

September — October, 1920

# Single Tax Review

AN INTERNATIONAL RECORD OF SINGLE TAX PROGRESS

FOUNDED IN 1901

The Single Tax Party's Campaign  
in the Nation

Interview With Candidate Macauley

Bruce Bliven in *New York Globe*

## Editorials

Bolshevism or Sanity—The Striking Power of Third Parties—Replies  
to the Committee of 48—The Foundations of Our Enthusiasm—Is  
There a Law of Social Progress?

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00

SINGLE COPIES 20 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

## What "The Single Tax Review" Stands For

**L**AND is a free gift of nature, like air, like sunshine. Men ought not to be compelled to pay other men for its use. The right to its use is, if you please, a natural right, because arising out of the nature of man, or if you do not like the term, an equal right, equal in that it should be shared alike. This is no new discovery, for it is lamely and imperfectly recognized by primitive man (in the rude forms of early land communism) and lamely and imperfectly by all civilized communities (in laws of "eminent domain" and similar powers exercised by the State over land). All points of view include more or less dimly this conception of the peculiar nature of land as the inheritance of the human race, and not a proper subject for barter and sale.

The principle having been stated, we come now to the method, the Single Tax, the taking of the annual rent of land—what it is worth each year for use—by governmental agency, and the payment out of this fund for those functions which are supported and carried on in common—maintenance of highways, police and fire protection, public lighting, schools, etc. Now if the value of land were like other values this would not be a good method for the end in view. That is, if a man could take a plot of land as he takes a piece of wood, and fashioning it for use as a commodity give it a value by his labor, there would be no special reason for taxing it at a higher rate than other things, or singling it out from other taxable objects. But land, without the effort of the individual, grows in value with the community's growth, and by what the community does in the way of public improvements. This value of land is a value of community advantage, and the price asked for a piece of land by the owner is the price of community advantage. This advantage may be an excess of production over other and poorer land determined by natural fertility (farm land) or nearness to market or more populous avenues for shopping, or proximity to financial mart, shipping or railroad point (business centers), or because of superior fashionable attractiveness (residential centers). But all these advantages are social, community-made, not a product of labor, and in the price asked for its sale or use, a manifestation of community-made value. Now in a sense the value of everything may be ascribed to the presence of a community, with an important difference. Land differs in this, that neither in itself nor in its value is it the product of labor, for labor cannot produce more land in answer to demand, but can produce more houses and food and clothing, whence it arises that these things cost less where population is great or increasing, and land is the only thing that costs more.

To tax this land at its true value is to equalize all people-made advantages (which in their manifestation as value attach only to land), and thus secure to every man that equal right to land which has been contended for at the outset of this definition.—JOSEPH DANA MILLER. Condensed from SINGLE TAX YEAR BOOK.

## SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING CO., at 150 Nassau Street, New York

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

*Advisory Editorial Board*

WILLIAM J. WALLACE, New Jersey      R. C. BARNUM, Ohio  
 ROY R. WATERBURY, California      FAY LEWIS, Illinois  
 K. P. ALEXANDER, Arkansas      DR. T. E. BULLARD, New York  
 G. J. FOYER, Ohio      JEROME C. REIS, Penn.      GERRIT J. JOHNSON, Mich.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$1.00 per year. Payable in advance.

Entered as Second-class Matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

### SEPTEMBER — OCTOBER, 1920

VOL. XX

No. 5. WHOLE No. 102

#### SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

CANADA: Sydenham Thompson, 195 Hillsdale avenue, Toronto.  
 ENGLAND: Fred. Skirrow, Yorkshire, and A. W. Madsen, London.  
 GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.  
 AUSTRALIA: Ernest Bray, Corowa, New South Wales.  
 NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.  
 ARGENTINE: Dr. Maspero Castro, Buenos Aires.  
 URUGUAY: Dr. Felix Vitale, Montevideo.  
 SPAIN: Antonio Albendin, Zamora.  
 DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.  
 BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.  
 PORTUGAL: Dr. Herrera y Reissig, Uruguyan Legation, Lisbon.  
 MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade.

#### INDEX TO CONTENTS

CURRENT COMMENT.....	131
EDITORIALS .....	133
AN INSPIRING WORD FROM THE CANDIDATE.....	138
SINGLE TAX CANDIDATE ARRAIGNS OUR LAND SYSTEM .....	<i>Bruce Bliven in New York Globe</i> 139
PROGRESS OF THE CAMPAIGN.....	145
STATES WHERE WE FIGHT FOR AMENDMENTS.....	151
A GLEAM OF REASON IN NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE.....	153
NOTIFICATION DINNER TO R. C. MACAULEY.....	154
NEWS—FOREIGN.....	155
THE REVIEW TO ITS READERS.....	157
CORRESPONDENCE .....	157
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....	158

## PUBLISHER'S NOTES

**W**E want a correspondent in every city in the United States, relating the doings of Single Taxers in their vicinity, lectures, etc., and giving all the editorial comments that may appear, favorable or unfavorable, on the Single Tax.

**T**HOSE whose subscriptions expire with this issue are asked to remit promptly.

**N**OTE the premium offer to anyone sending in 5 subscriptions, on back page of this issue.



# The Single Tax Review

VOL. XX

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1920

No. 5

## Current Comment

THE Single Tax Party placed in nomination at Chicago a presidential ticket. The candidates of the party are Robert C. Macauley, of Pennsylvania, and R. C. Barnum, of Ohio. Single Taxers who believe that the principle of the land for the people takes precedence of all other questions—and what Single Taxer does not?—can have no conceivable reason for voting any other ticket in those States where it is possible to cast their ballots for Macauley and Barnum. The States where Single Tax presidential electors will appear on the ballot are as follows: Maine, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Nebraska, Rhode Island, Connecticut and Massachusetts. A great deal of hard work was necessary to get on the ballot in these States, and for this the Party's organizers, James A. Robinson and Jerome C. Reis, working with the local Single Taxers, deserve much credit.

THE great bulk of Single Taxers in these States, will, we have no doubt, vote the Single Tax ticket. They will find it impossible to justify themselves in adopting any other course. If there were other questions which they might persuade themselves were of any real importance, sophistry might justify a contrary course, though it would have to be a very subtle kind of sophistry. For to the Single Taxer who would do this there would be an uneasy knocking at the door of his conscience. Election day is a momentous day to the man who holds a political conviction as a religious principle, and what Single Taxer does not? When the door of the voting booth closes upon him he is face to face with the gravest responsibility. He is in the presence of the Holiest of Holies—and we say this in reverent apprehension of all that we hold of profoundest import. What can be more sacred than the duty he has now to perform—that of signing, as a member of the Commonwealth, in the solemn sanctuary of the polling booth, his declaration of faith in the principle on which depends the security of mankind, the rescue of toiling millions, the happiness of little children?

IT is not conceivable that a doubt should arise at this time, and at such an impressive juncture, between the Single Tax voter and his conscience. How least of all at this time!—now, when the little that is of value in civilization, won by the struggles of heroic martyrs, seems slipping from us, when the pillars of the house are shaken by a thousand ominous upheavals, when all men distrust the stability of things, and all property rights tremble in the balance. The world is full of futile and sordid revolutions

that can accomplish nothing and result in nothing but confusion and the despotisms of temporary majorities, swinging now one way and now the other, and paving the way for some modern Cæsar to override all liberty in a carnival of despotism.

WHAT shall the voter do at this time? Above all what shall the Single Taxer do? Can he hesitate for an instant? The Land Question must be brought into politics. Neither of the two old parties show any disposition to do so. A continuing vote for the Single Tax will make it an issue, *the* issue. Nothing will do it but a direct vote for the Single Tax. We can educate all we may, even continuing to add to our numbers, but this will not count until there be a political register of the converts we make. Men must speak through the ballot; only then is their voice really potent for the change of institutions. All other methods are uncertain, incalculable and dubious. All other methods ask us to wait for a more propitious season to do—what? To speak through the ballot, of course. For is not this the ultimate and avowed end of all our educational propaganda? Are forty years not enough to wait and work for the time to begin to work in the only way that is possible to achieve our ends?

ELIHU ROOT in an address in London presenting the Saint-Gaudens statue of Lincoln as a gift from the American to the British people, spoke of "those conceptions of liberty and justice which have been the formative power that has brought all America, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to order its life according to the course of common law, to assert its popular sovereignty through representative government—Britain's gift to the political science of the world—and to establish the relations of individual citizenship to the State on the basis of the inalienable rights which governments are established to secure."

THIS is well said. But what profits it if these words, kept to the ear, are broken to the hope? What are "the inalienable rights which governments are established to secure?" Our Declaration of Independence declares that among the inalienable rights are "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Is the enjoyment of these rights possible where a few own the earth? Do not these owners then control the right of liberty and the pursuit of happiness by others? Is not the very right of life of the landless in their hands were they disposed to exercise it? If men can live only on land and from land, would not a notice of eviction, could it be enforced, be tantamount to a sentence of death? Accepting unreservedly the unrestricted power

of private ownership of the planet, does not the right to life or death of the multitude rest in the hands of those who own the earth?

**W**HY do the Great Ideals seem destined to become the Illusions? We have gone through a period of stress such as the world has never known. In the compulsion of that stress, in the peril of the world's great necessity, a dream was born. The world should be made "safe for democracy." Out of the welter of death and blood and misery should arise a new civilization. It was "a war to end war." "The parliament of man, the federation of the world," seemed on the point of being realized.

**P**RESIDENT WILSON was the spokesman of this dream, and when the clouds of partisanship have faded away, and his own errors of judgment (and they were many) are forgotten, history will not grudge him a place among the prophets of a better time. Twenty millions of the world's noblest and best are dust on a hundred battlefields, twenty millions more are maimed and crippled. Many men and women have been animated by the high thought of a great turning point in the history of civilization. The dream made them stern for battle and enabled them to face death with a calm indifference. Then the war came to an end, and with it the Dream. The hope of the world lay in fragments. The war instead of ending war seemed to many to plant the seeds of other and greater wars. The League of Nations looked to some like an attempt on the part of the victors to strengthen their imperialistic claims. It matters little whether this was actually true or not; the fact that it was so regarded was sufficient. Suspicion was in the air. Charges and counter-charges were bandied back and forth. Labor, realizing its own immense political power, looks upon the whole thing with ill-disguised indifference. And so the dream dies; the Great Federation must wait.

**N**EEED we wonder that this Great Ideal has turned out to be the Great Illusion? The opening of the war was itself the death of another great ideal. For years we had considered this age of ours the humanitarian era. We had looked upon the time as marking the end of war, the era of good feeling among nations. Never before in the history of the world had the energies of men been so effectively directed to the amelioration of human suffering. Never before had social ideals and pleas of social reform interested so many persons. The teachings of philanthropic socialism, of State aid to the needy, of relief to the poor, the unfortunate and distressed, became an important part of the people's education. Organized charity extended its benefactions to the darkest corners; help to the unfortunate was preached as a duty in pulpit and in the popular magazines. The world was growing in kindness and helpful ministrations.

**S**UDDENLY the Dream was broken. The tramp of the gray legions into Belgium at the command of the

German military power broke the spell. And in the welter of blood that followed in those four dreadful years another Great Ideal had become a Great Illusion.

**W**HAT is the matter with the world? Why must the Great Ideals become the Great Illusions? The answer is simpler than the so-called wise, the statesmen momentarily elevated to high positions, can reveal to us. The troubles of the world are not political, they are economic. Men are not free; they are pawns upon the chessboard of their masters, the slaves of the ignorant and designing; the creatures and playthings of politicians. They are the victims of their own delusions regarding their dependence upon the State, upon government, upon politicians, upon capital, upon employers, upon landowners. They are the lords of the earth, but accept the servile badge of dependents. The earth belongs of right to them; they have allowed it to be apportioned out to the few, and hence the predicament in which they find themselves. Living by production they obey the commands of their military masters to destroy their associates in production; living by co-operation with other peoples, they accept the malevolent doctrine that they can live better by going to war with them. Existing by trade, they nevertheless consent to the erection of barriers that make trade more difficult, and defend it by a curious system of teaching which is called National Political Economy.

They have consented to the greatest of all barriers that fence them off from the use of the earth, so that other barriers more or less do not greatly matter to them; and because their condition is one of slavery, the teaching that they are dependent upon governmental devices comes with great plausibility. It serves well the policies of so-called statesmen, who can marshal them for the purposes of conquest, military or political, and for schemes of domestic aggression, or pure buncombe. This is the explanation of the apparent indifference of political leaders to the intelligence of those they are supposed to "serve."

**T**HE Great Ideal of a world made "safe for democracy" died because the defects in human society and economic institutions were deliberately ignored. Man is not economically free; political readjustments therefore must rest upon an unsound economic superstructure, in which they bend to every wind that blows. To ignore this is to ignore the most potent fact in human relations; to attempt to rebuild political institutions, while ignoring the economic blunders of the past which demand immediate rectification, is to build upon quicksands.

**TO ABOLISH SLUMS:** Stop taxing buildings, improvements. Tenement owners can then afford to erect better buildings. Tax building sites, used or unused. Then owners cannot afford not to erect better buildings.

**TO DEVELOP MANUFACTURES:** Stop taxing buildings, machinery, raw materials and products. Tax factory sites, used or unused.

## Bolshevism or Sanity

THE experiment now going on in Russia, regarding which the most intelligent and intelligible account has come from Hon. Bertrand Russell, is simply communism in action. It is a try-out of that kind of economic government that comes of reaction. It demands even for temporary success the dictatorship of the strong hand. Lenine appears to furnish *that*, and Trotsky is his left arm.

A system of long continued injustice must result in one of two things. Either the injustice must be supplanted by justice, or the victims of economic oppression seize power by revolution. The Russian workmen appear to have done this. That they should have tried an experiment in democracy was impossible, or wildly improbable. Democracy requires an apprenticeship—this the Russians lacked. Czarism breeds czarism and Lenine succeeds Nicholas, a perfectly natural succession. The Russian is an idealist without practicability—even Tolstoy thought it necessary to illustrate an economic revolution by personal sacrifice that advertised his own eccentricity rather than the great ideal for which he stood.

Russia is the natural home of violent economic reaction, and furnishes a hospitable experiment station for just the kind of economic society that has grown up almost in the twinkling of an eye. That it should have happened anywhere else is hardly thinkable.

Yet—and this is spoken as a friendly warning to the conservatives of this country—the influence of such a system, with active or secret propaganda agents in every great center, with the support of parlor radicals whose mushy economic thinking leaves them incapable of virile conclusions, is bound to produce *some* results. That this tendency is with us, and may go from more to more, is not unlikely. The demands of the Socialist Party and the Farmer-Labor Party should give the conservative press and public, the small and large business men, serious pause. The almost pathetic ineffectualness of Harding and Cox and Coolidge to meet this particular issue cannot be very reassuring to the conservative. Mr. Coolidge's statement that these ideas are "importations" is illustrative of the feeble way that the party leaders seek to parry these assaults on our institutions. Their statements that property is inviolable is hardly a satisfactory answer to those who question its inviolability. These institutions are subjects of serious questioning, and the equity of their standing is under scrutiny. No mere *obiter dicta*, no talk of property rights, of imported foreign ideas, will avail. These critics have an economic "reform" which they propose to submit to the non-propertied classes—about ninety per cent. of the people—for the overthrow of all this. Talk of American principles does not interest them—especially as their opponents do not trouble themselves to define what these principles are. Nor are they concerned whether the ideas they hold are "imported" or not—they are free traders when it comes to ideas. Cries of "confiscation" do not frighten them—indeed it is confiscation they are bent upon, and they

are indifferent or wholly ignorant of the immorality of their proposals.

Now in this there is food for thought to all those who wish well to their country. To the wild schemes of the anarchist and Bolshevik and the milder claims of the Socialist, there is, in fact, an answer. It is furnished in the Single Tax. It meets the assaults upon all property with the explanation that that which is really property should be secure from all attack and even from governmental contribution. It would take for government the economic rent of land created by the people, leaving the product of the individual's industry and enterprise untaxed. It satisfies the claim of those who ask for nothing but what they earn, and it takes from none the wealth in their possession. And it leaves to them all the wealth they can produce in the future.

What more, or rather what less, can the owner of wealth, the business man, the employer of labor ask for? He hears everywhere the suggestions that smack of confiscation. Wildly or mildly communistic proposals are formulated in the demands of the new political parties. State and Federal taxation levy an ever increasing tribute upon the earnings of capital and labor. Government regulation and control, as part of our war policy, continues in time of peace to further hamper industrial movements. Between the socialism of government and the further socialism that is proposed by forces ready to seize the reins, the business man is confronted by perils on every side.

Is it not about time he stopped to think? The Single Tax would take away the vexatious imposts, the irritating inquisitions of tax departments, the legislation of operation and control by government—at all events, it would make nearly all such regulation and control unnecessary. It would remove the menace of socialism in front of him. It would take nothing from him save the opportunity to speculate in the needs of his fellow men. It would take nothing for government save what is produced by the people in common, the economic rent of land that is due to their presence and activities. It would remove forever the dangers of communism, save and perhaps that sort of communism, which none need fear, that might be indulged in by groups within themselves and for their own satisfaction, and from motives arising from feelings of Christian fellowship as a result of the increased production that would follow from a free earth.

Is it not worth while thinking about?

