

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

had before them, not only the direct, simple, explicit bill itself, but the testimony of such legal authorities as Judge James G. Maguire president of the San Francisco Home Rule Tax League managed by Todd, Troy, and Eggleston; Attorney E. J. Batten, secretary Chicago Single Tax League; E. E. Kirk dean of the Los Angeles Law School; Clarence Darrow of Chicago; A. C. Pleydell of New York, and scores of others well known among Singletaxers in California and elsewhere.

By no stretch of the cloak of charity can the acts of these men be considered as mistaken zeal. Honorable men, unable to agree with a procedure overwhelmingly endorsed by their colleagues, would have kept still—said nothing. For months they had intrigued and pettifogged against the adoption by Singletaxers of The Great Adventure immediate demand for a free earth. Time and again they were outvoted, usually by ninety percent. For months they filibustered, moving for reconsiderations on every possible technicality. At last, after The Great Adventure had finally fought its way to the People and secured a place on the state ballot, these ten men and one woman, more or less secretly but indubitably, and sometimes openly, allied themselves with plutocracy to defeat the measure at the polls.

As the name of John J. Abramson, former treasurer of the old Home Rule League in Los Angeles, only appears on the document sent to the Niagara Conference (which was printed in the Times) it may be unjust to include him with those who cooperated with plutocracy. Omitting his name, the list stands:

Dr. W. G. Eggleston	David Woodhead
Clarence E. Todd	P. T. Anderson
Robert L. Hubbard	S. B. Welcome
Ralph E. Chadwick	Homer P. Earle
E. P. E. Troy	Helen Murphy

These, having taken active parts in the Home Rule campaigns of 1912 and 1914, which were popularly supposed to be Single Tax campaigns, but which plutocracy well knew were not, but only tax juggling proposals, were able to supply the best weapon against Single Tax frankly, simply, ideally stated—that of doubt and confusion in the public mind.

Wherever any considerable group of people are permitted to vote on this clear, frank issue, "Shall the earth be held by a few or be open to all on equal terms?" the vast majority of them will vote right—for an open earth.

That is the faith of The Great Adventure. On that faith it proceeded in California, and that faith—really it is not sheer faith, but a perception of the primary impulses of human nature—was abundantly verified by the

recorded vote. This result startled the radical world which had lost faith in human nature and laid its own shortcomings (its confusing counsel) against the natural altruism of the bewildered crowd.

Consider against what odds this recorded vote was obtained:

The treacherous acts of Singletaxers that confused the public mind; the tricks of San Francisco labor politicians who prevented reindorsement as a labor measure at the eleventh hour; printing of the State Pamphlet to prejudice all interested in exemptions of the property of churches, educational institutions, and army veterans; secret trading by the liquor interests; the moral certainty that the full vote for No. 5 was not allowed in the count, by over 150,000 votes; a united plutocratic daily and weekly press which refused advertisements for No. 5 and suppressed all neutral reports of its meetings and activities; the cry of alarm raised by the savings banks that No. 5 would jeopardize depositors' savings; the combined attacks of all the plutocratic interests—the speculators and monopolists—spending over a million dollars in misrepresentations.

Against these odds, equipped with only a "shoestring" campaign fund of \$8000, The Great Adventure's direct appeal to the Heart of the crowd was answered by 260,332 acceded votes for the Immediate application of a Single Tax on land values!—which was frankly put before the people as a means of reversing the entire social system at its beginning and applying the Golden Rule at the base of life.

Unpleasant personalities have hitherto been carefully avoided in all public speech and print of The Great Adventure. But this considerate reticence has been distorted into another "reason" why the land of California should not be opened immediately. The editor of The Public specifically refused a short article on The Great Adventure because it contained no personalities and dealt only with issues. And Harry H. Willock of Pittsburg published broadcast a most unmannerly accusation against one of the ablest, kindest, and most esteemed women in the Singletax world, Lona Ingham Robinson, because she refrained from naming those who published the Times' article.

Well, since you must have personalities, there they are. Read the names and gloat over them, if you must. In my view the situation would be the same were the names, Roe, Doe, Jones, Smith, etc., instead of Troy, Hubbard, Eggleston, et al. I am not interested in names. In the bitter bread strife on a monopolized earth, always the traitor will appear. The Carpenter found one in twelve. Was that symbolic?

