

# Single Taxers Reduce Opposition Vote

In the last six years the Anti-Single Tax Vote in California has been reduced 10.5 per cent.

This is the direct result of intelligent and continued political campaigning to hasten adoption of the Single Tax.

The largest vote against a Single Tax Amendment in California was in 1916 when the total polled against the measure was 576,533.

In the recent election the vote against Amendment No. 29 was but 515,590, a drop of 60,943 as compared with 1916—a decrease of more than 10.5 per cent.

The opposition in 1916 was unorganized. Since then there has been built up the powerful Anti-Single Tax League with big campaign funds at its command.

Organization that will assure the polling of the full Single Tax vote of the State is all that is needed to assure ultimate victory in California.

## CALIFORNIA GREAT ADVENTURE LEAGUE

707 San Fernando Building

Los Angeles, California

8794

THE RENT OF THE LAND BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

## The Henry George Standard

Formerly *The Great Adventure*, published monthly by California Committee of the National Great Adventure for the Single Tax at Room 707 in San Fernando Bldg., Los Angeles. Subscription Fifty Cents a year. Entered as second class matter November 17, 1922, at the post office at Los Angeles, California, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

VOL. 5

DECEMBER, 1922

No. 7

### ANTI-SINGLE TAX VOTE DECREASED

Much has been said about the falling off of the vote in favor of the Single Tax in California by those who oppose political action to bring about the adoption of the philosophy of Henry George.

It is pointed out that the vote for the Single Tax Amendments is steadily falling off. This, alas, is but too true, but responsibility for the decreased vote can properly be laid at the door of the Single Taxers themselves. The vast majority of Single Taxers make little effort to swell the poll in favor of their big humanitarian principle. In fact, some of them have been guilty of advising voters, who would otherwise have supported the Single Tax Amendments, to vote against these measures.

What the critics of political action in California to bring about adoption of the Single Tax have failed however to comment on, is that the vote against the Single Tax measures has also been falling behind that of preceding elections.

In the first straight out Single Tax campaign of 1916, the vote against the Amendment was 576,533. In the most recent election the vote against Amendment 29, the most vigorous statement of the Single Tax ever submitted to the electorate of California, had shrunk to 515,590.

In 1916 the opposition to the Single Tax was unorganized. Since that date the beneficiaries of the present unjust system of land tenure have been thoroughly organized and have had ample funds at their command to put up vigorous campaigns against the Single Tax amendments in every section of the State. On the other hand the Single Taxers have had but insignificant campaign funds to help them bring their message to the voters; and, what is still of greater importance to the success of their cause, the Single Taxers have in the last six years managed to make what little organization existed in their ranks, function less efficiently than in 1916.

Despite their proficient organization and the large campaign funds they were able to command, the opponents of Single Tax are losing ground. During the last six years in spite of the tremendous advantage they had, by reason of their big slush funds and the prestige resulting from the organized beneficiaries of special privilege, the vote against the Single Tax has fallen off 60,943, more than 10.5 per cent of their highest total in 1916.

This fact proves that the continued campaigns conducted by its friends is having the desired result of lessening opposition to the Single Tax.

At the recent election in November more than 325,000 of those who went to the polls to vote for their choice for Governor of the State, declined to vote against the Single Tax Amendment No. 29. Had these 325,000 voters been very pronounced in their opposition to its fundamental principle of taking the rent of land for public use, they would undoubtedly have voted against the Single Tax Amendment when they were right at the polling place.

The real trouble in California is that the Single Taxers are not efficient campaigners. If they were they would see to it that all the friends of the movement were at the polls on election day to vote for their great humanitarian principle. Instead some Single Taxers are expressing satisfaction that the vote in favor of their amendment is being decreased. It is not that the vote of the opposition is growing but that Single Taxers, not only fail to go to the polls themselves to vote for their measure, but that they are equally indifferent about seeing that the full Single Tax vote is polled.

It never seems to suggest itself to many Single Taxers that they, perhaps, are the chief cause of the smaller vote polled in favor of their amendments.

Does it not suggest great possibilities for victory in the future, when we observe that the vote polled against the Single Tax has decreased more than 10.5 per cent in six years?

To the wideawake businessman such a field of potential prospects would be sure to spur him on to go out after the business. Think of it 325,000 of a total of 965,000 who voted at the November election are potential Single Taxers if we but bring our message to them in a salesmanship-like way. These 325,000 voters have proven by their action at the polls, that they—at the least—are not actively against our proposition. In addition to this 325,000 there were nearly 600,000 other registered voters who are so little opposed to the Single Tax that they did not even come to the polls.

