

the work. Not one of them cared for "leadership" or the limelight, or any of the things prized so highly by the publicists and politicians, and none of them was so situated that they had to have a salary for their work. These (from sheer force of circumstances—because no one else did or would do that which they deemed most essential) were: Mrs. Lona Ingham Robinson, president of the Los Angeles League, long known in the midwest as a single-taxer, a regular contributor to the Fels Fund,

formerly associate editor of *The Public*, a woman of sufficient means and of life-long devotion to the human cause; Herman Kuehn, thru whose early espousal of *The Great Adventure* in his own publication "Instead of a Magazine" came its second substantial subscription of \$1000 from Henry Bool of England (Otto Werner of Ocean Park, Cal., having supplied the first); and your unworthy servant, Luke North, for the last dozen years or more editor and owner of *Everyman*.

Obvious Public Need for Open Earth

Most intimately and helpfully associated with these were Edgcomb Pinchon (at different intervals) writer and lecturer, co-author with the late L. Gutierrez de Lara of Mexico and the Mexican People, and continuously down to the present moment, Thomas W. Williams until recently state secretary of the Socialist Party.

Not less than three hundred other valued, active, zealous workers in all parts of the state, were equally responsible for the surprisingly large vote. It would be invidious to name one and not all. But those already named were—because no one else was so situated that he could be—most largely responsible for the conduct of the campaign. And of these the first three must be credited with all its errors and shortcomings, because they alone were able to give all their time and attention to the work.

However faulty on our part was the 1916 campaign it proved our faith in the people—that they would embrace a full measure of justice—vote for a change in the land system—when the same was frankly presented to them—that the full measure of single tax could be enacted!

For the "success" of that election we claimed no uncton. We did not call it successful, but many other singletaxers did. Dan Kiefer wrote that we had done more for single tax than all the other political effort and agitation combined since the days of the Anti Poverty Crusade—or words to some such effect, as equally complimentary—and it is true that the California campaign did wake up both plutocracy and the single tax world, polled a larger vote than all the other votes cast for single tax everywhere in the United States; resulted in the birth of the first national militant body for immediate political action to secure the full single tax, with an alive membership in thirty states and the sympathy and endorsement of ninety-seven per cent of the singletaxers of this country and Canada.

Yet it did not feed a single child, or lessen

human misery by a hairsbreadth, or abolish one title to idle land, or begin to end the cause of war, or increase the food supply—and in that respect, for which alone it had enlisted our energies, it was a Failure—another lost battle against Privilege.

To "achieve something for Single Tax" was no part of our purpose. Single Tax is not human—it is like a chisel to a stone-cutter or a saw to a carpenter. We tried to apply it to human society—and lost—because we did not gain the interest and the money of that three per cent of the single tax world which (as everywhere in life) controls the means of life. That was our failure. Something lacked in us that we could not inspire confidence in the rich men and women of the single tax world who would gladly give of their abundance to exemplify single tax somewhere, so that the whole world might quickly learn the true way of social development and human suffering be stayed.

It is fair to say that only the poor and those of limited means contributed to the 1916 campaign. Two men gave practically their last thousand dollars. Three or four of the rich gave a few hundred each. The rest of the totally inadequate ten thousand dollar campaign fund came from a thousand different sources and included what might be classed as *Everyman* receipts.

Yet there are men and women high in the single tax world with great fortunes at their command, and not a few moderately wealthy ones, who have given generously for the theoretical propagation of single tax. It seems inconceivable that they would not give even more generously for its Practical Application—were they assured the money would be wisely spent and the campaign properly managed.

Such assurance can be easily given. Let them send a man of their own choice out here—or select one already here, anyone suitable to them—to manage the campaign and disburse every dollar of their contributions.

Our one object is to see single tax enacted—put into practise. To that end we have already sunk most of our inclinations—and gladly. Now, ungrudgingly, we are ready to sink the very last, that of having any personal part in the Victory!

These words are weighed, and set down slowly. They mean what they say. Lona Ingham Robinson, Herman Kuehn, and myself are ready to step aside from the active management, or any participation in, the California campaign, upon assurances that the canvass for signatures to the initiative petition now begun will be completed in due time—which is merely a matter of dollars for clerical work—and that the campaign for the enactment of the measure will be candidly and aggressively waged, the issues of changing the land system and of opening the earth to production kept constantly before every voter until the closing of the polls on November 5th—and that due effort will be made to guard against a miscount of the ballot.

All this can be easily done for about \$100,000, even if the enemy spends twenty times that as in 1916—which it will probably not do this year, for it has lost hope of defeating single tax, and if the amendment is presented as an immediate war relief measure, as it honestly is, the speculators will not dare to oppose it openly, and entire frankness on our part will disarm their bushwacking taxation and fiscal quibbles.

Do the Singletaxers Want Single Tax?

Only one thing lacks, at this moment, to insure single tax victory in the state where Henry George wrote and where was first published Progress and Poverty—an adequate campaign fund, \$100,000.

Out of an income of a million a year this sum could be given by pressing a button. It would mean food for a hundred thousand children, work and good wages for their parents, the opening of the richest land and resources in the world—the beginning of the end of privilege. Larger sums are spent carelessly every hour on the merest whims, on baubles, enervating luxuries—to care for pet cats and dogs. It would do more to strengthen the Allied armies and people and kill Prussianism—end the Cause of War—than any other thing.

Will a wealthy single tax woman sell her surplus jewels to open the twenty million idle acres of California to an impoverished populace half of which is unwillingly idle or working for less than the cost of living?

Will one or a dozen life-long singletaxers with incomes of half a million a year supply

There is no single tax opposition or division of forces in the state this year. No other taxation issue is mooted, nor apparently any other radical measure. Government assumption of the railroads has forestalled socialist activity in that direction. Over and again socialism and union labor have endorsed single tax and it needs only a little stimulus to make them active workers for it.

The three Scripps papers in California were boldly for The Great Adventure amendment in 1916—and now the powerful Hearst papers have swung in line. Arthur Brisbane's full page single tax editorial is reprinted in this issue. Brisbane is Hearst's chief editorial writer—probably the greatest and surely the highest paid editorialist in the country.

Francis J. Heney, a courageous and honest man, and a wonderful fighter of graft and profiteering, a singletaxer, will be the radical candidate for governor. He will sweep the state—and proceed with Hiram Johnson's good work.

At last there is (everywhere more or less) particularly in California a season of public receptivity toward single tax. World events have produced for single tax the one essential thing for the application of any theory or principle, a great and Obvious public need for it. Everybody sees the connection between land and food. It cannot be obscured or distorted by the most ingenious tricksters and quibblers if we are candid and sky-high in its presentation.

that lacking \$100,000—after having assured themselves that it will win California, and having provided for its proper disbursement?

We are not sure that a personal reason exists that retards the subscription of such a paltry amount—objections to the personnel of The Great Adventure or to their views on other subjects have in the main come from those who had nothing else to give—but if there is it can be quickly removed. There must be such a reason, it would seem, or the fund would have been over-subscribed before this. It can be completely obviated.

We three (or any one or any number of us) are prepared at once to relinquish our part in the management, control, direction, or any voice or participation in the campaign. We will absent ourselves entirely from it—or stay and work under orders of anyone or group of people who will supply the adequate war chest and conduct the campaign boldly and frankly as a moral humanitarian issue.

This is not a bluff. Call it and see. It is thoughtfully and seriously said. Nor is it a