

consumer alike, all products of industry and all evidences of title to such products should go untaxed. This is furthermore in the interest of equality of taxation; for without that exemption taxes fall most heavily upon the morbidly honest. But it is not desirable to sidetrack the Initiative and Referendum amendment in order to exempt even all kinds of personal property—the farmers' kind as well as Mr. Forgan's kind. If the tax amendment is put first, the Initiative and Referendum amendment would be staved off for at least two years, and the reform in tax laws would be of the canny kind that the canny Mr. Forgan wants. Whereas, if the Initiative and Referendum is put first, as the people have demanded and as the legislature is pledged, and it is adopted, tax reforms can be secured easily and speedily and by the people according to their own wishes.



In the Sweat of Another's Face.

The president of the sweatshop corporation of garment dealers around whose inhuman stubbornness a great but pitiful garment workers' strike—great in numbers and courage but pitiful in defensive power—is in progress in Chicago, declares his refusal to yield its employes the right to bargain with it collectively for wages instead of individually.



That is the real issue in the "open shop" policy for which this sweatshop contends. With the usual hypocritical pretense, this sweatshop president objects to the "closed shop" because that would discriminate against garment workers who don't want to join the union of their trade! The false pretense in all that sort of talk is that the employers and the workers are on a fair bargaining level; the hypocrisy consists in professing that the "open shop" contention is in the interest of workers who wish to make their own bargains.



It is far from true that employer and worker are on a fair bargaining level. The big employer, under existing economic conditions, which big employers insist upon maintaining, has a deadly advantage in individual bargaining, over the exploited mass of the men, women and children they employ. Nor is it true that the solicitude of employers is for the individual liberty of their workers. The reason they stand for the "open shop," meaning one-sided individual bargaining with the helpless poor whom they employ, is because it enables them to drive hard bargains.

The exploitative person alluded to above, says that his house would have to go out of its present business if collective bargaining for wages were adopted. This must mean that his house can survive only by jamming wages down to the deadly minimum, through oppressive individual bargaining with impoverished and unsophisticated foreigners, with women on the verge of despair, and with children driven by poverty into the clutches of the kind of men that compose that house. Infinitely better off would the whole community be if all such houses did have to go out of that business—out of all business, out of the city, out of the country. The difference between such business and the white slave traffic is hardly more than that of the difference between the sepulcher full of dead men's bones that is, and the one that is not, whitened on the outside.



"BACK TO THE LAND"*—THE OUTLOOK.

Let it be remembered what "back to the land" means. It means more than back to the soil, more than back to undeveloped natural resources, more than back to the land in even its widest physical significance, or from cities and towns by a fortunate or exceptionally venturesome few. It means for all the people what business men mean for themselves when they monopolize "good locations," what land speculators mean for themselves when they boast of the "growth of localities," what great capitalists mean for themselves when they scheme with governments for grants of natural resources. It means not alone to the soil for farming, nor to mineral deposits for mining, nor to sites for home-building, but to the land in that comprehensive sense which includes them all, along with common rights to all other natural opportunities. It means equality of right to natural opportunities for every form and phase of industry and trade, from the most primitive to the most minutely specialized and highly organized. It means back from the custom of land monopolization; back from the grinding capitalism that land monopoly breeds and nurtures, back from the exploitation of labor, back from poverty in the midst of plenty—from all this, back to common rights in the land in order to open unlimited opportunities for the full enjoyment by all the people of all the benefits of industrial progress. For it is control of the land that controls all.

*See The Public of October 21, 1910, page 990; of October 28, 1910, page 1014; of November 4, 1910, page 1036, and of November 11, page 1059.

I. The Way.

In nine of the principal divisions of "Progress and Poverty," Henry George taught the full meaning of "back to the land" as an *economic* problem, and surveyed the path to its realization. Its meaning with reference to *democracy* he taught in the tenth principal division; and in one brief cheering chapter at the end he suggested a *religious* relationship.

There is nothing sensational or spectacular about the plan he proposed. From the beaten path of land monopoly, his path diverges at an angle so acute as but barely to suggest a different direction. In its beginning it is a slight, an almost imperceptible, modification of familiar taxing methods. He proposed "to abolish all taxation save that upon land values."

