

the fame which "Progress and Poverty" had brought him, Hyndman entertained him at his house for a month.

"His indifference to some of our English prejudices was at times rather annoying," writes his host. "On one occasion we were passing the top of Great Portland street, going home to lunch when George espied a barrow load of whelks at the corner being sold by the costermonger who owned them. 'I say, Hyndman' quoted George, 'I like the looks of those whelks.' 'All right,' said I, 'if you like them I'll have some sent in for you.' 'No,' was the answer, 'I like them here and now.' Expostulation was useless. So George consumed the whelks from the barrow while I, got up in the high hat and frock coat of non-whelk-eating-at-the-corner civilization, stood by and saw him do it. I never see a whelk stall at a street corner to this day but I feel inclined to bolt off in another direction."

NOTABLE CAREER IN ENGLAND

Hyndman's interest in George, as he admits himself, lay in the belief that he would prove an easy convert to Socialism, but he was soon disillusioned. "It was useless," he writes, "to be angry with him or to press him too hard, for then he only went off to some of his devoted Single Tax worshippers, from whom he returned more single tax than ever. However, I believe I may take some of the credit of inducing him to write his 'Social Problems,' a book which, though it never attained anything approaching the popularity of his early work, showed that he was beginning to understand that in our complicated modern society man cannot live by land alone."

In the end Hyndman sat George down as "in his way a sort of intellectual Anarchist" and denied him possession of a first rate intellect, although admitting he was honest, sympathetic, well-meaning, humorous, good natured, in short, a good fellow and a delightful personality. George's religious feeling astonished the Briton.

"The religious turn of his thought I never fully comprehended," he says, "until I was debating with him, with Mr. Henry Labouchere as chairman, at the old St. James' Club Hall. Then his arched bald head rose up like an apse at the other side of the table and I saw that the bump of reverence was of cathedral proportions."

The furore made over George in England proved very disturbing to conservative minds who visioned an approaching end of the British land system. How seriously the menace was taken can be seen by the long article in the *Quarterly Review* in which the late W. H. Mallock, then at the beginning of his career as a staunch defender of the established social order, sought to refute the reasoning of "Progress and Poverty."

But George's ideas have made some progress abroad, although he himself did not live to see London adopting his ideas in a modified form by taxing land values without regard to improvements; New Zealand and parts of Australia applying the Single Tax; nationalization of the coal

mines recommended to Parliament by two Royal Commissions in Great Britain, and David Lloyd George promulgating a land policy which can scarcely be distinguished in principle from that set forth by his American namesake.

What Proportional Representation Offers For the Single Tax Movement

(Address of George H. Hallett, Jr., Secretary Proportional Representation League, at the Henry George Congress, Sept. 3.)

I AM speaking this afternoon as a member of the Henry George Foundation. There are many believers in proportional representation who are not believers in Single Tax, but I personally am working for "P. R." because of what it can do for this and other fundamental reforms.

We have listened to cheering evidence of the spread of Henry George's ideals and heard many suggestions for spreading them more effectively in the future. That brings us to the very practical question, How shall we make those ideals take form in actual legislation? How shall we get full representation for the Single Tax sentiment that has been created, so that it may have its full weight whenever our law-making bodies consider the raising of revenues?

Most of our law-making bodies are controlled by political machines. Can we hope to persuade those machines to espouse our programme? If our programme were less fundamental, perhaps we could. The machines are on the lookout for ways to win the favor of even small groups, and many an idea with less following than Single Tax they have enacted into law. But Single Tax strikes at the root of the special privilege whose political instruments they are. Whatever else they may surrender, they will not surrender that.

We must beat the machines. How? Suppose first that we organize a new party. Our difficulties begin with the platform. If we confine it to the Single Tax, we lose those who want a platform more inclusive. If we make it more inclusive, we divide our ranks by the other things we put in.

Suppose that we do get a platform on which all Single Taxers agree. Still we cannot get all Single Taxers to vote for it. For many who would favor the taking of the full rental value of land give their first allegiance to one of the established parties, say the Democratic or the Socialist. And many, many others think a vote for a new party would be just thrown away.

You all remember the campaign of 1912, when the Progressives overwhelmed the G. O. P. so that you had to look for its presidential electors with a microscope. The Progressives didn't elect Progressives, they elected Democrats, whom many of them wanted least of all. A new party may have its educational value, but our prospects of electing members by it are not bright.

