

Francis Neilson, by John Archer. In this coming number will also appear an article on the Somers System of Assessment, by E. W. Doty.

COPIES of the New Zealand number of the **SINGLE TAX REVIEW** have been sent by a committee of Land Value Taxers in Victoria, B. C., consisting of Mayor J. L. Beckwith, former Mayor J. A. Morley, former Mayor Louis Hall, city Treasurer Edwin C. Smith, Will Atkinson, L. A. Kerwin and others to the 106 members of the Ontario Legislature accompanied by a letter signed by every member. Its last sentence reads:

"Because we share your prosperity, as you share ours; because the tax on land values is the only tax which does not confiscate private property, we are sending you these facts for your careful consideration."

It is not the intention of the **REVIEW** to convey a wrong impression of the Liberal Party leaders whose names appear prominently in this issue as advocates of the Taxation of Land Values. Official Liberalism is not committed to the Single Tax. Indeed, the Single Tax has been repudiated by the Prime Minister, Lloyd George and even by the Lord Advocate. But this counts for little. They speak our language, and they are probably well aware of it. They know, too, where their doctrines lead.

Nor can it be said the sentiment of the voters of Great Britain is on the whole a Single Tax one, though the movement has been promoted and engineered by Single Taxers. And we know, whoever else may not, that the little group of brave, self-sacrificing men and women whose names appear in this issue and whose work is told herein, are the greatest living force in the United Kingdom.

MR. FELS announces his intention to visit South America, where the Single Tax has unexpectedly raised its head. It is reported the president of Paraguay is a convert to our doctrines.

## POLITICS VERSUS PROPAGANDA, AND THE FELS COMMISSION.

Hon. Frederick C. Howe is reported to have said, in an address at one of the dinners of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, that the Fels Fund Commission, of which he is a member, is not a propaganda but a political body.

The members of this Commission may not always have proven themselves the wisest leaders of the later day movement for the Single Tax, but they are at least to be credited with common intelligence. and we do not think they entertain any such conception of their office as custodians of the contributions of Mr. Fels and dispensers of Single Tax moneys for Single Tax activities. We may be in error in this opinion, since even the chairman of the Commission is reported to have said that "the days of propaganda have gone by," but this remark, if made at all, must surely have been accompanied with some important qualification.

We should deem it a grave misfortune if any body of men representing, or sincerely assuming to represent Single Tax sentiment, should take the position that we have moved beyond the educational stage, that such moneys and activities as we can now command should be exclusively devoted to political campaigns for the Single Tax, political campaigns entered into or fostered by any Commission, however much deserving of our confidence. We should regard such a conception of their exalted position as ill-advised at any time; how much more so after two decisive campaigns in which the adverse vote in one State was three to one and in another eight to one?

Of course, it is possible with large sums of money to *simulate* a real campaign for the Single Tax in any State, but until the ground is thoroughly prepared these campaigns are an illusion, and leave behind them the bitterness of disappointment, and perhaps real injury to the movement.

On the other hand where the ground has been prepared little money is required. Thus, the total expenditure of the Single Tax Committee in Everett where the Single Tax was carried, amounted, according to a

Communication in the *Public* from Mr. McDonald, to \$27.50.

We do not wish to be misunderstood. There will arise specific measures before legislatures, and in States where the people possess the Initiative and Referendum that will call for the earnest support of Single Taxers everywhere, but these cannot be artificially stimulated. And the expenditure of no sum of money however great can call Single Tax sentiment into being where it does not exist.

Our first consideration should be this. We are teachers in a great cause. We are propagandists first; our task is to create the public sentiment necessary to a successful political issue. The abolitionists understood this well. "You make history and we profit by it," said Seward to one of them. Said Henry George: "I do not care how you vote, but I do care how you think." He knew that the political issues could best be left to the politicians. He knew that they would come to us with their compromises when the time was ripe, the ripening of which we could accelerate by incessant propaganda. Then we could say to them, "This is good as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. We will aid you. But we will not cease to demand the full measure of justice. As for us we have no compromises to offer—no graduated land taxes nor land tax exemptions. We expect you to give us all of these; we expect you to move a step at a time, but we are embarked for the long journey and the ultimate goal."

Is it necessary to point out that if the whole Single Tax movement changes place with the politicians such compromises as are the inevitable history of every great reform movement are likely to emanate from us, and not from the politicians, that coming from us they weaken and retard the movement? Such offers of compromise will come from us because we have then set our eyes on political success, on some immediate victory. But it is a gratifying evidence of conversion that many Single Taxers, grown sadder and wiser at the results of the campaigns in which they took part in November, now say: "We think the fight should hereafter be made on straight Single Tax lines." Was there

ever any doubt about it in the minds of those who trace their Single Tax activities back to 1886, or who have read the history of reform movements? Some have expressed an amusingly naive surprise that so many voters opposed the Single Tax because it would "confiscate" their land values. Have we got to learn our philosophy over again?

It is of course easy to criticise. But our readers must judge for themselves how much truth there is in the criticisms that the Fels Fund Commission have heard during the past year. The dissatisfaction most frequently expressed is that they have neglected the propaganda phase of our movement for the political, and that money has been drawn away from local activities that promised well, and that the activities specifically named in their first letter soliciting contributions have been allowed to languish. Our readers must make up their minds whether this dissatisfaction has just cause or not.

But to return again to Mr. Howe's remark quoted at the beginning. Surely the cause of municipal ownership, for example, has made much more impressive advance than the Single Tax. Whether such advance is or is not a matter on which we should felicitate ourselves need not now be dwelt upon. But our accomplished advocate of municipal socialism does not hold that his day of propaganda has gone by, for he continues to add to those charming volumes in which public ownership is so alluringly set forth.

---

#### A CRITICAL TIME.

---

As the Single Tax movement grows, it must inevitably raise up enemies from within and without. Among these will be the political Single Taxers who in the pursuit of office will seek to minimize our demands, or who in the same pursuit will try to link our cause with sporadic movements for minor reforms, some real, though in comparison unimportant, some only apparent, and some positively harmful.

We do not now allude to those Single Taxers who having obtained office have ceased to interest themselves in the cause,