levying of an additional tax on all unimproved land. In New Zealand 68 cities have adopted this principle of taxation of the unearned increment of land values with unflinching success. It is this principle which is now unhorsing the landed aristocracy of Great Britain. Taxation of the unearned increment of land values and the socialization of public utilities is the secret of a full city treasury, collected from the city's own socially created values and providing abundant revenue for every needed municipal enterprise without robbing the poor and the working classes and enriching the rich and the privileged.

+ +

### Death of Henry George's Brother.

Thomas Latimer George, brother of Henry George (the author of "Progress and Poverty"),

died at his home in Philadelphia on the 21st, of heart disease at the age of 65. Mr. George was an expert accountant who held the position of chief bookkeeper and controller in the gas bureau while Philadelphia owned and operated the gas works. When the gas works were given over by the city to the United Gas Improvement Company, Mr. George became a general agent in the gas service. It was as accountant during the regime of city ownership and operation that his attention was drawn to the contrasts between public and private ownership; and as an expert accountant he became an advocate of municipal ownership and operation of all public utilities. He was a member of old St. Paul's Episcopal Church of Philadelphia; also of the Illuminating Engineering Society, the American Gas Institute, the National Commercial Gas Association, the Masonic order, the Royal Arcanum, the Athletic Club of Philadelphia, and the U. G. I. Athletic Association. As a Mason he had served as Master of his Lodge. Mr. George was a widower, and two daughters survive him. He was a coadjutor of his elder brother in the Singletax movement.

+ +

#### The Anti-Imperialist League Honors Gamaliel Bradford.

At a stated meeting of the Executive Committee of the Anti-Imperialist League on the 24th the following vote was passed:

Our colleague and friend, Gamaliel Bradford, presided over the first meeting in the United States, called June 15, 1898, in Faneuil Hall, to "protest against the adoption of a so-called imperial policy by the United States." Mr. Bradford's closing appeal was as follows:

"In the name of the Pilgrims who planted at Plymouth the seeds of civil and religious liberty; in the name of Washington, who, after leading us through the war of Independence and seeing the Constitution launched in full glory, left us that noble legacy of warning, which has never had a deeper meaning than to-day; in the name of the martyred Lincoln, who sealed with his blood the work he had done; in the name of humanity, whose fate is bound up with our institutions, I appeal to the people of Massachusetts to protest against this rush of reckless and unbridled ambition."

From this meeting sprang committees of correspondence which led to the formation of the Anti-Imperialist League, of which Mr. Bradford may be justly said therefore to have been the founder.

It is not always in official life that the widest influence may be exerted by a patriotic citizen of the Republic, but it is through voluntary organizations like our own and through individual effort that good seed may sometimes be sown most widely and even the best immediate results achieved. Mr. Bradford lived to see the nearing accomplishment of the objects of the Anti-Imperialist League, and to rejoice in the considerable advancement of the theories of government which he had so ably and persistently advocated. His life of good service is to have its ripe fulfillment.

But life is emptied of much of its value to us who survive him since that intense and vivid personality, single-hearted and sincere, has become only a memory, with the fiery eloquence tempered by taste, enlivened by wit and inspired by moral ardor in public speech and writing, and with the charm in familiar intercourse of the most beautiful courtesy, tenderness and kindness.

The Committee extends its very deep sympathy to Mr. Bradford's family.

ALBERT S. PARSONS,                      ERVING WINSLOW,  
Chairman.    Secretary.

+ +

#### Constitutional Convention in Ohio.

A platform was adopted on the 23d by the United Constitutional Committees of Hamilton County, Ohio, for the support of which this organization will exact pledges from candidates for delegates. [See current volume, page 772.]

+

On the subject of taxation the United Committees adopted the following plank:

The power of taxation shall never be surrendered, suspended nor contracted away. All taxes shall be uniform upon the same class of property, within the territorial limits of the authority levying the tax, and shall be levied and collected for public purposes only.

+

Objections to the taxation plank were made on the ground that any Big Business legislature might use such classifications to discriminate in favor of special interests, but these objections were met with the point that the people could control exemptions by means of the Initiative and Referendum, which was recommended as follows:

The Initiative and Referendum, with a 12 per cent petition for amendments to the Constitution, a 10 per cent petition for the initiation of legislation, and an 8 per cent petition for the referendum of any statute passed by the legislature.

+

Other planks in the platform demand home rule for cities, giving them power to frame their own charters, and the submission separately to the people of a Constitutional provision on the question of licensing or prohibiting the liquor traffic.

+ +

#### De Arriaga Elected President of Portugal.

The Constituent Assembly of Portugal, after completing the new Constitution for the Republic, as already reported, on the 24th elected Manoel De Arriaga as President of Portugal, to take the place of the provisional President, Theophile Braga, appointed to the office when the Republic was proclaimed last October. President Arriaga is a lawyer, and has been procurator general under the provisional government. The dispatches state that he

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

"was for years a professor at Coimbra university, and for a considerable period was instructor of English to the late King Carlos and the Duke of Oporto. He is a man of distinguished personality, and possesses great influence among all sections of the Republican party, but belongs to no special group. Hence he was chosen by the Assembly in an endeavor to conciliate all parties." [See current volume, page 877.]

---

## NEWS NOTES

---

—The twenty-fifth annual convention of stamp collectors was held at Chicago last week.

—In a campaign tour begun on the 23d, President Taft made several speeches at Rochester, New York, on that day. He spoke at Hamilton, Mass., on the 26th.

—John Paul (executive secretary of the British United Committees for the Taxation of Land Values), and Jessie M. Orr, of Glasgow, sister of John Orr of the United Committees, were married on the 19th of August.

—Admiral Count Helhashiro Togo, who has been visiting the United States as the guest of the nation, was banqueted in Seattle on the 28th, and sailed for Japan on the 29th. [See current volume, page 831.]

—Around the world in 59 days and a little less than 20 hours is the feat of a French journalist, André Jagerschmidt, who finished this record trip at Paris on the 26th.

—It is reported that there will be no appeal in the Des Moines labor injunction case, a new agreement containing ample provisions for arbitration and other safeguards having been signed and both parties being satisfied. [See current volume, pages 843, 847.]

—The Premier of Japan, Count Katsura, resigned his office on the 24th. He recommended the Marquis of Saionji as his successor. The cabinet of which Katsura has been premier and minister of finance, was formed in July, 1908. [See vol. xi, p. 394.]

—William H. Van Schaick, captain of the "General Slocum," which was burned at New York in 1904, a large number of passengers being lost, and who was consequently sentenced for manslaughter to ten years' imprisonment, was pardoned on the 26th. [See vol. viii, page 730.]

—A decrease of lives lost, from 466 to 57, and of the number of persons injured from 4,449 to 1,603, was the result of sane Fourth legislation in the nine years beginning with 1903 and ending with 1911, according to the Journal of the American Medical Association. [See current volume, page 661.]

—The longest aerial journey in a heavier than air machine yet made, was completed on the 25th when Harry N. Atwood, who had left St. Louis on the 14th, arrived at New York city. Atwood had traveled, making such stops as he desired for rest and fuel supplies, 1,265 miles in 12 days. The best previous record was held by Koenig, of Ger-

many, for a journey of 1,164 miles, made in 30 days.

—The Czar has approved a bill which is to be submitted to the Douma, for cutting off two parishes from the Viborg Province in Finland, and adding them to the Province of St. Petersburg. This measure is regarded as the first step in the partition of Finland. [See current volume, page 493.]

—The annual Conference of Governors of the States of the Union is to be held at Spring Lake, N. J., from the 12th to the 16th. Employers' liability, inheritance tax, fixing of interstate rates, public utilities and prison labor will be the principal topics discussed in the five days' gathering. [See vol. xiii, p. 1163.]

—In an interview at Aurora, Ill., on the 25th, William J. Bryan named the following candidates for President as available Democrats of the democratic kind: Speaker Clark, Gov. Wilson, Ex-Gov. Folk, and Gov. Marshall. Asked about Gov. Harmon, he said: "I don't regard Mr. Harmon as available." [See current volume, page 841.]

—A terrific storm struck Charleston, S. C., on the 27th. The wind reached a velocity of 94 miles an hour, and the tide rose eight feet at the battery in front of the city. Seven persons were drowned or crushed by falling roofs or wharves, and the harbor was filled with wreckage. Other Southern cities, notably Savannah, Ga., suffered severely.

—An unnecessary cry of fire when the fuse of a moving picture machine blew out, caused panic in an opera house at Canonsburg, Pa., on the 26th, through which 26 persons were crushed to death and many more dreadfully injured. A reward has been offered by the manager of the theater for the apprehension of the persons who raised the alarming cry.

—The commission form of city government was put into operation for the first time in New Jersey at Trenton on the 23d, when five commissioners were inaugurated. Frederick W. Donnelly, a Democrat, who was high man in the voting, was unanimously chosen president and mayor, and the other commissioners were assigned to departments as follows: Edward W. Lee (Republican), revenue and finance; George B. Labarre (Democrat), public safety; J. Ridgway Fell (Democrat), streets and public improvements, and William F. Burk (Republican), parks and public property. [See current volume, pages 779, 796.]

---

## PRESS OPINIONS

---

### Unearned Increment in Farms.

The (Lincoln) Nebraska Farmer (Agricultural), July 26.—If a man owned 1,000 acres of land ten years ago, and has not done a tap of work on it himself in the ten years, nor in any way added to its value by improvement, he is still able to count a mighty good profit to himself through this increment in value. Whether such an increase justly belongs to the man who holds title to the land or to the community that caused the increased value, is a question that is agitating the minds of many public men these days.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### THY PEOPLE PRAY.

For The Public.

O Thou that wrought with calloused hand  
And loved the life of humble folk,  
Thou who alone canst understand  
Our bitter bondage 'neath the yoke,—  
Help us, in pity, Lord, to say  
A pardon prayer for those who prey.

O Thou that made the good green earth  
A fruitful heritage of all,  
Recking no mark of horde or birth,  
Drawing no bound 'twixt king and thrall,—  
Keep us, O Brother-Lord, from stain  
When we shall seize our own again.

Our young men and our maidens fall  
To glut red Baal's reeking pyres;  
Unheard our little children call  
Where swirls the flame of Moloch's fires.  
Grant, Lord, when we have riven these,  
We rear no new idolatries.

Long we have suffered, Lord, our years  
Are filled with unrequited toil;  
We pay the price of blood and tears  
To buy our masters corn and oil.  
Lord, make us merciful when we  
Are come into the mastery.

Swift winged comes our triumphant hour;  
The red dawn vanquishes the night.  
Chasten, O Lord, the pride of power;  
Teach us to wield our sway aright;  
And grant in flush of victory  
We lose not sight of Calvary.

Amen.

GEORGE M. P. BAIRD.

+ + +

#### GEORGE AND CROASDALE.

Personal Recollections of E. N. Vallandigham, in  
the Boston Herald of July 30, 1911.

Henry George's establishment of the Standard, and its rapid attainment of a considerable circulation, marked an interesting stage of the Singletax movement.

The organization of the Anti-Poverty Society somewhat antedated the establishment of the Singletax organ. Certainly nothing could have been wilder than the scenes at the anti-poverty meetings when Father McGlynn was astounding good Catholics with the boldness of his defiance of constituted ecclesiastical authority. Croasdale afterward dubbed this epoch of the Singletax movement as its "howling dervish stage of emotional insanity."

All of us at the Standard office loved and hon-

ored Mr. George, and I think of him as the only great man that I ever knew. His simplicity was delightful. Although he was the master of an extraordinarily beautiful and effective prose style, he would consult anybody as to questions of verbal propriety, and even submit to advice as to matter as well as manner. He would have appealed to the office boy upon a question of orthography, and I fairly shiver now at the memory of having had the stupid audacity to mark his proofs with petty critical emendations, when, as not infrequently happened, he submitted them to me.