Potentially our possibilities are unlimited. With the 125,000 who voted for the Amendment positively and aggressively for the Single Tax; the more than 325,000, who though they were right at the polls, refused to vote against the Single Tax; together with the 600,000 who are so slightly opposed to the Single Tax that they would not take the trouble to go to the polling places to vote against it; there is every opportunity to win victory, if we but be brave enough to think so.

Last, but not least, those who voted against the Single Tax Amendment were but a third of the total electorate; a minority but a shade larger in percentage of the total, than was that of the vote polled in favor of Single Tax in Luke North's first memorable Great Adventure Campaign in 1916.

# Henry George Standard

Published Monthly at  
707 San Fernando Building  
Los Angeles, California  
by

THE CALIFORNIA COMMITTEE  
of the  
NATIONAL GREAT ADVENTURE

Subscription, Fifty Cents a Year

THE Single Tax is based on the proposition that everybody has an equal right to be on the earth, since in his coming to it he had no volition. The earth is God's provision for the continued existence of the race.

The Single Tax is based on the principle that service rendered is the only just basis of compensation.

Title to any kind of property can be honestly acquired only by the production of that property one's self or through a bill of sale or exchange from him who did.

Man did not—aye could not—produce land, and it is submitted in all reverence that Almighty God did not open a land office from which issued the first title.

It is therefore clear that no one ever could acquire a just title to land. The first so-called owner just took it and then sold what he did not rightfully possess, to some one else.

Increased value of the use of land cannot be produced by the title holder but is created entirely by the whole community, population being the sole basis of increased land values.

Since man did not make the land—it being the gift of God to the continuing generations of mankind—and, as the community is responsible for its increased rental value, it is evident that this value cannot in justice become the private property of the individual, but belongs rightfully to the whole community that created it.

The annual rent of land, because it is rightfully the property of the whole community, should therefore be paid into the public treasury of the community to defray its collective expenses.

Our present unjust system of taxation, with a current rate around three dollars per hundred, confiscates the production of man in less than twenty-three years, because in that period it has compelled him to pay, in the form of taxes, a sum in excess of the value of his production.

The Single Tax proposes to abolish this unjust system which confiscates man's production and establish in its stead the righteous method of protecting the individual in the possession of what is his, while at the same time protecting the collective community in the possession of what belongs to it—namely, the annual rent of land.

Do you wish to continue the system that fines men for engaging in useful production or do you wish it replaced by a just and righteous one that will reward those who do the things we say we want done?

If you are in favor of the square deal send your name and address to The California Great Adventure for The Single Tax, 707 San Fernando Building, Los Angeles, California.

## ELECTION RETURNS

The official vote on the Single Tax measure in California was yes, 124,403; no 515,590. The measure received 19.4% of the vote cast. The vote on the measure raising the percentage of names to put tax questions on the ballot from 8% to 15%, was yes, 298,347; no 421,945. The favorable vote was 40% of the vote cast.

For purposes of comparison the official vote on Single Tax measures is given for the last six elections.

Year	Measure	Vote Yes	Vote No	Per Cent in favor
1912	Home Rule	169,321	243,959	40.9
1914	Home Rule	267,618	375,634	41.6
1916	Singletax	260,332	376,533	31.1
1918	Singletax	118,088	360,334	24.6
1920	Singletax	196,694	563,503	25.8
1922	Singletax	124,403	515,590	19.4

(Reprinted from Tax Facts)

## FRESNO CONFERENCE POSTPONED

(Reprint from Tax Facts)

TAX FACTS for November contained the following notice:

We, the undersigned Singletaxers, acting as individuals, hereby call a conference of California Singletaxers to meet in Fresno, January 19, 20, 21, 1923.

The purpose of this conference is to consider issues involving the Singletax, and to determine upon a program for the future.

This invitation shall go to all known California Singletaxers, and shall be published (the editors willing) in the Single Tax Review, the Single Tax Bulletin, the Henry George Standard, and Tax Facts.

The call was signed by 95 California Singletaxers, residing at various points throughout the State. Since the call was sent out, and without waiting for the conference, the eastern leaders of the Great Adventure group have announced in the Henry George Standard the 1924 campaign for California.

Inquiry by mail of the 95 signers of the call indicate an almost unanimous desire for a postponement of the conference. In compliance with this wish the call for the Fresno Conference is hereby withdrawn.

## STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

OF THE HENRY GEORGE STANDARD, PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT LOS ANGELES, CALIF., OCT. 1st, 1922.

State of California, County of Los Angeles, ss.  
Before me, a notary public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared James A. Robinson, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the business manager of The Henry George Standard and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in section 413, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to-wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, The California Com. of the National Great Adventure League, 707 San Fernando Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.; Editor, James A. Robinson, 707 San Fernando Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.; Managing Editor, James A. Robinson, 707 San Fernando Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.; Business Manager, James A. Robinson, 707 San Fernando Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.

