

Forty Years of the Struggle for Freedom

As Viewed in the Pages of Land and Freedom

1901! A new century—the amazing Twentieth Century. The United States was rapidly becoming a great world power, with possessions overseas, and unprecedented industrial expansions. The McKinley administration had ushered in a period of that sort of “prosperity” against which Henry George had warned. Monopolies and trusts were in the ascendant. The shadows of Standard Oil and United States Steel dominated the national scene.

Throughout the world there was ferment and unrest. In Europe, Asia, everywhere, old forms were crumbling. The people were awakening. Equality was struggling against inequality.

In the midst of these world affairs, a new social reform was striving valiantly to bring its message to a long suffering humanity. It was the movement to which Henry George gave memorable impetus—the struggle for freedom—free land, free trade, free men. This trinity was entering a new phase in the evening of the Gilded Age. Its foremost apostle had passed away only a few years before, and now it was confronted with a critical test of survival. The brave workers in the cause faced the turn of the century with an enthusiasm unabated and with a conviction unshaken.

The Founding of the Review

Among the leaders of the Henry George movement who were carrying on the struggle in various ways—political, propagandistic, educational—was Joseph Dana Miller. A figure already respected in the literary world, Miller chose to enlist as a full-time worker in the Georgeist cause rather than merely bask in the more comfortable fame of belles lettres.

Miller came to see the need of unity in the movement—or something that would rally together the many workers in all the diverse fields of endeavor, and demonstrate to themselves, as well as to the world, that they were severally engaged in the same noble task—of establishing the reign of natural law in the economic world.

With this in mind Joseph Dana Miller founded in 1901 the journal which now bears the name of LAND AND FREEDOM. It was originally styled the SINGLE TAX REVIEW. (The Georgeist reform in those days was commonly known as the “single tax”.) The REVIEW commenced as a quarterly. Vol. 1, No. 1 appeared in the Summer of 1901. The subtitle of the magazine was “A Record of the Progress of Single Tax and Tax Reform Throughout the World.” In his Publisher’s Notes, Miller wrote: “We believe the REVIEW will demonstrate its reason for being; that it is the

best propaganda medium now published, and that it is worthy of general support.”

The contents of Vol. 1, No. 1 were fairly indicative of the field the REVIEW was to cover for the years to come. Among the items were the following: The story of Tom L. Johnson’s brave fight for municipal reform and single tax as the newly-elected mayor of Cleveland; an account, by Lawson Purdy, of a Conference on Taxation held at Buffalo, composed of delegates appointed by the Governors of the States; an obituary, by Henry George, Jr., of James A. Herne, the famous playwright and actor, and author of the highly successful play, “Shore Acres,” which incorporated Georgeist principles; a hitherto unpublished letter from Leo Tolstoy, in which the great Russian writer said: “Henry George composed a multiplication table—clear, universally comprehensible, irrefutable. He has done his work. Let those who can put it in practice do their part. One thing is certain; as those who desire to make calculations cannot avoid the multiplication table so also those who desire to organize the social life of mankind on juster foundations will not be able to avoid Henry George’s plan, and will take it as their basis.” There were also reports of the activities of Georgeists throughout the country, state by state, and throughout the world, country by country.

Here at last was a medium for the Henry George movement throughout the world. As such a medium, the REVIEW was to keep a universal record of the progress of the single tax everywhere—progressive legislation, the activities of Georgeists, interpretations of significant current events, explanations of the philosophy for newcomers, theoretical and controversial discussions, recommendations for the conduct of Georgeist activities and for the advance of the movement.

The Status of the Movement

There was optimism in the ranks of Georgeists in those early days—optimism and determined effort. They saw their ideas spreading, many great men espousing the cause, advancing legislation throughout the world. It seemed that success was in sight. Hamlin Russell wrote in the REVIEW in 1902: “We have the right; more than that, it is our bounden duty to claim victory, full and complete.” From Denmark, Sophus Berthelson wrote: “We can plainly mark a growing comprehension among all classes of society, of the great social importance of our doctrines.” In 1905 Louis F. Post testified that the movement was making great strides. He acclaimed the present “progress in the minds and hearts of the masses of the people” as compared with

the more "ebullient times of George and McGlynn" when the masses were more astounded than understanding.

In New York, Lawson Purdy was carrying on the fight to separate the assessment of land from improvements, and rode to victory. In Chicago, a newly formed Single Tax Party was thrice put on the ballot and doubled its votes successively. In Colorado, Senator Bucklin was campaigning for the "Australasian Tax System." In the United States Congress, Robert Baker was staunchly speaking for tax reform. In Ohio, Tom L. Johnson was carrying his struggle against special privilege.

In China Dr. W. E. Macklin, missionary, was collaborating with Dr. Sun Yat Sen in translating Georgeist literature into Chinese for spreading the doctrines in that country. In Switzerland Oscar Schar reported that the land monopolists "found us more dangerous even than the Social Democrats, who looked towards an indefinite future for their hopes whereas our reform could have been easily and instantaneously put into practice." Danish Georgeists were increasing their strength in Parliament, and a new Danish Henry George League was spreading its influence. In Russia, Tolstoy was observing the general unrest, and urging Single Tax as the only measure that would save that country from revolution.

England gave encouraging signs of progress. John Paul reported that many English leaders, such as Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Winston Churchill, Lord Asquith and others, were declaring themselves in favor of land value taxation. "Our question is at the very door of Parliament here," wrote Paul, "We have a knowledge of the political situation, know the constituencies, what can be done and what ought to be done." In Australia and New Zealand, tax reform was under way. Many municipalities in both countries provided for the exemption of improvements and a higher rate on land values.

To the nucleus of leaders in the Henry George movement, however, it was clear that there were numerous thorny roads ahead, much heart-breaking toil, and many disappointments to be suffered. Constantly in the SINGLE TAX REVIEW appeared "the clarions of the battle"—admonitions to Georgeists to pull together for the great work, plans and recommendations for the future of the movement. Naturally there were disagreements as to the best course to take, and unfortunately there were splits. There were those who advocated working with the major political parties; and there were those who advocated independent political action. There were leaders who asserted that the reform must be presented as a practical fiscal reform; and there were others who insisted on presenting the philosophy in its full strength. Some advocated cooperating with liberals and radicals and socialists; others opposed this, and insisted that socialists must be openly condemned.