So simple is this proposal that large hearted and buoyant social reformers with scant or untrained imaginations, or minds so nicely trained in particulars that generals elude them, "see nothing in it." To them it has no perspective beyond its uninviting portal. Nor is it attractive to thoughtless crowds; which may become an advantage, however, for thoughtless crowds tend to move in straight lines, and once in this path might push on to its democratic goal. But the great monopoly interests readily detect the point of divergence, and they lack no imagination. They can buy imagination as they buy skill, when they need it. The truth is therefore as clear to them as it was to Henry George when he described his proposal as the "simple yet sovereign remedy, which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital,* extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals, and taste, and intelligence, purify govern-

*To "increase the earnings of capital," does not allude to any such increase at the expense of labor. As here used, the term "capital" excludes bonds, mortgages, promissory notes, bank bills, and every other mere evidence of financial obligation; also all kinds of natural opportunities, whether ownership thereof or interest therein be evidenced by individual deeds or by stock in corporations holding such deeds. It includes only such objects as are produced from Land by Labor; and of these only such as are consumed or used up in further production by Labor from Land. In other words, "capital" as here used means those tools and materials which Labor alone can produce, which Labor alone can use; and which Labor alone would own were it not that Labor needs Land from which to produce them, Land on which to use them, Land on which to place or store them, and also that the more profitable lands for all these purposes is monopolized. To "increase the earnings of capital" means, as used above, to increase the earnings of the labor that produces capital.—See "Progress and Poverty," book I, ch. II, especially at pages 35 to 41.

ment and carry civilization to yet nobler heights."*

Through eighteen years of active leadership, and until the hour of his death, Henry George worked incessantly to turn men's minds into the path he had thus described. He worked with prophetic vision and the sagacity and skill of statesmanship. And now that thirteen more years have passed, what is the outlook along that pathway?

II. The Viewpoint.

To the value of any judgment on the opportunities for a social or political movement, an understanding of its present status is necessary; and if to this there be added a fair appreciation of its history, so much the better. On the latter score we have already written with reference to the Henry George movement "back to the land;"† our purpose now is to indicate its present opportunities.

+

As Henry George confidently predicted, Great Britain is in the lead. This is easily explained. Landlordism, which in other countries is much obscured, is in Great Britain clear and well defined. Through free trade in land in the United States, for instance, and its consequent "capitalization" indiscriminately with improvements, "capitalism" is here a mask for landlordism; but in Great Britain the survival of feudalistic land tenures has made landlordism there stand out in bold relief as landlordism. To accentuate that difference, land in Great Britain has been exempt from taxation for hundreds of years. Those conditions, in themselves an extraordinary opportunity for the single tax movement, were reinforced by the Irish land league agitation, which provoked general discussion of elementary principles. A further reason is the sensitiveness of the British Parliament to public opinion. And added to the rest is the exhaustion in Great Britain of all sources of public revenue except land values. The first pronounced pressure upon revenue resources, therefore, made a modified form of Henry George's fiscal policy the obvious recourse of British statesmanship.

Meanwhile, however, British workers for the extreme of this reform agitated with steady and thought-out effort as best they could while patient-

*"Progress and Poverty," book VIII, ch. II, pp. 403, 404. For elucidations of this otherwise seemingly extravagant estimate of the results of so slight a deviation from present plutocratic tendencies as the mere abolition of all taxation save that upon land values, read "Progress and Poverty," book VII; also chapter I of book VIII; also book IX; also chapters III, IV and V of book X.

†See The Public of November 11, p. 1059.

ly awaiting the psychological moment for definite political action. When that moment came, they recognized it, seized upon it, and made the most of it. Forming no third parties; fighting for supremacy within the Liberal party; thrusting upon Parliament now and again through sympathetic Liberals measures for municipal authority to tax land values; promoting conferences of municipal officials with single tax tendencies in behalf of what in this country we should call local option in taxation; and latterly securing the promotion of land valuation measures by a Liberal ministry,—in those and related ways they made progress along the British line of least resistance.

But in saying that Great Britain is in the lead, we do not allude to legislation. The land taxes over which British politics are convulsed, are much below the land taxes which the American States impose and actually collect. What really makes the British land tax movement a Henry George as well as a Lloyd George movement, is not the petty tax burdens the Liberal party is imposing on land values, and which the British landed interests have been desperately resisting, but the reasons proclaimed for doing it.

These land taxes are imposed upon the theory that the land belongs to the people and not to the landlords, and that land value is a social increment unearned by its beneficiaries. It is this that has turned Great Britain into a debating society, with Henry George's proposals for the question in dispute.

If in the United States we tax land heavily in comparison with the British land taxes, ours are levied on the theory that land is private property and ought to be taxed uniformly with other private property. But the trifling tax on British landlords makes for proof that they hold their land in trust for the British people. It is the discussion over this implication that puts Great Britain in the lead of the people's movement "back to the land."

