

Henderson's pages. It seems clear that this new movement, ushering in an era of regulation, nationalization and control, can hardly be called "democratic." In the narrow etymological sense it may be. Democracy, from the Greek word *demos*—the rule of the people—may indeed be loosely held to mean the governance of the fifty-one per cent. But democracy has come to have a more far-reaching and inclusive meaning, and to carry with it something more than this. The supremacy of the State is not admissible in this new and broader concept of democracy, and something of the philosophy of individualism, and something of the recognition of economic laws and the disposition to trust them, are included in it. The movement led by Arthur Henderson has no right to be called democratic, whatever else it may be.

There are other utterances of Mr. Henderson which, taken in connection with what is proposed, are impossible of reconciliation. He says: "What the workmen want is freedom, a definite elevation of their status, the abolition of the system of wage slavery which destroyed their independence and made freedom in any real sense impossible." Democracy to Mr. Henderson is rather an indefinable aspiration than a principle capable of being worked out in legislation.

Mr. Henderson is a man of high ideals, but of narrow vision. His somewhat loose thinking on the war is in line with his loose thinking on economics. He feels strongly but seems incapable of translating his emotions into practical measures. He is largely under the tyranny of socialistic terminology; he talks of freedom, and his ideals are bodied forth in a scheme of tortuous regulation, a State complex and ordered in minutest detail, a vast series of laws piled one upon another—a dreadful, impersonal, political monstrosity!

Is it not obvious that all this cumbersome framework with which it is proposed to replace the present social structure takes but scanty account of the foundations upon which any enduring edifice can be reared? These wonderful Four Pillars—on what are they to rest? Surely upon the land. Then why not build with some regard to the foundations?

Why do all these measures and recommendations, arduously and laboriously formulated, with an eye to an almost infinite prevision, amuse by their complexity and confusion? Why is it that their futility, their amazing contradictions, are obvious to all but the makers of this remarkable platform?

Is it because social systems are not spun, spider-like, complexly woven webs, from the bowels of men's imagination, however ingenious? The social system is here—what is needed is to discover the laws by which its functions are governed. God or Nature has made Man, given him the faculty and powers of labor, provided him with the land, the reservoir of the raw material from which to extract wealth and to fashion the tools for the making of more wealth. Whatever else is to be done, whatever artificial

plans are to be adopted, there must first be free access to this reservoir. And of this truth there is no recognition in this Manifesto.

And something else is not recognized. There is a great natural law of co-operation, by which under the terms of free exchange, fullest satisfaction of human desires are secured. Neither can this law work where freedom of access to the natural reservoir is denied.

Do not our friends of the Inter-Allied Conference see this? Has it not been preached to them for thirty years? Is it not of all things the most obvious to those who will but think?

If our comments upon these proposals seem unfriendly it is not because we regard them unsympathetically. The tendency is all too common and all too natural for men to seek in artificial adjustments the remedy for economic inequality. But existing maladjustments are originally of man's making, and the remedy is to be sought in the natural laws and in fundamental principles of justice—in the removal of those artificial obstacles which block the way to economic equality. We say the tendency is natural to build artificiality upon artificiality. We need to be on our guard against this tendency in ourselves.

"The way is all so clear and plain
That we may lose the way."

The Only Possible Economic Readjustment

SINGLE Taxers know that the economic readjustment in Europe to follow the war will necessarily illustrate the vital truth of Henry George's doctrine. If economic rent is left in the hands of the few, or, indeed, in private hands, no matter how many, rather than treated as the sole source of public revenue, the political liberties won by millions, will not avail to prevent the creation of privileged classes. If the ruined cities and devastated rural areas of Belgium, France, Russia, Serbia, are rehabilitated under the old economic system that does not treat economic rent as public revenue, a few persons will be enriched by the process of rehabilitation, and the generous aid of less unfortunate regions afforded to those war-wasted areas will help to swell the profits of the privileged.

Much of Continental Europe has seen or is seeing political and social revolution, but these things are vain without economic revolution. The great democratic revolution in France of a century-and-a-quarter ago gave the peasant his small land holdings, but did not avail to prevent France of the last three generations from developing contrasts of vast wealth and hideous poverty. This war just closed was truly a war to make democracy safe the world over, but "one thing thou lackest" is as true of modern democracy as of the virtuous youth in the New Testament story. We have helped the Central European powers toward political and social democracy, but we and the peoples of the Entente are quite as much in need of economic revolution

as the peoples recently under Czars and Emperors. We are, indeed, even more in need of such revolution, for apparently, Germany at least is to try the experiment of an orderly socialistic republic popularly ruled.

