

of land out of use for speculation and to apply the land values which the community creates to community purposes."

This is essentially the same bill as that which in November last gave plutocracy its first real scare and was endorsed by 260,332 (counted) votes—there were others uncounted. It has been shortened and simplified, but its chief demand and expressed purpose are essentially the same—yet one of the quibbles raised by the Teaspoon Seventeen is that the bill is different. Its difference is in simplified phrasing, which is now almost in the exact words of Henry George, and in its single demand, without any trimmings, for a Free Earth.

Another of the Teaspoon quibbles is that the bill is not "self-executing"! No piece of paper is that, nor any combination of words—except "Om mani padme om," when articulated thru each nostril alternately, feet to the sun and face turned leeward to the Southern Cross. Thus spoken, this is a very powerful formula, used by all reliable necromancers; but it isn't nearly as illuminating as the following:

A H W H A T A N A S S I A M

This is guaranteed to bring true enlighten-

ment on or before the Seventeenth repetition. It will also visualize in any mirror the image of every person who objects to the Single Tax demand because it is not "self-executing"!

If "self-executing" has any meaning at all in or out of legal fiction this plain honest mandate to all officials concerned that only land values shall be taxed, is "self-executing." It cannot be misunderstood or its simple provision evaded—unless the officials want to do so; and if they do, and the people acquiesce, words of fire written by Deity Himself would be—as indeed they are—unavailing. Only human beings can enact constitutional provisions; they cannot enact, or administer themselves; nor can the ingenuity of even a Teaspoon Singletaxer contrive an intrigue of words that will "slip over" something on plutocracy or that a plutocratic lawyer or judge cannot twist and nullify. This is so obvious, in light of the anti-trust law and all the other statutes and constitutional provisions recently invalidated or circumvented by the courts, that one must doubt either the honesty or the sanity of those who teach that the purpose of Single Tax can be achieved without frankly demanding it.

Eggleston and "Single Tax Incorporated"

Puerility unrestrained by taste nor shame has even published personal "reasons" for preferring a Teaspoon to a Shovel, and this or other of The Great Adventure council in California has been accused of this indecorum or that incapacity. Well, these are as good "reasons" as any why the earth should remain in the hands of plutocracy. They are as kindred to the land issue as the unblushing untruth that all or most of the Singletax organizations are opposed to The Great Adventure's immediate demand for a Free Earth—which if true would only indicate that Singletaxers are the first and worst enemies of Single Tax. Some of them are, about seventeen in the nation, of any strength or consequence, for economic deterministic reasons, intellectual analysts sympathetically sterile, and heeded by a few weak sisters who always follow the last or the loudest noise, the whole forming less than Three Percent of the radical world.

In all the bogus and honest Singletax organizations in California there has never been a thousand actual dues-paying members, nor half as many. Nor was the membership thereof ever arrayed against the One Tax demand for a free earth—such a published falsehood is a libel on the intelligence and manhood of California Singletaxers, the larger part of whom

never belonged to any California Singletax organization, but are now forming into Great Adventure groups under charter of the National Great Adventure.

But if (for the argument) there were five thousand Teaspoon Singletaxers in California, would that warrant You in pussy-footing with them? When did numbers ever indicate right conduct or the true ideal? If just numbers are to decide then it were right to work with plutocracy against Single Tax for, thanks to the Three Percent Teaspoon Singletaxers, plutocracy still has numbers on its side.

This Three Percent contributes and controls most of the Single Tax fund of the nation. One of its members gives the National Single Tax League of which Daniel Kiefer is chairman \$500 a month with this condition: That not a dollar of it shall be spent for the immediate demand for a free earth. This condition was attached in the summer of 1916 when the Niagara Conference of Single Taxers had hailed The Great Adventure as the Star of Hope and had endorsed its demand for a free earth immediately by a ninety-seven per cent vote. The Three Percent pussy-footed then against it and subverted the accumulated fund from California.

The Great Adventure went to the countries of

has recently come to light a whole township was betrayed at this incorporated office into voting against No. 5.