Henry George's followers in Great Britain appreciated and wisely availed themselves of his advice regarding practical politics. When the Lloyd George Budget came into Parliament, they could with plausible reasons have turned away from it as not a land-value-tax measure at all. They did point out its defects. They did try to influence more radical measures. But they did not scout it. They welcomed it for what it was—the "thin end of the wedge." Though the measure proposed a trifling tax on vacant land and only while vacant, though it proposed occasional 20 per cent taxes on unearned increments, though it wholly

exempted agricultural land worth as high as \$250 an acre, though it was crammed full of miscellaneous taxes at variance with the single tax principle, nevertheless those British followers of Henry George, realizing that this measure necessitated a valuation of all the land of Great Britain—a necessary preliminary to land value taxation—threw their influence with enthusiasm into the struggle in its behalf. It was not the single tax, to be sure, but it was prerequisite to the single tax. As a result, nearly 140 members of Parliament are in the "land values group," and the question in even its most radical aspects, has for nearly two years, and through one Parliamentary campaign, been under popular discussion from Southampton to the Scottish highlands.

Before it ends this may put Great Britain in the lead in legislation. As Japan has passed from jinrikishas to trolley cars without the intervening carriage, horse car and cable car, so in Great Britain, where land values have been exempt while we of the United States have been taxing land values as part of our general property tax, may, in consequence of those fundamental discussions, completely surpass us. The discussions may cause Great Britain to jump clean over the general property tax to a land value tax so heavy that, while producing ample revenues, it will put an end to land monopoly.

But for the conspicuous position of Great Britain in the eyes of the civilized world, more than one of her dependencies might reasonably claim leadership in the movement "back to the land."

New Zealand, which began this movement in Australasia, has long had general land value taxation; and has permitted local option since the early '90s. Under local option, well on to a hundred taxing districts there have adopted the single tax for local purposes. Among these are both agricultural and urban districts.* No district that has ever adopted this fiscal policy has receded from it.

In some Australian States the land value tax is to a degree compulsory, and the people may make it exclusive if they wish. This is true of the municipalities in New South Wales, where the compulsory land value tax is about 4 mills to the dollar of capitalized value; and where some of the municipalities have voted it up high enough to leave very little margin for any profit in mere

*See *The Public*, vol. xii, p. 420; vol. xiii, pp. 1023, 1043; also back references therein noted.

land *owning* as distinguished from profit in land *using*.*

Other States in Australia have the land-value tax for municipalities, some of which have carried it to the point of the single tax for revenue purposes,† and measures for the entire Commonwealth are now pending in the Parliament of Australia.‡ These taxes are frankly proposed not only for revenue purposes, but also for the purpose of checking land monopoly.

+

In Canada the lead is taken by the city of Vancouver. A provincial law allows municipalities of British Columbia to make variations in valuing property for taxation, and for years it has been a common practice to appraise land at full market value and improvements at a percentage of market value, the effect of which is of course the same as levying improvement taxes at a lower rate than land taxes. Pursuant to this practice, Vancouver began with 100 per cent valuation for land and 75 for improvements. The latter was then reduced to 50, then to 25, and finally to zero. Consequently, for local purposes, the single tax, as a fiscal measure merely, is in full operation in Vancouver.§ This is probably the only important industrial center in the world where the reform has been carried so far.

On a smaller scale and somewhat less completely, another Canadian city, Edmonton,** has had it in operation for several years; and Prince Rupert, the western terminus of the new Canadian continental railway, has had it from the beginning.†† Oak Bay, British Columbia, furnishes another Canadian example.‡‡

+

There are other places in which distinct tendencies toward the single tax ideal have found legislative expression, more or less crude in form. One of these is the German colony of Kiauchau, China, where the first colonial experiment with it was made§§ and where it still obtains. In consequence of the fiscal success of that experiment, numerous cities in Germany are now making lev-

*See *The Public*, vol. xi, p. 636; vol. xii, p. 990; vol. xiii, p. 149. Also back references therein noted.

†See *The Public*, vol. x, p. 81. Also references therein noted.

‡See *The Public*, vol. xiii, p. 1020.

§See *The Public*, vol. xiii, pp. 252, 444, 473, 675. Also citations therein noted.

**See *The Public*, vol. ix, p. 518; vol. xi, p. 787; vol. xii, pp. 277, 1159.

††See *The Public*, vol. xiii, p. 872.

‡‡See *The Public*, vol. xii, p. 323.

§§See *The Public*, vol. ii, no. 63, p. 6.

ies upon unearned increment, and the Imperial government is reaching out for a share.*

+

In the United States there is no single tax legislation; distinctively, and under our governmental methods none could reasonably have been expected.

The national Constitution (practically unamendable except through what amounts to revolution), and a Supreme Court to enforce or modify it at will, make land value taxation for national purposes, and even the exemption of industry, impossible. Indirect taxation reduced to its lowest terms, is the best that can be presently hoped for nationally.

In some of the States the possibilities are better. But most State constitutions must be amended by difficult and baffling processes; and in hardly any State can the single tax be adopted either for the entire State or in its municipalities under local option, without the consent of the upper and lower houses of the legislature and the governor, all three acting independently.

