

business and agriculture, and placed upon the unimproved speculative value of land."

"This change should be made by exempting one labor product after another."

"The exemption method of approach is the only one that has any hope of success."

"This method will bring us to a full realization of our ideals, without injury to legitimate business and without disturbing the elaborate system of credits upon which the social structure rests."

We asked old Michael O'Shea what he thought of the foregoing? After a moment's reflection, "I am reminded," said he, "of that fine auld song:

'Mither, may I go out to swim?
'Oh yis, my darling daughter—
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,
But don't go near the water.'

"I am an auld man and I haven't long to live," he continued, "but I thank God I have lived in better days than these, in days when a Single Taxer meant a man with red fighting blood in his veins and not such a lily-livered phantom as must be the Single Taxer who wrote those words ye've read, lines of apology and backsliding, traitorous words. 'The speculative value of land,' says he, when damn well he knows or should know that we have a right to the whole of land rent, no exceptions. And thin he says, 'exempt one labor product after another.' A revision of the tariff does he mean, each year for the next two thousand years?"

At this point Larry Wiggins broke in, being unable to restrain himself. "The Dervish is right, and I call the attention of this company to the following years as Red Letter Years: '1947—The prolonged efforts of the Los Angeles Tax Exemption League (formerly known as the Los Angeles Single Tax League) to exempt high bred, pedigreed canines from the common dog tax have at last been crowned with success.' '1973—which might be called the Year of Jubilee in Southern California, forever famous as the year in which the Los Angeles Limited Exemption League (formerly known as the Tax Exemption League) succeeded after two generations of effort in getting the Congress to exempt admission to moving picture shows from any tax whatever. The patriarchal President of the League stated that if the League had accomplished nothing more than this its existence would have been justified.'"

Old Michael, who did not relish Wiggins' interruption, now continued: "Where does he say that we all have equal rights in the use of the Earth? Or that the Lord has provided a bounteous Table for the use of all of His children? Please all the Saints, let me be still a Howling Dervish, even though I do be thinking I'm the last of that tribe. Thank God, the Party men have lifted again the Cross of the New Crusade and breathe the breath of life again into the movement, as we did in the Anti-poverty days!"

He trembled as he spoke, and we noticed tears falling from the old man's eyes, for he was greatly stirred. And lo, as if to justify his words we saw lying there before us on the table a copy of *The Commonwealth*, the organ of The Commonwealth League of England. "Object: The foundation of a Commonwealth based on the assertion of the common right to the land. *To assert the Common Right* The Commonwealth League demands that on the Appointed Day the land shall be declared to have been Restored to the People, and thereafter its economic rent shall be collected by and for the People."

A Message to Single Taxers

UNDER the above heading there was recently broadcast to the Single Tax world by the Executive Committee of the Los Angeles Single Tax League a statement that there could be no possible agreement in thought or harmony in action between themselves and those of us who supported the California campaign. This recognition of an evident condition receives our hearty approval, and we believe its acceptance will be a great benefit to the movement.

On what basis could an agreement be possible between groups of such divergent purposes and views? Harmony can exist only between those who agree on the end in view and the methods by which it can be attained.

Shall we then at the behest of the Los Angeles Single Tax League refrain from public expression of the principles we learned from the writings of our great teacher?

"What I therefore propose as the simple yet sovereign remedy, which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals, and taste, and intelligence, purify government, and carry civilization to yet nobler heights, is to appropriate rent by taxation."

And for giving expression to that belief Henry George was denounced in his day as an extremist, a theorist, a doctrinaire who delighted in announcing strange social proposals, and in flouting conventionalities even as the Los Angeles Single Tax League are now denouncing us.

For in what does the bill presented to the voters of California at the recent election differ from or enlarge upon this culminating thought of Henry George's teachings?

What strange social doctrine did the bill introduce?

All the virility and power of the movement centers around the belief that "Neither on the ground of equity or expediency is there anything to deter us from making land common property by confiscating rent." "Progress and Poverty," Book 8, Chap. 2.

Yet when a bill is presented which does no more than put this principle into effect, the inevitable happens and objections immediately proceed from the landed interests and their friends.

