

where the forces for industrial emancipation are practically united under the leadership of J. R. Hermann, and where a large measure of support has already been secured under the disadvantages of little publicity and inadequate resources.

The California Situation

THE Single Tax League of Los Angeles has decided to devote all its energies to educating the voters to understand the Single Tax before again putting the question on the ballot. Reasons for this course of action were given in a formal statement last month. The Great Adventure group of Single Taxers has announced its purpose of circulating petitions to have the measure on the ballot this year.

This difference of purpose on the part of California Single Taxers may cause wonder among friends in other parts of the country, and a few words of further explanation may be well.

Let it be said at the beginning that no question of orthodoxy or good faith is involved. It is merely a question of method or procedure. The members of the Los Angeles Single Tax League, and the Single Taxers throughout the State who are in accord with them, are as eager to get the relief that will follow the adoption of the Single Tax as any one can be. It is, indeed, because they fully realize what its adoption means that they have taken counsel of experience, and decided to work for the present along educational lines.

Ten years' experience, and five elections, show that the balloting method does not secure results in proportion to the time and money expended. Not only has the vote not increased materially in the ten years, but these repeated campaigns without the necessary educational work have resulted in organized opposition, and needless antagonism on the part of many people who were called upon to vote before they knew the reason why.

This opposition is not against the Single Tax as it is, but as it is represented to be by the press led by nine-tenths of the voters. The public is worse than uninformed; it is misinformed. It will take time and much labor to disabuse the people's minds of this error.

It was thought by some Single Taxers that the mere putting of the name "Single Tax" on the ballot, accompanied by a brief description, acquaints the voters with the nature of the subject. Experience has shown this to be a fallacy. The vote shows that the voters do not understand the question, or, understanding it, do not want the Single Tax. And every Single Taxer knows that it is rare indeed that a man or woman who really understands the Single Tax does not accept it.

Voters read and discuss what interests them. On what they are not interested in they vote "no," without troubling themselves to consider. Until they have been interested in the question they are quite content to accept the opponents' statement, which may include anything from Bol-

shevism to anarchy. Such phrases as "land owners are robbers," "freeing the land," "restoring the land to the people," "private property in land is robbery," and similar words used by over-zealous persons, have been seized upon by our opponents to prejudice our public. These phrases have always been questionable, but since the communistic regime in Russia they have been used to stamp the Single Tax movement as a system to take the farms and homes away from the people. The Anti-Single Tax League, and nine-tenths of the press, have fostered this idea until they have closed the minds of the vast majority of the voters.

To break down this prejudice requires patient and careful work. It cannot be done by a "hurrah" campaign. The people cannot be stampeded into "voting away their homes." Only an intelligent home-conservation campaign of education will remove this unjust stigma attaching to Single Tax. When the voters feel themselves reassured that the Single Tax will not disturb their title to land or other property in any way, shape, or manner, the measure can be put on the ballot and carried.

That the action of the Los Angeles Single Tax League has not been taken without the most careful consideration of all the factors in the case is evident from the cordial approval of Louis F. Post, John Z. White, James R. Brown, J. W. Bengough, George Foster Peabody, Otto Cullman, James A. Bell, James H. McGill, and many others in the east who have given time and money to the cause. Nor have the well known California Single Taxers like James H. Barry, Wm. G. Eggleston, C. E. Todd, E. P. E. Troy, Judge J. H. Ryckman, Mrs. Anna George deMille, and many others been wanting in their approval.

The Los Angeles Single Tax League questions no man's motives. Nor does it condemn those who choose a different course. The League has not retired from the field. On the contrary, it purposes to conduct an educational campaign throughout the year with the same zeal that has heretofore marked the ballot campaigns. It invites the co-operation of those who would instruct the voters before asking them to vote.

STOUGHTON COOLEY

From W. L. Ross

AN article signed by John H. Meyer appeared in the January-February number of the REVIEW under the caption, "The Farmers' Load of Taxes." Had this article appeared a year ago it would have sounded more plausible to those acquainted with the facts. Appearing when it did it becomes misleading. It gives the impression that educational work among the farmers of California is now being done that was abandoned over a year ago.

After the close of the last campaign Mr. Briggs announced that he would do educational work for eighteen months among the farm center organizations. He did this work a short time but gave it up over a year ago. It is important that this be made clear at this time because it was under the leadership of Mr. Briggs that the Los Angeles League

decided at the eleventh hour not to get our amendment on the ballot but to do "educational work" instead. How much interest will the voters of California take in educational work when there is no amendment to be voted on after all of our advertising has been to the effect that there would be an amendment on the ballot?