The pages of the REVIEW were open to all these different ideas. Miller stood for free and open discussion on all questions. He was a true democrat. But he hoped that sufficient agreement would come out of them to unite all Single Taxers into one great organization.

The advocates of cooperation with the major parties chose the Democratic label. J. B. Vining reported in 1903 that "the Single Taxers of Ohio have gone on, step by step, until today the entire Democratic organization is thoroughly permeated with their influence."

Edward T. Weeks, who proposed independent political action, asked these questions: "1st - Where Single Taxers are free to organize politically, can they vote with parties which favor the ownership of land, without themselves incurring moral guilt? 2nd - Should our political work be governed by moral principle or by mere seeming expediency?" There was a storm over these questions, and the majority of Single Taxers appeared to be in favor of independent political action. However, nothing substantial was done for some time.

There were other views. "The Single Tax at present," wrote Jane Dearborn Mills, "is an educational work. How to make our organizations strong for the educating of the world is the vital question, until we can put the system into practical exercise."

There was a flood of different proposals, and a great number of organizations. A summer resort on single tax lines was conceived. A single tax colony near a great metropolis was suggested. A Single Tax Information Bureau was started in 1903. It printed and distributed 60,000 pieces of literature. There was a Henry George Class of Economics in 1906. There were many lecture bureaus. And such orators as John Z. White, James Morton, and Frederick Monroe toured the country on speaking engagements.

One of the important organizations was the Massachusetts Single Tax League, under the direction of Charles B. Fillebrown. In 1902 the League gave a banquet to college professors and economists for the purpose of bringing them together to agree or disagree on certain phases of Georgeist doctrines. Among the points submitted to the professors were the following: A tax upon ground rent cannot be shifted; the selling value of land is reduced by the tax that is paid upon it; ground rent is what land is worth for use. Most were recorded in the affirmative. Among the professors were T. N. Carver, E. R. A. Seligman, C. J. Bullock and G. S. Callender.

Every so often in the REVIEW would appear a summation of the progress and status of the movement. Miller was convinced the reform was making headway. His chief recommendation was that there be a national organization and fuller cooperation among all the workers in various fields.

Controversies

In 1904 Louis F. Post said: "The SINGLE TAX REVIEW is coming rapidly to justify its mission as the organ of the movement whose name it has adopted. It collects with considerable fullness the news of the movement as an organ should, and is as interesting as well, which organs sometimes fail to be."

Among the many factors that made the REVIEW interesting were the various doctrinal controversies, often exciting, that appeared therein. It was quite natural that the Georgeists who had a "bone to pick" should turn to columns of the REVIEW as their mouthpiece. From the earliest days, there were perennial discussions on the interest question, single tax and socialism, public ownership versus taxation, and more obscure doctrinal points.

The earliest controversy in the REVIEW on the interest question took place in 1904. It started with a criticism of Henry George's theory of interest by Joseph Faigy, a young New Orleans Georgeist. Mr. Faigy claimed that "interest exists on account of the opportunity of investing capital in land," and that it would disappear in a free social order. This article brought such an avalanche of replies, both in agreement and disagreement, that Miller was obliged to devote a large part of a subsequent issue to a symposium on the question. Among the contributors to this discussion were such prominent writers as Lewis H. Berens, Michael Flurschein, Byron Holt, James Love, and Dr. S. Solis-Cohen.

In an editorial preface to the symposium, Miller disposed of the interest question in these syllogistic terms: "Interest is either natural, or it is not. If it is not, it will disappear under the reign of natural law which the Single Tax will inaugurate. But if it is natural, then it will persist, and its persistence will wrong no one." In the rule of economic freedom all laws are beneficent."

Another controversy that raged in the pages of the REVIEW was concerned with the Fairhope colony. Fairhope operated in some measure on single tax principles. An article appeared in the REVIEW criticizing Fairhope as a "semi-socialistic" scheme. Feeling ran high on this indictment, and the question was debated: Is Fairhope representative of Single Tax? Miller, as usual, allowed all sides to have their say, and he was criticized severely for this policy. Partisans of Fairhope ceased to give the REVIEW their support. Of one of these, Mr. Miller wrote: "We are sorry to lose Mr. as a subscriber, but if the price of his remaining on the list of our friends is suppression and silence we must perforce part with him, not, however, without regret that so good a friend of the cause should take this view of the matter." And again: "Both sides shall be heard until this unhappy controversy is disposed of."

Another article that evoked a storm was Peter Aitken's "The Chief Obstacle to the Single Tax and How to Remove It". As a matter of abstract principle, said Mr. Aitken landowners are not entitled to compensation, but as a practical matter, the question of compensation should be considered. The volume of replies required space in the REVIEW for another symposium.

There were many similar questions freely and openly discussed in the SINGLE TAX REVIEW. No debatable subject went without a flood of replies. Mr. Miller allowed all to have a voice. The REVIEW was proving itself an indispensable mouthpiece of the movement.

Conferences, Organizations, Politics

In 1908 a National Single Tax Conference was held, at which a nation-wide organization was founded. It was the American Single Tax League, and Bolton Hall was elected president. The REVIEW was adopted as the official medium of the League. (At this time the editor found it propitious to change the REVIEW from a quarterly to a bi-monthly. Its frequency has since remained unchanged; to this day it is a bi-monthly.) The League secured its own headquarters, and engaged in propaganda work—and there it seems to have petered out.

There was an important series of conferences sponsored by the Joseph Fels Commission. The leaders of this Commission were Joseph Fels himself, Frederic C. Howe, Lincoln Steffens, Bolton Hall and Daniel Kiefer. At a conference in 1910, the Commission decided to devote its resources to political action. A plan for a land tax campaign in Oregon was worked out, with Hon. W. S. U'Ren as the leader. The campaign was conducted with determination and it alarmed the entrenched interests to such an extent that they formed anti-single tax leagues, and with the help of a controlled press launched a desperate counter-drive. The Single Tax measures were defeated, but Georgeists encouraged by the near-success of their efforts, engaged in other campaigns. A Single Tax Bill was introduced in New York State. California had land-value-tax legislative proposals. A Land Value Tax Party was formed.