Inasmuch as these officials have no responsibility to the people except when they come forward for reelection at the end of their terms, and inasmuch as they are constantly within the sphere of influence of interests opposed to the single tax, it would be nearly a miracle if a reform so objectionable to special interests could be secured in almost any of our States, though public opinion were strongly in its favor.

The only good opportunities that offer are in those States where the Initiative and Referendum is established. This affords the best possible opportunity, provided public opinion does favor the reform. It also offers the best possible opportunity for awakening and educating public opinion.

In any State of the American Union which has the Initiative and Referendum, and at present in such States only, the single tax reform can be brought into practical politics with the effect that Henry George had in mind when he wrote: "How men vote is something we need not much concern ourselves with. The important thing is how they think. Now the chief agency in promoting thought is discussion. And to secure the most general and most effective discussion of a principle it must be embodied in concrete form and presented in practical politics, so that men, being called to

*See *The Public*, vol. xiii, p. 497, and citations there noted.

vote on it, shall be forced to think and talk about it."*



In many places, and in various ways both organized and unorganized, and with more or less adaptation to local circumstances and opportunities, the single tax is being agitated; and into these agitations there has recently come a tireless single tax promoter in the person of Joseph Fels. He pledges the devotion of himself as well as his fortune, and as many other persons and their fortunes as he can enlist, to the establishment of the single tax, not as a bare fiscal reform except for the first step, but to dry up the unearned incomes of the world by securing to every worker the full value of his work.

A man of large income from the international manufacturing business he has established and the monopoly investments he has made, Mr. Fels prefers this means of spending his income to such diversions as sports, charities, yachts, horses, dogs, or libraries. He contributes to the single tax movement on the basis of a dollar from him for every dollar from anybody else; and in this way he is helping to finance the movement in Great Britain, Denmark, Australia, Canada and the United States.

For the promotion of that purpose in the United States, there has been formed an executive commission. Known officially as the Joseph Fels Fund of America, and organized in 1909, it consists of Daniel Kiefer, of Cincinnati (chairman); Lincoln Steffens, of Connecticut, who is known wherever American magazines are read; Jackson H. Ralston, of Washington, D. C., a lawyer of national and international standing; Fred-eric C. Howe, of Cleveland, one of Tom L. Johnson's coadjutors in the Cleveland Council and the Ohio Senate through Mr. Johnson's long fight with Big Business in Ohio; and George A. Briggs, of Indiana, a large manufacturer at Elkhart, who has for nearly ten years been well known in and about Chicago as a disciple of Henry George. Besides this responsible commission of five members, there is an advisory committee consisting, for 1910, of James W. Bucklin, of Colorado, several times a member of the Colorado legislature, and sponsor for the "Bucklin bill"; Mrs. Jennie L. Munroe, of the District of Columbia, a leading single tax woman of the United States; Edward Osgood Brown, a judge of the Illinois Circuit Court, and Louis F. Post, of Illinois; William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., of Massachusetts; Bishop Charles D. Williams, of Mich-

igan; Dr. Mary D. Hussey, of New Jersey; George Foster Peabody, Fred C. Leubuscher, Bolton Hall, C. H. Ingersoll, Henry George, Jr., and Joseph Dana Miller, of New York; Fenton Lawson, of Ohio; and H. F. Ring of Texas. The treasurer is Tom L. Johnson. Mr. Fels has guaranteed to this Commission, for five years, one dollar a year for every yearly dollar secured by it from any other source. Its preliminary work has been difficult and often perplexing. It had no model and was obliged to pioneer the way. But it is now in shape for aggressive work, not a little of which has been already done. Its second annual meeting will be at New York city (p. 1076), on the 19th of November, 1910, at the Liberal Club, 46 E. 29th street.

This Commission marks a further advance of the single tax movement than has ever before been achieved in the United States, and a greater except by Henry George and his supporters in its early days. The fund collected, besides the Fels contribution, is by far the largest ever before secured; and the principal work the Commission has planned and partly executed is the most encouraging of any ever before undertaken in this country.

III. Future Progress.

Present opportunities for future progress in the single tax movement in the United States, would probably be comprised in the following enumeration:

1. In national affairs, the only opening on fiscal lines is in connection with tariff questions. American taxation is indirect, and so hedged in with Constitutional limitations as to perpetuate the indirect system until the Constitution is amended, meanwhile giving the preference to customs tariffs.

2. On land tenure lines, the Conservation movement offers opportunities. The proposal to retain public lands still in government ownership, and to conserve such natural opportunities as water power, forests, and mineral resources, though in private hands, involves that deeper purpose of the single tax movement which in Great Britain has found expression in the refrain of one of their campaign songs, "God made the land for the people."

3. In many of our States single tax legislation, whether on fiscal or land tenure lines, necessitates Constitutional amendments; and in nearly all States in which there is no constitutional barrier, the barrier of legislatures elected with reference to other issues or to personal or party considerations, must be surmounted.