Now suppose instead we try to capture one of the old parties, as the farmers of North Dakota have done on occasion. Right away we lose the support of the many Single Taxers who think so little of the party we want to capture that they will not vote in its primary under any circumstances. Also we lose the vast numbers who will not trouble to vote in the primary at all—enthusiasts are a minority in the camp of any cause. But the machine turns out in force, for elections are their means of getting a living. Again the prospect is not bright.

To beat the machine and make it stay beaten we must change the rules of the game. We must find rules that will let us all start even. The present "majority" system is anything but that. It gives all the representation in each district to the one group that is largest, whether it is a majority or not. Since there is nowhere any united majority, the representation goes to the best organized minority. That is pretty sure to be a machine which can add to the natural following of its candidates a nucleus of votes purchased by jobs or the promise of jobs. The divided and unorganized majority does not even put its candidates in the field.

Since we cannot hope to get the true majority united, we must find some means of representing it when it is not united. That means is proportional representation.

The best form of P. R., the one used in the Alberta election and also in Cleveland and Cincinnati, not only gives fair representation to each party but gives it also to the different elements within parties. It selects to represent each party the particular individuals who are most representative of the party's voters.

Now suppose this system were in effect for all our city councils and state legislatures and for Congress. The task of making effective the full strength of Single Tax sentiment, now almost hopelessly difficult, would be easy. All kinds and degrees of Single Taxers would get representation, without any necessity of concerted action. Single Taxers within the Republican party—and there are such, of course, for party labels may mean anything nowadays—would elect Single Tax Republicans. Single Tax Democrats would elect Single Tax Democrats. Single Tax independents and new party people would also elect their fair share. And when a question of public revenue came up in the legislative body they would all be there to influence the decision. If a majority of the people were favorable to the ideals of Henry George, a majority of the legislators would almost surely be also.

IT is for us Georgists to point to the real value of Free Trade—both for industry and its workers. But we must also show that Free Trade itself is not enough to solve the problem; that the campaign for access to land and against monopolies, which can gorge themselves also in Free Trade countries, must be taken up with far more energy and understanding than we have yet seen in ordinary Free Trade circles—JAKOB E. LANGE.

Henry George the Evangelist

PART of an address delivered by Mrs. Akeroyd in Sydney, Australia, and reprinted in the *Sydney Standard*:

Again, when teachers of political economy maintain that there is not enough food in the world to support the increasing population, that nature is niggardly and many must starve, that war and pestilence are necessary evils, because they exterminate thousands and leave more for those who survive, is it any wonder that Christ is resolved into a myth?

So in this unjust state of society, masses of people are not only deprived of the just reward of their labor, but are deprived also of their faith and hope—deprived of their ideals.

Surely, this is a very terrible state—masses of people, embittered by want, without faith and without hope. It is the cause of revolution and anarchy; it has overthrown mighty civilizations.

IT IS JUSTICE THAT DEMANDS OF US

It is in dealing with this question that Henry George stands pre-eminent as evangelist as well as political economist.

He says: "It is Justice that demands of us to right this wrong; Justice that will not be denied; that cannot be put off—Justice that with the scales carries the sword. Shall we avert the decrees of immutable law by raising churches when hungry children moan?"

"Though it may take the language of prayer, it is blasphemy that attributes to the inscrutable decrees of Providence the suffering and brutishness that come of poverty; that turns with folded arms to the All-Father and lays on him the responsibility for the want and crime of our great cities. We degrade the Everlasting; we slander the Just One.

"In the very centres of our civilization today are want and suffering enough to make sick at heart whoever does not close his eyes and steel his nerves. Dare we turn to the Creator and ask Him to relieve it? Supposing the prayer were heard, and at the behest with which the universe sprang into being there should glow in the sun a greater power; new virtue fill the air; fresh vigor the soil; that for every blade of grass that now grows, two should spring up, and the seed that now increases fifty fold should increase a hundred fold! Would poverty be abated or want relieved? Manifestly no! Whatever benefit would accrue would be but temporary. The new powers streaming through the material universe could only be utilized through land. And land, being private property, the classes that now monopolize the bounty of the Creator would monopolize all the new bounty. Land owners would alone be benefited. Rents would increase, but wages would still tend to the starvation point!"