In England, Georgeists were fervent over the famous budget debates of 1909-1910 in Parliament. Winston Churchill and Lloyd George presented a bill for the taxation of land values. The House of Lords fought furiously and finally defeated it. In 1910 the Danish peasants rose and organized, and demanded uncompromisingly "Equal rights for all, the taxation of land values, complete free trade and special privileges for none."

The Joseph Fels Conference of 1914, reported in the REVIEW, gave evidence of progress along political lines. The city of Everett, in Washington, voted for a single tax amendment but its validity was questioned in the court.

There was a campaign in Pueblo, Colorado, led by George J. Knapp, taking advantage of the home rule amendment, to secure tax-exemption of improvements. There were campaigns in Oregon, Missouri and California. Henry George, Jr., newly elected Congressman from New York, told of the movement in the District of Columbia to secure 100% valuation of land and to extend the number and power of assessors. The nation's capital was particularly a hot-bed of land speculation.

Special Numbers

During the years 1911 - 1913, Mr. Miller published several "Special Numbers" of the REVIEW, devoted to Georgeist reform in different countries.

The issue for May-June 1911 was a "Vancouver Special Number." Vancouver, in British Columbia, Canada, was proclaimed to be "the first Single Tax city in the world." L. D. Taylor, Mayor of Vancouver, wrote on the results of the Single Tax in his city, and pointed out the stimulating effects due to removal of taxes on buildings and industry.

The September-October 1911 issue was an "Edmonton and Grain Growers Number." The city of Edmonton in Alberta, Canada, was praised as the "freest city in America." In a feature article by Wm. Short, ex-mayor of Edmonton, the application of the Single Tax in Edmonton was discussed. The Grain Growers of Canada were also featured. The Farmers' Association of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, declared themselves strongly in favor of land value taxation.

The March-April 1912 issue was a "Special Number for Germany." It featured the work of Adolf Damaschke, head of the German Bodenreform League. Poultney Bigelow, a close friend of Kaiser Wilhelm, praised the Kaiser as an advanced socialist who had studied "Progress and Poverty," and initiated a measure of Single Tax principle in the German province of Kiao-Chow in China. Many noted German professors wrote for this special number, on various phases of the land question in Germany. Among them: Dr. Karl Tolenske on "Land Tax or Nationalization of Mortgages", which latter course the Doctor advocated for Germany's particular case; Dr. Adolf Wagner on "Economic Science and the Unearned Increment Tax"; Dr. F. Schar on "The Nationalization of Water Power"; and Dr. W. Schrameier on the status of the land reform movement in the Empire.

The September-October 1912 issue appeared as a "New Zealand Special Number." It gave a full and detailed account of the history and progress toward Single Tax in legislation, how the people gained control of the legislature, and the status of the Henry George movement in that country. In New Zealand the United Labor Party was the political force which was most instrumental in securing the Single Tax advances.

The issue for January-February 1913 was a "Great Britain Special Number." It presented the story of the famous budget fights in Parliament, the movement for municipal land value taxation, and the Georgeist movement in England and Scotland. The Members of Parliament at that time who stood for land value taxation (known as "the land values group") were Francis Neilson, Josiah Wedgwood, Alexander Ure, R. L. Outhwaite, Peter W. Raffan, E. G. Hemmerde, Henry George Chancellor and James Dundas White. (Today the land values bloc comprises fifty M. P.'s.)

The November-December 1913 issue came out as a "New York City Special Number." It included a long and fascinating article "The Romance of New York Real Estate," by Joseph Dana Miller; it was a history of the land deals and the rise of land values in New York. Frederic C. Leubuscher wrote for this issue the exciting story of Henry George's mayoralty campaign of 1886. The interesting history of the Manhattan Single Tax Club was also presented; and biographies of the many Georgeist workers in New York appeared.

Many extra thousands of these special numbers were printed for wide distribution. They were indeed impressive documents and must have done much to spread Single Tax influence.

The War Years: 1914-1918

The world conflict which opened in 1914 was indeed the most disastrous the world had ever witnessed. Yet it did not enter the daily lives of people to the extent that the present struggle does. And it does not seem to have interfered seriously with Georgeist activities, though there was some abatement. In the January-February 1915 issue of the REVIEW appeared a list of Single Tax organizations and periodicals, which covered two pages. Toward the end of 1918, greater organizations and more daring projects were conceived than were ever before attempted.

As to the war itself, Miller took an editorial stand, from the beginning of the conflict, in behalf of the Allies. He was not deceived by the high-sounding phrases of the propagandists, and he indeed saw that the matter required an economic solution; but he saw Germany as an aggressor nation committing immoral acts, and he saw the war as a struggle—basically, though vaguely—between despotism and democracy.

In 1914 a New York State Single Tax League was formed, which held a Conference at Buffalo (reported in the September-October 1914 REVIEW). This Conference was notable in that there were outstanding recommendations offered for the conduct of the movement. Mary Boise Ely proposed working among college students, since their minds were as yet open and untrammelled. Prof. Lewis H. Clark

suggested a compact organization, patterned after political organizations, but devoted to educational work. The organization, he said, should be democratically run, with a constitution, committees and chairmen.

At this Conference, Oscar H. Geiger also spoke, proposing an educational program in the form of "reading circles." This is the earliest record of Geiger's utterance on the subject, and it is remarkable in its completeness. "Fundamental social betterment," said Geiger, "to be lasting, must come in response to a demand from the people, and the people must understand before they can demand . . . It is proper for us to try to get whatever measure of justice we can by such legal enactments as with the present state of the public mind we are able to obtain, but we must not delude ourselves into believing that *merely* direct effort toward legislation in the people's present state of mind will secure fundamental justice . . . This accepted, there remains only the selection of effective methods of educating the people. There are many ways, most are expensive, while many are fraught with the requirement of undue effort, and therefore wasted energy."