4. Tax reform organizations, notably in New

*"Protection or Free Trade," ch. xxix, p. 318.

York, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island, offer opportunities through the co-operation of business interests dissatisfied with present taxing methods. These opportunities relate chiefly to such fiscal reforms as abolition of personal property taxes, distinct separation of land values from other values in tax duplicates, and local option in taxation.

5. The movement for the Initiative and Referendum, and that for city charters under the new system known as "commission form of municipal government," offer opportunities for clearing the way. In most commission-plan charters there are provisions for local uses of the Initiative and Referendum; but this electoral reform cannot be used in those instances for the adoption of reforms in taxation or land tenure without further legislative authority, nor with that authority in States whose constitutions set up obstacles. State-wide provisions for the Initiative and Referendum are therefore necessary for single tax purposes; and as they are necessary for other purposes also, this is a movement in which single tax advocates can both serve and be served.

6. In nine States the Initiative and Referendum has been established for State purposes; and in those States Initiative petitions for the single tax, whether in minor degree or in its full scope, might establish the single tax regardless of Constitutional limitations or legislative repugnance. That is, if a Constitutional amendment were required, Initiative petitions would enable the people to amend, if they wish to, and without the obstructive red tape now required; or, if there were no constitutional barriers, Initiative petitions would enable them to adopt the single tax for State purposes, and without legislative obstruction; or, if local option were desired, Initiative petitions would enable them to secure it. Wherever efforts to get the single tax were made, if they failed to secure legislation, they would nevertheless compel intense and widespread discussion.

7. Opportunities for the delivery of single tax lectures, and the distribution of single tax literature, are better now than they have ever been; and there is good reason to believe that in the future as in the past, they will become progressively better in so far as lecturers and literature distributors identify their work sympathetically with other progressive work.

8. The Fels Fund has come into the field with the purpose of vitalizing the single tax movement in the United States. If its plans are encouraged, supported and pursued, they may lead to early triumphs in legislation, with object lessons nearer home than Australasia, Great Britain, or even

Canada. Whether successful to that extent or not, they are as certain as anything human can be to provoke popular discussions of single tax principles, with direct interest and vigor in some places and with at least a high degree of reflected interest everywhere else.



In national politics, then, the coming together of the Conservation movement, and the popular reaction against plutocratic Protection, with the prospect of a new alignment of political parties, or possibly the advent of a new party of principle and power, seem almost like a clarion call to those of us who, like Henry George, look to national political agitation for promotion of the single tax cause in the United States locally as well as nationally.* On the fiscal side, we have now in the tariff question, and more intensely than ever in the direction of the single tax, all the elements for provoking radical discussion that Henry George pointed to in his "Protection or Free Trade."† And as the tariff question is associated with the question of conserving our natural resources,‡ we are nearer now than then to the climax that Henry George saw in 1885, when he wrote: "Property in land is as indefensible as property in man. It is so absurdly impolitic, so outrageously unjust, so flagrantly subversive of the true right of property, that it can only be instituted by force and maintained by confounding in the popular mind the distinction between property in land and property in things that are the result of labor. Once that distinction is made clear—and a thorough discussion of the tariff question must now make it clear—and private property in land is doomed."§

How much clearer the discussions of Conservation along with the tariff question will make that distinction, between property in land and property in things that are the result of labor, who can doubt? Conservation of national natural resources, suggests the substitution of land values for customs tariffs, for national revenues, thereby giving national expression in legislation—without amending the Constitution—to the single tax principle in its double aspect of fiscal reform and land reform.

On the question of Conservation, mark the historical parallel to which Jackson H. Ralston calls attention. In the early '50s there was no wider

*"Protection or Free Trade," page 321.

†See "Protection or Free Trade," ch. xxix.

‡See "Our Land and Land Policy," a monograph on our public lands written by Henry George in 1871, and published in volume ix of his works.

§"Protection or Free Trade," ch. xxix, page 326.

or stronger sentiment for complete abolition of slavery in the United States than there is now for complete abolition of the tariff and land monopoly. But the slavery interests forced the question of extending slavery into new States above the slave boundary line; and that little question compelled discussion of the merits of slavery itself. The arguments for and against extension were of necessity arguments for and against the principle of slavery. Result: weakening of old party ties, formation of new political alignments, a new party, civil war, abolition.

Should history repeat itself, let us hope that the analogy may not extend to civil war, nor to its horrible equivalent in any form; and it may not extend to the advent of a new party. But what about the rest? Land monopoly interests are forcing the little question of further monopoly land grants, and it is further monopoly land grants that opposing statesmen object to. But this comparatively trivial issue is compelling general discussion of the principle of monopoly land grants, whether past or future. And are not party ties weakening and political realignments forming?