Last Fall Dr. Henry F. Dessau, of Oakland, urged that we get the signatures on the old registration which would expire December 31st, 1921. I saw the importance of this as it would give the campaign an early start. I formulated a plan by which we might probably finance our half of the expense. I wrote Mr. Briggs that the Great Adventure League would be responsible for getting half the required number of names to get our measure on the ballot provided the Single Tax League would secure the other half. Mr. Briggs wrote that it would be better for propaganda purposes to get the names in the Spring. In January Mr. Briggs wrote us again mentioning something about the campaign to get our measure on the ballot, showing no sign of abandoning the contest.

We were much surprised, therefore, when Mr. Briggs informed us in the middle of February that the League had decided not to try to get our amendment on the ballot until 1924. Not only was this decision made, but the reactionary newspapers of the State were notified. That kind of publicity saves time, effort and expense for the Anti-Single Tax League, but it hardly helps the Single Tax movement of California.

One of the reasons given by the Single Tax League for quitting was the danger to the initiative and referendum involved in using it. The Antis are not so squeamish; they are not so easily frightened. Their amendment was beaten by nearly 125,000 majority last election, but they are on the job. They are working to get their amendment on the ballot again. Last election it required only 55,094 validated signatures to get our measure on the ballot. It requires the same this year. The number of signatures necessary is determined by the vote cast for governor at the preceding election and the vote cast for governor in 1918 was unusually light on account of the flu epidemic. In 1924 it will require 85,000 to 90,000 signatures to get a measure on the ballot and the new amendment of the Anti-Single Tax League would require at least 150,000 signatures for amendments relating to taxation and assessments, should it carry.

The action of the Single Tax League will make it doubly hard to secure funds enough to get our measure on the ballot but we shall make the effort. We shall do our best.

At a meeting in Los Angeles on March 18th, Mrs. Lona Ingham Robinson was elected campaign manager for Southern California, and headquarters opened at 203 Tajo Building, Los Angeles, as a branch of the Great Adventure. The petitions will be ready to circulate early in April, and before April 15th we expect to have a number of workers soliciting signatures in San Francisco, Los Angeles and other places throughout the State.

"Have you seen that car with the flags and Single Tax

signs on it running around town? I had to explain the Single Tax to two men yesterday who told me they saw the same car. I wonder whose it is!" said Mr. Barry, of the James H. Barry Company. "Yes," I said, "I too have seen it." Finally I told Mr. Barry that the car is owned by the Great Adventure League. It is used exclusively for advertising Single Tax and to speak from at open-air meetings.

Henry Warfield, who distributes over a thousand pieces of literature a week runs the car, takes care of it in his garage and gives his services free of charge. Over 36,000 pamphlets have been carefully distributed the past six months and over 300 books sold by the Great Adventure League.

Mr. John Cairns also continues to advertise the Single Tax to people in Oakland by driving his sedan car with Single Tax mottoes painted on the glass panels. Mr. Cairns says the signs do not hurt his business, but if he finds Single Tax interferes with his business he will give up his business. He says that if every Single Taxer who owns a car would put a Single Tax sign on it California would wake up after the next election to find the Single Tax an accomplished fact.

WM. L. ROSS.

Massachusetts Single Tax Conference

ON the evening of February 27th there was held at the Twentieth Century Club, Boston, a Supper and Conference with Hon. Louis F. Post as the principal speaker. A group of about one hundred persons attended, and William L. Garrison, Jr. presided.

Mr. Post spoke with his characteristic incisiveness and clarity, and expressed his belief that the original Single Tax movement set in motion by Henry George at the time of the appearance of "Progress and Poverty" was now reaching its logical conclusion as a separate and particular reform movement. In place of organized Single Tax propagandist groups expounding the Georgian philosophy as a cosmic faith and with an almost religious zeal, Mr. Post expects to see the ideas and purposes of Henry George find multiform expression in the programs of a variety of social and political causes, such as the Labor movement, the tax reform efforts of business associations, and the endeavors of enlightened citizen groups to shift the incidence of taxation from improvements to site values. Likewise he believes that the Georgian creed should find an outlet in special agrarian movements to open up the idle areas to use and occupancy on the theory of "The Land for the People." And finally he thinks it likely that those who seek to cut the roots of war must instinctively make use of the practical methods of the Single Tax to free production and exchange and make possible thereby a just and stable social order.

He counselled Single Taxers to cease standing apart as a peculiar people and strive as citizens to take part in all