The method he offered was that of study groups. The whole educational program, as later exemplified in the Henry George School of Social Science that he was to found, was worked out fully. The idea aroused much interest, and was followed up with action. Reading circles were organized throughout New York State. However, the project did not continue to flourish.

1916 was the year of the first Great Adventure in California. This was a campaign to secure a Single Tax amendment in that state. Luke North was the leader; he and his fellow-workers conducted a whirlwind campaign. But, as usual, the opposition countered with all its resources—and the amendment was killed. There was another Great Adventure in 1918, which was also defeated. Luke North died shortly after.

A Conference was held at Niagara in 1916, at which an independent Single Tax political party was proposed. We can imagine the heat with which the proposal was discussed from what Miller wrote: "We may regret that the policy of independent party action had not been discussed in a calmer frame and a more philosophic mood. There are reasons for a party and there are reasons against it that were not heard by the Conference at all." At any rate, it would appear that the idea of a political party was germinating.

In November 1916, the fourth Conference of the New York State Single Tax League was held, at the University of Syracuse. It was the first time a Single Tax Conference was held within University walls. The economics course at the University of Syracuse was notable in that the four

or five hundred students of that subject devoted six weeks to the study of Henry George.

The SINGLE TAX REVIEW changed its format in 1918, to the present one. Mr. Miller submitted to his readers the question whether the magazine should also be converted into a monthly—but the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of keeping it a bi-monthly. In his editorial notes on the new appearance of the journal, he wrote: "The REVIEW, now, as in the past, will give the tax reform features of the movement . . . But the goal set out for the Single Tax shall be the goal constantly before our readers—*To Free Natural Opportunities and Industrial Enterprise from all Tribute* . . . The REVIEW will give its undeviating support to the Single Tax Party movement, and will encourage the formation of Party Organizations in every State, for a test of its principles at the polls. We have witnessed the utter collapse of all forms of Single Tax organization. For educational as well as political purposes Party Organization gives the fullest promise of cohesion and progress. The REVIEW will therefore endeavor to enlist the now hesitant body of our believers into an Army for Political Action."

Thus the REVIEW gave notice to the world on two points—it stood for the Georgeist philosophy in all its strength, and not in any diluted form; and it stood for a determined united effort on the part of all believers to lead the Georgeist reform to success.

Independent Party Action

The independent political action movement was taken up enthusiastically by a great number of Georgeists. There were many, however, who were indifferent, and others who even opposed the idea; but enough were in favor of it to form successful party organizations in many States. By the end of 1918, the Single Tax Party had organizations in half the States of the Union.

This Party movement was an outstanding milestone in the progress of our reform. It marked the close of an era of attempting to work with the major political parties, particularly the Democratic. There had been nothing but disappointment in that policy. Miller called it "one phase of Single Taxers' activities for two or three decades, a phase now demonstrably a failure and approaching an inglorious close." Henceforth the Georgeist movement was to be more clearcut. It was to build up its own resources for the spreading of its philosophy and reform.

During 1918 there were various State-wide Party Campaigns. In the New York State Campaign, Joseph Dana Miller was the unanimous choice of the Party for Governor. In 1919 Miller made an impassioned plea for a united nation-wide Party campaign. He wrote: "Great God! We are the torch-bearers of an economic world-gospel! We bring balm for the healing of the nations, a message for the oppressed, a new Magna Charta of emancipation for

mankind. If rejected, Leagues of Nations, covenants of peoples, are veritable 'scraps of paper.' Again autocracy will challenge the political democracies that even now are shaken by internal revolutions. Again the Man on Horseback, a pinchbeck Hohenzollern or a real Napoleon, will over-ride the world. Again on dying democracies, by power of cannon and shot and shell a modern Tamerlane will seek to fatten." This dire and remarkable "prophecy" is reminiscent of Henry George's immortal words in "Progress and Poverty." Miller was in dead earnest.

The plea for a national campaign bore fruit. A national Convention of the Single Tax Party was held. They decided to enter the 1920 general election with a platform and candidates of their own. James Robinson was appointed National Organizer; Robert Macauley, National Chairman; and Joseph Dana Miller, National Secretary. For once Georgeists all over the country were united in a nationwide venture.

The Single Tax Party decided to hold their 1920 Convention in Chicago—the city where the Farmer-Labor Party and the Committee of Forty-Eight were also convening. This latter was a group of liberals, malcontents, and radicals of all sorts and shades, brought together from the forty-eight states (hence the name) by a wealthy man who hoped to have them agree on a single platform, acceptable to all liberals. The Single Taxers had a reason for choosing the same locale as the Committee of Forty-Eight. They proposed to attend the Forty-Eight convention, and attempt to swing it over to a pure Single Tax platform.

It was a dramatic moment when the Single Taxers entered the Forty-Eight Convention hall. There were only about fifty of them, but as they entered the hall where five hundred indeterminate "reformers" were wrangling, the Committee leaders regarded this small group with apprehension. Here was a band who knew what they wanted, and were determined.

After endless wrangling, the Single Taxers, by sheer force of fighting their way through the mob, obtained a hearing. They read their platform, which was vociferously seconded. Confusion followed, and the Single Taxers were on the point of losing their case, when in an inspiring strategy they forced the Chairman to recognize their speaker. He was Oscar Geiger. He proceeded to pour forth an impassioned and inspiring speech for the Single Tax, which brought down the house. The Single Tax platform was unanimously adopted by that great crowd. But the Committee leaders, who insisted on playing politics, sought to effect a merger between the Committee of Forty-Eight and the Farmer-Labor Party. They marched over to the latter's convention hall—and that was the last of them. They were swallowed up by the larger party—and the Single Tax platform was lost.

Disgusted by this loose game of politics, the Single Taxers went ahead with their own Party convention—adopted the platform, voted on resolutions, nominated candidates. But they had won the respect of the liberals. "You men have a sense of solidarity," said Amos Pinchot to them. The Single Tax Presidential candidate was Robert Macauley, and the candidate for Vice President was Richard C. Barnum. The Party succeeded in getting on the ballot of twenty-four states. In the national election, the Single Tax vote was not huge, but was encouraging enough to arouse a desire for more national campaigns.