Every argument against the Aldrich tariff is potential as an argument against the taxation of industry; every argument against the sale and for the leasing of government-owned mineral deposits in Alaska, is potential everywhere as an argument against land monopoly, and for land values for public revenues. The single tax question is in national politics, whether single taxers know it or not.

But no single tax party is necessary to take advantage of this situation. That policy is more likely to be detrimental than otherwise. It is still true, as when Henry George wrote in 1885, that "parties are not to be manufactured" but that "they grow out of existing parties by the bringing forward of issues upon which men will divide."*

There is forceful wit and genuine good humor, to be sure, in a certain socialist epigram: "Better vote for what you want and not get it, than to vote for what you don't want and get it." But like most epigrams and some dress goods, "it won't wash." When the only voting opportunity is for candidates instead of measures, it isn't always true that it is better to vote for a candidate who agrees fully with you and lose, than to vote for one who agrees partly with you and win—especially if by voting for the one who agrees fully with

you, you elect one who doesn't agree with you at all. Getting what you want in politics is matter of progressive compromise, except at extraordinary intervals when politics are convulsed; and new parties that are then effective spring full armed and ready recruited out of the situation.*

Of the small side party, however, the manufactured third party, it may be noted that there are two lines of policy open to it, one of them useful to its cause, the other detrimental.

Pursuing the useful course, it could be educative at all times, and might serve a purpose occasionally, though in a small way, by "going through the motions" in practical politics. But it must be considerate. If by any possibility a miniature party could be built up to normal size, it would have to be by great patience and forbearance, through a long time, in spite of many discouragements, and of frequent temptations to be offensive toward those whose co-operation it thinks it needs, but is slow in getting. The one thing it *must* do is to propagate its gospel faithfully and patiently; the one thing it *must not* do is to cultivate unnecessary enmities.

So conducted, a single tax party, for instance, might possibly become the nucleus for the single tax movement in politics when single tax tendencies were strong enough among the people to be an independent factor in politics. Meanwhile it would doubtless do something to help strengthen and accelerate those tendencies.

On the other hand, and this is the alternative policy—and unhappily the almost inevitable one—such a party might be so mismanaged in its "day of small things" as to destroy all hope of a serious political career for it, even if that were otherwise possible. If a single tax party—still using this cause for illustrating what is true of such parties in behalf of any other cause,—if such a party in its infancy were to discredit itself by propagating unnecessary antagonisms, it would be an obstacle to be thrust aside when the real fight came on, instead of a medium to be adopted, and with a leadership of proved capacity to be followed. Antagonisms belong to fighting periods, not to recruiting periods.

+

Apart from the national activities suggested with reference to the Conservation and the tariff questions, which make for the exemption of industry from taxation and the appropriation of land values to public use, there is little opportunity for effective single tax agitation in the United

*"Protection or Free Trade," ch. xxix, page 321.

*See The Public of April 13, 1901, vol. iv, p. 3.

States on national lines. This is evident from the summary of opportunities noted above.

For State activities opportunities are open in business circles for conservative agitation along lines that have been quietly pursued for several years. But this work must be done with prudence; and valuable though it is, it is slow and uninspiring. To abolish personal property taxation is to proceed in the direction of the single tax; but active single taxers thoughtlessly discount its value, unless they may label it, which would not unlikely obstruct its progress. The separation of land values from other values is doubtless also useful; but the advocacy of this frankly as a step toward the single tax may impede its progress among those to whom it might otherwise appeal. Opportunities of such a character are rather for men of conservative disposition and conventional business affiliations than for more radical types.

In the distribution of literature and delivery of speeches, there are opportunities for the kind of work which consists in making occasional converts by direct approach or appeal. It is to be observed, however, that opportunities for getting the ear of audiences to listen to expository speaking are very few, unless it be at street meetings. There is a notion abroad that every one understands the single tax. It seems a curious notion, when one listens to the explanations of single tax opponents who think they understand it; but it makes the assembling of audiences for this express purpose exceedingly difficult. Audiences assembled for kindred purposes, however, are interested enough, when single tax principles are presented without hostility to the object of the gathering, and with reasonable appropriateness and simplicity.

Owing to the obstacles to getting this subject into concrete form for political agitation and action in the States and municipalities, the most effective speaking work for the single tax is found to be, and for excellent and almost obvious reasons, in connection with the movement for commission government for cities noted above, and with the Initiative and Referendum movement. These lines of agitation help to clear the way for political action on the single tax, by securing the necessary opportunity. It is as if popular suffrage did not exist, and single tax advocates joined the movement to secure it; or as if the method of voting were so open to corruption as virtually to nullify the suffrage, and single tax advocates joined a movement to purify it, as Henry George and his associates did in the Australian ballot movement of the '80s and early '90s.