The secret of Mr. George's early death I have always supposed to have lain in his inability to take genuine rest. Not that he lacked the social instinct, but he had an insatiable scientific curiosity that led him wherever he found himself to pumping dry anybody with whom he came in contact.

His scientific curiosity joined to his transparent simplicity sometimes betrayed him into amusing questions. When introduced to a young Englishman in London who wore a monocle, Mr. George looked at him with the utmost interest and asked, as the rest of the company looked on with ill suppressed smiles, "Do you wear that because one eye is of different focus from the other?"

An Englishman who found himself at the same house with Herbert Spencer told me that the philosopher had the same kind of curiosity, manifested in rather embarrassing questions as to the table manners of those with whom he dined.

Mr. George himself was highly unconventional in all such matters. At home it was hard to get him to sit through a meal. He would rise while waiting for the dessert and stroll off to read a book. The women of the family spent anxious moments looking after his cuffs and his studs, his collars, ties and other small paraphernalia, for Mr. George cared for none of these things. Friends of mine who traveled in Europe with him and his family described with glee the difficulty of keeping Mr. George and his baggage together. He carried over with him a huge packet of manuscript, and no matter what happened to any other part of the luggage that packet had to be kept in sight. In the end the packet came back to America unopened.

Mr. George gathered about him a little group of disciples, and his Sunday evenings at home in his modest brick house over in East Nineteenth street were the oddest mixtures that can be imagined. Every sort of Singletaxer, from the few men of wealth and distinction in the movement to the simplest youth with enthusiasm for the cause, was received with the same simple and sincere courtesy that characterized the man and his family. Sometimes there would be an English M. P. or a visiting woman of letters in the Sunday evening company. Sometimes Hamlin Garland read from his own works. Sometimes there was a little music. Mr. George himself mingled with his guests, talk-

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

ing with anyone who presented himself, and now and then becoming obliviously absorbed in the conversation.

At the Standard office there was a constant come and go of visitors. The late William Lloyd Garrison occasionally dropped in, and Tom L. Johnson was a frequent visitor. Associated in the editorship of the paper was Louis F. Post, now editor and proprietor of the Chicago Public. Post and Croasdale became the warmest of friends. They had in common much humor and great seriousness of thought and purpose. Mr. George himself enjoyed the humor of both Post and Croasdale. Another active man in the office was William McCabe, half Maori by blood, with the characteristically huge chest of that race, and a marked simplicity of character. Herbert Ward, who had seen much of Australia before he became a companion of Stanley in Africa, came to the Standard office once, and saw McCabe for only an instant, but immediately recognized him as a man of Maori blood. Still another of the Standard staff, connected with the business office, was George St. John Leavens, now dead to the incurable regret of his friends, a man of singular personal charm, with a deliciously sly humor expressed sometimes in audacious exaggeration, a voice that charmed all who heard it, and an infectious laugh. There were few dull days in that office.

Almost my last work for the Standard was to write an obituary sketch of Croasdale, after his sudden death at Merriewold, the Singletax summer park in Sullivan county, had left his friends dazed, and the cause for which he stood the poorer even to this day.

\* \* \*

## FIRST AMERICAN SINGLETAX CONFERENCE.\*

Personal Reminiscences of the Chairman, Together With His Explanation Regarding the Second Conference and the Amended Platform.

On that table across the room is a jet black gavel—a parliamentary gavel which has just come of age. How old it is as a gavel, I don't know; much less do I know how far back its birth might be traced as wood, mere wood. But as the first national Singletax gavel, it is twenty-one years old precisely, on the day of the date of this issue of *The Public*—September 1, 1911. Around the center of its head there is wrapped a silver band, now as black almost as the gavel itself, and cherished so; and on that band there is this inscription: "First National Conference, Single Tax League

\*The proceedings of the Conference are reported in full in Henry George's "The Standard" (September 10, 1890), which was published at New York from 1887 to 1892 inclusive, and is on file at the Crerar Library, Chicago, the University Library at Madison (Wis.), the Reform Club library at New York, and probably in some other collections.

of the United States, Cooper Union, New York City, September 1st, 2nd and 3rd, 1890." The remainder of the inscription explains that the gavel was presented to the chairman by unanimous vote of the Conference; and this accounts for its spending its twenty-first birthday on the table yonder.

### Conference Preliminaries.

The first intimation I had of the possibility of my being chairman of that Conference, of the origin of which I intend here to tell as I remember the circumstances, and also of its proceedings as they appeared from the acerie of the chair, was near midnight of the day before.

A preliminary meeting, very much of the nature of a caucus I suppose, had been held at the Reform Club that night, August 31st, upon the call of William T. Croasdale, the official organizer of the Conference. I had not been invited, and knew nothing whatever of the meeting until it was over; but Mr. Croasdale told me then that every other well known Singletaxer he had been able to find was notified, and that the attendance, although some important delegates from out of town had not been found, was thoroughly representative.

It seems that reports of my service as temporary chairman of the United Labor Party's convention for New York at Syracuse in 1887, had favorably impressed this meeting, and the meeting un-animously agreed upon me for chairman of the Conference. A list of other officers was also agreed upon, consisting of Henry F. Ring of Texas (author of the most popular Singletax tract, "The Case Plainly Stated"), William Lloyd Garrison of Massachusetts (son of the great Abolitionist), and Arthur H. Stephenson of Pennsylvania (a Philadelphia business man), for vice-chairmen; of Warren Edwin Brokaw, of South Dakota, for recording secretary; and of B. Gratz Brown of Tennessee and John Z. White of Illinois for assistant and reading secretaries.

Although this caucusing was severely rebuked by the Conference, Mr. Croasdale, who believed that those who go to deliberative meetings with a plan are likely to be more successful and certainly more useful than those who go aimlessly, got great enjoyment out of the result. But of that in its order.

### Opening Session of the Conference.

The Conference organized in the middle of the afternoon, September 1st, 1890, having been delayed by the late arrival of the *Servia*, on which Mr. and Mrs. George were returning from their trip around the world.

The delegates had assembled informally at the *Servia's* dock to meet them; and one of the jokes of that occasion was the detention by customs officers of Warren Worth Bailey, now editor of the *Johnstown Daily Democrat*, but then a Chicago newspaper man and president of the Chicago



First National Single Tax Conference.

The photograph of which this is the middle section was taken at New York, September 3, 1890, at the north side of Cooper Union. Henry George will be recognized as sitting at the table. To the left of Mr. George from the point of view of the reader is William T. Croasdale (organizer of the Conference); and opposite Mr. George at the table is Louis F. Post (chairman of the Conference). Sitting between Mr. George and the Chairman, from left to right, are Warren E. Brokaw (secretary of the Conference), Judge James G. Maguire, Henry F. Ring and H. Martin Williams. Continuing from left to right are L. A. Russell, B. Gratz Brown and John Z. White. Immediately behind Mr. White is Tom L. Johnson, and to the right of Mr. White is Richard F. George, with Robert Baker next him and then William McCabe. The second person directly above Richard F. George is Thomas J. Hastings. The two faces immediately below Mr. McCabe are, from right to left, E. Quincy Norton and Henry George, Jr. Next to the latter comes E. J. Shriver, with James Malcolm immediately in front of him, and E. J. Foord farther front and slightly to the left. Continuing to the left consecutively from Mr. Foord, are H. L. Pleace, the Rev. W. P. George, George White, J. J. Mahoney, Richard Passmore, the Rev. Dr. S. W. Thackeray, and George St. John Leavens (knees crossed). The child at the left is Bertie Hueist (the first financial contributor to the League organized at the Conference); and the man on whose arm he leans is Dr. John W. Dick. In succession from Dr. Dick to the right are Edward Osgood Brown, James Beggs, an unidentified man, Read Gordon, C. J. Buell, Charles Brinton, Fred Deverall, and Dan Cavanagh, the last sitting immediately behind the Rev. Mr. George and in front and slightly to the right of the Chairman. W. J. Gorsuch stands behind Tom L. Johnson slightly to the right; and in succession from Mr. Gorsuch, right to left, are George W. Kerr, George E. Bedell, James Semple, Cliff S. Walker, Billy Radcliffe, A. R. Wynn, Thomas Hunt, and C. B. Hemingway. In front of Mr. Hemingway and to left of Mr. Croasdale, continuing from right to left, are R. L. Atkinson, Willard D. Warren, W. J. Atkinson, George Adams, Dr. Henry S. Chase, James Hill and Mrs. James Hill. Above Mrs. Hill is George Delisle Zimmerman. Charles Frederick Adams stands between but back of Mr. and Mrs. Hill, with W. A. Douglass, Charles S. Hopkins and Dr. J. J. Smythe next successively toward the right. Beginning above and slightly to right of Mr. Adams, from left to right are Adolph Pettinkofer, J. J. Faulkner, Charles H. Govan, Morris Van Veen and James R. Carret. Highest above Mr. Carret, to the right, is William Brittigan. Dr. W. N. Hill stands back of and between Mr. Faulkner and Mr. Govan, and W. J. Ogden back of and between Mr. Govan and Mr. Van Veen. Martin Battle, Charles S. Prizer, A. H. Stephenson, J. H. Scully and S. C. Rogers are in the middle doorway—Mr. Battle (full beard, without hat and between two ladies) at the left, Mr. Stephenson (mustache) third to the right, Mr. Prizer (full beard) slightly to the right of but above Mr. Stephenson, Mr. Scully (mustache) at the right of the doorway, and Mr. Rogers (mustache) just below and looking left. In the middle and deepest shadow of the doorway is James W. Bucklin. Second to right of Mr. Scully is S. H. Howes. High in left doorway, full-bearded and wearing hat, is Mr. Parrish, the reporter of the New York Times. The bearded man at extreme right, third in line below the left jamb of right doorway, is David Harrower. The complete group includes portraits also of W. E. Hicks, W. I. Boreman, Lee Meriwether, J. T. Altemus, A. M. Molina, Rev. J. B. Parmelee, E. F. Fellows, J. T. Ripley, W. O. Eastlake, E. L. Ryder, John M. Campbell, G. W. Everett, Joseph Dana Miller, O. T. Erickson, José Gros, Whidden Graham, S. H. Howes, Benjamin Doblin, W. L. Crosman, T. B. Preston, Dr. H. J. Woodhouse, L. E. Wilmarth, and several whom we are unable to identify. In regard to copies of the complete picture see advertisement in this Public.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY



### Second National Single Tax Conference.

This Conference was held in the Art Institute, Chicago, August 29 to 31, 1893. The photograph of which the above is the middle section was taken in front of the Institute. Some of the persons may be distinguished with the aid of the following description: Henry George, right of table; the Rev. Edward McGlynn, left of table; Richard Spencer, Louis F. Post (chairman), Edward J. Shriver (secretary), and Leonora Beck, seated at side of table in the order named from Mr. George to Father McGlynn. Warren E. Brokaw stands between the chairman and Mr. Shriver, and Estella Bachman stands between Mr. Shriver and Miss Beck. The Rev. S. W. Sample stands between Miss Beck and Father McGlynn. At left of Father McGlynn, from right to left, in front row, are Robert Baker and Mrs. John Z. White; and diagonally to the left from Mrs. White are Silas M. Burroughs and Edward Osgood Brown. George R. Macey stands above Judge Brown but slightly to the right. At right of Henry George is John Z. White, and just above Mr. White is Simon Mendelson (profile). Diagonally upward to the left of Mr. Mendelson is Theodore J. Amberg. Dr. Walter Mendelson is to the left of Mr. Amberg. L. E. Wilmarth (full beard) is in the next row but one above Simon Mendelson (profile) and slightly to the right. Between the Chairman and Mr. Brokaw in the middle foreground is Herman V. Hetzel. Katharine Musson is above Mr. Brokaw, slightly to the left; to the left of her is Mrs. Florence A. Burrell, and to the left of Mrs. Burrell but above her is Dr. Edward D. Burrell (full long beard). The man of full broad beard to the right of Dr. Burrell is H. C. Lippincott. In the center of the upper row of the uppermost group directly above the table stands John Filmer (hands crossed); at the extreme left of the lower row of the same group is L. P. Custer, with L. S. Dickey at the extreme right of the same row. Standing in the extreme left of the right window is Arthur H. Stephenson; the next person but one farther right is Frank Stephens; and at the extreme right of the window is S. L. Moser. The smooth shaven man below the center of the window and above and slightly to the left of Mr. Spencer is Dr. B. F. Longstreet. In the complete photograph, outside of this section are H. W. Macfarlane, Chas. Edward Moore, Bolton Hall, Percy Pepon, George P. Hampton, J. B. Carroll, and several whom we are unable to identify. In regard to copies of the complete picture see advertisement in this Public.

