

the subscribers to these papers who may prefer to be instructed rather than merely amused. Some of them, we do not doubt, have become tired of being fed on rhetoric, and conducted on pleasant but not very profitable excursions into the realms of art and æsthetics.

Readers may weary in time of the somewhat cavilling criticism of statesmen and their blunders. They may begin to ask themselves if these blunders are not for the want of some guiding principle of political conduct fortified by the economic knowledge which would have enabled them to avoid these pitfalls, of which knowledge the editors seem to possess a monopoly, but the origin and nature of which they obstinately refuse to divulge. They rarely suggest how they would have acted under similar circumstances, and readers may begin to ask if they are really as wise as they pretend. Faith in the editorial prescience destroyed, they may even lose their present keenness of relish for the writings of those infernally clever persons who cover so much white paper in these so-called radical publications.

A Few Words With Representative Sisson

HON. THOMAS UPTON SISSON is a Democratic representative from Mississippi. Here is part of a speech recently delivered in the House:

"Now, gentlemen of the committee, I believe that as Republicans and Democrats, we may carry this Government rapidly, radically into a socialistic trend, and do it unwittingly. Every time the Government of the United States or a State government goes into a line of endeavor, thereby adding to its payroll to become a charge against the taxpayers, unless it is performing a proper function of government, something that ought to be performed by the government rather than by private individuals, then to that extent you have socialized the Republic. I do not believe, for example, in the government ownership of railroads. The government ownership of railroads is the first long step toward socialism. When you say I believe in the government ownership of railroads, then it becomes necessary, follows as the night the day, that you also have the control of those instrumentalities necessary to operate the railroads. You cannot operate the railroads unless you own or control the coal mines; and if you own the coal mines then you must have all the instrumentalities necessary to operate them. Where will it end? In my judgment our government was intended only, as conceived by our fathers, to give to every man in this Republic a fair, equal opportunity to develop himself in accordance with those powers which God has given him. If he is energetic, if he is wise, if he is thrifty, if he is economical, he will succeed. If he is unwise, if he is thriftless, if he is extravagant, he will not succeed. So that government which rewards endeavor makes the best citizenship on earth, but that government which taxes endeavor for the purpose of rewarding people who do not make any endeavor is a government of special privilege and will not live long in the minds and hearts of a people that can and will make a nation great."

These be brave words. But experience proves that a

man may speak the language without an accurate knowledge of what the words stand for. George Pitt Rivers, in a recent work entitled, "Conscience and Fanaticism," says: "Symbolotry is a common trait of humanity and few men analyze the symbols they worship. . . . The power of words and symbols is entirely independent of their real meaning." To the degree, we may add, that language is a symbol one may use it and still be in ignorance of what it is symbolic of.

The Declaration of Independence is one of the revered documents of the history of our fight for independence. It is the object of much lip service to this day. But may we not challenge every devotee of its sublime utterance: "Illustrate by example."

Patrick Henry said, "Give me Liberty or give me death!" It would not have been necessary to challenge the great Virginian with the words, "Illustrate by example." What he was doing, placing his head in a noose by his bold declaration against King George, was example enough. He did not need to explain.

Congressman Sisson is not in the same position. Therefore, our challenge, "Illustrate by example." He is against government ownership of railroads. So far he is explicit and definite. He is opposed to a government of special privilege. Very well. How would he take away the special privilege given to railroads in the ownership of valuable roadbeds, terminal sites, etc.? It is conceivable that he may have a plan to reconcile private ownership of railroads with the abolition of special privilege. Many Single Taxers do not believe in government ownership of railroads, but then being against special privilege, as Congressman Sisson is, they have a plan.

"A fair, equal opportunity to develop himself in accordance with those powers which God has given him," says Mr. Sisson. Very good, Congressman. But illustrate by example. Single Taxers have a plan to give every man that "fair, equal opportunity." This is less a plan than conformity to the natural law. It is not government ownership and it is not socialization. Assuming that Congressman Sisson is sincere in the use of words his place is with us. But are these words merely "tinkling cymbals?"—we had almost written "tinkling symbols," which words so often are.

British Ex-Service Men Want The Land

HOW far we are behind Great Britain is indicated in the proposals made in Congress to raise the needed revenues for the soldiers' bonus as compared with the suggestion of the National Union of Ex-Service Men in England. Congress can think of nothing save an additional income tax upon excessive profits as far back as 1917. This suggestion for a retroactive tax, stands in startling contrast to this declaration of the English ex-service men in a recent manifesto:

"Ex-service men call upon the nation to fulfill its finan-