Direct legislation and commission government, like the Australian ballot, are methods for strengthening the political power of the people to the end that they may be self-governing. In these movements the influence of the single tax movement manifestly belongs, and into them that influence has almost everywhere gone. One of the most important assets of the single tax movement, an asset of increasing value, is its identification with movements for augmenting the power of the ballot. It is such an asset because this makes for the propagation of single tax doctrines, and also because those movements, as they succeed, open the way for the effective political action to which Henry George looked in his hope for that discussion of the single tax which brings into view the truth, now concealed in a network of custom but which once seen is never forgotten.

+

Along these lines, both large and small, the Fels Fund can be made a power for the advancement, both in thought and legislation, of single tax principles.

By co-operating wherever it can be of use in getting the Initiative and Referendum, it may secure the means for bringing single tax issues before the people for decisive action, and the good will and co-operation of the progressives with whom it thus co-operates.

Similar opportunities open in connection with the efforts of cities to establish commission forms of government with the local Initiative and Referendum, out of which may soon be developed irresistible demands for local option in taxation.

Its successful work in this connection has already given the Fels Fund a prestige worth to the single tax movement all it has cost. At the election on the 8th, a Constitutional amendment was adopted by the people of Oregon, under their Initiative and Referendum and with the aid of the Fels Fund, which allows county home rule in taxation. Where else has so great an advance been secured? On the basis of that amendment, it has been announced that in 1912, measures will be submitted to the people of Oregon for the total exemption from taxation of all useful business and labor, and the collection of all "the public revenues from the value of land and other natural resources." How better could general discussion be secured?

Meanwhile, and in furtherance of the amendment just adopted in Oregon, the Fels Fund has placed in the hands of every registered voter in that State, as a campaign document, a pamphlet showing with reference to each county, the fol-

lowing comparisons between present taxation and land value taxation: as to farmers' lands, farmers' buildings, etc., speculative lands, improved city lots, improvements on city lots, speculators' city lots, and franchise corporations. The comparison shows a saving in each county by farmers, business, and labor, which aggregates over \$3,000,000 for the State; and an increase in each county on franchise corporations and land speculators aggregating over \$3,000,000.

By prosecuting this kind of work in the future, with the same good judgment, in Oregon and other Initiative and Referendum States, the Fels Fund may score legislative victories in a short time. And though it miss the victories at first, it will compel national discussion and demands for literature to an extent that no other course can rival.

IV. The World Movement.

To "see the world" and to "see it whole," is necessary for the best agitation in behalf of any cause. It is especially important for the single tax movement.

This movement does not propose a substitute civilization. If it did there might be no necessity for understanding or caring about the present one. What it proposes is the removal of a barbarous institution which is to civilization what blood poisoning is to the human system. Our civilization itself must therefore be understood by single taxers; and not alone in its history, but also in its daily life.

Minute technical knowledge is of course not required; nor complete information of the sayings and doings of all mankind. But provincialism, whether of city or country, of nation or of section, is a drawback; and ingrowing sectarianism is worse than worthless. Some sympathetic understanding of the world's methods and work and hopes is necessary; the broader and more comprehensive and appreciative the better.

+

+

The single tax movement cannot be isolated and win. It is part of a throbbing world movement; and the more in harmony the lesser is with the larger, the more rapid and perfect will be the progress of both—provided the single tax principle is the true social law that those of us who think we understand it believe it to be.

With all its varieties and shades of thought and aspiration, the world movement is itself no narrow cult, and it does not tolerate cults. Broader than the single tax movement, it is broader also than the land nationalizing movement, than so-

cialism at its best, than individualism at its best; and its tendency is to sweep them all—together with the great rushing force of popular sentiment that knows little of any of them, but without which there can be no political progress—along with its rising, rushing tide. This greater movement is driving all before it, drawing all behind it, toward those higher levels of democracy of which "Progress and Poverty" gives us glimpses—economic democracy, political democracy, religious democracy.

Whoever will read, or having read will read again, the tenth book of "Progress and Poverty," in which Henry George indicates the fundamental idea of his philosophy of civilization, namely "*association in equality*," will recognize the real character of the single tax movement as part of the greater movement. And the single tax advocate who does this, will become in consequence all the stronger and more effective for his own phase of the general cause. For he will be able then to cooperate sympathetically, and consequently to better advantage, with every person of democratic disposition he meets; not only with those commonplace folks who haven't yet "seen the cat" and think it a tiger, but also with bumptious "radicals" who are so dull that they think it a kitten under nine days old.

