

# The Single Tax Review

Vol. XXIII

MARCH—APRIL 1923

No. 2

## Current Comment

SEVERAL inquiries from friends have come to us asking why we declined to print a communication from Mr. Stoughton Cooley giving the Los Angeles League's side of the controversy that raged among the two California divisions of Single Taxers. We decline to print a number of communications and contributions sent us. But we are not averse to giving a reason for it. And this we did at the time.

IN this case we did not refuse to print the side of the controversy as presented by Mr. Cooley. As every one knows who reads the REVIEW we printed an article from Mr. Cooley setting forth at some length the position occupied by himself and the League. To this we replied editorially. A second article by Mr. Cooley was carefully considered. It went over the same ground. We stated in November-December issue our reasons for declining to print, as follows:

"There is nothing new in it, except the statement that, as had been threatened, some 'withheld their votes' from the Single Tax amendment for fear of prejudicing the electorate against the Initiative and Referendum. The rest is a repetition of his arguments for doing nothing, that have already been given quite enough space in the REVIEW."

PRACTICALLY what we were asked to do was to keep standing for the REVIEW the type for these repeated statements from Mr. Cooley as to California. This would not be fair to our readers. Mr. Cooley has announced in *Tax Facts* "the insurmountability of the difference of opinion between the two groups in California." This means that those who radically differ as to methods and interpretation of the George philosophy must go each their own way. Mr. Cooley and his friends have made the decision, and so the matter rests. Frankly, we are of the opinion that it is better so.

PHILIP SNOWDEN, socialist and member of Parliament, has performed a distinct public service, despite his generous proposition to the landlords involving the purchase of their lands through the issuance to them of five per cent. bonds. The land question is again up in British politics. The Liberals are driven to a point where they cannot much longer remain silent. The Independent Liberals have already formulated their answer in an amendment to the Snowden proposal.

It declares that existing evils can and should, be remedied

not by such revolutionary changes, but by a wise, peaceful, and economical policy which will reduce public burdens, by instituting more harmonious relations between those engaged in production on the basis of an equitable distribution of its fruits, and appropriate participation in its conduct, and by opening up natural resources and liberating enterprise under a system of taxation which does not penalize improvements, but offers to all equality of opportunity.

THE names attached to the Independent Liberal Amendment are those of Sir John Simon, Mr. Vivian Phillips, Mr. Pringle, Mr. F. Gray and Mr. H. H. Spencer. The *Westminster Gazette* has this to say:

Many Liberals tonight are welcoming the statement of policy implied in the closing phrases which indicate how Liberal thought on the industrial problem is getting in tune with the working-class movement and how the growing urgency of the taxation of land values is asserting itself.

AND this brings us to the subject of the coming International Single Tax Conference at Oxford, on Aug. 13 to 20 of this present year, fuller details of which appear on another page. It is unnecessary to impress upon our readers that a large representation from all parts of the world will strengthen the hands of those who are influential in government, who desire to raise the standard of the land for the people, but are doubtful of the popular support they will receive in this Great Adventure.

IN the November-December issue of the REVIEW we gave some illustrations of the care with which the *New York Times* edits news articles so as to eliminate references to the Single Tax. But even the most vigilant editor nods at times, and so we thought that the *Times* editor had nodded when we saw this paragraph in an article sent by wireless to the *Times* from Russia—from a special correspondent and copyrighted:

"Russia is about to try for her peasant masses the first real "Single Tax" in history."

The words "Single Tax" duly enclosed in quotes, too, so that they would be seen readily. But alas, when one perused the contents, all that is proposed in Russia is that the national government shall levy all the taxes and hand some proportion back to the localities. And this "Single Tax" levy is what the *Times* puts in quotes and quite erroneously describes as the first real one of its kind. Probably, if there had not been the chance of misleading its readers—a favorite occupation of the *Times* headlines—the words single tax would not have appeared at all.