In England, many Georgeists were coming to the same conclusion as the American Georgeists—that it was futile to attempt cooperation with the major political parties, and that the only hope was in independent party action. An International Single Tax Conference was held at Oxford in 1923. There was intense discussion as to the value of attempting to work through the Liberal and Labor Parties, after so many years of disappointing stalemates, despite the presence of several courageous Georgeist Members of Parliament. There was a split between those who favored working with the present political set-up for whatever advances could be secured, and those who advocated an independent party to stand for the Georgeist reform in its fullness. The result was the founding of the Commonwealth Land Party, led by Graham Peace.

In America, the Single Tax Party decided to enter the national election of 1924. At their convention, Oscar Geiger urged the group to change the name of the Party, since the term "single tax" was a misnomer, and did not suggest all the implications of the Georgeist philosophy of freedom. The name of the Party was thereupon changed to the same as that of their English colleagues—the Commonwealth Land Party. At the same time (January 1924) the SINGLE TAX REVIEW changed its name to LAND AND FREEDOM.

The 1924 candidates were William J. Wallace for President, and John C. Lincoln for Vice-President. The candidates spoke at schools, forums and clubs, and received a good deal of press notice. The vote this time was not formidable, but Georgeists are not easily discouraged. However, this was to be the last nation-wide Single Tax campaign.

Fellow Travellers

A number of famous men, prominent in the political, civic, educational and literary worlds, have endorsed the Georgeist philosophy in one way or another. While these men may perhaps not be termed "Georgeists" in the full sense of the word, they have been "fellow travellers." Accepting Louis F. Post, Joseph Fels, Tom L. Johnson and Samuel Seabury as true followers of George, let us glance at some of our other friends through the pages of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW and LAND AND FREEDOM.

John Dewey, America's foremost philosopher, has often praised Henry George as a great social philosopher. His famous remark on George is quoted on the masthead page of this issue.

Hamlin Garland, the "dean of American letters," was a friend of Henry George, and in the early days appeared often at Georgeist gatherings. At a dinner given in his honor by the Manhattan Single Tax Club, he said: "Today our numbers are legion. The principles enunciated by Mr. George are being applied in a dozen adroit ways; not as 'Single Tax measures,' but under other names. Of this we do not complain. All we ask is to see the work done."

Edwin Markham, beloved American poet, was also often present at Georgeist meetings. His "Man With the Hoe" was reviewed by Joseph Dana Miller—the first review to appear in the East.

Elbert Hubbard, the famous Roycroft and author of the "Scrapbook," was deeply impressed by George, and published a brilliant essay on George's life and teachings. His "Scrapbook" also contains one of Joseph Dana Miller's outstanding pieces of verse, "A Hymn of Hate," in which the horrors of War are decried.

We have already spoken of Leo Tolstoy. As the years went on, Tolstoy was becoming more and more convinced that the Georgeist reform was the salvation of civilization.

George Bernard Shaw has from time to time acknowledged the influence of Henry George on his own ideas. He asserts that this influence was responsible for the founding of the Fabian Society. Of course, Shaw and the Fabians, while acclaiming George, would say "he didn't go far enough."

Many others prominent in the world of letters have endorsed George's views. Brand Whitlock embraced the Georgeist doctrine. Opie Read, the famous novelist, declared himself in favor of Georgeist reform in an interview reported in the REVIEW. Herbert D. Quick, another famous author, endorsed the philosophy, and his last article was written for the REVIEW. Frederic C. Howe and Lincoln Steffens, it has been noted, worked with the Joseph Fels Commission. Helen Keller, Kathleen Norris and many other writers have accepted the truths expounded by Henry George.

In the field of politics, many English statesmen were influenced by George during the first decade of the twentieth century when the English government "declared war on poverty." Outstanding among the measures proposed was land value taxation, endorsed by Lord Asquith, Winston Churchill, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Lloyd George. A later fellow traveller was Philip Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

In America, Supreme Court Justice Louis D. Brandeis was deeply interested in Henry George. He requested M.

N. Norwalk to translate for the SINGLE TAX REVIEW an article on the land question in Palestine, written in Yiddish. Woodrow Wilson seems to have been interested in George. Louis F. Post testifies that Wilson always kept a copy of "Progress and Poverty" on his desk. Col. George W. Goethals, engineer-in-chief of the Panama Canal, was a whole-hearted Georgeist. Surgeon General William C. Gorgas, the medical supervisor of the Panama Canal, declared that most medical problems were due to poverty, and that the solution to poverty was the Single Tax. Herbert Bigelow and Newton D. Baker declared themselves Single Taxers, but said "it is a matter for the future." Albert Einstein, world famous physicist, acknowledges his indebtedness to Henry George for the latter's beautiful synthesis of natural laws.

Henri Lambert, noted Belgian economist, was particularly impressed by Henry George's views on free trade. At the close of the World War he wrote an article for the SINGLE TAX REVIEW on "The Way to Salvation—an Economic Peace." In it he said: "The only remaining chance of salvation for civilization lies in the preservation by England, and the adoption by Germany, France and the United States, of a policy of international economic freedom and morality."

One of the most interesting figures of a couple of decades ago was Raymond Robins, brilliant lecturer, official and unofficial ambassador to many countries. Mr. Robins reported to Joseph Dana Miller an interview he had with Nikolai Lenin, leader of the newly formed Soviet Union. Robins asked Lenin why he did not apply the taxation of land values. Lenin replied: "The proper application of the Georgean taxation of land values is a tax on the mentality of a people and beyond the capacity of a nation not ten percent of whom have learned to read. They cannot understand it. They can only understand socialism at present. Some day, with a higher average intelligence, we may adopt the taxation of land values and enjoy economic freedom, but not now."