Singletax Club. Having gone upon the pier with a small satchel packed with imports from Chicago, Mr. Bailey wasn't allowed to leave it until the customs officers had searched his "baggage" in turn, and its turn didn't come for more than two hours after everybody but the Serbia's passengers had gone. To this incident there was an appropriate satirical flavor, since the Conference met in the midst of a Singletax campaign for free trade.

Late though the Conference was in assembling, it rushed its business through promptly enough when it got together. Mr. Croasdale brought it to order, with that same ebony gavel. He acted as chairman of "the enrollment committee," the origin and functions of which I will explain farther on. George St. John Leavens, secretary of that committee, read the formal call, and then Mr. Croasdale delivered his address of welcome. Three informal speeches in response were made

while the Conference awaited the report of the committee on credentials. One was by H. F. Ring of Texas, another by "Pa" Chase as he was affectionately called by his friends in St. Louis, and the other by H. Martin Williams of Missouri, now a reading clerk of the House in Congress—and a good one he must be unless these twenty-one years have narrowed the compass of his voice.

The committee on credentials having reported the names of delegates present from 26 States, Mr. Williams closed his speech with a motion for the appointment of committees on organization, rules, and order of business. His motion was delayed by objections necessitating a formal temporary organization, but this was speedily disposed of by electing the officers of "the enrollment committee," Croasdale and Leavens, as temporary chairman and secretary respectively of the Conference. Mr. Williams then renewed his motion.

So favorable of caucus custom was this motion that instantly there were vociferous democratic objections from all over that old cellar-hall of Cooper Union (the same wherein Abraham Lincoln had made his maiden Eastern speech thirty years before), and among the objectors was Carl J. Buell, of St. Paul, who was recognized by the temporary chairman. Mr. Buell had arrived in New York too late for the caucus, and might have gone to it only to move its dissolution had he arrived in time. His objection, like the others, was to the un-democracy of caucus rule, and he spoke so as to be distinctly heard and unmistakably understood.

In the midst of his vigorous speech Mr. Buell was interrupted by Edward Osgood Brown (now and for several years past a judge of the Circuit Court of Illinois, and, through assignment by the Supreme Court, one of the Appellate Court judges at Chicago), who had participated in the caucus of the night before and was now sitting close behind the earnest objector from St. Paul. Pulling Buell's coat sleeve and speaking in a confidential whisper that carried easily a distance of twenty-five or thirty feet in all directions, and therefore caught my own ear, Mr. Brown said: "I don't care what is done with this motion if you'll only elect Post chairman!"

"Oh! is that it?" Buell exclaimed. Turning then again toward the temporary chairman he resumed his oratory as vigorously as before; but it was along a new line now, and ended with his nominating me for chairman. There was no opposition. Neither was there any to Ring, Garrison, Brokaw, R. Gratz Brown, nor John Z. White. Each was nominated and unanimously elected from the floor. And this was what amused Croasdale. Although the caucus slate was broken to flinders, the caucus candidates were all unanimously elected by the Conference to the very places the caucus had chosen them for.

#### Origin of the Conference.

This conference, the first national Singletax conference of the United States, originated in efforts, managed by Mr. Croasdale, to organize Singletax sentiment for practical Singletax work. It sprang out of a situation of course, and also of course the situation had antecedents. In order therefore to understand the Conference, it is necessary that some account of earlier Singletax history be given. I shall attempt to do this briefly.

From the time of the publication of his "Progress and Poverty," which occurred in 1879, the agitation now best known as the Singletax movement revolved about the personal activities of Henry George. In New York it took on dramatic form in his first contest for Mayor. He was the candidate of trade unions which had collaterally and temporarily organized for political action as the United Labor party. This was in the fall of 1886. It immediately followed the outrageous sentence of imprisonment for three years at Sing-Sing for extortion (a high grade of robbery in New York), of several labor-strike committeemen. They were perfectly honest men, and their offense was not dishonest. Upon winning their strike they had exacted \$1,000 of the defeated employers, who had, as the result of open arbitration, agreed to pay it. It was to reimburse the unions in part for strike expenses, and was scrupulously so used. The conviction of the men on a trumped-up charge of robbery by extortion at a trial before Judge George C. Barrett, and the sentence he viciously imposed upon them—a species of class viciousness—solidified local labor sentiment for the time, and this caused the nomination of Henry George as Labor candidate for Mayor. George was defeated. His vote, however, was phenomenal—68,000.

His campaign having been frankly for "the land for the people" as the fundamental necessity for freeing labor, steps were taken by his supporters promptly after his defeat, to effect a national organization of the United Labor Party with "Land and Labor" clubs for units. Coincidentally, the Anti-Poverty Society was formed, representing the same economic doctrine as the party, but with a religious flavor. It was under the leadership of Father McGlynn, who had been expelled from the pastorate of the largest Roman Catholic parish in America and probably in the world, for disobeying Archbishop Corrigan by participating as a speaker in the Henry George campaign. At the first State convention of the United Labor Party, the Syracuse convention of 1887, where I was temporary chairman, George was nominated, against his will and his earnest protest, as the candidate for Secretary of State—the head of the ballot in that "off-year" of politics.

It was in this campaign that the Socialist Labor party, which had until then acted within the United Labor party, nominated candidates of its

own. It polled about 6,000 votes in New York City (now Manhattan borough). George polled about 37,000. George's vote was over 31,000 less in the city, and barely more in the whole State than in the city alone the year before. All who were at all weather-wise in politics knew that this was the virtual end of the party as a party, but others kept it faintly alive for nearly two years longer.

Within a month after this collapse of the United Labor party President Cleveland sent his famous tariff-reform message to Congress. George thereupon advised, in harmony with his book of two years before, "Protection or Free Trade," that Cleveland's timid free trade step be encouraged and strengthened by a rally of the "land and labor" people to his support. But just as differences between Socialism and what is now called the Singletax had separated Socialists from the United Labor party in 1887, so differences between Protectionists and Free traders alienated these elements in it in 1888, each from the other, with Henry George at the head of the Free trade element and Father McGlynn as nominal head of the Protectionists. The alienation took outward form and feeling was intensified, upon the discovery that Gaybert Barnes, who went with the Protection elements as their executive Secretary, and who was political manager in the United Labor party campaign of 1886 and 1887, had arranged with Thomas C. Platt, the Republican boss, to conduct United Labor party campaigns for the Presidency in the doubtful States of Indiana, Connecticut, New York and New Jersey, and only there. The meaning of this was obvious, and upon discovering it Mr. George and his Free trade friends withdrew preemptorily from the United Labor party. The remnant of the party nominated Presidential candidates, however, and, supported with Republican money as was discovered long afterward, made an opera-bouffe campaign. If George's name had been drawn into it, as was the intention of Barnes and Platt, it would certainly have involved him in a humiliating political scandal.

Meanwhile, William T. Croasdale, with Henry George as leader and Thomas G. Shearman and Tom L. Johnson for financial supporters and principal advisers, organized the Free trade elements of the United Labor party and their sympathizers for the support of Cleveland for re-election as President; but on the express ground that this was because they were opposed to all taxes except taxes on land values, and that Cleveland's tariff reform message faced in that direction. This action was decided upon by a conference of Singletaxers of New York and vicinity at Cooper Union, August 6, 1888.\* The mixed sense of reluctance to sup-

port Grover Cleveland but of duty to give vitality and impulse to his timid Free trade message, was illustrated in an extraordinary way. Perhaps I can tell it best by quoting from my acceptance speech as chairman of the Conference, as I find it in the report of Henry George's Standard of September 10, 1890. The part I quote followed a wave of spontaneous applause at my mention of Mr. Cleveland's name: "That spontaneous applause which we heard a little while ago for the name of Grover Cleveland reminds me of the very first meeting that was ever held in this particular Singletax movement, a meeting held upstairs in a little room that would not seat two hundred and fifty people. It must have been nearly half full on that occasion. It was a meeting called to endorse the plan of enrollment which has been carried on ever since, thanks very largely to Mr. Croasdale. It was called early in the campaign of 1888, and after we had performed the business that lay before us we were all of us somewhat doubtful as to the policy we were entering upon. It occurred to one of the men there, and he in a timid way moved, that we should give three cheers for Grover Cleveland. His motion was seconded in silence. I happened to be chairman of that meeting, and feeling as I always do that it is the business of the chairman to see to it that the sense of the meeting has expression, I put the motion; and by an almost unanimous vote, not quite—there were three or four votes in the negative—we decided to give three cheers for Grover Cleveland. And then someone relieved the Chair of his embarrassment by getting up and saying, 'Hurrah! hurrah! hurrah!' and then somebody said, 'Tiger!' as they always do in New York. That was the first round of applause that Grover Cleveland ever got in a Singletax audience."

There came a time, however, when a motion would again have been necessary, and when the motion would probably have been defeated by as large a proportionate majority as that which carried it in 1888.

The plan of organization decided upon for supporting Mr. Cleveland's tariff reform message consisted merely in circularizing for signatures to a voting pledge.\* About 11,000 were secured. As this was the first definite movement to adopt the name "Singletax," and the specific movement which developed the Conference of 1890, I shall take the space to quote that pledge:

I authorize the enrollment of my name on the list of voters who propose to support Cleveland and

elected secretary. Wm. T. Croasdale proposed the resolutions. The following enrollment committee was appointed: William T. Croasdale (chairman), Michael Murray, August Lewis, William H. Faulhaber, Jerome O'Neill, Edward J. Shriver, Charles O'Connor Hennessy, Benjamin Urner, and Thomas G. Shearman.

\*The pledge appears on page 8 of The Standard of August 18, 1888, and regularly in subsequent issues until November 3.

\*The meeting is reported in full in The Standard of August 11, 1888, at page 3. Henry George opened the meeting, Louis F. Post was elected chairman, and Henry George, Jr., now a Congressman from New York, was

Thurman in the coming election, on the ground that any step toward tariff reduction tends toward the abolition of all taxes on the products of labor, and the final transfer of such taxes to land values.

About a month after Cleveland's defeat in 1888, the Singletax "enrollment committee," of which Mr. Croasdale was chairman, met with sympathizers for consultation in a back-room of the same building on Union Square in which Henry George's "Standard" office was located. Their object was to consider work for the future. At this meeting\* two plans were tentatively discussed, one proposed by Mr. Shearman and the other by Mr. Croasdale.

Mr. Shearman's plan related to work in New York State. Its main purpose was to secure local option in taxation, similar to that with which we are now familiar as the means whereby a measure of the Singletax has been secured in western Canada, and under which in Oregon (the only State in the Union that has it) county campaigns are now being made for local adoption of the Canadian land-value-tax policies. Out of Mr. Shearman's suggestion there came the New York Tax Reform Association, organized by Mr. Shearman, Bolton Hall, Robert Baker (afterwards Congressman) and others, and of which Lawson Purdy long was and A. C. Pleydell now is the managing secretary. Efforts to get the desired local option from the New York legislature were begun. They are as yet unsuccessful. But the separation of land values from other values in assessments for taxation was secured, as in use in Massachusetts and some other States previously, and this lays an excellent foundation for Singletax construction.