But this is not all. A few months prior, these same five Singletax Incorporators and John J. Abramson and Ralph E. Chadwick, with the connivance of Clarence E. Todd and E. P. E. Troy of San Francisco, formed the Southern California League for Home Rule in Taxation, all but Hubbard still retaining their membership in the Los Angeles Single Tax League which was then adopting The Great Adventure measure. This new Home

Rule organization of seven or eleven members printed an imposing letterhead and issued a statement in which No. 5 was denounced in the name of Single Tax, because (quoting): "I would deprive municipalities of revenues collected from public utilities!"

As the California constitution taxes public utilities only for state revenue, as such tax is known to be a swindle, and as Single tax cannot be enacted while it lasts, this was a stupid sophistry scarcely worth its price to plutocracy—yet it helped to create the cloud of quibbles and doubt by which No. 5 was beaten.

The "Singletax" Allies of General Otis

October 22, 1916, near the close of the campaign, this document was published in the Los Angeles Times under this heading:

SINGLE-TAX BODY TURNS

ON VICIOUS AMENDMENT

Confiscatory Initiative Measure on November Ballot Is too Much for Home Rule League That Worked for Two Previous Proposals of The Same Purported Tenor—Destructive Features Exposed!

The article was two columns long, spoke an untruth or vicious half-truth in every paragraph, and was signed by David Woodhead as president, and P. T. Anderson, secretary of the Southern California League for Home Rule in Taxation. Appended were the names, as officers and "advisory committee," of R. E. Chadwick, Helen Murphy—and a score of well known men and women more or less closely allied with Single Tax and kindred work, among them, for instance, Thomas Barker, secretary of the Building Trades Council. Of course Barker promptly repudiated the use of his name in any such connection, and so did most of the others.

But these repudiations were not published in the Times—that was not part of the program. Again word went over the state that Singletaxers repudiated the Single Tax amendment.

Concerning this Times publication, on October 30, 1916, Daniel Kiefer wrote to Clarence E. Todd, the state Home Rule secretary at San Francisco, as follows:

Contributing Singletaxers of the United States should be assured that their funds will never go to anyone who cannot show that he or she is not under suspicion of connection with opposition to a movement (The Great Adventure) that had the approval of ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of the Singletaxers of the United States. I think it incumbent on you to denounce such unspeakable knavery.

When the roll is called, whether The Great Adventure win or lose, the traitors in California should be exposed and drummed out.

But the Eggleston-Todd-Troy "Singletaxers" were not in the business of exposing and drumming out their associates. There was other similar work to be done, and such workers were few. The matter was dropped, hushed, almost forgotten. The workers of The Great Adventure had no feeling to pursue the traitors, expose the "Singletax" infamy to the world. They contented themselves, after election, with refusing to confer on political action with those known to have worked with plutocracy against No. 5.

Yes, it was Treachery that defeated No. 5. Singletax money, dollars collected from Singletaxers, by Singletaxers, for Singletax, used by Singletaxers, in the name of Singletax, that defeated the first Single Tax measure ever proposed in the United States that ever stood the slightest chance of enactment.

It cannot be said that these were the acts of sincere but mistaken men who honestly believed that Amendment No. 5 was not a genuine Single Tax proposal which if voted into the constitution and administered by those in sympathy with its clear intent would not speedily end land monopoly in California.

They claimed that, they published it in the plutocratic press, but their plutocratic allies were more honest, openly declaring that if No. 5 passed it would destroy land values. Especially the banks and the real estate sharks flooded the state with such declarations.

If No. 5 was not a Single Tax bill, if it would not destroy speculative land values, if it would not stand the strain of the courts—then why was it so bitterly fought by united plutocracy? Why did the plutocratic press even refuse to publish paid-in-advance advertisements of it?

The Los Angeles Times declared it to be the "Greatest Menace to labor and industry as well as to all property interests of the state." By its enemies the crowd knew it to be a Single Tax bill—and honest Singletaxers in doubt