Samuel Gompers, founder and first president of the American Federation of Labor, was a close friend of Henry George. However, in an issue of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW (1922), Joseph Dana Miller criticized Gompers for publicly offering palliatives for the solution of the economic problem, such as public works, and not mentioning the Georgeist reform as the real solution. Gompers replied to this criticism as follows: "I have declared and now say that I am a Single Taxer. I believe the Single Tax to be the most practical, effective and generally advantageous tax which can be imposed, but you take me to task because in my article on 'Abolish Unemployment' I did not declare for the Single Tax as a remedy for Unemployment. All I need say in reply is that the organized labor movement cannot

wait for the establishment of the Single Tax system to have our unemployed workmen at work."

In reply to Gompers, Mr. Miller pointed out that the Single Tax had been on the ballot in Oregon and California with many hundreds of thousands of votes; but "it does not appear from the records that Mr. Gompers was impelled to add his enormous influence to increase the vote in these States, yet had he done so, and kept at it, the movement would by this time have been much further advanced than his own program of public works . . . If Mr. Gompers sees the truth as Single Taxers see it, it is his duty to announce it publicly, to proclaim it bravely."

In 1929, Mr. Miller disclosed that Princess Alice of Greece was deeply interested in the Georgeist principles. In an interview, Mrs. Fiske Warren quoted the Greek princess as saying, "A tax on the value of land leads to an open opportunity for every one who works." Princess Alice was collaborating with Pavlos Giannelia (now our French correspondent) in translating Georgeist literature into Greek.

Joseph Dana Miller, the Writer

As we have said, Joseph Dana Miller was greatly respected in the literary world. His style was commended for its pure, simple and rounded quality. His clarity of expression, his mastery of the English language, and his keen comments in both verse and prose, won for him the reputation of being the greatest writer, next to Henry George, in the movement.

Miller was sought after by leading periodicals, here and abroad. Among the articles he wrote for magazines were the following: "The Fallacious Doctrine of Work," *Valley Magazine*; "Theodore Roosevelt and Tom L. Johnson—a Contrast," *The Arena*; "The Income Tax," *Belford's Magazine*; "The Difficulties of Democracy," *International Journal of Ethics* (Miller considered this his best article. Louis Adamic praises it highly in "My America"); "The Single Tax and American Municipalities," *National Municipal Review*; "Has the Single Tax Made Progress," *Dearborn Independent*.

One of Miller's finest achievements was "The Single Tax Year Book." It was a history, statement of principles and study of the application of the single tax. It was a work of nearly 500 pages, edited by Joseph Dana Miller, and published in 1917. This Year Book received many press notices and secured a wide distribution. It was placed in nearly 1000 libraries throughout the world, and many of them deemed it an invaluable source book.

Another of Mr. Miller's volumes appeared under the self-explanatory title, "Thirty Years of Verse Making." This was published in 1926. Mr. Miller insisted on calling his efforts "verse," not "poetry." In this compilation, the cream of many years of work, the verses were classified un-

der the following headings: Poems of Social Aspiration; Tributes to Notables; From the Library; Fields, Woods and Sea; Verses Occasional and Topical; and, In Lighter Vein.

Joseph Dana Miller's writings in LAND AND FREEDOM itself, over a period of four decades, especially his editorials (which appeared successively under the title of "Editorials," "Current Comment," and finally, "Comment and Reflection"), constitute a vast epic commentary on world affairs viewed in the light of fundamental economics.

Aroused over an issue, Miller's pen was something to be reckoned with. When the soldiers returned from the overseas war in 1919, and the Lane Report informed the nation that there was no way in which the soldiers could be replaced in the nation's industrial life, Miller blazed away. "This is the final smirch on America's honor. It makes us the laughing stock of the world. It is our punishment for our betrayal to civilization during three shameful years, for our shallow sentiment, false heroics and theatrical posturing. . . The statesmen who can think of nothing better than to consign our war-worn veterans to the swamp and the desert, are of the same timber as those who allowed the doors of opportunity to close in the rear of the recruits as they left home to defend their country, our own and civilization itself . . . The execrations of posterity will weigh heavy on the memories of those who, with their hands on the helm of state, failed in capacity or duty and guided her upon the rocks."

Mr. Miller proved his awareness of the real forces at work in his comments on the international scene. He said this of the Russian revolution: "We venture the prediction that as the Bolshevik experiment develops, it will be found that its chief contribution to human progress will be its exemplification of the policies to be avoided by nations who wish to improve their social conditions and its complete and triumphal refutation of the sophistries of Karl Marx and his followers." He saw the Fascist revolution in Italy as a reactionary revolution against the radicals then in control. "A resort to physical force by radicals invites the use of force by reactionaries."

Mr. Miller's comments had their humorous side. When the New School for Social Research was established, Miller greeted it thus: ". . . The New School for Social Research is now launched. All questions concerning man's social relations are now in a fair way of being solved. We rejoice at the announcement that 'there will be an attempt at factual rather than normative generalization,' and that 'an attempt will be made to explain the implicit assumptions involved in the prevailing technical treatment of such subjects as frequency distribution, types and averages, measures of dispersion, etc.'

"On Thursdays the Course includes: 'Relation of the theory of errors to statistical theory. Theory and tech-

nique of the mathematical treatment of statistical frequency curves. The statistical problem of two variables. Linear and non-linear correlation. Importance of the equations of the regression lines as representing empirical laws. Etc., etc.'

"We lay down this announcement. Perhaps our levity will seem unpardonable, but we felt like Artemus Ward: 'We busted into tears and resolved to lead a different life—not necessarily a better life, but different.'"

Many of Mr. Miller's articles and editorials were reprinted in pamphlet form, at the request of many readers. Among them were: "Jones' Itemized Rent Bill," "Has the Single Tax Made Progress," "What is it that is Taught as Political Economy," and a keen "Comment and Reflection," written as late as 1938, criticizing President Roosevelt.

The Superlative Twenties

The nineteen-twenties ushered in another period of that hectic "prosperity" that does not deceive Georgeists. But the Georgeists were falling into disrepute. Their dire predictions seemed so fantastic.