Mr. Croasdale's plan, not in opposition to Mr. Shearman's but correlative, was national in scope. It proposed a continuation of the simple method used in the Cleveland campaign, but with a different formula for signatures in place of the voting pledge. As it was Mr. Croasdale's plan that took the Singletax name and led on to the first Singletax conference in the United States, of which I am now recalling the circumstances, I shall confine myself to the fortunes of that plan. It developed in the course of 1889 into an agitation for signatures to the following petition† to Congress:

To the Honorable the House of Representatives of the United States: The undersigned respectfully prays for the appointment by your Honorable Body of a special committee for the purpose of making a full inquiry into and report upon the expediency of raising all public revenues by a single tax upon the value of land, irrespective of improvements, to the exclusion of all other taxes, whether in the form of

\*One phase of it is reported in *The Standard* of December 8, 1888, at page 1.

†This petition first appears on page 2 of *The Standard* of December 15, 1888, in connection with a numerous signed address which begins on page 1 and explains the various objects hoped for from circulating the petition.

tariffs upon imports, taxes upon internal productions, or otherwise.

Favorable action by Congress was of course not expected. The object was Singletax organization and general propaganda. Soliciting signatures afforded many kinds of opportunity for propaganda—personal interviews, hall lectures, "soap-box" oratory, grocery store and railway discussion, distribution of literature, Singletax meetings, etc., etc. Singletax clubs grew also out of this agitation, and sympathetic clubs previously organized were changed to Singletax clubs. I am not sure whether the original Chicago Single Tax Club of which Warren Worth Bailey was long the president had already adopted this name, and I am in like doubt about the Manhattan Single Tax Club of New York and the Brooklyn Single Tax Club; but all three came heartily into the movement for that Singletax petition to Congress.

The propaganda incidental to the Congressional petition had more or less of an organizing tendency; but for this purpose "the enrollment committee," of which Mr. Croasdale was chairman, depended chiefly upon records of the petition work itself. A card index record of the sources of signatures was kept. Persons sending a certain number were indexed as "workers"; those who sent a larger number were "adjectived" as certain kinds of workers, according to the number of signatures they sent and the kind of letters they wrote; and through those who thus rose above the surface, information regarding the character, special abilities, local standing and influence, etc., etc., of other Singletaxers was obtained. Out of this work many men and women came to be noted for serviceableness, not a few of whom have since achieved distinction both as Singletaxers and in public life.

Mr. Croasdale did not live to see the petitions presented to Congress. He died August 9, 1891.\* But they were sent to Congress by the Secretary, George St. John Leavens, in 1892.† and were presented by Congressman Tom L. Johnson. They were on cards indexed by States and placed in the drawers of a large cabinet especially constructed for the purpose. Unless some Congress has in the course of these 19 years made a burnt offering of that cabinet and those petition cards, they are there yet; but no investigating committee has up to this hour been appointed.

Though Mr. Croasdale did not live to see the petitions presented to Congress, he did live to see the realization of his prime purpose in collecting the petitions—the assembling in Cooper Union of the Singletax conference of 1890. And he left behind him a definition of a Singletaxer which long attached to his own name. "A Singletaxer," he said, "is a person who does something for the

\*See *The Standard* of August 12, 19, 26, and September 2, 9, 16, 1891. Also this issue of *The Public* at page 493.

†See *The Standard* of March 20, 1892.

Singletax." Therefore a worker for the Singletax came to be known in those days as "a Croasdale."

#### Continuance of the Sessions of the Conference.

When I took that ebony gavel from William T. Croasdale and looked out from the chair upon the First National Singletax Conference, I recognized only four persons who had ever held an elective office of importance. One was James G. Maguire, ex-Judge of the Superior Court of San Francisco; another was Leonard W. Hoch, then the Mayor of Adrian, Michigan; the third was James W. Bucklin, an ex-member of the lower house in the Colorado legislature; the fourth was State Senator Hastings of Massachusetts. All the others save one were hardly known, so far as my memory serves me now, except to personal and business acquaintances and in Singletax or Labor circles. The exception was Henry George. Besides those already named there were Hamlin Garland, by no means so distinguished in literature then as now, though coming to distinction then; Alonzo J. Steers, who gave to Father McGlynn the copy of "Progress and Poverty" that converted him; Wm. McCabe, the foreman printer to whom I owe more directly than to anyone else my own conversion; Benjamin Urner, once Greenback candidate for Governor of New Jersey and the first treasurer of the Anti-Poverty Society; Read Gordon, an intimate friend of Croasdale's, who has but recently followed him; August Lewis, Tom L. Johnson's associate in making George's "Science of Political Economy" possible; Thomas Hunt, afterward a State Senator in Ohio; David Harrower, the veteran Singletaxer of Rhode Island; A. J. Moxham, who afterward helped lay the foundations for the work of Joseph Fels in western England; Richard F. George, whose sculptured bust of his father links their names by another than the ties of blood; Frank Stephens, H. D. Albright, Herman V. Hetzel and Arthur H. Stephenson, Philadelphia pioneers; Charles S. Prizer, already well to the front in business; W. I. Boreman, of West Virginia; John Z. White, who has since done continental service and achieved continental fame in the Singletax movement and its allied or supplementary causes; Louis Prang, the famous artist in chromo making; Lee Meriwether, who afterwards won the mayoralty of St. Louis at an election and lost it in the count; Joseph Dana Miller, poet then, editor of the Singletax Review now and poet still; John J. Hooper, the Independence League's candidate for Governor of New York a year ago; Robert Baker, who has since been in Congress, where he gave the railroad pass for Congressmen its death blow; Billy Radcliffe, s. t., whose fame was limited then to Youngstown and Singletaxers, but extends now over the State of Ohio; Dan Beard, the artist, naturalist and promoter of boy scouts for peace, and

Henry George, Jr., now a Congressman from New York.\* Many well known Singletaxers of today were not in that conference because they were not yet Singletaxers; but few persons were absent who had "seen the cat" and were well known in the movement.

#### Work of the Conference.

After permanent organization, the Conference directed the appointment, on motion of Judge Maguire, of two committees, one on resolutions and one on platform, to consist respectively of seven and nine members. Upon the first I appointed Tom L. Johnson (chairman), and John Z. White, L. W. Hoch, W. J. Ogden, George White, Herbert Boggs and C. S. Walker; on the second, Henry George (chairman), James G. Maguire, L. A. Russell, Warren Worth Bailey, H. Martin Williams, Bolton Smith, C. J. Buell and Edward Osgood Brown. These appointments comprised a large proportion of the ablest and best known Singletaxers of that time in the United States. Thomas G. Shearman would have been upon the larger committee, but for his absence in Europe.

Another committee was ordered at the second day's session. Its function was to report upon proposals for a national league. This committee, consisting of Malcolm McDowell (chairman), Carl J. Buell, Wm. T. Croasdale, J. D. Ripley and William J. Atkinson, reported a plan which was adopted; but it called out one of the two most spirited debates of the Conference. The debate was over the question of organization on State lines or on club lines, and with particular reference to the religious element as a distinctive part of the movement.

More or less unconsciously, no doubt, the earlier McGlynn and the subsequent Pentecost defections gave color to the debate on both sides; but as a parliamentary incident it sprang out of a motion by the Rev. Dr. S. W. Thackeray (author of "The Land and the Community") to amend the committee's report by providing specifically for representation on the national committee of delegates from religious organizations of Singletaxers. Dr. Thackeray, who represented a delegation from the Singletax Brotherhood of Religious Teachers, was supported by all his clerical associates in attendance except the Rev. Dr. John Gregson of Massachusetts. Dr. Gregson spoke against the amendment.

Among those I recall as participants in that debate, besides Dr. Thackeray and Dr. Gregson, were the Rev. John Anketell, Carl J. Buell, the Rev. John W. Kramer, William J. Atkinson, John Filmer and William T. Croasdale. John Filmer, gentle of manner and speech, but rigid in purpose, stands out clearly in my memory as he rose to say for the New Churchmen's Singletax League, which had been expected to take opposite ground,

\*The official roll of the Conference, arranged by States, will be found in this number of The Public at page 913.

that "no member of that League, be he man or woman, seeks recognition here on any other ground than manhood or womanhood." And Croasdale's speech in that debate, no one who heard it could ever forget. There was something in the manner, even more than in the matter perhaps, that made one of his points thrill the audience to applause and cheers till those historic cellar walls rang again. "We represent in this movement in America," he said, "what is understood by the word 'state'; they represent what is here understood by the word 'church.' The sound American doctrine and good common sense is to let the church stand on its own bottom and let the state stand on its own bottom, each doing the work for which it is appointed, without any danger of complication or other responsibility of one for the other."

The amendment being defeated, the national committee was ordered to consist of one member from each State and Territory and the District of Columbia, to be elected locally, and five members at large to be elected by the Conference. The name reported by the committee and adopted by the Conference was "The Singletax League of the United States."

When nominations were in progress for the five members at large,\* Tom L. Johnson spoke. It was almost his only speech in the Conference, and one of the few he had at that time ever made in a public meeting. His subsequent career and recent death give it added interest. Noticing that the nominations were widely scattered geographically, he got the floor and said: "The object of having five men from the United States at large on this committee was that they act as an executive committee who could be got together quickly near its headquarters. New York is the only place for that headquarters. The men who have been doing the enrollment for the last two years are the best men we could possibly have. The five gentlemen who have steered us thus far, who brought this movement up to the point of calling this convention, these men can be trusted, and I say the wisest thing to do is to elect these five men as the members of the committee at large." H. Martin Williams seconded that motion and it was unanimously adopted.\*

Of one especially spirited debate I have already

\*The original national committee, was as follows: At large (chosen by the Conference), William T. Croasdale, G. St. John Leavens, Read Gordon, Louis F. Post and August Lewis. From States (chosen locally), Ala., E. Q. Norton; Cal., H. L. Pleace; Colo., James W. Bucklin; Conn., Lawrence Dunham; Del., George W. Kreer; D. of C., Robert J. Boyd; Ill., Warren Worth Bailey; Ind., Henry Rawle; Iowa, Richard Spencer; Ky., Samuel H. Edgar; La., James Middleton; Maine, F. D. Lyford; Md., Dr. W. N. Hill; Mass., James F. Carret; Mich., A. F. Wettlaufer; Minn., Oliver T. Erickson; Mo., H. Martin Williams; N. J., John W. Jakeway; N. Y., Thomas G. Shearman; Ohio, L. E. Siemon; Pa., A. H. Stephenson; R. I., David Harrower; Tenn., Bolton Smith; Texas, H. F. Ring; Va., F. J. Conroy; and W. Va., W. F. Thayer.

told; the other came off at the third day's session and over the final clause of the platform—the clause making a declaration on the subject of public utilities. This clause as adopted at the first Conference was altered at the second, three years afterwards. I will tell about that farther on. Here I recur to the debate it evoked at the first Conference.

Henry George, as chairman of the platform committee, had read the platform unanimously recommended by his committee, in the form in which it is subjoined to these reminiscences.\*

There was an objection by Mr. Ogden, of Maryland, to attributing land values to any other cause than the services of government. Mr. George replied on this point, not to the satisfaction of Mr. Ogden, whose views on the subject had been carefully thought out and were clearly presented, but entirely to the satisfaction of most of the delegates—reasonably so I think, as I read the speech after an interval of twenty-one years. It was J. Whidden Graham of Massachusetts, however, who brought on the public utilities debate. Mr. Graham moved to strike out the final paragraphs of the platform.