Without hate or contempt for the men themselves their names are revealed—reluctantly; but who will care to condone their acts? Only one who can read the secret workings of the mind and weigh the pressure of known and hidden circumstances may sit in judgment on a fellow creature—but his public conduct we do and must appraise. We do not judge a leper, but we isolate him.

No man knows whether the one who falls or the one who stands firm has fought the bravest fight, overcome the most—but all men everywhere shun the traitor. The conduct of these

was traitorous. Morally they are lepers to be herded with their kind. They sold out the People of California. Harrison Gray Otis, the most heartily detested man in this or perhaps any other state, was in comparison almost a friend. At least he was an open foe; he fought out in the daylight. These Singletaxers stabbed in the back from a dark alley. They went about the state as Singletaxers and in the name of Singletax, under the cloak of Singletax, most effectively helped the banks, land sharks, and trusts defeat the first Single Tax measure for which the people ever had a chance to vote!

Who Didn't Know It Was Loaded

And these are the men (and one woman) with whom the Three Percent have been clamoring that the workers of The Great Adventure should "get together" and adopt some other than a One Tax demand for the next election!

These are the persons who, because they had not been publicly branded, soon after election drew to themselves half a dozen Singletaxers by nature of the Teaspoon variety and invited The Great Adventure with its 260,332 votes for One Tax to "get together" in the name of "harmony" and "democracy."

These are the identical individuals, tho their names are now kept modestly in the background, who banded themselves into an Equity Tax League and "adopted" at a "representative state convention" (you are not compelled to believe it) an elimination tax bill that specially exempts land values from levy for state revenue, reinacts the tax on occupations and gross earnings of public utilities, and nowise provides for the slightest increase in the tax on land values.

This bill is so patently plutocracy's own measure (after 260,332 votes had been acceded for a One Tax amendment)—so obviously designed to prevent the people from again voting for a frank, direct provision to open the land at once—that The Great Adventure was content to eschew personalities, scorn the cheap and easy bunc about "harmony" and "democracy" (on a monopolized earth!) and discuss only the issues involved in the two measures.

Failing to get The Great Adventure workers to rescind their One Tax demand, the Equity sent out a number of cheap prints, in which were personal accusations and every paragraph had its untruth or twisted half truth.

A few good men seem to have fallen for their easy words—"democracy," "harmony," "get together," "autocracy," and what not—and a few uninformed persons are mystified where the money came from to send two Equity people clear across the con-

tinents to force their bickerings and personalities upon the first national assembly of The Great Adventure—to "draw its fire" from the One Tax.

That money was subscribed by the Three Percent Teaspoon Singletaxers—doubtless some of it by those who honestly believed the Equity falsehood that "all the Singletax organizations and most of The Adventurers" had joined the Equity; but most of it was subscribed by those in whom the "wish was father to the thought."

In the Equity and other Three Per cent prints it has been argued that the 260,332 California votes do not "belong" to anybody or group; that most of these electors would have voted for any kind of a tax bill put before them; that the Home Rule bill of 1914 received 7000 votes more than given The Great Adventure.

This is Three Percent fact and logic—three more "reasons" why the people should not again be permitted to vote for a Free Earth.

The Home Rule bill of 1914 was not opposed by plutocracy, its banks, or its press—or but mildly. No one cared much whether it won or lost. Either way it could harm no one or benefit none. In the south, where it was openly preached as a step toward Single Tax, it carried. In the north, its home, it was advocated as a business man's reform and its Single Tax leaning (truthfully enough) was denied—and there it lost heavily. The Home Rule League handled about \$30,000 on that campaign, and had no opposition from any Singletaxers. The Great Adventure fund was \$8000. That means \$22,000 for 7,000 votes, doesn't it?

Yes, the electors will vote for almost "any old thing." They are trained to vote mechanically. They are used to being betrayed—but The Great Adventure will not betray them.

No, the 260,332 votes are not the property of any group, but they do "belong" to an Ideal. They are so many pledges to the disinherited millions, and whoever would lower that Ideal to replace it with a tax reform bill would be as false as the Otis Ten.

Not much money was deflected from The Great Adventure in California campaign fund by the lies and quibbles of the Equity—some, no doubt, and to that extent the Equity's single purpose is well served. But in the main those who caught at the quibbles and gulp the lies were only looking for an excuse to withdraw support from a movement condemned by the Banks. When they contributed they "didn't know it was loaded." But the banks knew.

Very few monied men are not amenable to the