Miller and his co-workers struggled valiantly to keep aloft the light of the Georgeist philosophy in its fullness. He strove to recapture that vision and determination which characterized the early days of the movement. He inspired the workers in the movement to carry on.

In those disappointing hours, another light flared on the horizon. In 1925 the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation was established. Robert Schalkenbach, recently deceased, made provision in his will for this Foundation, which was to publish the works of Henry George and encourage such literature as would be helpful in the propagation of the Georgeist philosophy. Mr. Miller joyfully featured this good news in *LAND AND FREEDOM*. It was another milestone in the progress of the movement. It was another step making the movement more clearcut. Henceforth Georgeists would not have to rely on an occasional publisher who would be willing to print George's literature. Here were the resources for doing so, right within the movement. Such steps had to be taken, since Henry George's works were so shamefully neglected by the contemporary publishing houses.

The Schalkenbach bequest provoked many editorials in leading newspapers. An editorial appeared in the *New York Sun*, under the title, "An Odd Bequest." After nebulously "refuting" the Georgeist proposals, the editorial concluded with this strange moral: "Even if the Single Tax were regarded as thoroughly sound by current thought, a will which provides for the indefinite propagation of any given man's set of ideas courts future difficulties . . . Suppose the reforms aimed at are accomplished? . . . Must propaganda in favor of the reform go on and on forever?" Of course this puerile argument could be applied to any work, not excluding the Bible. However, there were many favorable

newspaper editorials on the bequest. The *Brooklyn Eagle* and the *Philadelphia North American* made favorable comment, and asserted that it was a good work.

In 1926 an International Conference was held at Copenhagen, Denmark, sponsored by the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade. Georgeists from seventeen nations convened. One of the steps taken at this Conference was the sending of a message to the League of Nations for the consideration of the Council and Assembly. Another message was sent by the Union a year later on "The Interdependence of the Economic Causes of War and of Industrial Depression." It was addressed to the International Economic Conference of the League of Nations held at Geneva in May, 1927.

The year 1926 marked the inauguration of another series of Georgeist conferences. The Henry George Foundation of America initiated its annual Henry George Congresses, which have been held every year since then. The first Congress was the year of the Sesquicentennial Celebration of the Declaration of Independence, at Philadelphia. The Georgeists convened at that city, and, seizing upon the occasion, issued "A New Declaration of Economic Independence." Another of the Henry George Foundation's accomplishments was the purchasing of Henry George's birthplace in Philadelphia.

1929 was the fiftieth anniversary of the appearance of "Progress and Poverty." It was celebrated by a Fiftieth Anniversary Edition published by the Schalkenbach Foundation; it is the edition still distributed by the Foundation.

In 1929 also was held another International Conference, this time at Edinburgh, Scotland. Georgeists from twenty-four nations convened and reported activities and progress throughout the world. Engineer D. de Clerq spoke on the reclamation of the Zuider Zee, which was being organized along Georgeist lines. The land was to be leased by the government, and the government had refused to sell the reclaimed land. In Denmark, steady progress in land value taxation was reported, as well as in Australia, New Zealand, and municipalities in many other countries.

While in Great Britain for this Conference, Mrs. Anna George de Mille, daughter of Henry George, stopped at London for an interview with Philip Snowden at 11 Downing Street. She reported the interview in *LAND AND FREEDOM*: "Although he spoke conservatively and couched his statements in diplomatic phrases that made neither promises nor guarantees, I hold the firm conviction that we are going to see our beliefs fought for in the open political fields in England, and that Philip Snowden will be in the frontline trenches, directing the campaign." It was only two years later that the battle for the separate valuation of land and improvements was fought in Parliament, with Snowden leading the battle.

Henry George School of Social Science

During the dark days of the early depression, there was a man with a vision, who decided that now was the time to realize his dream. The man was Oscar H. Geiger—treasurer and editorial associate of *LAND AND FREEDOM*—and the dream was an institution where the philosophy of Henry George might be taught. He consulted Joseph Dana Miller, who enthusiastically endorsed the idea. And so, on January 1, 1932, the Henry George School of Social Science was founded, with Oscar H. Geiger as Director.

At first the School did not appear to be an institution at all—it was just Mr. Geiger lecturing here and there, under the auspices of the Manhattan Single Tax Club and the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. But the faith of Messrs. Geiger and Miller was that it would grow and become a great and influential institution. The office of *LAND AND FREEDOM* was adopted as headquarters of the School.

The March-April 1932 issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM* carried a feature story of the School and an ardent plea that Georgeists support this new and worthy venture. "At the Henry George Congress in Baltimore," wrote Miller, "Dr. Mark Millikin, who is one of the sponsors of the new movement, suggested the founding of a Henry George University. Here is the beginning that may eventuate in the establishment of such a university."

The School and its educational program was enthusiastically received by Georgeists throughout the country. The financial support, however, was somewhat disappointing, but Mr. Geiger, moved by a deep faith, carried on and struggled to build the School on firm and secure foundations. At great personal sacrifice he devoted almost his entire savings to keep the venture alive, and pure. He was truly a martyr.

The School grew, so that in each succeeding issue of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, more and more progress could be reported. "Mr. Geiger seems determined to make the School a United Movement Effort rather than a one-man institution." "If success is the accomplishment of what one sets out to do, the Henry George School of Social Science can surely be accounted a success." But it must not be thought that Mr. Geiger was so engrossed with the educational program of the School that he had no interest in the larger purpose of the institution. He constantly iterated that the School was "but a means to an end, i.e., the attainment of our reforms."

Through the issues of *LAND AND FREEDOM*, we trace the growth of this School. Step by step it unfolded. A Board of Trustees was organized. It secured a Charter from the New York State Board of Regents. John Dewey consented to be its Honorary President. Within a year it had larger headquarters at 211 West 79th Street, New York City. "An address that is the making of an epoch," Mr. Miller called

it. Classes were held every day, with Mr. Geiger as instructor and "Progress and Poverty" as the text-book. The students, fired with the enthusiasm imparted by their master, formed a Student Alumni Council, headed by Helen D. Denbigh, and conceived of a Henry George Fellowship which was to rally all the followers of Henry George together. "The students have taken hold!" Miller wrote joyfully in *LAND AND FREEDOM*.