TO GIVE labor full freedom; to make wages what they ought to be, the full earnings of labor; to secure work for all and leisure for all, and abundance for all; to enable all to enjoy the advantages and blessings of an advanced civilization—we must break down all monopolies and destroy all special privileges.—HENRY GEORGE.

TO DEVELOP YOUR CITY: Stop taxing industry and commerce. Tax land values only.



## The Committee of 48 Issues a Statement

A STATEMENT has been issued by Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins, entitled "Facts About the Chicago Conference." These facts are by this time pretty well known. The managers of the 48 Convention brought to Chicago certain chemical elements and attempted to combine them with other elements impossible of combination. The result was an explosion, and the managers have been busy ever since trying to reconstruct the ruined house out of the bits of wreckage that remain.

Mr. Hopkins reviews the various attempts at conciliation between the conference committees of the 48ers and the Labor groups. It is clear that somebody had blundered. The story is told in the SINGLE TAX REVIEW for July-August. Mr. Hopkins tells it in the following paragraph:

In the natural course of procedure the report of the sub-committee would go to the two Platform Committees for consideration and from these bodies to the Convention floor. The report of the Platform Sub-Committee was not considered by our Platform Committee and was not by that body reported to our Convention. The clock was moving rapidly toward the moment when the Convention of the Committee of Forty-Eight had voted to move to Carmen's Hall. George Record, Chairman of our Platform Committee, hurried to the Convention floor to make a report of what had occurred. In the midst of this report, he was interrupted by the Chairman of our Convention who gave the floor to Max Hayes who appeared to welcome our delegates to Carmen's Hall. This consumed the remaining time and our Convention *adjourned without understanding the situation which had developed in the Platform Sub-Committee Conference.*

The readers are asked to note the italicized portion. The italics are ours. If the neophyte in politics inquires how it was that a great convention was permitted to adjourn "without understanding the situation" he will have to be told that the leaders of the 48ers were hopeless amateurs against the men representing the Labor Convention who knew what they wanted and how to get it.

But not all the members of that convention were in ignorance of the situation. The men who were not for an instant deceived were the Single Tax Party delegates to the Convention, and many other Single Taxers not members of the party. They saw the Convention hopelessly floundering; they saw groups of diverse and irreconcilable political and economic affiliations at loggerheads, and they saw the Convention melt away, as they predicted it would, when confronted by the sterner, overpowering convictions of men strong in purpose and united in their demands.

The lesson can be repeated whenever desired. The cause given by Mr. Hopkins for what happened is not the true one. He does not even hint at it. He thinks and says: "The responsibility for the failure must rest with those Labor leaders whose vision was narrowed and who could not see beyond the confines of the infinitesimally

small section of the organized labor which they represented." He does not seem to see that the Farmer-Labor Party did not fail, but did just what it went to Chicago to do. It formed a political party. It matters not whether this party is large or small. It carried its programme through victoriously, and the estimable *bourgeoisie* composing the Committee of 48, for whom these hardened persons never had anything but the most thinly veiled contempt, melted away when the burning glass at Carmen's Hall turned its fierce intensive rays toward the Hotel Morrison.

We say the experiment can be repeated whenever desired. Apparently the Committee of 48 desire to repeat it. A burnt child dreads the fire only in the old-fashioned copybooks. Mr. Hopkins still thinks an amalgamation possible on the basis of the St. Louis platform. That platform has a labor plank for collective bargaining; labor laughs at it. It has a plank for government ownership of railroads and public utilities; the Socialists are already in the field and go the 48ers a lot better. It has a Single Tax plank, or a plank for the taxation of idle land to force it into use; the Single Tax Party is in the field with a full Single Tax programme. The St. Louis platform is a painfully strained dilution of issues that are now before the country, presented by men who are not afraid of their convictions. The programme of the 48 Committee is chiefly interesting to the disembodied ghosts of the Chartists of the early 40's.

The world may lag a trifle—but "*e pur si muove.*" It has moved tremendously in the last few years. It has moved somewhat since the date of the St. Louis conference. A presidential campaign is on and no one is wildly excited about it. Harding and Cox fail even to amuse. The Ohio of William McKinley was never an exciting State, but it is not a patch on the Ohio of Harding and Cox for the deadly dull. The Farmer-Labor Party, on its part, does not even ripple the sea of things.

Now why? It is because the voter is tired of asking for bread and receiving a stone. The time is here for a real voice, a genuine conviction, a party that will assure something to the voter, and not continue to insult his intelligence with platitudes.

Sincere men like the members of the Committee of 48 who are individualistic in their inclinations and philosophy must make up their minds to adopt an attitude consistent with their convictions and professions. The strength of the Farmer-Labor group at Chicago was their determination to stand for what they wanted, and that was the strength of the Single Tax Party members. And by the way, why does not Mr. Hopkins speak of *them*? Why does he not tell their part of the drama enacted at Chicago? Does he not know that the Single Tax Party has made nominations? And we put to him this very pertinent question: Why is he silent about the nominations made at Chicago by the Single Tax Party in view of the fact that 70 per cent. of the answers to the Questionnaire

sent out previous to the Chicago Convention voted to make the land question the paramount issue of the platform?

We have long suspected that Mr. Hopkins cares more for parties than he does for issues, and this silence is the proof of it. He wants a third party, as if there were some particular virtue in being a third party. We repeat that 70 per cent. of the 48 membership voted by questionnaire to make the land question paramount; why does he not tell that element of the membership who will receive this communication what the Single Tax Party did at Chicago, and that they answered by their action the desires of nearly three-quarters of the former adherents of the Committee of 48?

## The Mystery of Amos Pinchot

IN the *Freeman*, of August 18, Mr. Amos Pinchot reviews the causes of the debacle that resulted in the elimination of the Committee of 48 and the formation of the Farmer-Labor Party. He points out that the party is controlled by Socialists and is purely a second—and in this case a secondary—Socialist Party.

The position of Mr. Pinchot is well stated where he opposes the "collectivism" of the new party. He is not sufficiently emphatic in stating his own convictions, and he might have elaborated to advantage. But he does not leave his readers in doubt. He speaks of the necessity of increasing the demand for labor by opening up the land and the natural resources, and thus bringing about a situation where there is more industry, more jobs than men to fill them, and consequently where "labor will have its bargaining power restored and strengthened."

This is explicit enough. Mr. Pinchot is a Single Taxer, of course, and of course, too, his place is in the Single Tax Party as one of its leaders.

The mystery of the whole matter remains, however, which is that he should cling to the hope of a third party that will not put this principle to which he accords chief importance in the forefront. His political associations with the Hards, Malones, Bucks and Max Hayes is of all things the most incongruous.

More incongruous still and most incredible, too, in a man of his political intelligence, is his faith in the dream, now shattered into fragments, that sought to erect the foundations of a political party out of the material gathered together in Chicago. The combination of

"Moses and Aaron  
Paul Jones and old Charon,"

was not a marker to it, and this was the aggregation with which otherwise seriously-minded men like Mr. Hopkins, Mr. Pinchot, and Mr. McCurdy, sought to challenge the compact, splendidly-equipped and ably led organizations of the Republican and Democratic Parties. Did ever human folly go further?

But of the causes of the failure to form a third party at

Chicago Mr. Pinchot is strangely silent. He seems to imagine, also strangely enough, that if it had been possible to organize a third party without the collectivist doctrines of those who formed the Farmer-Labor Party and composed of men entertaining the convictions of Messrs. Record, Hopkins and McCurdy—and he mentions these names—a third party would have resulted that would have been a not unimportant factor in the presidential campaign of this year.

We say this is a curious illusion. Because if it be desirable that a third party be formed that shall meet the views of those opposed to Socialism it must not be merely a party that does not contain socialistic planks in its platform, but it must frankly antagonize the whole theory of Socialism. It must not only be individualistic, but it must know why it is individualistic. Merely to oppose the propaganda of state socialism is not enough; it must have a programme that shall boldly declare that it will do as much or more than state socialism, without the dangers that inhere in government ownership and control.

Such a party must be led, too, by men free from the suspicion of holding socialistic views. Mr. Pinchot's confession that LaFollette's name was used as a club to compel the minimizing of the demands of the socialists in the Committee of 48, is the disclosure of a fact that was not unsuspected in Chicago. But that these men should have thought that LaFollette could have led such a party does little credit to their political sagacity. LaFollette's name is associated in the public mind with quite other issues and causes than the opposition to socialism.

Doubtless the inclination to repeat the disastrous experiment enacted in Chicago will persist until men learn better, though it would seem that the lesson had already been sufficiently driven in. Mr. Pinchot sees clearly the economic laws the recognition of which is essential to the prosperity and happiness of the people. He is the most hopeful of all the members of the late gathering at Chicago, though others are hardly less so. Why cannot they accord their political with their economic convictions? The times are calling insistently for a political leadership that will demand the restoration of men's rights to the land they live in. The Single Tax Party, as it now exists, few in number but strong in purpose and enthusiasm, is the beginning. Why will Amos Pinchot and men like him hesitate? Why halt timidly at the parting of the ways when thus

"The native hue of resolution  
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought  
And enterprises of great pith and moment,  
With this regard, their currents turn awry  
And lose the name of action."

BREAK yourself of a bad habit. Stop throwing your vote away. You're not at a race track placing a bet on what you hope will be the winning horse. Even there you have a chance to win once in a while, but what chance have you got by voting for the old parties?



## The Striking Efficacy Of Third Parties

WE sometimes hear men say: "We do not believe in third parties." Some Single Taxers have been heard to say this. If by this is to be understood the powerlessness of third parties to force the issues they stand for on other parties, then to doubt their efficacy is to misread much of American political history. For third parties, or side parties, as they are sometimes called, have been tremendously effective instruments for the organization of public thought in the accomplishment of many important reforms.

The latest manifestation in this direction is the work of the Prohibition Party now concluded in the complete triumph for the principle contended for. It matters not if its full fruition saw the Prohibition Party melting away, and that even before this its place was largely supplanted by the Anti-Saloon League. The Prohibition Party had done its work; that work was one of education undertaken at the polls, where only political principles are effectively expounded. Whatever our views regarding the principle of Prohibition may be, that principle has triumphed temporarily, at least—by the third party method pursued for nearly fifty years, even before the election of Neal Dow as governor of Maine. State Prohibition parties had existed for some time previous to the formation of the National Prohibition Party. It is interesting to note the figures of the several elections. In 1872 its first presidential candidate received 5,068 votes; in 1876, 9,759; in 1880, 11,460; in 1884, 151,070, and in 1888, 244,034. To the vote in 1884 is attributed the defeat of the Republican Party, the bulk of the vote being drawn from that party.

The vote thus growing made more and more Prohibitionists of individual voters (from conscientious motives) and of politicians (from motives of self-preservation) until the principle finally triumphed in the nation.

The history of the Populist Party is instructive for those who "do not believe in third parties," as powerful aids in making political questions political issues. Many of these despised issues were adopted by the two old parties, and, its work accomplished, the Populist Party abdicated.

The history of the Socialist Party is also instructive. Its victories have been notable—both the two old parties, while affecting to despise socialism, have become more and more socialistic. The political power of the Socialist Party has never been greatly impressive, but its influence has been enormous. As a third party it has done an educational work which only the thoughtless will despise.

Going back a little further into history, let us take the question of chattel slavery, the question most nearly allied to our own. A party for the abolition of slavery was formed in 1840 and met in April of that year in Albany. It called itself the Liberty Party and its platform was the abolition of slavery. Its candidates received in that year 7,059 votes in the nation. In 1844 this party again nominated

candidates, James G. Birney and Thomas Morris. The reason for the nominations was Clay's "pussyfooting" attitude, as we might say today. The great question before the people was the annexation of Texas as a slave-holding territory. Polk was frankly in favor of it, and Clay was understood to be opposed. But on the very eve of the convention that highly over-rated politician had written a letter in which he said that "far from having any *personal* objection to the annexation of Texas, *I should be glad to see it*, without dishonor, without war, and with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms." This caused the Liberty Party to make its own nominations, which resulted in Clay's defeat. The total vote for Birney in the nation was only 62,263. But in New York the popular vote was: Polk, 237,588; Clay, 232,482; Birney, 15,812. Clay's long-sought ambition to attain the presidency was defeated by this vote, for the overwhelming proportion of it would have gone to Clay but for the latter's cowardly truckling to the pro-slavery movement on the question of the annexation of Texas at the last moment.

The result was not without its lesson to the politicians.\* The Liberty Party was succeeded by the Free Soil Party. The platform of that party declared that "Congress had no more power to make a slave than to make a king." In 1848 this party received no electoral votes, but its popular vote was 291,342. In 1852 its nominees again received no electoral vote, but it had from fifteen to twenty representatives in Congress, among them such men as Charles Sumner and Salmon P. Chase. The Free Soil Party was finally absorbed by the Republican Party, but it had done its work in forcing the slavery question to the fore. No party could ignore the question thereafter. The Republican Party was destined to be the real Abolition Party, if not under Lincoln, then under some other wise and capable leader. But the war intervened, and the course that history would otherwise have taken must remain a question for interesting conjecture. But the abolitionists had tested the efficacy of party methods for the establishment of their principles; they had forever ended the political aspirations of one of the great popular idols of the day, and they had seen the idea of the freedom of the slave expand from the small and despised Liberty Party into the greater Free Soil Party, and finally into the Republican Party under Lincoln, whose leadership they were willing to trust, and who finally justified, in a manner that is to his and our country's everlasting glory, their faith in him.

The Single Tax Party is wholly justified. As the years go on its growth in votes will be ominously suggestive of

\*History repeated itself in the last municipal election here in which the vote cast for the editor of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW as the Single Tax Party's nominee for President of the Board of Aldermen resulted in the defeat of Tammany Hall. This has not been hitherto pointed out in these pages, but it is of sufficient interest to warrant this footnote. Mr. La Guardia was elected by about 900 votes; the vote cast for the Single Tax candidate was something over three thousand. As the bulk of this vote was drawn from those who would otherwise have voted for Mr. Moran, the Tammany candidate, our nomination was the deciding factor in an election in which over a half million votes were cast.

the loss of power by the old party politicians. It will educate as no other method can, and it will supplement every form of proselyting activity that the individual may undertake. It will deter us from taking part in those political activities which are at the best but of small importance and which have in the past too greatly absorbed our activities. And it will keep the principle itself clear of other entangling alliances with movements, excellent in themselves but remote from our purpose, which have too often enlisted our short-lived enthusiasm, followed by the depression at so little accomplished. We have, we think, learned a great deal in the last few years.

## The Philosophy of The Single Tax Movement

WENDELL PHILLIPS, in an address delivered before the Anti-Slavery Society in Boston, on June 27, 1853, said in opening: "Mr. Chairman, I have to present from the business committee the following resolution:

"Resolved, that the object of this society is now, as it always has been, to convince our countrymen, by arguments addressed to the hearts and consciences, that slave-holding is a heinous crime, and that the duty, safety and interest of all concerned demand its immediate overthrow, without expatriation."

These words may well hold our attention at this time. For slave-holding substitute in words of your own choosing the laws which permit the private collection of the rent of land, and let the rest stand as our declaration of policy. The man or woman who subscribes to it is a Single Taxer, and he who refuses to subscribe to it does so because he is not a Single Taxer, or because he desires to compromise the principle in the interests of something or somebody.

To the contention of the conservative Single Taxer that we should moderate our demands, we quote this from the same address:

"The cause is not ours, so that we may rightfully postpone or put in peril the victory by moderating our demands, stifling our convictions, or filing down our rebukes, to gratify any sickly taste of our own, or spare the delicate nerves of our neighbor."

To the argument that we might win the support of conservatives by our attitude, he says: "The elements which control public opinion and mould the masses are against us."

If it be urged that the appeal for the Single Tax be to the intellects rather than to the emotions and sympathies of men, Phillips furnishes the answer: "There are far more dead hearts to be quickened than confused intellects to be cleared up."

To the contention that we seek not to give offence, Phillips replies in the language of Fuller: "I should suspect the preaching had no salt in it if no galled jade did wince."

To the defence of the past political programme of Single Taxers by which they have sought to engage in political

activities as members of one or other of the old parties and and by such means induce them to take up measures "looking in our direction," Phillips gives us this noble reply:

"We do not *play* politics; anti-slavery is no half jest with us; it is a terrible earnest, with life or death, or worse than death, on the issue. It is no lawsuit, where it matters not to the good feelings of opposing counsel which way the verdict goes, and where advocates can shake hands as pleasantly as before."

To those who would condemn appeals to the principle in all its fulness and urge us not to denounce the political time-servers, the eminent but hollow idols, with heads of brass but feet of clay, Phillips says again:

"How shall we, a feeble minority, without weight or influence in the community, with no jury of millions to appeal to—denounced, villified, and contemned—how shall we make our way against the overwhelming weight of some colossal reputation, if we do not turn from the idolatrous present and appealing to the human race, say to your idols of today, Here we are defeated, but we will write our judgment with the iron spear of a century to come, and it shall never be forgotten, if we can help it, that you were false in your generation to the claims of the *landless*."

We have substituted the word *landless* for the word "slave" in Phillips' great address.

Again, and toward the close of this wonderful oration, Phillips furnishes the reply to those who think the Single Tax can be advanced by treating it timidly as a change in taxation merely:

"Caution is not always good in a cause such as ours. It is said that when Napoleon saw the day going against him he used to throw all caution to the winds, and trust himself to the hot impetuosity of his soldiers. The masses are governed more by impulse than conviction."