"I move this," he said, "as one who believes in the Singletax and does not believe in the government control of railroads and telegraphs." Mr. George explained that the committee were unanimous on the point, but that if there was much objection he thought the clause had better be left out. In reply, though, to Hamlin Garland, who asked if the Singletax does not cover the point. Mr. George said: "In my opinion it does not. Mr. Shearman thinks it does, but I am inclined to think that over and above all that would be accomplished in that way there still remains a residuum, still a tendency in some directions to proper extensions of the function of the state." But as to the details of such extensions Mr. George urged agreements to disagree. "Agreeing about the Singletax," he proceeded, "we can agree to disagree as to everything else; and that last paragraph is so drafted as to embody the essential idea, leaving matters of method and detail to personal opinions."

Others who participated in this debate were Tom L. Johnson, H. F. Ring, James G. Maguire, John Z. White, L. A. Russell and C. J. Buell, all of whom spoke for adoption of the clause as reported. Mr. Buell discussed the platform as a whole in order to show that the last clause was an essential part, covering one of the three great necessities of free society—the Singletax, Freetrade, and government control of monopolies. The amendment was defeated and the platform adopted. An attempt to make its adoption unanimous failed by a negative vote of perhaps five or six.

\*See page 912.

There was no further business of importance, and in a little while the Conference adjourned.\*

\*Between the sessions of the Conference there were two large mass meetings in Cooper Union and a banquet at Coney Island.

At the mass meeting on the evening of September 1, James G. Maguire presided, and Henry George spoke in response to Judge Maguire's welcome-home address. Hamlin Garland read verses written for the occasion by Mrs. Frances M. Milne. Mr. George's eloquent address, in the nature of a report upon the progress of the cause in Australasia, Great Britain, Canada and the United States, was an appeal also for that peace of the world which only universal freedom of trade can secure.—See *The Standard* of September 10, 1890, page 14.

The second mass meeting, September 2, was presided over by Edward Osgood Brown. The other speakers were William Lloyd Garrison, Henry F. Ring, Judge Maguire, Lee Meriwether, H. Martin Williams, Tom L. Johnson, A. H. Stephenson, Bolton Smith, C. J. Buell, and Henry George. The chairman having introduced Mr. George with the statement that it was his 51st birthday, Mr. George said: "Yes, it is my birthday to-day,"—and he was interrupted with a voice of cheer from the audience, "Long may you live," followed by tremendous applause. When the applause subsided he went on, and his restrained manner appeared to tell even then of a consciousness of what may have seemed to him near by, but was in fact nearly seven years away. "But not too long," he said in acknowledgment of the greeting. "Life, long life, is not the best thing to wish for those you love. Not too long. But that in my day, whether it be long or short, I may do my duty and do my best."—See *The Standard*, September 10, 1890, pages 20, 21.

At the Coney Island banquet, given on the 3d by the Manhattan Singletax Club of New York and the Brooklyn Singletax Club, A. H. Stephenson presided. Henry George, Judge Maguire, H. Martin Williams, John Z. White, H. F. Ring, Bolton Smith, Louis F. Post, Major Calhoun, Thomas R. Fitch, W. A. Douglass, Dan Beard and L. A. Russell, were the other speakers. The latter (the lawyer whom Tom L. Johnson had consulted about the logic of "Progress and Poverty" when he himself first read it) spoke the last sentiment of the Conference occasion. "Remember the words," he said in closing, "of the great prophet when he said and truly said that the land belongs in usufruct to the living, and all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."—See *The Standard*, September 10, 1890.

Another conference on the Singletax, but otherwise wholly unrelated to the one at Cooper Union, was held at Saratoga on the day next but one after the close of the latter. Called by the American Social Science Association, it met on the 5th day of September, 1890. The acting secretary of the Association, John Graham Brooks, of Brockton, Mass., arranged for the debate, and the following persons participated, each with a special subject: Samuel B. Clarke (law partner of Elihu Root, now a Senator from New York), on "What the Singletax of Henry George Is"; Thomas Davidson (the philosopher), on "The Singletax"; William Lloyd Garrison, on "The Justice of the Singletax"; Professor J. B. Clarke (then of Smith College but now of Columbia University), on "The Moral Basis of Property in Land"; E. Benjamin Andrews (then president of Brown University), on "A Single Land Tax from the Point of View of Public Finance"; Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman (of Columbia), on "The Relation of the Singletax to the General Science of Finance"; Louis F. Post, in explanation of the Singletax with special reference to its incidence and fairness; Edward Atkinson (the statistician), in general opposition to the Singletax; Henry George, in a general exposition and in specific answer to criticisms and questions; James R. Carret (a distinguished conveyancer of Bos-

Meantime, however, with H. F. Ring in the chair, and on motion of Charles Frederick Adams (the first full-fledged Henry George convert that I had ever recognized as such after my own conversion save William McCabe and Alonzo J. Steers), that little black gavel over there was given me by vote of the Conference as a reminder, so Mr. Adams put it, that I was chairman of the first national Singletax conference of the United States.

#### Afterwards.

The accomplishments of the Singletax League of the United States, organized at that first Singletax conference, were disappointing. Financial contributions were small and contributors few. The aggregate was altogether inadequate. Local organizations tended toward segregating the Singletax movement and Singletaxers from the common interests of their communities. The lack of influence of the League in these and other respects soon went far to confirm the misgivings of Mr. George. While disinclined to discourage, he had not been very hopeful. At the time I attributed this to his distrust of Singletax organizations of the authoritative kind, but I have long since come to account for it more by his sensitiveness to the magnetic currents of democratic opinion. On the broad field of higher politics he was more "weather-wise" than some of his followers, or than they thought him.

It was with much lack of enthusiasm, therefore, that he contemplated the second Singletax conference, which met in the Art Institute at Chicago in 1893, upon a referendum call through the national committee. He was not far wrong, if wrong at all. Although the time and place coincided with the greatest Exposition ever held in this country, the Columbian, the attendance at the Conference was much smaller and much less representative than that in New York three years before.

It is indeed to be credited with one great mass meeting, at which Henry George and Father McGlynn, though personally friends again for a year or more, met for the first time since Anti-Poverty days as speakers on the same platform; but this meeting could easily have been the same if there had been no conference. At another of its mass meetings John Turner White, of Springfield, Mo., made a most impressive address.

It is also to be credited with this resolution, recommended by the committee on platform and resolutions adopted by the Conference: "We favor

(ton), in advocacy of the Singletax from the point of view of a conveyancer; W. T. Harris (U. S. Commissioner of Education), who made and elaborated some rather extraordinary objections to the Singletax. A report of this meeting was promptly prepared by the Secretary, F. B. Sanborn, of Concord, Mass., and published in a pamphlet of 127 pages for the American Social Science Association, by Damrell & Upham of Boston and G. P. Putnam's Sons of New York. The pamphlet is probably out of print.

local self-government, with the Initiative and Referendum, Proportional Representation, and Equal Suffrage for men and woman."

The most important action of the second Conference was the alteration of the final paragraph of the Singletax platform which Henry George had drawn and the first Conference had adopted. This marked one of the differences between two elements of the Singletax movement. For convenience rather than precision they may be called the "socialistic" and the "individualistic."\* The concrete issue arose over the question of public ownership of railroads, the same that had caused one of the two most spirited discussions at the first Conference.

Mr. George opposed the drawing of any definite line between public and private functions. It was his contention that serviceable activities in human society shift back and forth between *private* and *public* functions, in response to invention and social evolution. For example, that the water supply, a private function on farms and in small vil-

lages, becomes a public function as reservoirs and distributing mains come in and highway as well as sanitary questions arise; or, that the lighting of a dwelling house, a private function when candles or portable lamps are used, but a public function when gas and electric power are supplied under highway franchises by pipes and wires, may become again a private function through the invention of portable lights of a kind as yet unknown. He also believed that in great aggregations of capital there may reside, and possibly over and above the aid of land-monopoly, powers of exploitation analogous to those which come from land monopoly.\*

It was with a view to leaving these questions open until the mother monopoly of all shall be caught and caged, that he wrote the final paragraph of the platform adopted at the first Conference. The alterations made at the second Conference were against his protest and his vote.

L. F. P.

✦ ✦

### The Singletax Platform.

Adopted by the National Conference of the Single Tax League of the United States at Cooper Union, New York, Sept. 3, 1890.

We assert as our fundamental principle the self-evident truth enunciated in the Declaration of American Independence, that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights.

We hold that all men are equally entitled to the use and enjoyment of what God has created and of what is gained by the general growth and improvement of the community of which they are a part. Therefore, no one should be permitted to hold natural opportunities without a fair return to all for any special privilege thus accorded to him, and that value which the growth and improvement of the community attach to land should be taken for the use of the community.

We hold that each man is entitled to all that his labor produces. Therefore no tax should be levied on the products of labor.

To carry out these principles we are in favor of raising all public revenues for national, State, county and municipal purposes, by a single tax upon land values, irrespective of improvements, and of the abolition of all forms of direct and indirect taxation.

Since in all our States we now levy some tax on the value of land, the Singletax can be instituted by the simple and easy way of abolishing, one after another, all other taxes now levied, and commensurately increasing the tax on land values, until we draw upon that one source for all expenses of government, the revenue being divided between local governments, State governments and the general government, as the revenue from direct taxes is now divided between the local and State governments; or,

\*See "Progress and Poverty," chapter iv of book iii, pages 192, 193 and 194.

\*The following quotations from "Protection or Free Trade," written in 1885, define Henry George's attitude toward this difference: "In socialism as distinguished from individualism there is an unquestionable truth—and that a truth to which (especially by those most identified with free trade principles) too little attention has been paid. Man is primarily an individual—a separate entity, differing from his fellows in desires and powers, and requiring for the exercise of those powers and the gratification of those desires individual play and freedom. But he is also a social being, having desires that harmonize with those of his fellows, and powers that can only be brought out in concerted action. There is thus a domain of individual action and a domain of social action—some things which can best be done when each acts for himself, and some things which can best be done when society acts for all its members. And the natural tendency of advancing civilization is to make social conditions relatively more important, and more and more to enlarge the domain of social action. This has not been sufficiently regarded, and at the present time, evil unquestionably results from leaving to individual action functions that by reason of the growth of society and the development of the arts have passed into the domain of social action; just as on the other hand, evil unquestionably results from social interference with what properly belongs to the individual."—From the text of "Protection or Free Trade," chapter xxviii, at page 303.

"The term 'socialism' is used so loosely that it is hard to attach to it a definite meaning. I myself am classed as a socialist by those who denounce socialism, while those who profess themselves socialists declare me not to be one. For my own part, I neither claim nor repudiate the name; and realizing as I do the correlative truth of both principles, can no more call myself an individualist or a socialist than one who considers the forces by which the planets are held to their orbits could call himself a centrifugalist or a centripetalist. The German socialism of the school of Marx (of which the leading representative in England is Mr. H. M. Hyndman, and the best exposition in America has been given by Mr. Laurence Gronlund), seems to me a high-purposed but incoherent mixture of truth and fallacy, the defects of which may be summed up in its want of radicalism—that is to say, of going to the root."—From foot note in "Protection or Free Trade," chapter xxviii, at pages 302 and 303.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

a direct assessment being made by the general government upon the State and paid by them from revenues collected in this manner.

The single tax we propose is not a tax on land, and therefore would not fall on the use of land and become a tax on labor.

It is a tax, not on land, but on the value of land. Thus it would not fall on all land, but only on valuable land, and on that not in proportion to the use made of it, but in proportion to its value—the premium which the user of land must pay to the owner, either in purchase money or rent, for permission to use valuable land. It would thus be a tax not on the use or improvement of land, but on the ownership of land, taking what would otherwise go to the owner as owner, and not as user.

In assessments under the Singletax all values created by individual use or improvement would be excluded, and the only value taken into consideration would be the value attaching to the bare land by reason of neighborhood, etc., to be determined by impartial periodical assessments. Thus the farmer would have no more taxes to pay than the speculator who held a similar piece of land idle, and the man who on a city lot erected a valuable building would be taxed no more than the man who held a similar lot vacant.

The Singletax, in short, would call upon men to contribute to the public revenues, not in proportion to what they produce or accumulate, but in proportion to the value of the natural opportunities they hold. It would compel them to pay just as much for holding land idle as for putting it to its fullest use.