2. That the owners are: (Give names and addresses of individual owners, or, if a corporation, give its name and the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of the total amount of stock.) The National Great Adventure League, president, William J. Wallace, 491 Mt. Prospect Ave., Newark, New Jersey; E. Yancey Cohen, treasurer, Palisade, N. J.; Robt. C. Macauley, secretary, 1247 N. 13th St., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

JAMES A. ROBINSON,  
Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 30th day of September, 1922.  
(SEAL)  
(My commission expires April 2, 1925.)  
Chaim Shapiro.

## THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

### EDITOR'S NOTE

The author, James MacGregor, is a well known authority on political economy and has long been a champion of the Single Tax. He was associated with Henry George when the Prophet of San Francisco was a candidate for Mayor of New York City.

He was a solid, well-to-do citizen. Prosperity seemed to ooze from every square inch of his solid, and substantial person, and from his countenance radiated complacency, self-satisfaction and a vast content with things as they are. Under his arm was a copy of a Sunday paper, and one could visualize his contentment as, later, seated in a comfortable chair, the ever shifting panorama of the world's history unfolded itself from its pages.

To a passer-by he ventured a few timely remarks about the weather, and from thence drifted to the subject of the late war, the outrageous conduct of the packers and other profiteers as manifested in high prices—particularly the high price of food. Passing from these topics he told the story of his life. His father had owned a farm on the shore of Lake Erie. His early life had been one of toil—unremitting arduous toil. From the farm he had drifted to various employments—factory, store and office, and seemed to believe that the wages paid to labor was not as large as they, in justice, should be, and that something should be done about it. Particularly, something should be done to curb the packers and everybody else who were responsible for the high price of food.

Reverting back to his own personal history he told that, his father having died, he was now the owner of the farm on the shore of Lake Erie, and that he was no longer concerned with the necessity of working to earn a living, as the farm provided an ample income. No, he did not work the farm, he rented it. Fortunately for him the lake shore along his farm was a place greatly desired by fishermen as a basis for their operations on the lake, so he granted them the privilege of using it, of course, for a consideration. The consideration amounted to \$100 per week, which he had no trouble to collect as he rented the use of the shore to one man, who farmed it out to the fishermen and paid him the rent every week. To the patient and attentive listener there arose a picture of hardy men braving the danger, cold and hardship and undergoing the toil and fatigue which are incidental to the life of a Lake Erie fisherman, and who, when their work was done, were compelled to give to this gentleman of ease and luxury \$100 per week for the privilege of using the shore. He, the owner, thus at one and the same time, depriving the fishermen of part of the fruits of his labor, and to the buyer of fish increasing the price. Intuitively, the thought arose; Is not this man equally guilty with the packers and other profiteers whom he berates so lustily?

But consideration of this point, interesting

though it was, was interrupted by the continuation of the story of his life, which flowed on as the little brook famed in poetry. Not only did he rent the shore of the farm, to fishermen, but the remainder was rented to another who also paid our friend \$100 per month for the use of it. An industrious man the tenant was, he said; works from early till late, but who, although prices for farm products were high, complained he could not get along. Here, said our story-teller, the high prices are to blame again. Look what fertilizer costs; see the price of farm machinery, clothing, household necessities, taxes. I tell you, he said, waxing wrathful, and giving his voice that force and vigor which comes from one who sees an evil which should be remedied: "If I had my way I'd give those profiteers that rob the people a short trial and a long sentence!"

And with these words he departed, presumably to enjoy the pleasures of a contented, care-free life, without a thought that a strict measure of justice might include those who, by virtue of holding the title to a piece of land and did no work save collecting toll from those who use it, might be counted among those who are responsible for the high cost of living.

JAMES MacGREGOR.

Los Angeles, Dec. 28th, 1922.

## SUBSCRIBE FOR HENRY GEORGE STANDARD

Subscription price of the Henry George Standard has been reduced to fifty cents per year.

The reduction of the subscription price is to make possible an increased circulation that will reach every voter in California, as well as every supporter of the Great Adventure League in all sections of the United States.

To this end all well-wishers of the Single Tax movement are urged not only to subscribe, for themselves, but to subscribe for copies to be sent to others, the latter class of subscriptions to go chiefly to non-Single Taxers who may thus be convinced that the adoption of our philosophy will solve our pressing economic problems and safeguard the liberties of the whole people.

Send your subscriptions at once, so that the work of publicity for the spread of the Single Tax gospel may go forward efficiently and without interruption.

Make all checks payable to National Great Adventure, 707 San Fernando Building, Los Angeles, California.