It is neither by accident nor design, but in the nature of things, that distinctive organizations of the single tax movement on a large scale do not flourish, notwithstanding the spread of its ideas. Its function is to vitalize all progressive tendencies with its own fundamental truth. Whatever other progressive movements may do, they can accomplish nothing large and permanent until in some manner appropriate to time and place, equality of right to land is established, and with reference to value rather than area. And this the single tax movement can secure. But only in sympathy with the democratic movement as a whole.

There is no need for quarrels with socialism. The single tax is a method which all but hopeless sectarian socialists must adopt, whether they will or no. They cannot get far with an exclusive program of fighting a privileged class with an impoverished class. If the single tax abolishes the exploitation of labor, as we believe it will, their work is done; if it does not, their further work will be easier and quicker, and its results more secure. The first necessity for the abolition of labor exploitation, whether it be the last one or not, is common rights to land.

Nor is there need for quarrels with individualists who are not impossible sectarians or greedy plutocrats. The single tax principle is a vital force which, in so far as it is true, will promote democratic individualism, and if completely true will bring it to complete fruition. The first necessity for democratic individualism, as for democratic socialism, and for democracy itself, is common rights to land.

For such a cause as this there is no need for quarrels with any economic or religious sect or political party with a democratic disposition. Neither is there need for severing association with bodies as yet unaroused to the necessity for putting an end to social injustice. On the contrary, that policy will best serve the single tax cause which encourages its converts to continue and to establish congenial affiliations in politics, in church, in progressive societies, in social bodies. It is in this way that the leaven of the single tax principle can be made to work most effectively.

As to separate single tax organizations, there is no need for them at all, except for incidental purposes among folk of like mind, or in committee forms for the promotion of such single tax work as gives evidence of value and vitality.

What is necessary—or, at all events, highly desirable—is a thorough appreciation of the virtues of the single tax principle. Not as the god of a segregated cult, or the offensive slogan of enthusiasts “in season and out of season;” but as part of that complex democratic movement of the world, in which its own special function is to stimulate general progress and supply the method for so promoting general progress as to secure advances as they are made.

To this end it should be the part of single tax advocates, as it seems to us, to establish such intelligent, sympathetic, and influential relations as they can with the world movement as a whole. Timid and dainty as in some of its manifestations that movement may often appear, or grotesquely boisterous as in others, it is nevertheless a movement within which the single tax movement must do its work. It is a movement upon which the single tax movement must exert a favorable influence. Unless this is done, complete reaction will come. “A great wrong always dies hard, and the great wrong which in every civilized country condemns the masses of men to poverty and want, will not die without a bitter struggle.”* Into that struggle, then, every element of progressive force must be enlisted and all be fused.

Let us reserve hostile energy for the movements

and tendencies that make against democracy. Let us recognize and utilize the current of the great democratic movement of the world, in all its phases, even in its disheartening windings and convolutions. As Henry George said in another connection, but not more appropriately, “With the current we may glide fast and far; against it, it is hard pulling and slow progress.”*

*“Progress and Poverty,” book viii, ch. ii, page 403.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

THE CAMPAIGN FOR HENRY GEORGE, JR.

New York, Nov. 12.

Henry George, Jr., won his fight for a seat in Congress from the 17th Congressional District of New York after a spirited campaign in which he gained the good will of the voters of his district. In a district normally 6,000 to 8,000 Republican he won by a majority of 1,721 over William S. Bennet. Mr. Bennet has represented the district for three terms. He is popular as a handshaker and vote-getter; he is a “stand-patter” and voted for every increase of duties in the Payne-Aldrich tariff. He stood upon his record as a high tariff man and belittled the arguments of his opponent that the high cost of living was due chiefly to the tariff.

It was one of the few Congressional districts in which the tariff was directly and persistently assailed. It was the only one in which free trade was openly and boldly preached without equivocation. The candidate frankly announced himself as a free trader, and went even further than his enthusiastic speakers in the clear cut radicalism of his utterances.

An analysis of the vote shows that he was cut by Democrats here and there. But this was counterbalanced by many voters who cast their ballots for Stimson and George. Many of these, it is safe to say, were cast by Republican free traders, of whom there are many in this district where the Single Tax and abolition of all tariffs have been preached by the adherents of Henry George for many years at the corner of Seventh avenue and 125th street. This was one of the causes which helped.

Another was the endorsement of the Independence League and the support of John J. Hopper, the League's candidate for governor. Mr. Hopper is very popular in this district, where he lives, and though he could not, in view of the hopelessness of his candidacy and the rapidly receding wave of Hearstism, receive the full vote of his personal and political admirers, he nevertheless contributed the weight of a support that may have turned the scale.

And it is but just to say that Mr. George received the hearty, full and unquestioning support of Tammany. The leaders of the organization and the speakers from the Tammany trucks and the more pretentious hall meetings, struck telling blows for the candidate. One man should be singled out for special mention in this connection—the man who

*“Progress and Poverty,” book viii, ch. ii, page 405.