The Singletax therefore would—

1. Take the weight of taxation off of the agricultural districts where land has little or no value irrespective of improvements, and put it on towns and cities where bare land rises to a value of millions of dollars per acre.
2. Dispense with a multiplicity of taxes and a horde of tax-gatherers, simplify government and greatly reduce its cost.
3. Do away with the fraud, corruption and gross inequality inseparable from our present methods of taxation, which allow the rich to escape while they grind the poor. Land cannot be hid or carried off, and its value can be ascertained with greater ease and certainty than any other.
4. Give us with all the world as perfect freedom of trade as now exists between the States of our Union, thus enabling our people to share, through free exchanges, in all the advantages which nature has given to other countries, or which the peculiar skill of other peoples has enabled them to attain. It would destroy the trusts, monopolies and corruptions which are the outgrowths of the tariff. It would do away with the fines and penalties now levied on anyone who improves a farm, erects a house, builds a machine, or in any way adds to the general stock of wealth. It would leave everyone free to apply labor or expend capital in production or exchange without fine or restriction, and would leave to each the full product of his exertion.
5. It would, on the other hand, by taking for public use that value which attaches to land by rea-

son of the growth and improvement of the community, make the holding of land unprofitable to the mere owner, and profitable only to the user. It would thus make it impossible for speculators and monopolists to hold natural opportunities unused or only half used, and would throw open to labor the illimitable field of employment which the earth offers to man. It would thus solve the labor problem, do away with involuntary poverty, raise wages in all occupations to the full earnings of labor, make overproduction impossible until all human wants are satisfied, render labor-saving inventions a blessing to all, and cause such an enormous production and such an equitable distribution of wealth as would give to all comfort, leisure and participation in the advantages of an advancing civilization.

With respect to monopolies other than the monopoly of land, we hold that where free competition becomes impossible, as in telegraphs, railroads, water and gas supplies, etc., such business becomes a proper social function, which should be controlled and managed by and for the whole people concerned, through their proper government, local, State or national, as may be.\*

✦ ✦

### Roll of First Singletax Conference.

- Alabama**—E. Q. Norton.  
**California**—Hon. James G. Maguire, John A. Maynard, H. L. Pleace, Mrs. M. E. Rice, Miss Emmie Williams, John O'Gorman.  
**Colorado**—G. Frank Otis, Oscar J. Frost, George Champion, John N. Lloyd, Jas. W. Bucklin.  
**Connecticut**—W. C. Miner, David Wagner, Wm. H. Talmadge, Noah Pomeroy, John W. Lane, Willard D. Warren, Lawrence Dunham, J. J. Ryan, A. J. Bostwick, George St. John Leavens, Oliver Rule, Thos. Corscaden, J. N. Belden, W. J. Gorsuch.  
**Delaware**—Geo. W. Kreer, Cornelia Kreer.  
**District of Columbia**—Charles Frederick Adams, William Geddes, M. D., C. B. Hemingway.  
**Illinois**—E. O. Brown, W. W. Bailey, J. T. Ripley, J. Z. White, Jas. Malcolm, E. J. Foord, Geo. J. Guenther.  
**Indiana**—C. A. Kersey, M. D., C. S. Schneider, E. F. Fellows.  
**Iowa**—Frank S. Churchill, A. O. Pitcher, M. D.  
**Louisiana**—James Middleton.  
**Kentucky**—Samuel H. Edgar.  
**Maine**—A. C. Dunning, Thos. Marsden.  
**Maryland**—Henry R. Hall, Wm. J. Ogden, John W. Jones, I. M. Pruzan, David Wassergug, W. N. Hill, M. D., George N. Numsen, James T. Kelly, J. G. Schonfarber, Charles Watson, J. Hicks Wrightson, David Bachrach.

\*The second Singletax conference, held at the Columbian Exposition, in Chicago, affirmed August 30, 1893, the foregoing platform, except the last paragraph, "With respect to monopolies," etc. For this paragraph the Chicago Conference substituted the following: "In securing to each individual his equal right to the use of the earth, it is also a proper function of society to maintain and control all public ways for the transportation of persons and property and the transmission of intelligence; and also to maintain and control all public ways in cities for furnishing water, gas, and all other things that necessarily require the use of such common ways." Mr. George himself drafted the platform adopted in New York in 1890, including the final paragraph, and was chairman of the committee that reported it. As a member of the Conference at Chicago he opposed and voted against the alteration.

**Massachusetts**—Mark W. Cross, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Louis Prang, E. M. Chamberlain, Hamlin Garland, J. K. Hiscock, W. B. Pendleton, E. H. Underhill, G. K. Anderson, W. Burhenne, Chas. K. Cutter, M. D., John Watrous, Jas. R. Carret, Wm. E. Bell, W. L. Crozman, C. S. Mitton, W. A. Verney, John Adams, S. W. Burnett, Ed. Frost, Israel Hey, John Lavis, C. B. Totman, Q. A. Lothrop, Thomas R. Fitch, Edwin T. Clark, Charles N. Cottrell, Willard W. Gray, L. M. Marston, Israel A. Trask, Wm. Chapman, Horace L. Dunnell, Dr. E. Ellenwood, Rev. John Gregson, T. J. Hastings, S. H. Howes, F. W. Morton, Edwin K. Page, C. W. Estabrook, Charles H. Cooke, J. Whidden Graham.

**Michigan**—L. W. Hoch.

**Minnesota**—Oliver T. Erickson, C. J. Buell, William Donaldson, W. A. Carpenter, Rev. S. W. Sample, R. J. Brown.

**Missouri**—H. Martin Williams, H. H. Hoffman, C. B. Keeler, Dr. Henry S. Chase, Lee Meriwether, Charles E. Reid.

**New Jersey**—John W. Jakeway, Joseph Dana Miller, C. Merquillan, P. Merquillan, Wm. Wellstood, John Molay, J. Blacklock, John Cronin, R. Campbell, E. Nobis, E. N. Jackson, Wm. Lindsay, Jas. McGregor, Wm. Langstaff, B. Ennis, P. Garrihan, Edward McQuillan, Robt. Ennis, Henry Bradshaw, Wm. M. Callingham, Louis M. Randall, John Essler, G. Delisle Zimmerman, ——— Porter, T. J. Werner, Herbert Boggs, C. B. Rathbun, M. T. Gaffney, ——— Post, ——— Meistle, Wm. Kirkpatrick, David L. Thompson, J. L. Anderson, J. H. McCulloch, G. H. Neal, Mrs. A. Stirling, J. J. Streeter, Jos. Reppetti, E. W. Nellis, Martin Hughes, Richard Carroll, Wm. Gray, John T. Abbott, Wm. Mosley, John Ridgeway, Jas. Hill, Geo. Adams, Jas. MacNamara, Hugh Watson, Jacob Nick, Jr., Paul Breen, J. A. Craig, David White, William B. DuBois, James Taylor, Henry W. Churchill, John Henry Brooks, Benjamin Urner, Thomas Thorp, Read Gordon, Thomas Flynn, Robert Welch, Edward Houllhan, Frank Proirer, W. C. Kip, George M. Vescelius, Thomas H. Potter, H. C. Kirby, John H. Edelman, Robert Butterworth, A. W. Davis, H. R. Mathews, N. W. Gage, J. W. H. Maclagan, Timothy Barrett, Nicholas Schneider, Robert Leslie, H. F. Haase, A. Mooney, E. A. Wallace, Edward C. Alphonse, George R. Webb, W. B. Judd, John McKechnie, Richard F. George, O. D. Wood, James Mackintosh, José Gros, John Morrison, H. L. Beaty.

**New York**—Henry George, J. T. Altemus, J. H. Babcock, William Brittigian, George Brunswick, James Beggs, William T. Croasdale, Holbrook Cushman, Daniel Cavanagh, Benjamin Doblin, J. A. B. Dilworth, G. W. Everett, Henry George, Jr., George Harnwell, William E. Hicks, John J. Hopper, Charles P. Kelly, August Lewis, Walter Mendelson, M. D., William H. Mathews, Louis Morris, William McCabe, Thomas H. McGeoch, Jerome O'Neill, Louis F. Post, Gaston Protin, Richard Passmore, Edward J. Shriver, George Simon, A. J. Steers, J. H. Scully, William F. Sherlock, W. B. Scott, Lindley Vinton, Morris Van Veen, John Welsh, Alfred J. Wolf, William D. Williams, John F. Winter, Patrick Murray, George Newton, A. H. Cameron, G. F. Jones, Harry A. Du Souchet, J. B. Sabine, Henry L. Hinton, John J. Murray, F. W. Croak, M. W. Norwalk, Joseph C. Roshirt, Joseph McDonough, James J. Mahoney, Edward Ferguson, Gustav W. Thompson, Alfred R. Calhoun, George White, Peter Aitken, John Hickling, E. O. Roscoe, A. L. Sessions, Robt. Baker, George N. Olcott, Kenneth R. Cranford, James T. O'Neill, R. C. Utess, W. J. Horan, C. W. Hughes, Chas. Simpson, Thomas B. Preston, H. B. Brown, George R. Gage, H. Camps, Joseph McGuinness, ——— Whereley, Rev. Henry Sharp, Fred J. Deverull, Morris Cohen, Martin Battle, George Helme, H. C. Turphey, ——— Titus, ——— Noldenberg, Jas. B. Connell, Adelph Pettinkofer, J. J. Faulkner, Chas. H. Govan, John H. Blakeney, Anthony Schram,

Charles D. Blackhall, S. C. Rogers, C. W. Rogers, J. S. Crane, Bernard Manning, A. M. Molina, James F. Darmour, Dan Beard, Theodore Lane, Dr. Fox, James F. Connor, Henry Stahner, Andrew Craig, Edward Richardson, George E. Bedell, Dr. J. J. Smythe, George Winter, Thomas M. Hyatt, R. M. Rosty, Charles H. Fuller, J. K. Rudyard, James Ryan, J. D. Foster, James C. Murray, J. H. Root, John Rix, George Rix, John M. Campbell, John S. Cogan, W. Deshon, A. B. Stoddard, John H. Schilling, Lester M. Clark, Martin Gay, M. J. Mehan, Charles S. Hopkins, Charles Huiey, Henry Sterling, L. B. Perry, Fulding Gowe, John Forsyth, John Woodruff, William Young, D. Mackenzie, John McCarthy, John Howarth.

(Single Tax Brotherhood of Religious Teachers)—Rev. Dr. W. S. Thackeray, Rev. John Anketell, Rev. Dr. W. P. George, Rev. Dr. J. W. Kramer, Rev. A. Whitaker. (New Churchmen's Single Tax League)—Alice Thacher, Altona A. Chapman, Emma Smith, Albert Smith, A. J. Auchterlonie, L. E. Wilmarth, George Waterson, John Filmer, Rev. J. B. Parmelee, Geo. Coleman, E. B. Swinney, G. W. Hopping, Charles Maginn, Edward L. Ryder.

**Ohio**—Tom L. Johnson, L. E. Siemon, W. K. Field, John Quinlan, Colonel A. W. Johnson, L. A. Russell, Cliff S. Walker, Thomas Hunt, Joseph L. Schraer, James Semple, Billy Radcliffe, Richard Hughes, A. R. Wynn, S. G. Rogers.

**Pennsylvania**—P. D. Tangney, A. E. Wagner, Claude M. Johnson, Richard Eyre, A. J. Moxham, Dr. Edward G. Rhoads, William J. Atkinson, Michael Geiselman, James Ashton, J. L. Shoemaker, Arthur H. Stephenson, Samuel E. Clarkson, C. Brinton, Herman V. Hetzel, David R. Emsley, R. L. Atkinson, G. Frank Stephens, Daniel S. Brown, Oscar F. Pollar, Dr. H. J. Woodhouse, Samuel Shouls, U. C. Munch, Louis Klein, H. D. Albright, A. D. Fraim, Dr. J. W. Dick, I. J. Quinn, Thomas Malady, C. F. Knight, Mark Roberts, J. H. Moyer, H. O. Skinner, Charles S. Prizer, Charles Corkhill, J. J. Smythe, John H. Jones, Duncan Wright, William Hancock.