Do the privileged classes of the United States imagine that this country can escape the revolutionary spirit of the age? Do they think that we are to meet the huge taxation of the immediate future by the old indirect methods that permit the burden to fall with disproportionate weight upon millions of those least able to pay? Now, when taxation is going to be the great question of the hour, is the time to learn the lesson of the only sane and just taxing system. If we do not learn it now, we may in a comparatively few years find ourselves face to face with a revolutionary movement as threatening to social order as anything that Russia has recently shown.

The way to peaceful readjustment lies through the practical application of those economic principles laid down by Henry George. This is the true and wholesome economic revolution, the one form of economic revolution that reconciles a sane individualism with the only sound socialism that distinguishes justly between *meum* and *nos-trum*. Until the world has accepted this form of economic revolution the victories of social and political revolution will be imperilled, and we shall be exposed to the recurrent dangers of industrial war and mutual class hatreds.

E. N. VALLANDINGHAM

The Dog's Bad Name

THERE is an adage warning us of the evil consequences of "giving a dog a bad name," and there is need of one to impress reformers with the disastrous effects of attaching wrong and misleading terms to the reforms they advocate. The obvious result is to prevent people from understanding and therefore appreciating the ideas sought to be propagated.

The advocates of the most vital reform of all have, I think, been specially unfortunate in this respect.

If the Gospel of Henry George has failed to win its way to the heart and judgment of the great majority of those who have heard it expounded, it is chiefly because it is, in our popular language, known as the "Single Tax," a term which is expanded into the explanatory phrase, "The Taxation of Land Values."

There are two serious objections to the phrase, "Taxation of Land Values." Firstly, there is no taxation proposed; and, secondly, there is no such taxable thing as "land value."

Apart from these rather important errors the phrase is objectionable because it seems to put a fiscal proposition in the foreground, and fiscal propositions do not touch the average man.

Every great reform wins by force of moral appeal, and moral appeals are made to the heart as well as the judgment.

Now, Henry George's proposal is pre-eminently moral and ethical. It is this—to take public property for the use of the public and to leave private property to the exclusive enjoyment of the private individuals who own it. It is a

plain proposition of justice that appeals to every honest heart and clear-thinking head.

But who would ever guess that this principle of justice and right was concealed in the phrase "Taxation of Land Values?" Yet that is exactly what the phrase is supposed and intended to mean.

I say the first unfortunate inaccuracy is in calling it taxation.

For the people to collect what belongs to them and put it in the public treasury is not taxation, even though it were done by the agency of officials now called tax collectors.

Suppose we employed the tax collectors to also collect the street sweepings and deposit them in a place provided for the purpose, could that be called taxation? Yet that is precisely all Henry George proposes—viz., that each year the value created by the presence and activity of the population shall be gathered and put into the public till.

In the second place I say it is erroneous and misleading to talk about the value thus created as "land value."

To be sure, land *has* value, but it is not the sort of value here referred to. Land has an intrinsic value. It is invaluable for walking on, for building on, for getting coal and iron out of, for growing crops on, and so forth. But it had that sort of value in the time of the wild Indians; and that is not at all the thing meant by the expression "land value."

For example, the piece of land upon which we are assembled at this moment was here, and had the kind of value I have mentioned, when there was nobody in the country but roaming savages. Now it has the other kind of value, which you might call market or rental value. Where did that come from? From the fact of a settled population—it is the automatic creation of population according to an unfailling natural law.

Mark well, this value comes from the fact of *population* not from the fact of *land*—it is therefore people-value and not land-value. It ought accordingly to belong to the people as public revenue and not to land or landowners as private revenue.

Now, the average man is an honest hearted and fair minded fellow, who believes in the square deal, and when he hears anybody talk about land value he naturally thinks it is something connected with land, and something which therefore rightfully belongs to the man who owns the land; and when he further hears it said that this value ought to be taxed into the public till by a Single Tax he at once shakes his head and says: "No, that is class legislation. It isn't fair to put all the taxes on the landowners." And that is where the advocate of Henry George's idea is stopped; that's where he comes up against a stone wall of opposition. But you see it is all through the use of a wrong term which suggests a wrong idea.

Now, I think it would be a very useful thing for all the Georgeites in the world to unite for the next five years or so, and devote themselves to making clear one point, namely, the difference between land and land value; and their best course to that end would be to stop calling the thing land value and give it its proper name, people-value.

It won't be hard to convince honest men that people-