Oscar H. Geiger, the Founder and Director, passed away June, 1934. But he lived long enough to see the beginning of an assured growth. "The School must go on!" was the watchword of Oscar Geiger's loyal followers. The Student Alumni Council, the Henry George Fellowship, all rallied together to continue the great educational work. They were the true apostles of the Founder.

The founding of the Henry George School of Social Science was another milestone in the progress of the Henry George movement. It was another step in the clarification of the movement. It was another of the resources the followers of Henry George were creating in order to carry the movement to success. Since Henry George had been unjustly ignored by institutions of learning, a special institution had to be founded devoted to filling what Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown calls "the void in college curricula."

Year by year the Henry George School continued growing. An increasing number of students took its courses, an increasing number of *leaders* were made. Extensions of the School were established in cities and towns all over the country. Its fame spread to other nations. Georgeists in Canada, England, Denmark and Australia emulated the School and its educational program. In Canada, a School of Economic Science was launched. England took the name of Henry George School of Social Science. In Australia it was the New South Wales School of Social Science. In Denmark it was the Okoteknisk Højskole. The Henry George School method also influenced such later Georgeist organizations as We, the Citizens, and the School of Democracy.

The idea of the Henry George Fellowship was enthusiastically taken up by graduates of the Henry George School in various cities. Chapters of the Fellowship were formed, and a Federated Fellowship was established. Joseph Dana Miller saw this as a step toward the goal of a United Movement Effort. He wrote: "Disproving the old theory that the Single Taxers were too individualistic to organize and achieve their common goal, the Federated Chapters of the Henry George Fellowship have demonstrated that Georgeists can and will cooperate."

Today the Henry George School occupies a large 5-story building at 30 East 29th Street, New York City, with Mr. Frank Chodorov as Director. The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation also has its offices in the same structure.

Unto the End

From the heights, as a spiritual leader of the Henry George movement, the aging Joseph Dana Miller continued with undiminished zeal and ability to chronicle the epic of a mighty movement to free mankind. The hands trembled a little, the eyes were somewhat dimmed—but the mind was as clear, the pen as keen as ever. The parade went by . . . The Henry George School was growing. In California, most persistent center of political action, Judge Jackson Ralston was waging a campaign to repeal the sales tax and substitute a land value tax. Overseas, the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade was spreading its influence despite darkening clouds on the international scene. The old controversies within the movement were again being waged: To organize or not to organize; is interest justified; is political action premature; the School of 1897 versus an improved and modernized science of economics; etc., etc.

And Joseph Dana Miller, venerable sage, was growing more kindly, more tolerant. Around him, the Samuel Johnson of the movement, the Georgeists flocked. They were all his children, all working for the same cause. Let them all have their say. Something good will come out of it.

The November-December 1938 issue was the last number of *LAND AND FREEDOM* edited by Joseph Dana Miller. As long as he was able he appeared every day at the office. After that issue, ebbing health did not permit him to continue. But this, his last issue—did it show any signs of decline, or senility? Let us glance at it:—A powerful editorial on the current trend toward collectivism, and a clarion call to return to Liberty—a clear-headed evaluation of organization and political action, and a plea for unified Georgeist effort—the story of the California campaign by Jackson Ralston—an article by Benjamin W. Burger demonstrating the possibility of collecting the rent of land under existing Federal laws—the program of the newly formed Tax Relief Association, an organization intended to interest business men, by Victor A. Rule—and the news of the Georgeist movement throughout the world.

During Mr. Miller's last illness in the early part of 1939, the business and editing of *LAND AND FREEDOM* was assumed by Charles Jos. Smith, who now conducts the enterprise as Trustee under the last will and testament of the Founder. Mr. Smith enjoys the collaboration of his co-editors, Mr. Jos. Hiram Newman and Mr. Robert Clancy.

On May 8, 1939, Joseph Dana Miller passed away. The May-June 1939 number was devoted to his memory. Tributes poured in from every part of the world. They were followed by a ringing appeal that *LAND AND FREEDOM* should continue the work of the Founder. And it has,

L'Envoi

LAND AND FREEDOM, after Miller's death, continued to be just what it had been in the past—the voice of the Henry George movement. If the world wished to know what was the status of the Georgeist cause, it might turn to the pages of this journal.

With the clouds of world conflict again darkening Georgeists from all over the world convened at New York in 1939 to celebrate the Centenary of Henry George. It was fateful that September 2nd, the hundredth anniversary of the birth of that great economist and social philosopher should witness the outbreak of a cataclysm that he prophesied would engulf our civilization.

With these terrible world events accumulating, *LAND AND FREEDOM* continues to perform its mission, continues the tradition of Joseph Dana Miller. It continues to exhort the people to turn to Liberty while there is yet time. It stands for the philosophy of Henry George in all its power. And it stands for a United Effort on the part of all who embrace the philosophy of freedom to pull together for the great work of leading the Georgeist reform to success—the only salvation for mankind.

L & F and the Biosophical Institute

WE have been fortunate in making the acquaintance of the Biosophical Institute, an organization devoted to peace and character education. The Institute welcomes all views that tend toward better understanding and more peaceful relations among men. In keeping with such a policy, it has offered its radio facilities to this journal and already we have been on the air twice, over Station WLTH, New York City.

Pleased with our radio presentation of the Georgeist philosophy, Mr. Francis Merchant, Program Director, invited us to give a talk before a group which meets weekly at the headquarters of the Institute. For this occasion, Mr. Robert Clancy and Mr. Charles Jos. Smith engaged in a dialogue before an audience of about 75 persons. The dialogue was based upon "You and America's Future," the pamphlet prepared by Robert Clancy and William W. Newcomb. The audience appeared well pleased with the presentation, showing remarkable intelligence in the type of questions put to the speakers after the dialogue.

We feel that a fine relationship has been established, and we endorse the lofty purposes of the Biosophical Institute. Its headquarters are at the Hotel Dauphin, 67th Street and Broadway, in New York City.