**Rhode Island**—William Howarth, John J. Reavy, George D. Riddell, David Harrower.

**South Dakota**—W. E. Brokaw.

**Tennessee**—J. S. Menken, Bolton Smith, M. H. McDowell, R. G. Brown.

**Texas**—H. F. Ring.

**Virginia**—S. J. Conroy, Edward K. Robertson, Alexander Cruikshank.

**West Virginia**—W. E. Sugden, W. H. Curry, W. F. Thayer, W. I. Boreman.

\* \* \*

## TACTICS OF THE SINGLE TAX MOVEMENT.

Condensed from a Speech of Henry George, Jr., in Congress, June 10, 1911, on the Wool Tariff.  
From the Record of June 14.

In the times of Alexander the Great the Macedonian phalanx was the invincible military formation of the world. It originated in Macedonia before Philip and Alexander, was greatly developed by them, and then was taken up by the Greeks. For centuries it swept all before it. This formation consisted of spearmen. They were heavily armored and carried great oblong shields to hide the body. They bore but one weapon—a spear 16 feet long. They formed in close order, shoulder to shoulder, their spears extending. They were ranged in ranks, close together, four, six, eight

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

and even more deep. Those behind had their spears extended those in front. They made one solid mass of moving armor and spear points; a formation at first 4,000 men strong, then 6,000, and at last up to 20,000; a great, slowly advancing wall, flanked on either side with armor and spears and likewise backed. Advancing over flat ground, this huge living military machine carried all before it until it tried to conquer Italy. Under Pyrrhus the phalanx went down into the dust before the free formation of Rome. The Roman soldier, carrying his lighter body armor, his smaller shield, his short double-edged sword, was quicker, more nimble, could move over the field in open or close order. But when he met the phalanx he had a new military problem on his hands; spears, spears, spears, a gigantic oblong of spears; whether in front, on either flank, or in the rear. They bristled like a vast porcupine. How was he to get within arm's reach of the body of the Greek soldier, for do this he must to use his weapon—the short sword. Then was Roman genius called upon to invent a weapon that should destroy the phalanx. The weapon was produced. It was the pilum, a lance or short spear that could be hurled with great force and accuracy 50 feet or more. Each Roman soldier marked out an individual behind the wall of spears. Watching for an exposed part, he hurled the pilum. If a spearman fell, he made confusion and a breach in the line of spears. That was the Roman chance. The legionaries ran in between the points and with their swords had the spearmen, helpless in heavy armor, at their mercy. One such breach made, there was a wedge-like rush from the Roman ranks and the whole phalanx was destroyed. Thus was Pyrrhus vanquished. The Roman with his broadsword and his pilum became the world's master.

Mr Chairman, the tariff beneficiaries have been the economic and political phalanx for long years in the United States. They have formed one great compact united body. Realizing that they must stand together or be destroyed in detail, they have acted as a mass, their shields spread, their spears advanced; from time to time moving forward to new ground of vantage; making at all times a common bristling defense against all general attack. And so it has been until this Congress. In this special session the method of attack on the tariff phalanx has changed. The pilum has now come into use in this Democratic House. This wool bill which we are now debating; the Canadian reciprocity bill and the free-list bill which we have passed; the other schedule bills that may hereafter pass, are our Roman lances which we hurl at weak points in the tariff ranks. We break down the spears here, we break down the spears there, we make a breach and widen it with a rush, and then the cry in the tariff ranks is each for himself. Small and insignificant as these bills may appear, they carry destruction. Hurling by

the Democratic side in this Congress, the tariff army line will at points be pierced and breached, and the monopoly phalanx which, so long as it could stand intact, was invincible, will end in utter rout and destruction.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have great joy in voting for this wool bill. I do not regard it as much of a bill, but since it unites the Democratic side in battle order it will do. My preference was to have free wool and free woolens, too. I would have liked the bill to declare for free trade in wool and woolens. But, thank you, I shall take what I can get. I believe that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr Brantley) is perfectly right in stating that any tariff at all involves protection. I am against any protection whatever, and therefore, I am altogether against a tariff. I am against a tariff for revenue, for I regard it as one of the worst ways for raising revenue.

But, Mr. Chairman, suppose that we reach a revenue basis; suppose we cut out much of the tariff, how are we to supplement the revenue? I am a Singletaxer. I do not believe in taxes upon any kind of industry, or upon anything that comes from industry. I believe the whole burden of taxation—Federal, State, and municipal—should fall upon monopoly. I believe it should fall upon the mother of all monopolies, upon the earth; upon that value which comes to any piece of land not by reason of the toil of its owner—for all improvements should be exempted—but from the development of the community; from social growth and social improvement.

To tax land values alone is not a mere dream. It is not the utterance of a man so far in the advance of practical affairs as just to be listened to for a brief hour and then be dismissed. My colleagues, it is a principle that is now and here. It is claiming the grave attention, shaping the legislation, of the advanced nations of the earth. It is in the Orient; it is in the Occident; it is in the Antipodes; it is amongst the progressive people to the north of us with whom we are seeking closer ties; it has made a momentous, convulsive drive forward in Great Britain.

*Mr. Norris:* In fixing the value of the land for the purpose of taxation, you would not take into consideration any improvements?

*Mr. George:* As though it had no improvement on it; what it would sell for in the open market. That market price is the sum of advantages in the situation; if there be public streets or other public improvements, for instance; if there be improvements on adjoining lots—all such considerations enter into value.

Up north of us, in Vancouver, British Columbia, they have applied what is called the "single tax." So far as local revenues are concerned, it is a single tax; but it is not the single tax I am advocating, since it is very small in amount—not sufficient to check the great land "boom" now in progress there

in consequence of the exemption of buildings and all other improvements from taxation. As a result, Vancouver has increased in improvements faster than any city in the world. The increase in Vancouver's improvements during the last year was 87 per cent. There being no tax on buildings or other things a man might put on his land, industry and thrift are encouraged. Indeed, there is so much benefit from this policy that land values are rising. There is very active speculation in land. The advantages from the exemption of improvements are likely to be absorbed by land speculation. Against this the people of Vancouver will be compelled to defend themselves by increasing the tax rate on land values. But this aside, the idea of exempting improvements from taxation is spreading all through Western Canada. Wherever tried, it is working most prosperously. And nowhere in Canada, Australia, or anywhere else, is there the least disposition to go back to the old taxes. The people in Washington and Oregon, as you can find if you go out to those States, are looking with amazed eyes at Canada and her exemption of industry from any taxation. Attracted by that, many are going up over the border. Many more will most assuredly go unless those Western States shall adopt a similar policy of exempting improvements from taxation.

Some say the farmers would object to this single tax. This tax is upon land values exclusively. When you come to consider the values in a farm you find that they are largely betterments—improvements the farmer's labor has wrought. Exempting them, the value that remains to be taxed is very much shrunk up. Moreover, speculative value in the land would lessen. Indeed, speculative value would disappear with heavy taxation of land values.

The British budget fight, of which the world has heard, was nothing but a fight with landlords over a tax upon land values. As for the amount of revenue to be raised under this tax on land values, it was preposterously small. Why, then, all the opposition we have read of? Because the lords perceived in this small tax the thin edge of the wedge. Lloyd George and his progressive party were pulling down coroneted landlordism. The tax was small, but British privilege knew its import. The tax was small then, but it is going to be increased, not only as an Imperial tax, but as a basis for local revenues.

So here we have the way made clear to us. Why should we in this country not go to land values for all our revenues? We get part there; why not all? Abolish the tariff and other taxes on production and increase our present taxation on land values.

Is there in any part of the world a greater, more damaging, more damning kind of land monopoly than in this country? A steel trust has vast pos-

sessions. Those possessions form the very core of its monopoly. You will find the roots of most of the trusts in land monopoly. By "land" I do not mean mills, I do not mean railroad tracks, I do not mean anything made by labor. By "land" I mean that which nature offers to man before man has put his hand to it.

*Mr. Sherley:* In that sense, there is practically nothing; there is no value at all until he puts his hand to it.

*Mr. George:* I can have a vacant lot here in Washington, and it may lie just as it was at the time the Indians occupied it. I can sell it for a price. Yet not a stick or a stone has been touched upon it.

*Mr. Sherley:* Yes; it has a potential value.

*Mr. George:* It has an actual value, for value proceeds not only from labor, but also from a power to exact labor.

*Mr. Graham:* Mr. Chairman, in my State, in my section of it, hundreds of thousands of acres of coal rights have been bought up by combinations of capital, and much of the coal can not possibly be taken out, perhaps, for generations yet to come. On the other hand, some of that coal is being taken out from time to time. Now, the two estates in land are separable and are separated, the farmer owning the surface and all but the coal, which he has conveyed to the grantee. Is the grantee's estate there land, as you understand it, or not?

*Mr. George:* I should say that the whole earth is land, whether it be the surface or underneath, or altogether.

*Mr. Graham:* Would you tax the coal right to the person or combination of persons who owned it?

*Mr. George:* I should.

*Mr. Graham:* And so heavily that they could not afford to retain possession of it?

*Mr. George:* On its market value.

*Mr. Graham:* Well, they could not possibly use it for many years to come.

*Mr. George:* Very well.

*Mr. Graham:* How would you make a distinction in that particular acreage from which they were then removing the coal, from the other acreage from which they could not remove the coal for a long time?

*Mr. George:* You are asking me whether I should tax land that is at a disadvantage in production. I should, but not at the value of land having more advantage. That is, I should be governed by the one thing by which men are governed now, namely, the market price. If coal is actually underlying certain lands, but for one reason or another that coal can not be got out and mined, that land would have a distinctly low price in the market; whereas other land no richer in mineral, but more get-at-able, would have a high market price. I should assess the one kind of land low.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

the other high. I should place each piece of land on the tax list at its market value, and then tax that value.

But, Mr. Chairman, this land tax does not mean merely a better way of raising revenue, a more economical way, a more direct way, a more just way. It means far more than that. It means the opening to use of vast quantities of land now shut off by speculation. There is no real scarcity of land anywhere. There is no scarcity even in the city of New York. With all its congestion it has been computed that there is land enough inside the corporate limits of the city to give to every head of family from one-eighth to one-quarter of an acre of good ground. I am not proposing to divide the land. I am explaining that there is no such thing as a scarcity of land. There is land enough, but most of it is held out of use. Why is this? Because the penalty of holding land out of use is so slight that men can pay the small tax and yet, owing to social growth and social improvement, and the consequent increase in value, realize handsome profits by the speculation. This is so in every State; it is so in every village, town, and hamlet of our country. Apply this tax and you tax out the speculators, you tax in the users, you produce a new order in the United States.

We have a landlordism greater than Great Britain or Germany or the Orient. We have the greatest landlords that have ever been seen. Should we meet this condition, should we apply taxation to land values so as to break down land monopoly, a prosperity will come such as will dumfound mankind and give to America the glory of carrying civilization higher than ever yet reached in the destinies of the race.

---

## BOOKS

---

### ECONOMIC HISTORY.

**History of Economic Thought.** A Critical Account of the Origin and Development of the Economic Theories of the Leading Thinkers in the Leading Nations. By Lewis H. Haney, Ph. D., Associate Professor and Chairman of the School of Economics of the University of Texas, Author of "A Congressional History of Railways."

Professor Haney attributes the beginning of economic science to the French Physiocrats of the Eighteenth Century; but he reviews the progress of economic thought through many centuries and in many countries. An excellent bird's eye view of the subject, and that is all that can be asked of a single compact volume, this book cannot be easily dispensed with by any person interested in political economy. Professor Ely has collaborated in its preparation, and the atmosphere of his influence is evident. But the

author's own individuality has not been submerged.