And again to the absurdly timid programme of some of our friends in the Single Tax movement his answer is conclusive:

"Every thoughtful and unprejudiced mind must see that such an evil (as slavery) will yield only to the most radical treatment. If you will consider the work we will have to do you will not think us needlessly aggressive, or that we dig down unnecessarily deep in building the foundations of our enterprise."

In the passages we have quoted Phillips gives us the keynote of the new movement for the Single Tax now beginning. The title of the address was "The Philosophy of the Abolition Movement." We have adapted the title along with the passages, so pertinent they seem.

A FUND has been started to place the REVIEW in every Y. M. C. A. Reading Room in the country. How much will you contribute to this object?

THIS great country, which we are pleased to call ours, belongs, by legal title, to a few landlords whose number and proportion to the whole people are annually growing less.

—JAMES G. MAGUIRE.

## An Inspiring Word From the Candidate

**I**NJECTED into the arena of political action through the formation of a separate party committed solely to but a single plank—the collection by government of the entire rent of land—the Single Tax is rapidly becoming a major issue in the economic and industrial as well as the political life of the Nation.

This fact is attested by the marvelous growth of the Single Tax Party since its inauguration in Philadelphia, five short years ago by five enthusiastic and patriotic men, who had neither prestige nor resources at their command. Since then the Single Tax Party has formed organizations in twenty-two States of the Union, twenty of which will in all probability have full tickets in the field to be voted for at the coming election on November 2.

Not since the campaign of 1886 conducted by the inspired leadership of Henry George and Father Edward McGlynn has there been such united and enthusiastic support of the philosophy of the Prophet of California, as now when men and women of the Nation once more are returning to the true American system of expressing their demands for progress and reform at the polls.

Although some of the States have had recourse to the Initiative and Referendum laws to give expression to their demand for a free earth for free men, rather than through the instrumentality of a separate Single Tax Party, it is due solely to the fact that they employed the vote to make their demand for the adoption of the Single Tax, that they achieved their big successes; as was evidenced in California in the 1916 campaign when the Single Tax Amendment was supported by 260,322 voters, a fraction in excess of 31 per cent. of the entire vote polled at that election.

Something more than the mere adoption of the principle is imperative, if final victory is to be achieved and maintained—the *election of officials who will sympathetically and intelligently administer the Single Tax after it has been adopted.*

Officials can be relied upon to enforce the Single Tax only when they are responsible to *Single Tax constituencies*: hence the urgent necessity for a strong Single Tax Party in the Nation as well as in every State in the Union.

Another prominent advantage the separate party movement has gained for the Single Tax is the wide publicity it has obtained for the principle. During the ten days preceding and following the holding of the National Convention of the Single Tax Party in Chicago, last July, nearly every newspaper in the United States averaged from a half to three-quarters of a column of space telling the people of the country about the Single Tax and the great strides it is making in the Nation.

Think of it. The whole country talking and thinking Single Tax for a continuous period of ten days. Has there ever been so wide a publicity given to our cause as resulted from the holding of the National Convention of the Single

Tax Party? The value of this publicity—measured in dollars and cents—is virtually incalculable. It could not have been duplicated for two millions of dollars at regular advertising rates. This feature of the separate party movement should commend it to the heart and intelligence of every advocate of the philosophy of Henry George.

There are many other important advantages which a separate political party affords to advance the propaganda of the Single Tax, as has been pointed out many times before in the columns of the *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*.

Among these are the power of intelligent organization, which makes for concerted and therefore more efficient results.

The Single Tax Party has also been responsible for clarifying the definition of our principle, through the generally accepted medium of an authoritative platform. This method has been employed with beneficial results by virtually every political party which has existed in the United States.

Such declarative announcement by the Single Tax Party has resulted in a more thorough understanding of its principles and what it purposes to do than could have been brought about by any other instrumentality. Even those who are not in accord with the philosophy of the Single Tax now have an understanding of its purpose. They now know that it is not only a better and more scientific plan for raising revenue to maintain government; but, what is of far greater importance, they realize that the Single Tax is a demand that the land rent created by the community belongs to that community and should be collected by it to establish equality to the use of the earth and to maintain the service of government responsible for such land rents. It has also been made clear to everybody by the Single Tax Party that the Single Tax is the collection by the government (all the people) of the entire rent of land and not merely the exemption from taxation of improvements; although there would be no taxing of improvements of any kind or of labor or its products if the Single Tax were collected, for the reason that there would then be more than sufficient revenue to pay for a far better and greater governmental service than any we have ever experienced.

Remember, Single Taxers, this wonderful organization has come about in five years through the efforts of but five men who were virtually without resource in the way of funds. Should the same ratio of increase be maintained for the coming five years, the Single Tax Party will be a tremendous force with which to reckon in the National election of 1924.

What might have been the result in the present presidential campaign, had every Single Taxer co-operated in the separate party movement during the past five years?

Surely the Single Tax Party influence would have been many thousand times as great, had all co-operated, for there were not less than 500,000 avowed Single Taxers in the nation in 1915.

Although it is better never to be late, it is better late than never. *Now is therefore the time for all good Single Taxers to come to the aid of the party.*      ROBERT C. MACAULEY



# Single Tax Candidate Arraigns Land System

ROBERT MACAULEY, PRESIDENTIAL NOMINEE,  
TELLS WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE U. S. A.

BRUCE BLIVEN IN NEW YORK GLOBE, OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1920

**W**HAT is the outstanding issue facing the American people in this presidential campaign."

"I can answer you in one word—taxation.

"If the people only realized it, no other question of such vital importance confronts them today as the question of taxation. For by taxation we determine what part any man shall receive of the wealth he produces."

Robert Macauley, Single Tax Party candidate for the President of the United States, leaned forward in his chair, fairly shaking with the intensity of his thought, as he hurled this challenge at me.

"The Single Tax Party is interested in just one subject,



ROBERT MACAULEY

this year, as always," he remarked. "We are making our campaign on the solitary issue of taxation. We do not say that an intelligent taxation scheme would cure all the ills the nation is heir to, but we do believe that it would cure a major part of the economic and industrial evils which are rampant in the United States today."

## FOR THE WHITE COLLAR MAN

Mr. Macauley, whose ideas are of course presented here without any indorsement, merely for information, wants it made plain that the Single Tax Party, which is seeking to put him in the White House next November—and which would be the most astonished group of men on earth if it should succeed—is not interested merely in the wel-

fare of the man who works with his hands. It is concerned with the problem of the white collar class just as much. In fact, Mr. Macauley declares that every man who sells his services to society is today a victim of what he regards as the monumental injustice involved in the private ownership of land.

"Mind you, we have no quarrel with inequalities of wealth," he hastened to explain. "But we insist that the returns to any individual ought to be based on the value of the services of that individual to society. We would have no objection whatever to a man's receiving an income of a million dollars a year if he earned a million. What we object to is a man's receiving a million dollars that somebody else earned, just because he happens to have what we regard as an unfair and unjust 'legal title' to a portion of the earth's surface which is needed so badly by someone else that the latter will pay a premium for the chance to use it."

The Single Tax theory, as readers of the *Globe* are doubtless aware, is so named because its founder, Henry George, proposed to do away with all other forms of taxation and secure all national, State and municipal revenues from a single tax on land. He would make this tax in every case equal to the full annual ground rent of the land involved. That is to say, no one would be entitled to profit from the mere ownership of land. He would only be entitled to profit from the use to which the land was put, for agricultural, business, or residential purposes.

## LAND VALUES BELONG TO PEOPLE

Mr. Macauley in explaining his position said: "Now, we all know that the only reason land is valuable is because of the competition of people who use it. The more people there are desiring a single piece of land, and the more urgent their need for it, the greater the value of that land. If there were only one man in all North America, no land here would have any value. It is clear that it is the competition of people which creates land values. Therefore, the Single Tax Party maintains these values belong to all the people, not to any individual.

"The size of the burden which the people of the United States are forced to contribute to the private owners of land is almost unbelievable. Look, for example, at the State of Ohio. I can remember within my lifetime"—Mr. Macauley is fifty-five—"when the United States government would gladly give away free land in Ohio to any citizen who would come and settle on it.

"Today, forty years later, about the lowest price at which you can buy that land is \$400 an acre. Much of it costs \$1,000 an acre. That is to say, forty years ago the food which was raised on that farm and sold off it had no overhead cost except that of human labor and the cost of machinery and other equipment to till the soil. Today,

on the lowest valuation of \$400 an acre, that quarter-section of land is worth \$64,000. The food raised on that farm must bring enough money not only to pay for the labor involved, the cost of machinery and other equipment, but, at the average interest rate of 6 per cent., it must bring in \$3,840 a year as interest on the investment. No wonder that we talk about the high cost of living!

#### WHAT WE PAY FOR LAND

"The land in the United States, so far as can be estimated from a careful study of government statistics, has a value of one hundred twenty-five to one hundred fifty billions. I believe the latter figure is much more accurate than the first. It is also significant that a great majority of the people of the country own no land at all. All the land is in the hands of a small minority. As a matter of fact, the percentage is about 5 per cent. of land owners and 95 per cent. of landless people today. Three-fifths of this 5 per cent., or 3 per cent. of the total population, own just enough land for their own immediate purposes—a house and lot, or a comparatively small farm. The other 2 per cent. owns the rest.

"If we assume that their land brings in only 6 per cent per annum on the money invested—which is a reasonable supposition—then we have the staggering total of \$9,000,000,000 a year which the people of these United States are obliged to pay to the landlords for the privilege of making the ground produce the wealth which keeps us all alive. As a matter of fact, 80 per cent. of all the wealth produced in America is paid over for the mere right to use the land for productive purposes. Behind every farm, behind every factory, behind every productive enterprise in the whole country, stands the landlord, waiting to take the lion's share."

#### OUR HOUSING SHORTAGE

"You could ask no better example of the system than right here in New York City. Here you are confronted with the worst housing crisis in the history of the nation. Yet, right at this moment, when your tenements are so dreadfully overcrowded, one-third of all the land in New York City is in the form of vacant lots. It would be laughable if it were not so tragic."

At this point the writer remarked that many people regarded the Single Tax theory as confiscation of the property of the land owners.

"Confiscation? Nothing of the sort!" Mr. Macauley replied vigorously. "The passage of laws involving the Single Tax would merely be 'restoration.' We deny that any man has the right to own land, or ever has had that right. There are only two ways in which the right to the ownership of property may be established; either you must produce it yourself, or you must be able to show a bill of sale from the man who did produce it. The man who 'owns' land can do neither of these things. He did not make the land, which is the gift of nature to all the people. How, then, can he own it?"

"When the United States government decided to free the slaves in 1860, it did not worry about confiscation of property," he remarked. "As a matter of fact, every municipality in the country is confiscating all the time. I live in Philadelphia, where the tax rate on real property is \$2.85 per \$100. That means that the City of Philadelphia confiscates every house within its borders every thirty-five years, since the taxes for that length of time amount to more than the total value of the house itself, assuming that the valuation for taxation purposes equals the real valuation—and you may rest assured that it always does, when the house in question is a poor man's house."

"For many years before the war we had almost continuous unemployment in America. Now that the artificial stimulation of the war is dying away, we are beginning to have unemployment again. Why? Because the system of private ownership of land does not give the worker a chance to follow the occupation which nature intended him to pursue, as a tiller of the soil."

#### IS AGAINST SOCIALISM

More strongly than any other point Mr. Macauley emphasized for me the fact that the Single Tax Party has no sympathy with socialism, and abhors the Bolsheviki quite as enthusiastically as any good and loyal member of the National Security League. Mr. Macauley declares that this is an American movement through and through; that they do not want or seek any change in the laws of the United States until the majority of the people of the United States want such a change, and that whatever change is demanded by the majority ought to be carried out, no matter how little it may be liked by a minority.

The Single Tax candidate is honest enough to say frankly that he has no expectation of being elected President this year. The party enters the national campaign primarily for educational purposes. However, he does declare that this movement is growing; that it has shaken off the inertia of many years' standing, which followed the death of its great leader, Henry George; and from now on, the people of the United States being oppressed as they are with a burdensome cost of living, he expects to see the Single Tax movement making great strides.

In appearance, Mr. Macauley is further from the "professional politician" than almost any of the other presidential candidates whom I have interviewed for the *Globe*. His hair, mustache and close-cropped VanDyck beard are all snow white. He has the burning eyes of the zealot, and in conversation he leans forward, looking up under his brows with concentrated enthusiasm for the ideas which he expounds. He is not a large man, is quick and deft in his movements, and can be characterized, perhaps as well as in any other way, by the fact that he is not at all ashamed to smoke a pipe in public.

Macauley's business in life has been a varied one. He was born in 1865 in Philadelphia, where he still lives. The



first twenty years of his maturity were spent as a clothing cutter, and he was one of the prime movers in the unionization of that trade in Philadelphia. For ten years he was in the insurance business, and twelve years ago entered newspaper work. He has had experience in all sorts of editorial work, leaving this field only recently to go into publicity for a large financial house in Philadelphia. He secured a leave of absence from his employers for the duration of the campaign in order, as he expressed it to me, that he might "go out and see how decisively he could be beaten."

In spite of his jocosely method of speaking, Mr. Macauley has made very considerable sacrifices for the Single Tax idea. He has preached it enthusiastically for many years, and for some time edited a magazine of his own in Philadelphia devoted to the doctrine of the "great adventure." He was national chairman of the Single Tax Party in 1919 and 1920, and in the last two campaigns he was the party's candidate for United States senator and for governor of Pennsylvania, respectively.

## The Foundations of Our Enthusiasm

THE enthusiasm for humanity is, like all impulses' transient, though it may be summoned again and again. But the enthusiasm based upon a rational knowledge of the world's economic problem abides as a calm perpetual glow which lights the dark places with a lamp of abiding comfort. It is in the nature of a religious faith based upon the knowledge that in our economic relations, as in fact in all other relations, "the power not ourselves," to use Matthew Arnold's phrase, moves in a mysterious way its wonders to perform.

To know that man in his relation to his fellow man, and to the planet, is destined for a grander future; that progress is real; that harmony and not discord in these relations is the law of his being; that civilizations may come, grander, nobler and more glorious than any of which we dream, merely by the recognition of the natural order which is the law of society as much as it is the law of the heavenly bodies, supplying as it does a religious faith founded upon knowledge, reinforces what is best in every religious faith ever entertained by man.

So simple seems the remedy, yet so complex the results! To take the rent of land, thereby making men free from economic thralldom, seems so little a thing to herald in the dawn of a new era. Yet it is the nature of liberty to call for little. All it asks is the absence of these bonds; all it asks is to be free. Man has never been free since the dawn of history. Whatever liberties he has won have left him still in bondage to the earth-owner; have, in many cases, increased the degree of his economic serfdom, with such mitigations as have been introduced from time to time for the benefit of the more distressed groups.

The thought that stirs within us at the thought of man-

kind free at last supplies a faith in comparison with which the old religious faiths seem to pale to hard and ineffectual dogma.

## Is There a Law Of Social Progress?

IS there a law of growth in society? Is there a law of social progress? So much has happened in the last four years that seems to cast a doubt upon it. Many faiths were shaken by the world war, and among them the notion of a continuing stream of human progress.

The defect of the idea appears to reside in the assumption of its continuity. This the course of history expressly disclaims. Perhaps the truth is that civilization may really progress while whole forms of organization, good and bad within it, undergo processes of growth, decay and death. Civilization may be apprehended as a method which experiments with forms of organization as they appear, develops them to the perfection of which they are inherently capable or surrounding conditions permit, puts them to such use as they may serve, and finally discards them for the systems that grow out of newer necessities, or newer moral aspirations.

But this course, orderly, inevitable and constantly creative, is not free of interruptions. It is not possessed of the same unvarying and invariable character as the movements of the material universe, because the material universe is motiveless in itself. Civilization deals with human nature endowed with a free will; the laws of the material universe, and those governing the movements of civilization, do not possess an exact analogy. The most we can assume is the presence of a law of social growth, and this we are far from comprehending at this stage of the world.

But maybe history can tell us something. Nothing is surer than that the decay of great nations began with a diseased condition from within. No great nation has ever been overwhelmed from without and this negatives the notion that all nations must grow, and sooner or later decay and die. There is no warrant in history for this belief, for this reason. The diseases that overtake nations and result in their death are not inevitable accompaniments of national evolution. In other words, we can see how they might have been avoided. There is no reason at all for assuming that a nation cannot grow from century to century, reaching higher and higher levels of achievement. France and England among the modern nations have lived many centuries and show no sign of decadence. Spain has lifted herself out of a long decline and is showing signs of a renewed and vigorous life. That nations must grow, decay and die is a thought welcome to mental indolence, saving us the search for causes that operate to forward or retard national progress. But there is absolutely no warrant in reason or history for the assumption.

What are the forces that sustain national life at a high level of efficiency? Henry George has indicated his belief

that the true source of social progress and national greatness is to be found in association in equality.

It seems demonstrably true that where there are classes divided by artificially determined differences of income and possession, contrasts will arise that will hasten a nation's decay. Even when these inequalities are not deeply rooted or strongly marked, the effect is to arrest progress and keep national development stationary. A high level of civilization can only be maintained where these artificial inequalities do not exist and where opportunity and individual consciousness of opportunity are generally shared.

Association in equality does not mean equal possessions. Differences of fortune will arise that are due to unlikeness in abilities, and in this way variations in income will and should persist. But based on equal opportunity these will not be so strongly marked as now, and will arouse no bitterness and no consciousness of injustice. The sympathetic and spiritual bonds would be strengthened by the absence of antagonisms of groups socially divided by inequalities of possession, and the field open for that wider co-operation which is the real strength of nations, as it is the real motive power of civilization itself.

Henry George was right. The law of progress—association in equality—which he laid down, is not the least of his pregnant contributions to social thought.

## A Correction and Apology

WE are sorry to have fallen into a grave error in the statement made in our last issue that Prof. T. S. Adams, of Madison, Wisconsin, was an advocate of the Tax on Sales. We are glad to print this denial in as prominent a place in the REVIEW as that in which the error occurred:

Editor, Single Tax Review,  
150 Nassau Street,  
New York, N. Y.

My DEAR SIR:

My attention has been called to the statement in your July-August number that I am "an ardent advocate of the tax on sales." No statement could be more untrue. I am opposed to a tax on sales as would be evident to any intelligent reader who read my recent article dealing with the subject in the *New York Evening Post*.

Very truly yours,

T. S. ADAMS.

The source of our information was some exchange as ignorant as ourself. We are more sorry regarding this because Prof. Adams has been in the main more than fair in his attitude toward proposed reforms in taxation and reasonable and temperate in such opposition as conviction impelled him to express.

UNDER all forms of government the ultimate power lies with the masses. It is not kings nor aristocracies, nor land owners nor capitalists, that anywhere really enslave the people. It is their own ignorance.—HENRY GEORGE.

## A Mendacious Newspaper

THE Los Angeles *Times* is horrified at the result that the Single Tax would bring about in California. It estimates that there are about \$1,500,000,000 of loans on real estate, and that in the event of the passage of the amendment mortgages based on real estate would become valueless. Real estate is land and houses, and it would be interesting to know just what proportion is land wholly or partially improved, and what proportion is vacant land. The Single Tax proposes to relieve of all taxation that part of real estate which consists of improvements. Just how vacant land can pay interest on mortgages the *Times* does not state.

The *Times* speaks of the insecurity of land tenure under the Single Tax. About 97 per cent. of the population of New York pay to the landlords rent for the privilege of living here. What proportion it is in Los Angeles we do not know. In New York the only security of tenure is that enjoyed by 3 per cent. of the population. Is it as much as 10 per cent. in Los Angeles? That is what is troubling about 90 per cent. of the people in all the cities—security of tenure. But what the *Times* will not see, or tries to fool its readers into not seeing, is that what Single Taxers propose is to tax what is being taken from those who by the exercise of their labor and capital produce all interest upon mortgages—the economic rent of land. This does not belong to the landlords, because they did not make it. To take it in taxation, and in lieu of all taxes, is not to destroy the incentive to build, for the landlord gets it now whether he builds or not. He gets it in the selling price of land when he sells and he gets it as the price of permission for letting other people build or work. If he builds a house and rents it he gets two returns, one for the house and one for the land occupied by the tenant. The price of the latter is determined largely by the number of lots held out of use. If the taxes are light on land values more lots will be held out of use, and the price of land will be higher.

The people of Los Angeles pay a few other people for the privilege of living there. However the *Times* may seek to frighten its readers with bogie tales, that system is doomed—if not at this election, then at some other election. The only hope is that in the destruction of that system other things, useful or desirable, will not be destroyed along with it by angry men in revolt.

This is what the Los Angeles *Times* deliberately challenges by its systematic misrepresentation of the sane and reasonable proposal now before the people of California—a good deal more moderate than some of us would like to see. This attitude is unfortunate, for the Single Taxer seeks to render inviolate all rights of property—even the manufacturing plants of lying newspapers.

ISN'T anyone a statesman if he deals with affairs of a State? Whether he's wise or foolish, selfish or noble?

—H. M. Holmes, in *Cleveland Citizen*.

## Economics and Bankers

OUR American banking institutions, it is pleasant to note, are giving increasing attention to the study and teaching of economics.

In some cases, however, and with lamentable results, the teaching precedes the study. The Bankers Trust Company of New York, for instance, has just issued for circulation a 78-page pamphlet, entitled "Ten Minute Talks with Workers." A brief introduction confidently describes the pamphlet as "a contribution to straight thinking about the relations between Capital and Labor, which is essential to the progress and peace of the world." But the matter and the argument are admitted to be borrowed and "re-printed by special permission from the Trade Supplement of the *London Times*." It is, therefore, an imported production, and not the result of the Bankers Trust Company's own study and thinking. It must be confessed that in the borrowed plumes of the *London Times* the Bankers Trust Company does not gain in dignity and respect.

For the "straight thinking" of the *London Times* on the problems of Capital and Labor turns out, as might have been expected from the traditional policy of that partisan organ, to be a characteristic specimen of loose and crooked thinking.

In proof of this criticism, it is quite sufficient to point out the fact that, in all the 78 pages of the pamphlet, there are but two allusions to land, the primary factor in wealth production. On page 17, we find conceded the first place in production to land, as follows: "(1) The gifts of nature, land in particular." And then, on page 18, it is admitted that "the first requisite of wealth production is one which man does not create and cannot do much to control." But throughout the rest of the pamphlet no further mention is made of this "first requisite of wealth production!"

The relation of Capital and Labor to this basic condition of existence and its bearing on their relations toward each other, apparently do not concern the *London Times*, except perhaps as matters whose discussion must be avoided. Transparently, the pamphlet is an attempt to stage the play of Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark.

It is hard to believe that the same class motives which inspire the *London Times* in its suppression and distortion of economic truth can exist in an American banking institution. The interests of such an institution might be supposed to be identified with productive American industry rather than with that limited non-producing class which enjoys control of "the gifts of nature," "the first requisite of wealth production," and by grace of unjust fiscal laws extorts a vast and increasingly heavy tribute of economic rent from American industry and the mass of the American people.

The Bankers Trust Company manifestly owes it to itself and to the American public to make an independent study of economics and a frank statement of its stand on basic economic issues, upon whose just and speedy solution un-

doubtedly depends the progress and peace of this country and the world. Straight thinking and plain speaking on fundamental economics was perhaps never before so urgently needed. Civilization has reached a critical stage. The decisions of misguided statesmen are apt to be catastrophic. Those who imagine that unjust economic conditions, however advantageous to a class, can safely be prolonged, are living in a fool's paradise. Henry George foresaw the approaching and irrevocable test of our civilization, when he wrote: "The struggle that must either revivify or convulse in ruin, is near at hand, if it be not already begun."

Our leading industrial men and bankers seem already to have sensed the danger, even if they have not diagnosed its cause. May we count on their sound sense as well as courage in meeting the situation? Do they realize that temporizing subterfuges and palliative devices are now utterly futile, that we are at last face to face with a final settlement and that our only salvation lies in the complete surrender to the demands of Justice?

## Iowa's Farm Land Boom

LAST year, 1919, Iowa was the land speculator's paradise. Now what is the land speculator's paradise one year is everybody's hell the next. According to a recent issue of the *Weekly News Letter*, issued from Washington by the Department of Agriculture, the land boom that swept Iowa "forced land up to a level at which it was impossible for any but exceptional farmers to make more than 3 per cent. on his capitalization and made it out of the question for a large proportion of the tenants to buy land on borrowed capital with a fair chance of paying out."

The Department of Agriculture, in co-operation with the Iowa State College, made an investigation of the conditions, and brought out some interesting facts. It was found that the increase in the average value of farm lands in sections of Iowa where the investigation was conducted was greater during the year of the boom than during the fifty years from 1850 to 1900.

Whereas the general increase in value of farm land for the country was 21 per cent., in Iowa it was 32 per cent. One of the conclusions arrived at by the investigators was that about two-thirds of the increased value on farms bought and resold during the boom was appropriated by residents of towns and cities.

The report is not very frank as indicating the possible consequences of this boom, but it does say that "the current prices of land (in Iowa) are not justified by the earning power of the soil, and at current prices for land it is not financially profitable for the tenant to become an owner, and that for the great majority it is practically impossible."

The *Weekly News Letter*, after stating the conditions thus gingerly, touches—but just touches—upon the burning problem:

"A logical inference from these facts is that an improve-



ment in credit arrangements, frequently suggested as a remedy for the increase of tenancy, may not be regarded as a fundamental solution so long as land values are so high that it is both unprofitable and impossible for the majority of tenants to acquire ownership.

"When conditions are such as are revealed by the present study, the solution of the evils of tenancy would appear to require methods that will limit the tendency toward the over capitalization of farm-land values in relation to farm incomes. In part, this may be accomplished by educating farmers in alternative lines of sound investment, and in showing them the folly of sacrificing their standards of living in order to purchase land at excessive prices. In part, it may be necessary to employ more direct methods for the purpose of reducing that part of the demand for land which is the outgrowth of speculative motives or other motives not connected with the desire to acquire land for the purpose of utilizing it."

Thus, with delightful euphony, the system that has given over the farm lands of Iowa to the speculator is referred to in Chesterfieldian terms. It is a characteristic little touch, that about "educating the farmers," telling them how foolish it is to "sacrifice their standards of living in order to purchase land at excessive prices." But as land goes up many buy that they may sell again. Though there has been a slight increase of ownership of farm lands in Iowa (if we are to trust the Report) it is to be doubted if the actual number of working framers is increased. High prices of farm land, united with unprofitable returns to farming based upon the capitalization of these inflated values, is not likely to result in increase in the number of farmers. It is conceivable that there might be an increase in the number of farm land owners.

How naive is the advice urging "the education of farmers in alternative lines of sound investment." Who are the farmers of this country that they need to be educated by anybody as to where and how they will invest their money? What they need is a system that will safeguard them from the attacks of the land speculators, and this can be done by the utter destruction of that dangerous, demoralizing and wholly corrupt institution which permits the private collection of the rent of land which in Iowa is the creation, for the most part, of the working farmers of that State. Left to the sport and gamble of land speculators the result is economic disaster—as Iowa will wake to find.

A vote for the Single Tax is a vote to change all this.

## Mr. Buck Defends The Farmer-Labor Party

ROBERT M. BUCK, one of the leaders of the Farmer-Labor Party, says in the *Nation* of Aug. 7th: "The effort of the Farmer-Labor Party is to induce all the exploited groups to arise in their political might and throw off their exploiters."

These be brave words. But who are the exploiters, and how are these groups exploited? What is the machinery of exploitation—its exact nature and operation? The

platform tells us that "political democracy is only an empty phrase without industrial democracy." Good again! But what is industrial democracy? How is it to be brought about? The party tells us in the plank which reads "The right of labor to an increasing share in the responsibilities and management of industry; the application of the principle to be developed in accordance with the experience of actual operation." Cautious in this particular are these friends of trade union management of shops and factories. They would not do it at once, only as its reasonableness were developed by experience. But *how?* By legal enactment? By revolution? The industrial institutions of the country, the factories, the mines, the great wholesale and retail businesses, are in private hands. How shall labor proceed to take a larger share in the management of these?

Is it to be assumed that Labor is as wise in management and supervision as it is in the work essential for the actual production in these enterprises, these myriad industries? Conceivably, progress may give an increasing share of direction and supervision to labor in the management of great and small industries. This would be eventually developed, as the platform makers of the Farmer-Labor Party assumed in a moment of sanity, "in accordance with the experience of actual operation." It would also develop (but this the platform makers of this party are not wise enough to see) in accordance with the increasing freedom and independence of labor that would be the result of securing to it the right of access to the natural opportunity, such natural opportunity being land in all its forms, mineral sites, forest and city land, agricultural and grazing land, forest and city lots.

But for a political party to declare in favor of labor taking a larger part in the management of business either means nothing at all, or is a covert assault on every form of property held by over one hundred million people whose right to own, sell and bequeath is recognized by the laws of the land and the conventions of society.

In thus arraigning themselves against the idea of property, and adopting and mischievously extending Proudhon's familiar slogan, "Property is robbery," the Farmer-Labor Party may be assuming ground which they are capable of defending. But if so, they must defend it on the assumption that there is no true basis of property, and place themselves in opposition to the Single Tax Party, whose members are sticklers for the sacred right of property, and who, regardless of the smallness of their numbers, are yet strong in the principles to which they appeal, principles the triumph of which awaits only a clearer perception of the true nature of property and an awakened conscience on the part of the electorate.

A TAX upon ground rents would not raise the rents of houses; it would fall altogether upon the owner of the land, who acts always as a monopolist and exacts the greatest rent which can be got for the use of his ground.

—ADAM SMITH, in his "Wealth of Nations."

# Progress of The Campaign

## New York

**T**HANKS to an autocratic election law, enacted by Democrats and Republicans for the very purpose of keeping new political ideas off the ballot, the citizens of New York will not have the opportunity this year of voting for Macauley and Barnum.

After months of futile planning, the Single Tax Party of New York gave up the hope of getting on the official ballot of the State. The law simply made it impossible without an expenditure of at least \$5,000—which the party could not raise this year.

In order that every citizen of New York City, at least, might have the opportunity of voting for the Single Tax, the party, at an expense of about one thousand dollars, succeeded in placing on the official ballot the names of the following candidates:

Benjamin W. Burger, for Justice of the Supreme Court, First District, which includes all of New York and Bronx Counties.

Edmund Conger Brown, for Justice of the Supreme Court, Second District, which includes all of Long Island and Staten Island.

Morris VanVeen, for Congressman from the 21st Congressional District.

George R. Macey, for Assemblyman from the 7th Assembly District.

Burger and Brown afford an opportunity for every voter in the greater city to register his or her conviction on the Single Tax. Every follower of Henry George should urge all of his friends to vote for either of these two candidates.

The larger the vote for the Single Tax the sooner will the land question be injected into the political arena.

Immediately after the election the party will inaugurate a movement for the democratization of the election law, so that in 1922 it may be possible to place a State ticket in the field. Also, plans are being formulated for the organization of County Committees throughout the State.

## New Jersey

**N**EW JERSEY has placed on the ballot the following names as presidential electors for Macauley and Barnum:

John Greany, Newark; J. Benjamin Douglas, Bloomfield; Mark M. Fagan, Jersey City; Wm. B. DuBois, Bayonne; Chas. Goldzier, Bayonne; Herman G. Loew, Newark; Rayner M. Bedell, Montclair; Edwin J. Jones, Westfield; David White, Paterson; Orrin I. Briebý, Palisade; Henry A. C. Hellyer, Tenafly; Frank L. Pollard, East Orange; Percy S. Marcellus, Orange; J. T. R. Proctor, Bayonne.

In Monmouth County Mr. Gaston Haxo, son-in-law of that old friend of Henry George, A. M. Molina, has been nominated for the State Senate.

In Hudson County the following ticket has been nominated for Members of General Assembly:

Samuel R. Shoup, Weehawken; Adolph I. Lohse, West Hoboken; J. Wm. Oliver, West New York; Henry Molteni, Weehawken; James M. Dow, West Hoboken; Thos. W. Edwards, West New York; Robt. Bruckhoff, West Hoboken; Geo. E. French, Jr., Jersey City; Thos. A. Gilson, Hoboken; Frank Wagner, Hoboken; O. Edward Smith, Hoboken; Amelia E. DuBois, Bayonne.

In Essex County the following have been nominated for Members of the General Assembly:

Frank B. Connor, Belleville; Geo. E. Sanderson, Belleville; William J. Wallace, Newark; Alfred Bourgeois, Nutley; Eugene T. Leach, Belleville; Alfred Cooper, Belleville; Jeremiah V. B. Parker, Newark; Gladwin Bouton, Bloomfield; Joseph E. Stegner, Newark; Walter J. Triner, Caldwell; William A. Bock, Newark; George L. Rusby, Nutley.

In Bergen County Chas. T. Logan, of Palisade, has been nominated for Congress for the 6th District.

The nominees for General Assembly in Bergen County are Mrs. Agnes Lillian Shannon, Morsemere; Wm. P. Rothman, Palisade; and William D. Newman, Hackensack.

In Union County the following were nominated for Members of the General Assembly: Mrs. Caroline Peddie Ball, Westfield; Paul T. Peckham, Westfield; and William F. Wakeham, Rahway.

There is a very general and widespread interest among the people of New Jersey and they are beginning to understand and appreciate the explanation of the Single Tax as to what would naturally follow the policy the Single Tax Party has adopted, in the phrase, "The rent of land belongs to the people." They receive it gladly, and a largely increased vote is looked for in this State.

The State Committee is thus officially constituted: Raynor M. Bedell, of Montclair, Chairman; and E. M. Caffall, of West Palisade, Treasurer.

## Connecticut

**T**WO candidates of the Single Tax Party have entered the race for representation in the General Assembly, John Cairns and Will Asimus. Mr. Cairns is too well known to need any introduction to readers of the REVIEW. Mr. Asimus has been a newspaper man for fifteen years and previous to coming to Manchester was a member of the reportorial staffs of the *New York World*, *Evening Sun* and *New York American*. It is his first venture in politics. He is editorially connected with the *Manchester Herald*.

Mr. Cairns is conducting an active campaign and has addressed a number of good meetings in Manchester, Hartford, and Thompsonville. Mr. Macauley spoke in Bridgeport on October 6.

The presidential electors are as follows:

William J. Lee, Bridgeport; John E. Heyke, Whitneyville;



Frederick K. Perry, Union City; George E. Mecorney, Meriden; Oliver Rule, Meriden; Will Asimus, Manchester; John Cairns, Manchester.

## Ohio

**E**VEN the old-line Single Taxers said we could never get 9,000 signatures to petitions in Ohio and get on the ballot, for every signer had to pledge himself to support and vote for the Single Tax.

In six days we secured 18,979 signatures in Cleveland alone. 5,000 signatures were secured in one day in the city of which Tom Johnson was formerly mayor.

September second was a proud day for us, for it was Henry George's birthday and our little band marched by Tom Johnson's statue, which holds in its hand a copy of "Progress and Poverty," on our way to file with the Board of Elections our Single Tax petitions containing nearly 19,000 signatures. We were on the ballot in Ohio with over twice the number of signatures required, and most of them, because of the diligence of our able Chairman, George Edwards, were sworn to twice instead of once as the law requires. We were taking no chances with the politicians.

In two months we have secured more publicity in Ohio for Single Tax than it has previously had in a great many years. The *Cleveland Press* has notified us that if we will furnish them Single Tax news they will give us space every day until election.

Already E. H. Foote, Single Tax nominee for Governor, has challenged both the Republican and Democratic candidates to debate the question, "Resolved, that the one-plank platform of the Single Tax Party will effectively solve more of the vital problems of today and come nearer to establishing justice to all, both rich and poor alike, than all the planks of both the Republican and Democratic platforms combined." They will hear from Foote again whether or not they accept this challenge.

Thousands of pieces of Single Tax literature have already been distributed, and we are arranging a speaking programme for the spreading of the gospel of the Single Tax. Meetings are being held on the Public Square in Cleveland.

Some Single Taxers said it would be far easier to get signatures to the Amendment petition than to our Party petition. Cleveland was the city where the Amendment people had their best success, but they had worked for many weeks to secure only 8,000 names when our straight-out Single Tax Party appeared on the scene and secured nearly 19,000 names in six days. We then turned our organization over to the Amendment people and in two weeks they had added 14,000 names to their list, but even now the Amendment will not get on the ballot this year. This should convince timid Single Taxers that the Party movement is a real good for the Single Tax cause, and the way to get a thing done is to go after it.

At the present writing the Single Tax Vice-Presidential candidate, R. C. Barnum, is preparing a challenge to debate with the Vice-Presidential candidate of the Farmer-Labor

Party. He, too, is a Cleveland resident. Mr. Barnum has also taken steps to secure an aeroplane in which he hopes to be able to make a trip over several States campaigning and distributing literature. Here in Ohio our motto is "ACTION."

On Saturday, September 18th, four of our Single Tax candidates spoke on the Public Square in Cleveland, and got a statement of what the Single Tax stands for in each of the three leading Cleveland papers.

We filed with the Secretary of State a drawing of a black cat which we propose to use as the Single Tax emblem. Below is what the *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, of September 19th, said:

"R. C. Barnum, Single Tax Party candidate for Vice-President, E. H. Foote, candidate for Governor and other Party leaders have put up to Secretary of State, Harvey C. Smith, the proposal to give the Single Tax ticket on the presidential ballot an insignia of its own. The Democrats have a rooster, the Republicans have an eagle, the Socialists have a torch, and the Single Tax Party wants a cat, a black cat.

"'Not because we are superstitious,' the Party leaders say, 'but because when a man is converted to the Single Tax principle he says, 'I see the cat,' or 'that keeps the cat in the bag.'"

At Columbus yesterday members of the Secretary of State's office said they would try to comply with the request although it may be impossible to get the cuts to all counties before the ballots are printed.

Cleveland papers carried an announcement of our adoption of the emblem of the black cat.

E. H. Foote, the Single Tax Party's candidate for Governor, has challenged the Democratic and Republican candidates to a series of joint debates. He has also attacked those Democratic leaders who have formerly been Single Taxers, among them being Vic Donahey, Democratic candidate for Governor, and the Republican candidate as well.

R. C. Barnum has publicly pilloried men who were formerly avowed Single Taxers and who are now silent on the principle. "Chameleons," he calls them, and among them are Robert Crosser, Newton D. Baker and Vic Donahey.

He says:

"I challenge these men to come out and stand for what they once advocated. On the other hand, I challenge them to denounce the Single Tax and lose the votes they once might have had."

Mr. Barnum's position is that one cannot be for and against the Single Tax, at the same time, and that Henry George's definition of a Single Taxer holds good: A Single Taxer is one who does something for the Single Tax."

At the executive meeting of the Ohio Single Tax Party on Saturday, September 18th, we passed a resolution to mail to each banker in the city of Cleveland a copy of our platform and arguments together with a letter calling his attention to the fact that there is an organized political party in the field that intends to stay in the field until it brings down rents and land values, and we call the attention of the bankers to the fact that they may be able to use this

fact with some customer who wants to borrow on the present fictitious land values.

Following are the names of the Ohio nominees of the Single Tax Party: For Governor, E. H. Foote, Cleveland; Lieutenant-Governor, W. O. Blase, Youngstown; Secretary of State, Jasper Shuman, Toledo; State Auditor, J. H. Kaufman, Columbus; State Treasurer, Adam Lehr, Cleveland; Attorney-General, George Edwards, Youngstown; Chief Justice, Joseph W. Gottlieb, Youngstown; Supreme Court Judge, Frank R. Field, Youngstown; Supreme Court Judge, G. D. Hersey, Youngstown; Supreme Court Judge, George Cook, Cleveland; U. S. Senator, Henry B. Strong, Cleveland.

A telegram has been received from the Secretary of State announcing that the Single Tax ticket is safely on the ballot, having secured 25,000 signatures to the nominating petitions. The Farmer-Labor Party has secured only 6,000, several thousand less than the law requires, and will not appear on the ballot. And this is instructive as to our course in Chicago, for if the Single Tax Party had allowed itself to be swallowed up by the Farmer-Labor Party the Single Tax would not now be on the ballot.

Following are the presidential electors for Ohio: F. E. Barnum, Garrettsville; Thomas Taylor, Youngstown; John E. Jennings, Cleveland; Evan J. Edwards, Youngstown; W. F. Hammond, Youngstown; Arthur J. Morcomb, Youngstown; W. E. Tuttle, Warren; John McCaughtrey, Lisbon; W. J. Williams, Youngstown; Albert Davis, Youngstown; John McGovern, Cleveland; John Kelly, Youngstown; S. G. Foote, Medina; F. E. Cottier, Cleveland; E. Lee Young, Youngstown; M. T. Foote, Lorain; M. C. Fisher, Youngstown; O. C. Budde, Cleveland; James D. McDougal, Youngstown; A. R. Nelson, Columbus; A. M. Finnie, Youngstown; Andrew Russell, Youngstown; James H. McCormick, Youngstown; Morgan Davis, Youngstown.

Following are the officers of the State Committee: George Edwards, Youngstown, Chairman; E. H. Foote, Cleveland, Secretary; and R. C. Barnum, Cleveland, Treasurer.

## Pennsylvania

**P**ENNSYLVANIA, the birthplace of the Single Tax Party, is to know a whole lot more about the Single Tax before the campaign is over, if the plans of the State Committee of the Party can be even half-way carried out. Not only the old war horses who have been plugging away, pushing forward the Party's cause since five years ago when the Party was organized in Philadelphia, but a lot of new blood as well, is taking an active part in spreading the good news broadcast that there is hope for better conditions through the freeing of the land, for which the Party stands.

James H. Dix, who has been the State Secretary ever since the formation of the Party's State organization in Pennsylvania, has become the State Chairman this year, and in addition to holding down the job of Chairman of the National Executive Committee is trying to put ginger into the State Committee's work. In addition to receiving val-

uable support from the Party's candidate for President, Robert C. Macauley, who was formerly Chairman of the Pennsylvania State Committee, his efforts are being backed up nobly by such well-known Pennsylvania workers as Frederick E. Mayer, Chairman of the Press Committee, John W. Dix, Secretary of the State Committee and head of the Delaware County organization, Oliver McKnight, who is known to thousands as a Single Tax letter writer through the newspapers, that old veteran, Thos. Cavanaugh, and others.

In naming presidential electors the presidential candidate recognized the women voters by honoring two women a lectoral candidates. One is Frances I. Macauley and the other Mrs. Caroline Ludy Dix, wife of James H. Dix, the State Chairman. The State ticket is headed by one of the new leaders in the movement, Mr. Joseph E. Jennings, of Lansdale, Pa., as candidate for United States Senator. Among the State candidates the women are also recognized by the nomination of Mrs. Janette Reynolds Dix of Delaware County, as candidate for Auditor-General.

At the last meeting of the State Committee special committees were appointed for the raising of campaign funds and for extending the organization in various counties of the State. The State Committee will hold its next meeting in Philadelphia on Monday, September 27, at which time the committee will take up definite plans for a schedule of meetings in the principal towns and cities and as much detail canvassing as it can arrange for.

While realizing the great publicity value of large meetings which will be reported in the newspapers, the officers of the committee are emphasizing to all workers the importance of personal canvassing, as they believe nothing has shown the same vote-getting power as this individual effort in bringing the question before the voters. Chairman Dix says that while it is a little too early to make estimates, he believes that Pennsylvania will show that it has not been asleep in the question of getting votes for the Party, and will be found to have done its part in bringing the day of actual accomplishment nearer.

The Pennsylvania Woman's Committee of the Single Tax Party, under the leadership of Mrs. Caroline Ludy Dix, organized during the campaign last year, is at work again, endeavoring to interest especially the new women voters. Women's organizations are being communicated with, and speakers will be placed before such as are holding meetings for the discussion of political subjects.

Following are the presidential electors for Pennsylvania:

Frank E. Martin, Hatfield, Montgomery Co.; Harry S. Macauley, Glenside, Montgomery Co.; Mrs. Caroline Ludy Dix, Brookline, Delaware Co.; Frederick A. Boch, William Penn P. O., Montgomery Co.; John A. C. Owens, Philadelphia; George A. Haug, Philadelphia; Frank Pfrommer, Philadelphia; James A. Robinson, Philadelphia; Dr. John T. Purdy, Philadelphia; Miss Frances I. Macauley, Philadelphia; Oliver Wingert, Philadelphia; Joseph B. Chamberlain, Philadelphia; John W. Dix, Ardmore Park; Edward

J. Lafferty, Pottstown; Henry L. Webster, Lancaster Co.; Andrew J. Cox, Luzerne Co.; Joseph H. Painter, Lackawanna Co.; William H. Dieter, Schuylkill Co.; Calvin A. Miller, Berks Co.; Charles J. Ford, Susquehanna Co.; George W. Genter, Lycoming Co.; Daniel W. Pesler, Sullivan Co.; Henry W. Dietzel, Franklin Co.; George R. Enck, Cumberland Co.; Oliver F. Clapper, Bedford Co.; William Snodgrass, York Co.; Martin P. Burk, Clearfield Co.; George Pancoast, Westmoreland Co.; Snyder M. Kelly, Fayette Co.; Edward Manus, Washington Co.; Henry V. Bell, Erie Co.; Robert F. Hartzell, Northampton Co.; Harold H. Jones, Clarion Co.; John Z. Diem, Venango Co.; George P. Loomis, Allegheny Co.; August A. Mackel, Allegheny Co.; James B. Sharpe, Allegheny Co.; Thomas J. P. Brown, Allegheny Co.

## Massachusetts

THE fate of our Massachusetts petition is in grave doubt. The Boston Registration Board has put tremendous obstacles in our way. In Massachusetts we have to have 1,000 names which are certified to as voters by the Registration Board, and the Boston Registration Board has been going out of its way to refuse to certify to various names. Thus far we have submitted something like 2,700 signatures, most of which are undoubtedly genuine, but the Board rejects everybody who does not insert the middle initial in a signature, or who does not spell William fully. In other words, they throw out all the names such as Wm., Jos., Geo., Jas., etc. Their interpretation is that a signer of a petition must sign his name exactly as he placed it on the Registration rolls, and inasmuch as almost everybody may sign his name in several different ways, this makes the work very hard. Mr. Reis has only about 900 names and will make a trip to the Registration Board to see if they will certify to enough more to put us over the top. If they refuse, we are lost, as the time for getting more signatures has expired.

It will be a glorious opportunity for the citizens of this State to vote for a principle instead of a humbug, for every sensible man knows that the difference between Cox and Harding is the difference between tweedle-dee and tweedledum.

Massachusetts, the home of Hancock, Adams, Warren, Theodore Parker, William Lloyd Garrison, and a galaxy of the noblest of those who have fought for freedom, will show the world that her sons are worthy of these great names.

We are working hard. Mr. Reis is here, an indefatigable worker, at it constantly and enthusiastically, and just where he ought to be every moment of the time.

Our candidate for Governor, Hollis C. Joy, whom we all admire for his devotion, is working steadily. He has addressed a number of meetings on the Boston Common Sunday afternoons, ably assisted by Messrs. Capen, Reis and Crossman. The audiences have been unusually large and the cause is gaining ground.

We gave a luncheon recently to our distinguished visitor

from New Zealand, Hon. George Fowlds. He was the guest of William Lloyd Garrison and we co-operated with Mr. Garrison in honoring him. He gave a careful summary of events in New Zealand and instilled new hope in our hearts by his very fine address. Mr. Garrison was chairman and gave a brief and excellent talk on the Single Tax. Candidate Joy and Jerome C. Reis contributed brief addresses and the luncheon passed profitably for the cause. All present with one exception signed the nominating petition. The ticket is as follows:

For Governor, Hollis C. Joy of Boston; Lieutenant-Governor, Frank Grant of Westfield; Secretary of State, Robert B. Capon of Newton Centre; Auditor, Lincoln Crowell of Sandwich; State Treasurer, Dr. Charles S. Millet of Brockton.

Following are the names of the presidential electors for this State:

Emanuel Petersen, Wakefield; Jane Dearborn Mills, Brookline; Albert J. Orem, Brookline; Weldon L. Crossman, Revere; Sophia E. Haven, Boston; Gustaf Miller, Roslindale; Anson K. Cross, Ashland; George H. Preising, Matapan, Boston; Henry D. Nunn, Boston; John R. Nichols, Cambridge; Michael C. O'Neill, Brookline; Rupert B. Rogers, Newtonville; John Lavis, Boston; Elizabeth C. Millet, Brockton; Benjamin F. DaCosta, Roxbury, Boston; John H. O'Neill, Brookline; Arthur B. Harper, Weymouth; George D. Ashgate, Boston.

Following are the names of officers of the State Committee: M. C. O'Neill, Chairman, Boston; Hollis C. Joy, Secretary, Albert J. Orem, Treasurer.

## Illinois

THE Single Taxers of Chicago have at last woke up and taken hold of the party movement with enthusiasm. At the time of the Single Tax Convention in Chicago last month, the local Single Taxers had not had their ideas for political action crystallized into a definite and concrete conviction. As a consequence that Convention was viewed with more or less apathy on the part of Chicago reformers. Now, however, the situation has changed and the disinclination to enter the political field largely overcome.

This change has been mainly brought about through the energy and enthusiasm of one man, Mr. W. J. Leary, the State Chairman. He has rounded up the local Georgeites, induced them to see things as he sees them, and in fact wrought a complete change in the local situation.

The first task that Mr. Leary had to accomplish was to get the consent of Single Taxers to have their names placed on the ballot as candidates for the various offices to be filled. This was finally accomplished, notwithstanding the reluctance of many to have their names printed on the ballot for one reason or another (mostly business reasons) or because, while Single Taxers, they did not like to give their adherence to party action without further consideration or perhaps, persuasion. However, Mr. Leary overcame all



obstacles. He secured a full list of candidates for all national and State offices.

The next task was to have the petitions printed, to collect money for expenses and to enlist volunteers to secure signatures. This has all been accomplished. The State law provides that 1,000 names of registered voters who have not voted at the primaries must be secured in order to have the party ticket placed on the ballot. The petitions have been circulated and instead of 1,000 signatures it looks now as if it will be nearer 3,000 than 1,000.

Besides the Single Tax Party ticket on the ballot there will be three or four other parties in the field competing for recognition. The Farmer-Labor or trade union ticket is one, the Liberal Party or the discontented 48ers, is another, besides one or two more now incubating.

The outlook for a large vote for the Single Tax ticket is most encouraging. Estimates by good judges are that the ticket may poll from 10,000 to 20,000 votes in Chicago alone. This opinion is based on the theory that there will be many dissatisfied Republicans who will be unwilling to vote for Harding with his reactionary and "normalcy" ideas, besides his stand on the League of Nations. On the other hand, there will be many Democrats who will be indisposed to vote for Cox on account of their feeling of resentment at the present administration, who are opposed to the League and who fear the Democratic candidate's moist inclinations. Neither of these elements will want to vote for their traditional enemy, the opposition ticket. They will either refrain from voting at all, or can be induced to voice their protest in a third party ticket. The Single Tax ticket, being the best known reform movement on economic lines except the socialistic ticket and on account of the disrepute that party has fallen into in the minds of many, the Single Tax Party is the logical party for them to affiliate with. Besides this, thousands who are not open advocates of the Single Tax will welcome an opportunity to vote a ticket which voices their convictions.

The time is most auspicious for launching the new party.

Following are the presidential electors for Illinois:

Ernest N. Braucher, Chicago; Lillian B. Cronin, Chicago; Dr. Mary C. Conner, Chicago; Lorenzo C. Daniels, Chicago; Dr. Wendall Diebold, Chicago; Dr. Walter E. Elfrink, Chicago; Clayton J. Ewing, Averyville; Herman Forel, Chicago; William A. Gilbert, Oak Park; Dr. Andrew A. Gour, Chicago; Henry H. Hardinge, Chicago; Dr. William Edward Harper, Chicago; Charles Henry Hartman, Chicago; James Derrel Hart, Vienna; Oscar E. Hedrich, Chicago; Charles J. F. Kraft, Chicago; Emil Kurtz, Chicago; Barbara C. Len, Chicago; C. Edward L'Hommedieu, Berwyn; Dr. Morris Lychenheim, Chicago; Michael J. McGane, Chicago; George Chandler Madison, Chicago; Jennie L. Madison, Chicago; John O'Connor, Chicago; Anton S. Rosing, Chicago; Detleff Sievers, Chicago; William K. Smith, Chicago; William D. Tate, Oak Park.

Following are the candidates for office on the Party ticket: Geo. D. Carrington, Chicago, for U. S. Senator; Lewis Dana

Spaulding, Springfield, for Governor; Arthur D. Foyer, Evanston, for Lieut.-Governor; William A. Wittick, Peoria, for Secretary of State; James F. Cronin, Chicago, for Auditor of Public Accounts; Dr. Robt. T. Aiston, Chicago, for State Treasurer; Judge Joseph W. Vistain, Chicago, for Attorney-General; Huldah L. Potter, Chicago, for Clerk of the Supreme Court; Dora Welty Jeremiah W. Connors, of Chicago, and Albert Hennings, of Peoria, for Trustees of the University of Illinois.

## Michigan

**F**OLLOWING are the presidential electors for Michigan: Wilbur Brotherton, Detroit; A. Lawrence Smith, Detroit; Alex S. Diack, Detroit; Henry C. L. Forler, Detroit; Basil McKnight, Detroit; William C. McCarthy, Detroit; Elmer Letourneau, Detroit; Ray Robson, Addison; Geo. D. Ball, Addison; and James N. Symons, Detroit.

The State Chairman is Ray Robson; State Secretary, Elmer Latourneau; and State Treasurer, Geo. D. Ball. Single Taxers in this State have adopted a star as emblem.

## Oklahoma

**J.** A. HAMM, of Enid, and Organizer Robinson, worked hard to get on the ballot in this State, but owing to the time required have failed. But organization will be pushed and there will be no trouble in the future. Mr. Hamm is running for Assessor in Enid.

**O**THER States in which the Single Tax Party will appear on the ballot and in which active campaigns are in progress, may be briefly indicated. Petitions have been successfully filed in Maine as a result of the efforts of Dr. A. W. Plummer, of Lisbon Falls, and Organizer Reis. There is much general dissatisfaction with the old parties. It is hoped that the vote will be sufficiently large in Maine to enable the Party to retain an official place on the ballot.

The presidential electors of this State are: Sanford K. Ballard and Henry G. Casey, of Auburn; Frank B. Hayes and Fred Lyford, of Lewiston; Elmer E. Knowles, of Portland; George E. Kittredge, of South Portland. Dr. Plummer, of Lisbon Falls, is State Chairman, and Mr. Lyford is State Secretary.

Rhode Island appears to be safely on the ballot, with the following presidential electors: John T. Giddings, David Fraser, Jeremiah Sweeney, James A. Doran and Samuel M. Morino.

Indiana is also safely on the ballot, through the work of Organizer Robinson and John F. White. Mr. White was one of the prominent 48ers and was featured in the Chicago papers as a possible candidate for the presidency at the hands of that departed aggregation. Mr. White is enthusiastically supporting the Single Tax Party, and is a tower of strength in Indiana. The presidential electors for the Party in this State are as follows:

T. J. Bowles, Muncie; Frank D. Brown, Indianapolis; George L. Coulter, Muncie; John H. Hewit, New Castle; Esther A. Edwards, Indianapolis; Grace E. Herin, Indianapolis; Lot A. Hufferd, Eaton; Ralph P. Lancaster, Indianapolis; Conrad Rust, Indianapolis; John F. White, Indianapolis.

The State Committee of Indiana are: John F. White, Chairman; Conrad Rust, Secretary; and Edward Barber, Treasurer, all of Indianapolis.

Mr. White writes the REVIEW under date of September 24:

"We now have the healthy nucleus of an organization, have circulated a petition for the required names to get the party ticket printed on the ballots—500—and now have it ready to file Monday, Sept. 27, with a couple hundred names to spare. Unless some complication arises not now contemplated, the Single Tax Party ticket will be printed on all the ballots to be used in the Indiana election Nov. 2. In addition, this will insure it being printed on all the sample ballots usually being circulated throughout the State before the election as well as being printed in the newspapers. The publicity thus secured will be of immense importance, though we are still very seriously handicapped in making any effective propaganda campaign.

"Among the things we have done was the running of an advertisement in the city newspapers asking Single Taxers and others interested in the Single Tax to address the chairman for registration and literature. The response was not large but there were some worth-while results."

Other States where active campaigns may be waged for Macauley and Barnum are Arizona, where our old friend, N. A. Vyne, of Camp Verde, is in charge and Nebraska, where the following State Committee has been officially organized: J. L. Wick, Lincoln, Chairman; and John R. Aye, Lincoln, Secretary and Iowa, with R. N. Douglass in charge of the campaign. Oklahoma was accounted sure, but later information shows that we were too late.

Delaware appears to be on the ballot and the following constitute the State Committee: Louis Kramer, Chairman; John Hagan, Secretary; and A. W. Grant, all of Wilmington. From other States details are lacking as we go to press.

## The Thousand A Month Club

### LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL TREASURER OF THE SINGLE TAX PARTY

I WANT to have a talk with you through the SINGLE TAX REVIEW, with every man, woman and child who is fortunate enough to be one of its readers. You haven't heard of The Thousand a Month Club? Well, it is a very *recherche* institution and I want you to be a member. As National Treasurer one gets a chance to study the psychology of party contribution. Money comes from unexpected sources—and fails to come from those well-intentioned, well-to-do yet lazy people who are prone to "let things slide" until they get good and ready. It is difficult under these circumstances to figure on carrying out a party budget. "Prince and Pauper" might be the sobriquet of your

Treasurer. It is very nerve-racking after a period of plenty to feel the pangs of recurring poverty and starvation.

I lately determined to remedy this unpleasant situation and have founded The Thousand a Month Club. I figure that there are a thousand Single Taxers who will rally to the relief of the Treasurer and the support of the Treasury by pledging themselves to give one dollar a month for the furtherance of the Party programme. It isn't much, but it will suffice. It means \$12,000 a year; and with that income the Treasury for the present will be "on easy street."

How can you become a member of The Thousand a Month Club? Just mail to me, at the address given below, one dollar to pay for your first month's contribution. I will send you a pledge card to fill out, so that your membership may be properly filed.

Our Party plan of campaign includes briefly the following:

1. The organization of State Committees throughout the Union. Of these by Nov. 2 we shall probably have about twenty. We aim to have an active group in every State within a year, so that in the 1921 elections every voter in the country will have an opportunity of registering his or her vote for the Single Tax.

2. The sending of trained organizers into every State to help local Single Taxers place their tickets upon their respective ballots. The election laws of the several States have been carefully analyzed for this purpose. Our organizers will show Single Taxers how comparatively easy it is to place the Single Tax before the people.

3. The creation of a lecture system through the State Committees, so that lectures on the Single Tax may have a continuous forum throughout the country. In time it is expected that this work will be self-supporting through collections and paid admissions. From now on it will afford opportunity for several excellent speakers to work continuously for the cause.

4. The publication and distribution of propaganda literature to be issued by the National Committee and by the recently formed Single Tax Publishing Company.

Such is a brief outline of the work The Thousand a Month Club will underwrite and support. I want every reader of this letter to become a member of the Club and send me his or her dollar at once—now.

Yours for the Single Tax

E. YANCEY COHEN,  
National Treasurer,  
32 East 13th Street, N. Y. City.

ARISTOTLE'S rule was that the first step to the discovery of what a State ought to be is the discovery of what men and life ought to be.

TO ENCOURAGE INDUSTRY: Stop taxing products of labor and industry. Tax special privilege, tax natural opportunities used, or unused, tax land values which are produced and maintained by the community.



# Two States Where We Fight for Amendments

## California

SINCE reaching the ballot campaign work is being carried on in earnest in California, and members of both organizations—the Single Tax League and the Great Adventure League, are doing their utmost to induce people to “Secure low rents and food a-plenty by voting ‘Yes’ on number twenty.” Publicity work is conducted by Gerrit J. Johnson and the above slogan, together with other advertisements, appear regularly in over two hundred California papers.

George A. Briggs is superintending home meetings in Los Angeles and vicinity. Meetings are being held every night where speakers instruct small groups in an informal way and much valuable work is done in this way as many are enlightened who would probably never hear of the message which Henry George gave the world.

Wm. C. deMille instructs a class in Progress and Poverty every Thursday evening at his home and refuses to let anything interfere with this work.

Mrs. Anna George deMille and W. L. Ross were instructed by the Lieutenant-Governor of the State to write the argument for the Single Tax which will appear in a pamphlet containing arguments for and against the various amendments to be voted upon at the coming election. As this pamphlet is sent to every voter in the State it is in itself excellent propaganda.

Over one hundred thousand pieces of literature have been distributed throughout the State during the past month and work in this direction will be carried on until the end of the campaign.

Mrs. Lona Ingram Robinson is devoting much of her time to doing hand-to-hand work, interesting people in the amendment and distributing literature. Mrs. Robinson gets our message to many persons in the course of a day. Mr. Robinson is also one of our faithful workers, and attends to the most important work of looking after the funds, which, however, do not long remain in his keeping as the avenues through which they slip are so many that they are disbursed almost as soon as received.

W. L. Ross is spending a few weeks in San Francisco and is speaking to two and three large meetings every evening. He is speaking mostly to labor organizations and his addresses are being received with enthusiasm.

A dinner was given September 17th at the Hotel Ramona by friends of the Single Tax movement. The dinner is the opening of the campaign for Amendment No. 20, which appears on the November ballot. This campaign is in charge of William L. Ross, of Los Angeles, who is here for a few weeks.

Joseph S. Thompson, of the Pacific Electric Manufacturing Company, will preside at the banquet and the speakers will include Professor Arthur Brodeur of the University of California and Dr. Mary Hussey, of New Jersey.

In these days of unrest caused by high prices, scarcity of houses, etc., people are eager for a change—people who have heretofore been satisfied with things as they are.

## Oregon

J. R. HERMANN is making an active campaign among the labor elements in behalf of the Single Tax amendment. In this he has the active co-operation of Arthur Brock, of the Typographical Union, who was a recent visitor to the East at the Typographical Convention in Albany.

The Portland *Journal* continues to print letters from J. R. Hermann. Just how long that paper will be permitted to do so is problematical, for the advertisers are threatening to withdraw their patronage and are even now doing so.

Mr. Hermann has announced that the headquarters at Portland will be maintained whether the Single Tax forces win or lose. If they win, they will keep open for the purposes of glorifying the victory, and if they lose they will re-submit the measure the same day—so the unconquerable leader of the Oregon forces announces.

The measure on which Oregon voters will vote in November provides that after 1925 “the full rental value of land, irrespective of all improvements, shall be taken in lieu of all other taxes for the maintenance of government, and for such other purposes as the people may direct.”

Copies of the proposed constitutional amendment, with arguments pro and con, have been mailed to the number of 339,750 to all the voters in the State. The argument opposing is furnished by the Oregon State Chamber of Commerce, in which they say: “Land is the one imperishable property,” and “as such lends itself to being bought and held until the owner is able to use it productively.” To this Mr. Herman replies in the columns of the *Portland Journal*:

We deny that statement. Land never was and never can be made property by nature. Man may make artificial laws governing its tenantry. But property originates in the effort of man himself. Labor applied to land is the only source of property. Whatever labor fashions from land that will conduce to human desire alone is the origin of property. Since the possession of some locations gives an advantage over others, the Single Tax would equalize this advantage by charging the individuals who enjoyed the special advantage the difference in the value of their location for the general welfare, in which all share equally. The Chamber of Commerce assumes that capital and labor would not improve land unless they paid first the price the forestaller exacted. The entire West was built up on free land. Free land and free land alone is the cornerstone of American democracy. It was the one inducement that caused the oppressed of Europe to break away from their rulers and brave the struggles of a strange land. Free land means free men, and it was free men that in turn overthrew the autocracies of Europe.

The one single fortification the forestallers entrench behind is fear, born of ignorance. Their sole reliance is that they may bluff the people into believing that if they dis-

continue to rob the people, the social order will fly into space, and there will be no security anywhere. That if this awful Single Tax should carry, Oregon will become a hole in the earth and a kindly sea will fill the gap and the inhabitants will be engulfed under a tidal wave or be seen racing naked and hungry across the mountains to safe shelter.

A debate has been arranged by the Pine Grove Grange between C. C. Chapman, editor of the *Oregon Voter*, and J. R. Hermann. The State Chamber of Commerce supplies the opposing speaker.

It is significant that in this campaign the Chamber of Commerce represents the opposition. Never before have the forces favoring and opposing our reform been so clearly lined up.

To the printed arguments against the measure put out by the Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Cridge has replied through the labor papers, and Messrs. Bowerman and Hermann through the Portland press.

James Richmond, of Coquell, is stumping the Coast on his own initiative.

The *Oregonian* remains strangely silent on the issue, and the Portland *Telegram* has printed only one editorial against it. Several bets are offered at even money that the measure will pass, with no takers.

Gerrit Johnson has thrown himself into the campaign with all his old-time enthusiasm.

## Maryland

THE most important political movement in Maryland this Fall is the attempt in Baltimore County (the largest county in the State, which does not include Baltimore), to adopt a Home Rule Charter, which will give it a County Council, who will have power to pass local legislation and who will appoint a County Manager to conduct the affairs of the county in place of the County Commissioners.

A Constitutional Amendment adopted in 1915 provided that the legislature of 1916 should make a grant of express powers under which any county could elect a Charter Board and adopt a Charter giving it a certain measure of Home Rule. Twenty per cent. of the voters of the county had to nominate the Board, and, if the Charter is adopted, amendments thereto may be proposed by 20% of the voters, and adopted by popular vote.

The Charter Board was elected last Fall and has submitted a Charter providing a County Manager form of government, as above outlined.

The politicians of both parties are making desperate efforts to defeat the Charter at the polls. Ex-Judge Burke, who recently resigned from the Maryland Court of Appeals, has declared that it would legalize the Single Tax, and is leading the opposition, speaking in all parts of the county and making all sorts of wild statements regarding it. One of his assertions is that the County Commissioners being Constitutional Officers, cannot be abolished, so that the

adoption of the Charter will create a dual government and all kinds of chaos. Only extreme judicial bias could uphold a view of this kind.

The Taxpayers League of Baltimore County, who were instrumental in electing the Charter Board, are making a gallant fight, which if successful will be one of the few bright spots in this Fall's rather gloomy election.

James R. Brown of New York is booked to speak at the City Club here on October 9th on the "Problem of Municipal Revenues," and a meeting at which the Mayor will preside has been arranged for him in Annapolis the night before.

CHARLES J. OGLE.

## Texas

MAYOR FRANK W. WOZENCRAFT, of Dallas, the youngest chief magistrate in the Union, speaking recently to a reporter of the *Houston Post* said:

"The amount of land between Houston and Dallas that is not cultivated nor even cleared of timber is very noticeable and covers practically half of the distance. From my position in the airplane I could distinctly see the outlines of timbered areas below. There is enough uncultivated land between here and Dallas to furnish homes and farms for twice as many people as are now living in that area."

That the big landowners of Texas are fearful of the agitation now proceeding to make land pay more of the burdens of taxation is shown by a letter which recently appeared in the newspapers from one of the largest landholders, calling Mr. Neff a "Socialist." The latter is the Democratic candidate for the nomination of Governor. Mr. Neff has declared in favor of a graduated tax on land.

The *Wichita Falls Labor Journal* comments on Sir Auckland Geddes statement that the crop shortage of 1914 caused the great war, that the usual surplus was lacking in that year, and that the ruling powers of Germany, looking about for new sources of supply, brought on the war. The *Labor Journal* says that if the war was caused by land monopoly then other and future wars are possible and should be averted, and points to the Single Tax as the measure that could have averted that war and will prevent another.

Wm. A. Black is now a member of the House of Representatives.

James A. Robinson, National Organizer of the Single Tax Party, who visited Texas with a view of getting the Party on the ballot in that State, found Texas a peculiarly fertile field for Single Tax agitation, offering an unrivalled opportunity for Party activity. He arrived too late to secure the Single Tax a place on the ballot for this presidential election, but the Party will go ahead to make the Single Tax a political issue as soon after the November elections as possible. Mr. Robinson believes that two years of Single Tax Party activity in Texas, with its great numbers of tenant farmers, would produce a revolution.

## A Gleam of Reason in The New York Legislature

**D**RIVEN by the dread of impending public disorder and calamity which seemed inevitable if the power of eviction hitherto possessed by landlords should be exerted to the full on October 1st, Governor Smith called a Special Session of the Legislature of the State of New York, to meet at Albany on September 20th for the purpose of dealing with the housing problem. The session lasted from Monday until early Saturday morning. Probably because certain members of the legislature disliked being regarded as "quitters," they deemed it incumbent to repeat their performances, which had consumed so much of the time of the Assembly at the regular session. The ousting of the Socialist members who had been re-elected at special elections, thus consumed the Tuesday session in the Assembly. Thursday was devoted to a public hearing on various proposals amending the laws governing landlord and tenant, and certain new proposals which were expected to remedy the housing difficulty. As a matter of fact it was chiefly an opportunity for a grand stand play, for with a single exception it had no effect upon the course of legislation. It seems probable that the bill proposing to exempt income derived from mortgages from State Income Tax was killed by arguments submitted at the public hearing.

### DEFEAT NOT TO BE REGRETTED

The defeat of the bill was no calamity. The amount of exemption which would have been obtained under it was so slight as to leave the situation substantially unaffected. The important features of the bills adopted were, first: to deprive the landlords of the power of summary eviction; second: to penalize landlords, who with a view to compelling tenants to vacate buildings, deprived them of any service to which they were normally entitled; and, third: to permit local authorities to exempt from local taxation residence buildings, begun within eighteen months, for a period of ten years.

### THE TEN YEAR EXEMPTION

In order to understand the action taken, it must be kept in mind that the Joint Legislative Housing Committee appointed at the regular legislative session of 1919, of which Senator Charles C. Lockwood is Chairman, had been continued to consider the housing problem, and report to the next regular session of the legislature. This Committee prepared substantially all the bills that were enacted and reported some bills which were not enacted. The Committee held a number of hearings during the Summer, and was bombarded with all sorts of suggestions for solving their difficulties, many of the schemes involving the use of State or municipal funds for housing enterprises to be directly undertaken or subsidized by Government. The Committee is to be congratulated on having wisely steered clear of these measures, and for not having been taken in by their speciousness, which seems to have captured so

many otherwise sensible citizens. One loses faith in the reality of the traditional American sense of humor, when one beholds people urging the same Government which throttles housing enterprise by unjust taxation with one hand, to administer stimulants to the victim with the other. The Legislative Committee after struggling against the acceptance of the idea of exempting improvements from taxation, which had been suggested to it for two years, finally found itself in the position of being obliged to confess that it could make no contribution whatever towards solving the housing problem except by adopting the idea. It may further be said with truth that little gratitude is due the Committee for the action which it took only as a last resort. The Committee recommended a bill to exempt buildings completed after April 1st, 1920 and completed, or in process of construction on January 1st, 1922 from taxation for ten years, or until January 1st, 1932.

### THEY DIDN'T KNOW—SOMEBODY TOLD THEM

It must be said the legislature adopted this measure without really understanding the principle involved. The Committee had been told by a number of persons that this measure would work, and so drafted the bill, and the legislature was told by the Committee this bill would work, and therefore they adopted it. Finally Governor Smith signed the bill, though it was not one of those recommended by his own Housing Reconstruction Committee. This report represents considerable thought, but had all its suggestions been enacted into law, it would have led nowhere.

### MAKING HOME BUILDING NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE

It passes comprehension that almost none of the students of the housing problem have observed the fact that money invested in manufacturing houses is more heavily taxed than that employed in any other industry. If anyone doubts this, let him consider the fact that at the present rate of taxation, substantially the entire value of the investment is taken in taxation during the life of the structure. The reason why this escapes the attention of so many people is because of the absurd confusion involved in classifying land and buildings together as real estate, and applying to two such different subjects of taxation the same rule. It is no wonder that in spite of the unusual attractiveness of houses as subjects of investment, that this heavy burden has discouraged building to a point where good housing for the poor is unobtainable. If the investor puts his money into the manufacture of clothing or food, he is able in the State of New York to escape nearly all direct taxation upon it.

### THE BASIC ERROR

The reason for this misapprehension is of course the mistaken idea entertained by nearly all but Single Taxers, that the house, as well as the land upon which it stands, benefits by expenditure on public improvements, and therefore should pay its share of the cost of these improvements. One thing this house stringency should have taught us is, that a house is never worth more than the cost of reproduction.



Of course it must be kept in mind that the legislature did not make this law mandatory. It gave the option to city authorities to grant the exemption if they should see fit. It is therefore important to those who wish to have the measure made effective, to see that the municipal authorities act promptly, so that the full benefit of the time allowed for construction may be had by citizens who wish to take advantage of it.

#### SOMETHING TO BE GRATEFUL FOR

Perhaps the thing which this action of the legislature most impresses upon us is the willingness of the public and its representatives to try all kinds of quack nostrums before utilizing commonsense remedies. Had the Constitution not stood in the way, we would almost certainly be launched upon a programme of paternalistic legislation which would have been as futile to achieve the result desired as has been the housing programme launched by the British Government along the same lines. We may therefore be grateful for a Constitution which gave the legislature power to do the right thing and prevented it from doing the wrong one. It generally happens the other way. Perhaps when the people have had a chance to observe the effect of untaxing new buildings, they may want to extend the period of exemption for all time.

## A Notable Dinner

**M**OVEMENTS, like individuals and institutions, have habits. The irrepressible habit of the Single Tax movement is to hold dinners. So much so that neither the announcement of a dinner to be or the reporting of one that has been arouses much enthusiasm. When the announcement is received we feel it a duty to the habit to go, regardless of our attitude toward the reason that prompted some Single Taxer to call us together, and when the dinner is reported we interest ourselves only in knowing who were there.

However, a dinner was held on August 28, 1920—the year must not be forgotten—at Keen's English Chop House, New York, which was of more than passing moment. It was a gathering of forward looking men and women, a gathering that differed from most dining hall meetings of Single Taxers in that the pervading spirit was earnest rather than critical, purposeful rather than reminiscent. It was the Notification Dinner tendered by the National Single Tax Party to its candidates for President and Vice-President. A similar dinner had never been held before, and, as these are the first national candidates of the party, it will never be repeated.

The number present was not large—somewhat less than a hundred. But everybody there felt the importance of the occasion, that he or she was participating in a solemn undertaking to advance the cause of humanity. For the first time in the history of the movement the Single Tax was launched as a national issue. No voter can henceforth ignore it; he must be for the Single Tax, or against it.

Mr. Oscar H. Geiger, of New York, presided. The earnest character of the meeting was indicated in his opening remarks. He begged indulgence for his shortcomings as presiding officer, explaining that he did not know until shortly before the dinner that he was to sit at the head of the table. Then with his characteristic earnestness he declared that the Single Tax Party never asks its members to serve but drafts them as he had been drafted on this occasion. The cause is too great to permit personal amenities to hinder its progress; every man is expected to do his duty as prescribed by the organization.

James H. Dix, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the memorable Chicago Convention, made the notification address. Dix always smiles. He smiled his way into the hearts of those who sat before him in Chicago, so that they forgave him his strict adherence to and thorough knowledge of Cushing's Manual of Parliamentary Rules; and now that he was divested of his commanding gavel his smile seemed all the more winning. There is a moist twinkle in his bright eye, his mouth curls up at the side, his high-pitched, resonant voice breathes sincerity. And he is sincere; that is why we love him. For a moment, when he delivered the message of the Chicago Convention to candidates Macauley and Barnum, declaring that this was the greatest moment of his life, it looked very much as if Dix's emotion was getting the better of him; a close observer asserts that a tear was visible.

Then came Macauley—our own "Bob." It did one's heart good to hear the applause and cheers that followed toastmaster's Geiger's introduction of the first candidate for President of the Single Tax Party. It was spontaneous, it was real. Those who know Macauley need not be told that he delivered a great speech; for he is an orator. But, as usual, he did the unusual. He talked for over an hour on the Single Tax to a group of people almost every one of whom knew the story as well as he knows it. He warned them in advance that he was going to do it. Yet they listened. They did not fidget. They hung on his every word, just as if this were the first time they had heard the great gospel. A man who can do that deserves to be the standard bearer of the Single Tax movement; for if he can make Single Taxers listen to and like his presentation of the philosophy, then he surely can preach it effectively to the unknowing millions.

Of course, Macauley was eloquent, fiery, thundering. How well, then, did the suave and humorous address of Richard C. Barnum, of Ohio, candidate for Vice-President, fit into the picture. Those who had met Barnum in Chicago, had heard him present the Single Tax before the Platform Committee of the Forty-Eighters, had noted his quietly convincing manner in the Single Tax Party Convention, knew that Barnum would acquit himself as befitted the occasion. He has a calm, modest demeanor, a shyness that belies his remarkable business ability until his ardor and determination become evident. He is the ablest and most sincere candidate for Vice-President of any of the political parties.

Something happened after Barnum's speech that readers of the REVIEW are requested not to divulge to candidate Cox. There was an appeal for campaign funds. While somewhat less than fifteen million dollars was subscribed, nevertheless the generous response was indicative of the zeal of those present. At this point it might be well to mention that if the Single Taxers of America knew on how little amount of money the party conducts its campaigns that are so productive of publicity value, all objection to party action will disappear. Political action is the cheapest form of propaganda.

National Chairman William J. Wallace, of New Jersey, closed the speech-making with an account of how the legislature of his State had recently enacted a law making it exceedingly difficult for the Single Tax Party to get on the official ballot. He instanced this as indicative of the opposition we must expect from the reactionary parties, controlled by the landlords, as we gain in numbers and influence, and exhorted us to keep together for the terrible battle that will ensue. "That," he said, "will be the time that tries men's souls."

It was a great gathering—great in its object and great in the earnestness that pervaded it. "From now on," said Oscar H. Geiger, in his opening remarks, "a Single Taxer is one who votes for the Single Tax," and from the applause that greeted this remark it was certain that those present agreed with this definition. F. C.

## Canada for an International Single Tax League

AT a dinner given in honor of Wm. H. Dunkley, of Birmingham, England, at Toronto on August 17, the following resolution was moved by Mrs. Hector Prenter and unanimously adopted:

"That in order to advance reconstruction among the nations, after the waste and ruin caused by the recent war, it is necessary that such nations as Great Britain, the United States and Canada, now enjoying large measures of freedom, should lead in this work, so as to bring about international peace, based on justice.

"Therefore, be it resolved that we, here assembled, representing the Single Tax Association of Ontario, pledge ourselves to assist our American and English co-workers in forming an International Single Tax League, free from sectarian or political influences, for the purpose of freeing the land for the people, as a basis for reconstruction.

"It is also resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to the National Single Tax Party of the United States, the League for the Taxation of Land Values of England, the Western Canada Single Tax League, and the leading Single Tax journals of Great Britain, United States and Canada."

Mr. Dunkley will be remembered by those who attended the Single Tax Party Convention at Chicago. If he will consent, we tender him the nomination as first president of the proposed International League.

## Argentine—A Single Tax Party to be Organized

THE Georgist Society of Cordoba has issued in pamphlet form an address delivered by Dr. C. Villalobos Dominguez, July 20, 1919, in the Rivera Indarte theatre of that city, upon the subject: 'Our Feudalism and the Georgist Doctrine of Freedom.' Cordoba, with its University and traditions of culture, claims to be the Oxford of the Argentine. Naturally enough, therefore, the local Georgist movement is led by a phalanx of intellectuals; and in this campaign work the philosophy of Henry George, with all its ethical and historical implications, takes precedence over his merely fiscal device of the Single Tax.

Dr. Villalobos Dominguez occupies a chair in the University of Buenos Aires. He is himself a recent convert from Marxian socialism. He was speaking to a congenial audience when he declared:

"Many good things we have learned from the most cultured nations of Europe; but also some things that we must unlearn as quickly as possible. And there is no more important and peremptory task before us than the abolition of the feudal system which we inherited from the Europeans. When we have accomplished that, we shall have done something great and memorable; we shall have at last emancipated mankind." . . . .

"We are taught in the schools that feudalism ended with the Middle Ages. But that is not so.

"In the whole civilized world, and therefore here, in the Argentine Republic, we are still living essentially, though not in all its forms, under the feudal system; and until that is destroyed, we shall not be free and independent men."

"The feudal system means that in society there shall be some men, a few men, who are owners of the land: they are the masters; and others, the many; who do not possess land and have to live on that owned by the masters and pay them tribute: they are the laborers, the plebeians, the leaseholders and tenants.

"And this country is full of leaseholders and tenants who pay tribute to the lords of the soil. Nominally, in theory, men are free, for the Constitution says so; but in reality they are mere laborers, because the Property Registry proves it."

"Life here," he says further, "is for the worker as hard as in any other country. Only the laborers of the poorest regions of Europe—Poland, Galicia or Calabria—can gain any advantage by coming here. And here we have some people who are eagerly hoping that the poverty and devastation in Germany and Belgium will be so great that many unfortunates there will find it to their advantage to come to the Argentine Republic!"

Dr. Villalobos Dominguez will have nothing to do with programmes of compromise:

"Do not be satisfied," he says, "with a Georgism that pleases and does not alarm the landlords. Such a Georgism will accomplish little. I do not propose beheading the land-

lords, but to deprive them bit by bit of their rentals—not for you to hold, but for the State, which is the community. Try to persuade the landlords—because it is the truth—that their privileges are unjust and that you are striving for social conditions in which they and you, their children and yours, will enjoy a better existence.

“But we do not expend much energy in such a campaign, because few will be convinced. Devote yourselves, rather, and ardently, to making converts amongst those who are not land owners

“Then you will have on one side the land owners, and on the other all the workers, the manufacturers, the business men, professional men, artists, employees—and then let us see who will win the elections!”

Dr. Villalobos Dominguez, in a letter just received from him, advises us that a “National Georgist Party” is in course of formation in the Argentine, under the leadership of prominent intellectuals and influential social and business groups.

Under the inspired leadership of her first President, the great Bernardino Rivadavia, the Argentine took a tentative step toward real democracy. Clerical reaction, however, soon obliterated that initiative and its author; and the world still awaits elementary economic justice.

Our hearty best wishes to Argentine Georgists in their new enterprise. Their success would be a welcome instance of historical justice, the fulfilment of a nation’s earliest and holiest dream—of a deed “great and memorable,” an “emancipated mankind.”

## Mexico

THE *New York Times*, of September 9th, in the report of an interview with President de la Huerta, with a sub-heading “Huerta Believes in the Single Tax,” quotes him as saying:

“Personally, I believe in the Single Tax and I have started various measures, which are now being studied, which have a tendency toward implanting the Single Tax system in Mexico.”

## Ontario Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920

THE Farmer-Labor Government of the Province of Ontario, Canada, has marked its first year of office by permissive legislation apparently favoring municipal tax exemption of improvements, incomes and business. The following is the main clause of The Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920, as it is called:

“Notwithstanding anything contained in The Assessment Act or in any general or special Act of this Legislature, the council of a city, town, township or village with the assent of the qualified ratepayers as required by the Municipal Act, may pass a by-law exempting from taxation for all purposes including school purposes for the first year

in which the by-law takes effect not less than 10 and not more than 25 per cent. of the assessed value of improvements, income and business assessment and from year to year thereafter a further additional percentage of such assessed value not less than 10 and not more than 25 per cent. until (a) the whole or (b) such portion as may be fixed by the by-law of such assessed value is so exempted from taxation.”

The original draft of the Bill, as presented to the Legislative Assembly, referred assent to the “municipal electors,” which would have meant submission to vote on a broad franchise. But, under pressure from the Conservatives and a few leading Liberals, the reference was restricted to “qualified ratepayers.” In other words, the new Law, while apparently favoring an economic reform of considerable promise, in reality disfranchises the majority of the makers of economic values, depriving them of the precious political right of voting in the adjustment of municipal tax burdens. This is hardly a seemly performance in this year of grace, 1920. Have liberalism and the progressive forces of labor and agriculture of Canada been shell-shocked by the war into political aphasia, to forgetfulness and neglect of primary democratic rights? We trust this matter will not be allowed to remain where the Ontario Municipal Tax Exemption Act, 1920, has left it.

## Kingston, Ontario

OUR Canadian colleague, *The Square Deal*, is responsible for the following item of news:

“By a by-law voted, May 19, with a view to encouraging the building of houses, provision was made for exempting from taxes up to \$2,500 for a period of five years all dwellings erected on vacant lots during 1920 and 1921. The vote was 572 for and 104 against.”

## Prince Rupert, British Columbia

THE *Square Deal* of June contains the following extract from a letter received from C. W. Peck, M.P., who represents Prince Rupert City:

“I would like to point out,” he says, “that the City of Prince Rupert, which I represent, has no taxes on improvements, nor has there been since the town was incorporated. I took a part myself in having this instituted, and it is a notorious fact that Prince Rupert is in the best possible financial position.”

## How Many Single Taxers Are There in the U. S.?

ONE often hears the remark that the country is honeycombed with Single Taxers. Perhaps this is merely another case of the wish being father to the thought. In order to compile as extensive a list of Single Taxers as possible the REVIEW asks you to send in the names and addresses of all the people you know who believe in the



Single Tax. Do not give us names of people you think are Single Taxers, or of people you would like to have in the movement. Send in the names only of those who have told you that they believe in our doctrine. If you confine yourself to such names only, we think you will be surprised at the few you can submit. Try it. Send names to the SINGLE TAX REVIEW, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

## The Review to Its Readers

**T**HE Single Tax Publishing Company has not yet formulated all its plans. It will do so before the year is ended.

The REVIEW will appear as a monthly. But our readers are asked to exercise patience.

In the meantime send us subscriptions. Get your friends to subscribe. Get their subscriptions and send them in. Do not take their promise to send—they forget it. Get their dollar and remit to us. It is just as easy.

And remember we want news, news, news! Clippings from newspapers commenting in any way on the Single Tax; legislative measures, actual or proposed, showing a trend in our direction; notices of lectures and addresses on the Single Tax or taxation; information as to the doings of Single Taxers.

Let us have a correspondent in every city. Keep in touch with this office. Remember that while the REVIEW advocates the party, because it believes in the party idea to which all Single Taxers are now coming, there is much independent work of individuals going on that is of great value. Keep us informed.

And when the election returns are in send us in time for the next issue an analysis of these returns, incidents of the campaign, personalities coming to the front. Tell us all about the new leaders. Let us get in touch with one another.

I plead for team-work. I ask for hospitable recognition of every honest effort intended to advance the cause. I ask your help in getting subscriptions for stock of the Single Tax Publishing Company.

Help place the gradually increasing subscription list of the REVIEW where its value as a carrier of news and our fundamental message will make itself felt in the newspaper offices of the country, in public libraries and in the minds of men in public places. The REVIEW has outlived all its rivals. It is the only Single Tax paper in America, excluding of course, those which sympathise with the movement but are issued primarily for other objects. A circulation of from ten to twenty thousand is attainable, but to do this within the next two years requires work. Every Single Taxer should see that every other Single Taxer is a subscriber. Do this now.

Messrs. Reis and Robinson, whose notable work in getting on the ballot, East and West, has been of enormous value to the movement, will make a tour of the country in the interests of the Single Tax Publishing

Company. You will be notified of their coming. Give these splendid veterans of the cause all the help you can.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

## BOOK NOTICES

### A FINE BIT OF BOOK-MAKING

Mr. Emil O. Jorgensen, of Chicago, has issued a new edition, much enlarged and supplemented with charts and additional quotations, of the little publication which he got out two years ago, and which had a large circulation.

This volume is attractively bound in cloth, beautifully printed, and has 121 pages, pocket size  $9\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$ . It is entitled "The Next Step Toward Real Democracy," and is published at \$1.25 in cloth and 75 cents in paper. It is the result of much careful discrimination in the selection of passages from authorities that buttress our arguments for the Single Tax, and we trust it will have a large circulation. Liberal extracts are made from the SINGLE TAX REVIEW and SINGLE TAX YEAR BOOK. Copies can be had by addressing Mr. Jorgensen at 1440 American Bond and Mortgage Building, Chicago.

### FREE COMPETITION (LIBRE COMPETENCIA)

by Manuel Lopez Villamil, is the 9th in the series of popular economic booklets issued by Ediciones Populares Bernardino Rivadavia, Calle Esmeralda 91, Buenos Aires. This booklet is an exceptionally brilliant exposition of the Geogist philosophy, recalling by its lofty inspiration some of the most impressive pages of "Progress and Poverty." The booklets of this series are published at 15 cents per copy, including foreign postage.

\* THE United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, 11 Tuthill street, London, S.W.I., has issued an important pamphlet, entitled "Land Value Rating and the Abolition of Rates on Buildings and Improvements," and prepared by A. W. Madsen, B.Sc. It is a mine of carefully collected and collated official data on the operation of the tax exemption of buildings and improvements, with particular reference to Australia and New Zealand. Every Single Taxer taking an active interest in the progress of this movement, as well as every student of political economy in its fiscal aspect, should consult this little pamphlet, with its 32 pages of closely packed and well arranged facts and figures. The selling price in London is one shilling. We shall be glad to mail a copy on receipt of 25 cents.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### COMMENDS OUR ACTION

I was very glad at the time of the recent Chicago Conventions of the Single Tax and other parties to see that the Single Tax Party was not drawn into the vortex of half principles and palliative and subversive platforms being urged by Labor and other interests.

Agate Beach, Ore.

C. A. LINGHAM.

### FROM AN ENGLISH FRIEND

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

All around we are waiting for something to turn up. I believe that every civilized country must have a separate roll of site valuations, and everywhere local taxation tend to site values. Protection has a new lease of life from the war; any country which is dependent upon any other for any necessity or convenience of life has given hostage to whoever rules their communications beyond the frontier. Even gross tribute to a taxable fellow citizen is better than utter deprivation in foreign or civil war, which we must regard as a normal condition pending American agreement. But Henry George's principles and teachings ring as true and clear amid our sordid revolutions as when he wrote, and the besotted

folly of humanity is not to be laid to the charge of those who have organized a Single Tax Party. May their hearts be steeled to take courage under defeat. Antæus, son of Possidon and Ge, was unconquerable when thrown in contact with his mother, the land. And we doubly so, for have we not a double inheritance, of Ge in the frontiers of our Prophet's name?

Falmouth, Eng.

(CAPT.) MERVYN STEWART.

#### CAME OUT ALL RIGHT

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I received the SINGLE TAX REVIEW last night and read it through, as I have long wanted to read a personal account of the doings of the 48 combination. When I came to what appears under the sub-head, "Aimless Idealists and Plain Nuts," I laughed until I thought the party in the next room would conclude that I had gone insane.

I agree with you that the Single Tax Party was the only one of the combination that came out of the pitch-pot all right; you will gain strength from the contrast.

Washington, D. C.

LEONARD E. TILDEN.

#### JONES' ITEMIZED RENT BILL

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I am interested in the proposed change in the REVIEW, and will be glad to see the news of the day discussed therein. Since last Spring I have been meaning to write my appreciation of your article, "Jones' Itemized Rent Bill." I think little stories of this kind are very pertinent, and more likely to attract the attention of outsiders than heavier and more substantial articles.

Sometimes stories are too fanciful, or contain statements that are likely to antagonize; but it seems to me that this one will commend itself to many, and that if it could be printed as an attractive little folder, and under it a few terse sentences explaining the Single Tax, it would make a valuable pamphlet for distribution.

Swarthmore, Pa.

BERTHA SELLERS.

#### FROM ONE OF THE OLD GUARD

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Allow me to congratulate you on your Convention Number of the REVIEW. I am delighted with the course of the Single Tax delegates at Chicago who refused to be stampeded into Socialism by the Farmer-Labor route. The running of Single Tax candidates for President, Vice-President and Congressmen, for the first time in our history, is an epoch-marking event, and means that the death struggle between true Americanism and the pseudo-Americanism of the old party politicians and their monopolist backers, is on at last.

Hgo, Mexico

R. B. BRINSMADÉ.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

HAROLD SUDELL, one of the old time Single Taxers of Pennsylvania, says, referring to the activity of the party: "I'll not quarrel with any Single Taxer as to the way of working so long as it diffuses knowledge—so much needed—of our great reform". This spirit is to be commended.

LESLIE M. SHAW, Secretary of the Treasury under President McKinley, is retained by the Anti-Single Tax League to combat the proposed amendment in California.

We ask indulgence of Max Hayes, editor of the Cleveland *Citizen*, and vice-presidential candidate of the Farmer-Labor Party, for speaking of him as William Hayes. Mr. Hayes is too well known for such an error to have slipped by us. He has edited a labor paper for twenty-five years. He is a State Socialist, but believes in the taxation of land values. Certainly his paper has always been hospitable to the Single

Tax, and articles in favor of the principle have appeared from Mr. Hayes himself in the columns of the *Citizen*. His full name is Maximilian Sebastian Hayes.

DR. VICTOR C. ALDERSON, well known Single Taxer and president of the Colorado School of Mines, has written what is said to be the first book on the oil shale industry. Dr. Alderson spent the Summer of 1920 investigating the oil shale industry in England, Scotland and France. The work is published by Frederick A. Stokes, of this city.

THE *Fairhope Courier*, speaking of the attempt made by Chicago Single Taxers to form a party, some twenty years ago, says that owing to the "serious division" caused by this effort, the organization in that city that was doing a valuable educational effort soon died out. This is a trifle disingenuous, since our friend Gaston must know of many other cities where once flourishing Single Tax organizations have ceased to exist in the absence of any attempt to form a party.

VICTOR DONAHEY, State Auditor of Ohio and Democratic nominee for Governor of that State, points out that there are 181 sections of the Ohio laws levying taxes, fees and assessments that accrue to the public treasuries of public officials.

MRS. JULIA GOLDZIER lectured on the "Single Tax and the Evils of Vacant Land" at the Dress Shop in Bayonne, N. J., on September 3, before an intelligent and appreciative audience. Mr. Chas. Goldzier is one of the presidential electors of the Single Tax Party in New Jersey.

THE body of Major-General Wm. C. Gorgas, who died in London on July 4, arrived in this country to be conveyed to Arlington Cemetery, near Washington. Impressive simplicity marked the ceremonies attending the passing of the remains to their final resting place.

JOHN SERRIGAN is a frequent contributor to the *International Molders' Journal*, of interesting and racy articles advocating our principles.

THE *New Freedom*, of Boise, Idaho, edited by James D. Whelan, published liberal extracts from our Open Letter to DeValera.

JOHN B. MCGAURAN, of Denver, was a recent lecturer before the McGlynn Association at a meeting to which the public were invited to view the completed Quinn statue of Dr. McGlynn. Charles Whelan and Frank McGlynn, nephews of Dr. McGlynn, were present. Frank McGlynn's wonderful impersonation of Abraham Lincoln in *Drinkwater's* play at the Cort Theater, this city, has received the plaudits of playgoers and critics.

PRESIDENTIAL candidate Macauley's statement in the *Globe* of this city, which is printed elsewhere in our columns, will appear in translation in *El Impuesto Unico*, of Buenos Aires.

AMONG the recent visitors to this office may be mentioned our old friend, John B. McGauran, of Denver; William H. Dunkley, of Birmingham, Eng.; Hon. George Fowlds, of New Zealand and Paul Schweitzer of Budapest, who came with a letter of introduction from Lieut. Braun; and Dr. Juan Alvarez, of Rosario.

WE have duly acknowledged receipt of an invitation to a dinner in this city, in honor of Gen. Salvador Alvarado. Absence from the city prevented our attendance. General Alvarado is a Single Taxer and while Governor of Yucatan, adopted the principle of heavy land taxation and exemption of improvements as his policy for the government of that province. He is the Minister of Finance for the new government of Mexico.

THE SINGLE TAX MUST BE IMMEDIATELY APPLIED TO PALESTINE" is the title of an article in the *Jewish Forum* for July, by M. W. Norwalk.

EDWARD M. CAFFALL, of Palisade, N. J., is now running his column of current economic and political comment in 15 papers, one of which is in Colorado and another in New Orleans. This column will be furnished weekly to any Single Taxer who can get his local paper to use it. For full particulars address the SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

A BEAUTIFUL tribute to the character and genius of Marion Reedy from Laurie J. Quinby appears in the *Star* of San Francisco, for September.

GEORGE EDWARDS, of Ohio, sent this characteristic letter to the Macauley Notification Dinner: "The Party forever! And cursed be he that henceforth maketh for us a graven or molten image of a pussy."

THE *Cleveland Press* prints the picture of Mrs. Charlotte Smith with a biographical sketch of the lady. Mrs. Smith is in charge of the Single Tax headquarters at Cleveland.

EDWIN MARKHAM's new volume of poems, "The Gates of Paradise," contains a poem on Dr. McGlynn, not up to Markham's usual excellence. Since "The Man with the Hoe," "Lincoln," "The Angelus," and a few others, all epoch-making work, much of Mr. Markham's verse has been deplorably commonplace. Some of the verses, but not many, in the present volume, are distant echoes of his old incomparable power.

THE Single Tax Party is on the ballot in twice as many States as the Farmer-Labor Party. The failure of the latter to get on the ballot in Ohio is surprising. No effort was made by the Christensen supporters to get on the ballot in New England.

THE Wabash, Indiana, papers gave good reports of a lecture of National Organizer Robinson before the Rotary Club, of that city.

THE New Castle, Ind., papers also contained liberal mention of Organizer Robinson's work in that city.

AN addition to our news from Indiana printed on another page should be made here. The Indiana workers were unable to secure electors for all the 13 districts along with the two electors at large, so they have been permitted to file the petition for the two electors at large. It was considered that as a party they were merely trying to secure a test vote, and thus that it was not necessary to print all the electors on the ballot. The Single Tax Party presidential electors are Dr. Thomas J. Bowles, of Muncie and John H. Hewit, of New Castle.

AS AN illustration of what the Party has done in one single section of the country, there has been no Single Tax meetings on the Boston Common for four years and more. Now regular meetings are held, and eight or nine speakers turn up at every meeting—more than are needed.

AT Providence, too, in front of the City Hall, on every Saturday night, where Messrs. Giddings, Fraser and Sweeney address the meetings, large and attentive audiences gather.

MESSRS. ROBINSON AND REIS found that in many States the difficulties of getting on the ballot are great. These have been sufficient to daunt the more timid. But it should be remembered that in no State are these difficulties insurmountable.

JOHN CAIRNS is stumping South Manchester, Conn., in the interest of his candidacy. He will use movie screens.

WE ARE sorry to learn of the death some time ago of J. J. Kelso, of Mooretown, Ontario, Canada, whose visit to this city some years ago will be pleasantly remembered.

"OH, GOD, why did we not start twenty years ago," was the pious ejaculation of J. A. Hamm, of Enid, called forth by his disappointment at the failure to get on the ballot in Oklahoma.

MORRIS VANVEEN is the Single Tax Party candidate for Congress in the Manhattan District once represented by Henry George, Jr. Mr. VanVeen is one of the old line Single Taxers, whose activities date back to 1886. He was one of the founders of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, is still a young man, and a perfect dynamo of energy.

DR. T. J. BOWLES, of Muncie, Indiana, one of the two presidential electors at-large in that State, has a letter in the Muncie *Morning Star* urging the claims of the Single Tax Party.

ORGANIZATION has been perfected in Wisconsin. Mr. S. Y. Gillan, of Milwaukee, is State Chairman.

#### COMMENDATIONS

"I wish to compliment you upon the peculiar excellence of your Convention Number. It is well calculated to kindle enthusiasm."—J. B. CHAMBERLAIN, Philadelphia, Pa. "More power to your elbow; it is only by enthusiastic persistence such as yours that the great reform can be securely initiated."—CHAS. H. LAMB, Capetown, Africa. "I want to commend you for the able and vigorous manner in which you present our cause."—CHARLES B. M. KNOWLES, Brookline, Mass. "Last issue of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW was the best yet."—ALFRED D. CRIDGE, Portland, Oregon. "The REVIEW is a perfect inspiration which none can afford to be without."—JOSIE THORPE PRICE, Inwood, L. I.

## A GREAT OFFER

To anyone sending us Five New Subscriptions to the SINGLE TAX REVIEW will be sent postpaid a copy of

*The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth*

BY LEWIS H. BERENS

This is a large 12mo cloth bound volume of 259 pages, which tells the fascinating story of Gerrard Winstanley, the Digger, who founded on Surrey Hills his squatter community, and issued pronouncements to the English people that the land was the common property of mankind. The work is a classic and as interesting as a novel. Winstanley's pronouncements are thrilling declarations of human rights at a time when no voice was raised in England for Land and Liberty. Mr. Berens has given a great picture of the time.

The work was sold for \$1.75 at a date when books were much cheaper than today.

This offer will hold good as long as the books, about 100, remain.

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING COMPANY

150 NASSAU STREET

NEW YORK CITY

Telephone Cortlandt 2901

George R. Macey

PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT AND AUDITOR

165 Broadway

New York



## OREGON WANTS FREEDOM

In Oregon there is a group of rare, common people who are a hundred per cent human. They are not seeking to remodel the world, but they are trying to do the thing at hand; they are struggling against great odds to free the idle land of Oregon held out of use by landlords. They have succeeded in placing an amendment on the ballot so that the voters can vote this fall as to whether or not the unused land shall be taxed the same as the used land. If this amendment carries, holding land out of use will become unprofitable and will kill landlordism. Single Taxers maintain that if human beings are made in the image of God, then they should have the same privilege as the birds of the air and be able to build their nests or homes any place not in use.

Henry George's Single Tax idea is the most radical, yet the most constructive and practical reform before the world today. He realized that when some people get something they do not earn, there must be others who earn something they do not get, and yet he fully realized that the rich are no worse or better than the poor; changing them about would not remedy conditions. Single Tax would simply change the system, giving the souls of men a chance to grow. Single Tax is a "made in America" one hundred per cent human reform, and can be brought about by a battle of ballots. Remember! There is nothing that so frightens the dignified Shylocks as intelligence displayed at the ballot box. Single Tax may not be a cure for all of our economic ills, but it is a big step in the right direction. It simply means to take the shackles off of struggling humanity. The drones may then have to cut their own toenails, but we would have fewer insane asylums, prisons, poorhouses and potter's fields.

When the dignified Shylocks want to control a political convention so as to guide the ship of state down the golden stream of profit, they do not make any noise about it but just reach for their check book. Single Taxers, too, would guide the ship of state, not through a selfish golden stream, but towards the century's golden dream of freedom.

Remember! It is easy for special privilege to raise a million or more in order to retain their position. Do you hear the cries and feel the heart throbs of awakening humanity? They are the ones who have been disinherited by the greed of man. They are just commencing to realize that free access to the unused land means equal opportunity. How many friends have you who would give a dollar or more in order to make this golden dream a reality? If you want to help in this great earthly movement without expecting any personal reward, get your friends to send their contributions, together with your own, to J. R. HERMANN, 316 Stock Exchange Building, Portland, and do it Now! Now! Now!

In order to free the land in Oregon we must hold our remedy high up before the people, and you know publicity costs money. Turn all your good intentions into cash. This is not a whine for charity, but a demand for justice. It is the real Goddess of Liberty knocking at your door.

Yours for a better world,  
GERRIT J. JOHNSON.