It is well to remember that the first general notice of the intention of the Los Angeles Single Tax League to quit

placing a Single Tax amendment on the California ballot appeared in that arch enemy of the Single Tax, the *Los Angeles Times*.

As the result of our activities in the year 1922 we are described by the Los Angeles Single Tax League as interlopers, but it should be remembered that the interlopers did not become active until those who now claim to be the owners of the movement had quit.

However, the "interlopers," or "dictators," as they are called, had some reason to think that they should have been at least consulted about the matter before the owners of the movement abandoned the State: for the interlopers had been contributing quite large amounts to carry on during the years 1921, in the expectation that this preliminary work would help the campaign of 1922. This money was accepted; and part of it found its way to the Los Angeles Single Tax League to carry out that purpose. Good faith, it seems to us, required that these contributors should have been consulted before abandoning the purpose for which their money was received.

As to the California vote: Why has it declined?

California has gone land crazy. Principles are forgotten. All sense of justice as related to land holding has been subordinated to the universal hope of making money from land speculation. Immediately on his arrival in the State the tourist is invited to take part in the game, and his ten dollar deposit on his purchase of the future corner of Broadway and Wall street makes him a conservative and substantial citizen, who is opposed to the disproved and discredited theories of Henry George.

The native son overflows with an enthusiastic expectation of the future greatness of the State, which, his training in the science of political economy and the law of rent, obtained from "Progress and Poverty," enables him to see will enhance the value of land until it is ripe for development, and will thus make him financially able to assist (at some future time) the Single Tax movement.

Buying lots for speculation makes thousands of voters confirmed opponents of Single Tax.

To the extent to which the members of the Los Angeles Single Tax League are land speculators and have induced others to become land speculators, they have created antagonism to the Single Tax and are responsible for the smallness of the vote.

To the extent to which their influence has been exerted to prevent others from voting for the bill, they bear upon their own shoulders the responsibility for the result.

To the extent to which their personal influence has been used to discredit a reproduction of the message of Henry George, they are responsible for the vote.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

WILLIAM J. WALLACE

Chairman National Committee
Single Tax Party.

The Single Tax in Australia

TWO SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

TWO events of varying significance have recently occurred—the Federal elections and the Single Tax picnic at Nielsen Park. Most people think that the former was by far the most important of the two, and that the latter was of no account at all. Others consider that the election was a mere temporary incident in the long and dreary panorama of an effete system of politics, and that the picnickers held the winning cards. For the newly elected Parliament belongs to the old order of things, while the picnickers represent the new.

It may be some time before the Georgian era of equal rights and equal opportunities is established here, but it is distinctly on the move. The vanguard has already arrived, at any rate in Australia, and there are unmistakable signs that the main army will be firmly entrenched in different parts of the world before very long. Whatever importance attaches to the Federal election arises from the fact that it represents a triumph for the Country Party, a solid phalanx of 14 members which has already brought about the downfall of Mr. Hughes, and is pledged to see that country interests are equally consulted with those of the town, and that the man on the land gets a fair deal. Everybody acknowledges the genius for statesmanship possessed by Mr. Hughes, the inspiring influence of his personality during the war, and the remarkable organizing ability which marked his career throughout. But there are faults in every character, and the Country Party saw clearly that the continuation of his autocracy was incompatible with the triumph of the principles for which the Country Party was returned.

THE INIQUITY OF PROTECTION

Mr. Hughes is a socialist and a protectionist, two things which are generally combined, and either of which is against the interests of the man on the land. The extraordinary gift of £25,000 to Mr. Hughes, about which so much was said during the election, mostly came from English protectionists, who were delighted to hear an Australian statesman make such fervent and almost melodramatic appeals in support of their nearly moribund creed. Shortly before the recent election he scrapped the report of the Royal Commission which inquired into the sugar industry, and, without acquainting Parliament with its contents, induced it to levy a much higher duty than that recommended by the Commission, to the gain no doubt of the sugar growers, but to the loss of the allied industries and of the community generally. One of the leaflets issued by the Country Party to the electors gave some startling figures as to the heavy burden laid on the farmers especially by a tariff expressly designed to swell the manufacturers' pockets at the expense of the men on the land. "Nationalists and Labor," ran the leaflet, "made you pay last year (1920-1) £1,221,096 in Custom taxes on £3,254,977 worth of your machinery