One of the great values of the book is indicated by the author's reason for prudence in prophecy. "It would ill-befit," he writes toward the end, "an account so full of recorded errors, to venture upon dogmatic predictions." Full of "recorded errors"! That is certainly a pat characterization of the economics of the schools, and quite significant of the confession some future historian of like candor will have to make of the economic "scientists" of to-day. But making predictions tentatively, the author awakens a hope that the scientific economists whose rejection of moral considerations have threatened to reduce the science to the level of business bookkeeping, have had their day and are about to drop down and out.

Although Professor Haney names the distinction between business economy and political economy as "public" economics and "private" economics, there is no ambiguity. "A closely related distinction," he says, "that between public and private economics, appears to be increasing. The growth of college courses and literature along the lines of private finance and semi-technical commercial subjects points this way. The term 'political economy' might almost be rejuvenated to designate public economics, the branch which would take the social view point. Private economics takes the individual view point in defining wealth, and income, and costs." Never was any immature science more wretchedly bedeviled than the science of political economy has been by scientists of the individual view point. Good riddance to such rubbish, and something like a cheer for the economic professor who predicts it, though only tentatively.

---

## PAMPHLETS

---

### The V. L. C. S.

A business only three years old. Pays 400 per cent on investment. Has 2,600 shareholders and a long waiting list! It sounds like a bunco game, but it is simply farming—Joseph Fels' gardening in the city of London. The Vacant Lots Cultivation Society has just issued its third modest little report, which, along with those for the two previous years, tells the story of a very wise object lesson in public economics in the guise of a most successful charity. Sixty-five acres of idle city land has been lent by the owners, and thereon \$25,000 worth of vegetables—and any amount of health and happiness—have been raised by 520 men and their families.

A. L. G.

† † †

I set out on this ground, which I suppose to be self-evident, that the earth belongs in usufruct to the living; that the dead have neither power nor rights over it.—Thomas Jefferson.

---

## PERIODICALS

---

### McClure's.

The unpopularity of Senator Bourne in Big Business circles in Oregon is lucidly explained in Burton J. Hendrick's article in the September McClure's on "How the Oregon Democracy Working Under the Direct Primary Has Destroyed the Political Machine." Governor West as well as Senator Bourne figures large in the article. It tells the whole story of that political revolution in Oregon which, through direct primaries and direct legislation safe-guarded from tricks by the Interests, has placed the people in power and abolished political machines.

+ +

### Tom L. Johnson in Hampton's.

The September installment of Tom L. Johnson's autobiography in Hampton's Magazine is as interesting as the other two and probably more useful than either at the present time. It tells the story of Johnson's contest with Mayor Pingree of Detroit, of his conversion to 3-cent fares by Pingree, and of his 3-cent fare fight in Cleveland. In this article Mayor Johnson discloses the full meaning of his low fare movement, and his words of advice are well worth heeding by the people of every city. "I believe," he advises, "in the municipal ownership of the public service monopolies because if you do not own them in time they will own you." Here we get the story, too, of how Detroit lost the chance that Johnson and Pingree tried to give her, of a complete municipally owned street car system worth \$25,000,000 for \$15,000,000; also the way in which New York was squeezed out of ownership of the Brooklyn Bridge line, because "the city had given away the rights to run everywhere except across the bridge." Dramatic enough is the scene described "to illustrate how Big Business deals with itself;" and the account of the first five years of the street car fight in Cleveland, with which the article closes, is valuable local history. The helpful part played in the Cleveland fight by Ben T. Cable, of Rock Island, Illinois, though it may surprise many of Tom L. Johnson's friends, will gratify them all.

+ +

### The French Singletax Review.

Too warm praise cannot be given to the simple, clear statements of economic doctrine, and to the brilliant analysis of the politico-economic problems of the world, furnished to La Revue de L'Impot Unique by its able editor, Georges Darien. Mr. Darien writes at present all departments of his Revue; but should he finally obtain the assistance of others, which would seem to be ultimately necessary for his own sake, the Revue under his editorial management cannot in any event fail to be a powerful instrument in reviving interest in the doctrines of the Physiocrats and in establishing land values taxation in France. The August issue, the second, opens with an editorial on the aim of the French League for the Single Tax, of which the Revue is the organ. The first statements fall into these simple sentences: "We affirm the right of all

human beings to existence. This right is a natural Right, and is not of human institution. 'Man,' says Quesnay, 'can no more constitute natural order than he can create himself.' This right to life necessarily includes a right to the use of the earth, as a dwelling assigned to the human species, and as an indispensable base for all labor. This right begins with birth and terminates with death." (3 rue de Furstenberg, Paris, France. Price of subscriptions outside of France, seventy cents.)

---

## The Public

The Public is a weekly review, giving in concise and plain terms, with lucid explanations and without editorial bias, all the news of the world of historical value.

It is also an editorial paper, according to the principles of fundamental democracy, expressing itself fully and freely, without favor or prejudice, without fear of consequences, and without regard to any considerations of personal or business advantage.

Besides its editorial and news features, the paper contains a department entitled Related Things, in which appear articles and extracts upon various subjects, verse as well as prose, chosen alike for their literary merit and their wholesome human interest in relation to the progress of democracy.

We aim to make The Public a paper that is not only worth reading, but also worth filing.

Published weekly by Louis F. Post, Ellsworth Bldg., 53 Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago, Illinois, Postoffice as second class matter.

### Terms of Subscription

Yearly .....	\$1.00
Half yearly .....	.60
Quarterly .....	.35
Single Copies .....	.05
Trial subscription—4 weeks.....	.10

Extra copies, \$2.00 per 100, in lots of 50 or more.

Free of postage in United States, Cuba and Mexico. Elsewhere, postage extra, at the rate of one cent per week, or 50 cents per year.

All checks, drafts and money orders should be made payable to the order of Louis F. Post. Money orders, or Chicago or New York Drafts, are preferred, on account of exchange charges by the Chicago banks.

Subscribers wishing to change address must give the old address as well as the new one.

Receipt of payment is shown in about two weeks by date on wrapper, which shows when the subscription expires. All subscribers are requested to note this date and to remit promptly for renewal of subscription when due or order it discontinued if the paper is no longer desired.

### Advertising Rate, 10c Per Agate Line

(14 lines to the inch)

One page, each insertion.....	\$64.00
Half page, each insertion.....	32.00
7 inches, single column, each insertion.....	9.00
Quarter page, each insertion.....	6.00
One inch, each insertion.....	1.00

5% discount for 3 months' (or longer) insertion of one advertisement, or 6 months' insertion every other week.

1% discount for cash in 5 days from receipt of bill.

Columns 3 inches wide, 130 lines long, two columns to the page.

Advertising forms close on the Monday preceding the Friday of publication.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY

"Are you reading the accounts the papers are printing of the battles of the civil war, as they occurred fifty years ago?"

"Yes, I've read a number of them. Quite a war, wasn't it? I had no idea the thing had been so serious."—Chicago Record-Herald.

+ + +

"What are her days at home?"

"Oh, a society leader has no days at home any

more. Nowadays she has her telephone hours."—Smart Set.

+ + +

"Do you think it is possible in these times for an honest man to get rich?"

"Certainly it is possible. Most of the rich men are honest."

"Yes, I know, but were they honest before they got rich?"—Chicago Record-Herald.

## It isn't the wearing,

but the washing that sends light clothes to the rag-bag before their time. The way to stop that is to wash them with Fels-Naptha soap in cold or lukewarm water. No boiling to weaken their fabric; no hard-rubbing to wear and tear them. And Fels-Naptha won't harm the most delicate lawns or laces.

Say you have a lot of white shirtwaists and things to wash. Just wet them, soap with Fels-Naptha, roll and soak for a few minutes in cold or lukewarm water. Then rub lightly, rinse and hang on the line. Easy, isn't it? And the clothes will be cleaner and whiter and sweeter than you can get them any other way.

Follow directions on the red and green wrapper for using Fels-Naptha.

## New Edition of the Complete Works of

# HENRY GEORGE

The Fels Fund Library Edition of the Works of Henry George. Complete in Ten Volumes. Handsomely bound in Blue Buckram, Gilt Tops, Paper Labels, Portraits.

**Price, \$12.00 at our office, or \$13.00 with transportation prepaid to any express address in the United States or Canada.**

The volumes run as follows:

- I. Progress and Poverty.
- II. Social Problems.
- III. The Land Question.  
Contains "The Land Question," "Property in Land," and the "Condition of Labor" (open letter to Pope Leo XIII).
- IV. Protection or Free Trade.
- V. A Perplexed Philosopher.
- VI. and VII. The Science of Political Economy.
- VIII. Our Land and Land Policy.  
Contains the miscellaneous writings, speeches and lectures.
- IX. and X. The Life of Henry George.

**THE PUBLIC, Book Dept, Ellsworth Bldg, Chicago**

## Efficient Reformers

Are those who in some way extend their influence from time to time, and one of the forceful ways of doing this is to get a friend to join The Public army.

Cincinnati, August 26, 1911

DANI KIBFER

### Women's Trade Union League of Chicago

LABOR DAY, SEPTEMBER 4

#### Picnic in the Woods at Forest Glen

Music, Games and Dancing on the Green  
Miss Mary Henry will lead the Games.  
Mrs. Frances Squire Potter and Mrs. Raymond Robins will Speak

DIRECTIONS TO THE GROVE—Take Milwaukee Ave. car to end of the line, walk East on Carmen Ave. to 51st Ave., then North to Forest Glen Ave. to Grove.

#### EVERYBODY WELCOME

Guides will meet cars until 2 o'clock. Bring your lunch. Coffee will be served free from 1 to 3 o'clock

EMMA STEGHAGEN, Secretary. MRS. RAYMOND ROBINS, President.

Five-inch oval picture of the late TOM L. JOHNSON, and Edmund Vance Cooke's poem "A MAN IS PASSING," combined in an attractive wall card, sent postpaid for 10 cents. PITT PUB. CO., Pitt Bldg., Cleveland, O.

### 3 Annual Subscriptions for 2 Dollars—two of them new

4 Dollars pays for six;  
6 Dollars pays for nine subscriptions.  
Give the new subscribers the benefit of the reduction, if you choose.

THE PUBLIC, Ellsworth Bldg, Chicago

Warren W. Erwin

Calvin Tomkins { Special  
W. N. Cowles }

## Warren W. Erwin & Co.

Investment Bankers

26 Beaver Street - New York

### SPECIAL CIRCULAR

Discussing political and industrial conditions as affecting security values.

Four per cent. interest allowed on daily credit balances, subject to check.

## SINGLE TAX GROUPS

The Two Photographs of which the middle sections appear in this issue of The Public, namely, the

**First Singletax Conference**  
and the

**Second Singletax Conference**

are available to a limited number in halftone reproduction on good paper, mailed together in one cylinder, postpaid, for

**Fifty Cents**

Address  
THE PUBLIC, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.  
Ellsworth Building

## GEORGE PICTURES

A Few Copies Only of Each Style.  
All Book Illustration Size.

22 PHOTOGRAVURES of Henry George from San Francisco photograph of 1879, at period of writing "Progress and Poverty."

Price of one copy, including postage, 35 cents

10 PHOTOGRAVURES of Henry George from London photograph by Mayall, 1884.

Price of one copy, including postage, 35 cents

13 PHOTOGRAVURES of house in Philadelphia in which Henry George was born.

Price of one copy, including postage, 35 cents

10 SETS OF HALFTONES, nine pictures in each set, comprising portraits of Mr. George at varying periods of his life, and of others near him, and a picture of the house in which he was born, and of one of his last homes.

Price of each set, including postage, 75 cents

THE PUBLIC, BOOK DEPT, Ellsworth Bldg, Chicago

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARY