

as the Prophet of San Francisco. Wherever the few were gathered who refused to bend the knee to the modern Baal, he was ever present with his inspiring presence, quiet, dignified, and with that gentle smile and searching eye that distinguished Henry George.

At this time the good old custom prevailed of family gatherings in the evenings, at which social and economic problems were discussed. Henry George was often present at these gatherings and always welcome. The land question was the chief topic of consideration. At these meetings they got no further than limited land ownership, upon which no two could agree owing to the different purposes to which the land must be put, and differences in the capacity of the owner, etc. At this time Henry George wrote his first book on the Land Question, and it was at one of these gatherings at which I was present that Henry George expounded his solution of the question, in his quiet and unassuming manner. It was here I was converted by his short and lucid talk to what is known as the Single Tax, which was received by the company with a hearty and unanimous approval. Soon after this Henry George went to New York and published his great work, "Progress and Poverty."

I see in the not distant future a monument wrought in enduring bronze to this young man whom it was my privilege to know in these early years. It will stand as a reproach to those who rejected the message for the inauguration of a better, sweeter, purer civilization that he preached to the world in his immortal work, "Progress and Poverty."

F. J. TRAPP.

Not Through The Pressure Of Population

THE principal justification for concern about the growth of tenant farming lies in the change in the underlying economic conditions of the country. Till recently, there has been a relationship between tenant farming and the opening up of new lands. But the last of the good farm lands have now been taken up. No longer is the wastefulness which characterized the growth of American agriculture economically profitable. No longer are tenant farmers transient pioneers. As the urban communities develop, the demand for fixed agricultural settlements increases. Gradually the country is being driven toward conditions of production similar to those brought about in Europe through the pressure of population. The great danger is that at the same time the European tenancy system may be adopted. This, unlike our own, is dependent upon permanent rather than on changing conditions inherent in the growth of a pioneer nation.

N. Y. Times.

Our Case Plainly Stated

(Address Delivered Sept. 11, 1924, by William J. Wallace, Candidate for President Commonwealth Land Party.)

WHEN the question of taxation is settled justly the world will enter into a period of happiness and comfort far beyond any experience of the past. The universal dissatisfaction with methods of taxation is convincing proof that unjust methods are still employed. Any light on this dark subject should be welcomed by all.

The Commonwealth Land Party considers it to be the most important question of the time and as they know the correct answer, they have adopted a platform and have nominated Presidential Candidates.

We call attention to these indisputable facts.

The people of every community create land values by living in the community and by trading, manufacturing, keeping store, practicing law or medicine, teaching or doing any work or rendering any service that is or may be an assistance to others.

No one in that community can tell how much of the total land value was made by him. It is not an individual product. It is not consciously produced. It arises as the unconscious product of general activities carried on with other purposes in view. As an individual no man has earned it. It is a public product, created by all, and can be justly used for no other purpose than the general welfare.

It is the ideal source from which the government of the community should obtain the revenue needed for its support.

The rent of the land belongs to the people and the first duty of the government is to collect it.

This simple truth, that a child can understand, solves the question of taxation.

All natural resources, bestowed upon humanity by a beneficent Creator, should be the property of the people.

Royalties and rents of natural resources and city and town lots would amply support all governmental activities, without intruding on the rights of any individual to have and to hold what he has individually produced, or the values which, under free competitive conditions, he has justly obtained.

Security of tenure would come by paying the annual rent instead of the annual taxes.

This is true socialism, the recognition of the cooperative production of land values, which places the revenues of the state on a just basis, and makes the state the protector of the individual in his individual rights instead of extorting from him unjustly values which do not belong to it, through the income tax and other methods of public plunder which oppress and dishearten effort in every useful industry that benefits mankind.

The product of the individual for the support of the individual.

The product of the community for the support of the state.

Like all moral truths this requires a conscience rather than any unusual intelligence to understand it.

With this great issue, that solves the subject of taxation and also solves the rights of all men in their relation to the world in which they live, on which the great parties and the Progressive Party are hopelessly uncertain and bewildered, we would be false to our belief and recreant to our duty if we did not, to the best of our ability, endeavor to keep before the American people the belief that justice between men is not an empty dream but a practical possibility as soon as the conscience of mankind asserts itself above the selfish interests which now revel in the enjoyment of the public wealth.

We make our demands, even if for the present they are to remain unanswered.

The public wealth is a public trust, and the Commonwealth Land Party will not be recreant to that trust if in the course of future events it should be called to power.

The Commonwealth Land Party is the only party that recognizes the truth that there is public wealth from which the government can derive a revenue to defray its expenses.

In the platforms of other parties guarded references are made to natural resources as follows:

Republican Platform. "The natural resources of the country belong to all the people and are a part of an estate belonging to generations yet unborn."

This is interesting and it invites questions as to its scope and purpose.

Does the term "natural resources" include only those which have not yet been given away in the wild prodigality that marked the distribution of the public domain; or does it, as it should, include all the natural resources of the country, its mines, water power, timber, oil and farm lands?

If the natural resources are part of an estate belonging to all the people, what is the other part of the estate? Does it include the values of city, town and suburban lots, water fronts and the terminal sites and rights of way of our railroads?

If these resources belong to generations yet unborn it would appear to be the purpose of the Republican Party to retain them as public property. Is it the purpose of the party to lease them at their full annual rent so that the government will derive a revenue from this source?

We ask that an authoritative statement be made in answer to these questions so that the ambiguity of the platform may be corrected.

Democratic Platform. "We pledge recovery of the Navy's oil reserves and all other parts of the public domain which have been fraudulently or illegally leased, or otherwise wrongfully transferred to the control of private interests. We believe that the nation should retain title to

its water power and we favor the expeditious creation and development of our water power. We favor strict public control and conservation of all the nation's natural resources, such as coal, iron, oil and timber, and their use in such manner as may be to the best interest of our citizens."

To clarify the vagueness of this programme we ask; when "all other parts of the public domain, which have been fraudulently or illegally leased, etc." have been recovered under the administration of the Democratic Party, what will they do with them? Are they to remain idle, or to be sold outright, or how will they be administered so that the right of the people will be preserved?

If the government retains title to the water power will it also retain the rent which may be collected from this source? Or is it the purpose of the Democratic Party to permit the use of waterpower at such nominal rents that the title remaining in the hands of the government will be an asset of little or no value?

"Strict public control and conservation" are terms of most indefinite meaning. We believe it to mean regulation, a mere continuation of the policy now in force, as, if a change was intended, it would be more clearly expressed.

In view of the vagueness of this programme what evidence is there that the public wealth in the natural resources of the country will be protected by the Democratic Party? What evidence is there that it is the purpose of the party to collect, from the permission to use these resources, the rent which would be a just governmental revenue?

Progressive Party. Apparently in order that there might be no ground for criticism from the Democratic Party, the Progressive Party has adopted the plank of the Democratic Party almost verbatim, the small changes making no change in the meaning with but one essential difference as follows: "We favor public ownership of the nation's water power and the creation and development of a national super-water power system, etc."

This evidently means that the system will be owned and operated by the National government.

All of the questions asked to ascertain the meaning of the Democratic Platform are equally necessary here. The one clear statement is in the Socialist plank, which in regard to water power provides for public ownership and operation.

The framers of the Constitution of the United States were statesmen. They instituted a government in which the rights of the individual were protected, and they gave us civil and religious liberty. They placed in the constitutional law principles of right and justice and provided a Supreme Court whose manifest duty it was to determine whether the laws passed by Congress and approved by the President infringed the principles of justice which the country had accepted as its guide.

At the time the Constitution was adopted the means by which economic liberty could be secured were still unknown. The Constitution provided what appeared to

be a fair field and no favor. The influence of land ownership over the lives of the people was little understood and no way was known to correct its evils. The answer came within the memory of men of this generation and it is not surprising that the hoary headed iniquity of all the ages has not yet been overthrown.

With this clear answer, easily understood by all, why rush to socialism to escape the evils of land monopoly? Why rely on trade unionism with its arbitrary methods and selfish purposes when the right way of securing economic justice to all, even those that it appears to injure, is plainly in view?

Why in the interest of socialism destroy the safeguard which gives the Supreme Court the duty of deciding whether laws conform to the principles of the Constitution?

The government should be the protector of the rights of all. Members of Congress should not be subservient to pressure from those who seek special privileges and who would destroy freedom and equality.

We are most fortunate in having a court that will restrain our misrepresentatives from scrapping the Constitution.

We are most fortunate in knowing how social justice can be secured so that we are not tempted to throw away the civilization that has grown up by centuries of effort and reduce men to the senseless slaves of autocracy and despotism under the pretense of giving them economic freedom.

And we are most fortunate in having a programme of social reform which is easy of accomplishment, and which without any violent shock to existing institutions will secure to every citizen the economic freedom under which the progress of civilization to higher and higher achievement is assured.

Who Owns The Land Owns The Wind

YES, wind power may be had almost everywhere, but by landowners only. The wind-mill must be fixed in land as a base. The landless would be as completely disinherited if every want of man could be realized completely by forces generated by wind as they are now. Man is a land animal. Even his activities on the seas are initiated from the shore and if other men own the shore, he is in the power of those other men. If every form of slavery were abolished, the ownership of land with no exercise of the power of the community over it would still make the struggle for liberty the struggle for life. The men who own the earth are able to sell the wind, the light of the sun, the progress of science, and even the right to labor, to those who are disinherited of their right to the earth, and sell it at their own price.

HERBERT QUICK (*Syndicated*)

The Land Question In British Politics

WORK OF THE COMMONWEALTH LEAGUE
SINCE THE ARMISTICE

THE signing of the Armistice on November 11th, 1918, marked the close of one phase of the Great War, and that by no means the most difficult, as subsequent events have shown. At the outbreak of hostilities in 1914, a Liberal Government was in power in Great Britain, with Mr. Asquith at its head. Though elected as a Free Trade Government, it had shed its principles in this regard ere it gave place in December 1916 to the first of the two Coalition Governments which succeeded it. This is not the place to relate the story of the back-stairs intrigue which resulted in Lloyd George displacing his chief and succeeding to his position as head of the Government. Suffice it for our purpose to say that before this happened, the Asquith Cabinet, of which Lloyd George was an influential member, had outraged every principle of Liberalism. To it we owe the Paris resolutions and the McKenna duties (so named after Reginald McKenna, the Free Trade Chancellor of the Exchequer, in whose budget they were first imposed,) two admittedly protective measures. The former was to become operative only in certain events, but the latter forthwith. These import duties of 33-1-3rd per cent. have just been removed by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Snowden. The Paris resolutions, as it happened, never became operative. This first breach in the walls of the Free Trade citadel was made, not by Protectionists, but by professed Free Traders!

Mr. Lloyd George was in the saddle until December 1918, when, after passing an Act enfranchising at the age of 18 instead of 21, soldiers and others on service with the Forces, he went to the country under circumstances which rendered it quite impossible for more than 25% of the new electors to record their votes, and sought a fresh lease of power on the fraudulent cries of "Hang the Kaiser" and "Make Germany Pay." It has to be recorded with regret that he found a sufficient number of the electorate so deluded as to give him a majority. These have since paid dearly for their folly, but it is doubtful if they quite realize this yet.

A striking feature of the period 1914-22 was the gyrations of politicians of all parties. No rudderless ship drifting helplessly at the mercy of wind and waves ever shifted her course so frequently, so completely, or with such expedition as these manifested in boxing the political compass. Such principles as the average politician had on board (usually a very light load) were speedily jettisoned to the cry "The War has changed everything." Of course, the War could *not* affect fundamental principles,