of both, the landed interest. Nowhere in Mr. Lane's scheme do we find the slightest perception of the wrong done to labor by the foreclosing of its free access to the source of production.

That the Secretary of the Interior does not seriously believe that large holdings in themselves are dangerous to society, might fairly be inferred from his spontaneous offer of a huge block of Indian lands to Wall St. But there is further proof. As is known, there exist vast holdings of oil, mining and agricultural land in all parts of the country. If land-holding on a large scale is a menace of revolution, then there is an imperative prior duty to perform. To raise such a fuss over the small as yet unreclaimed farms of the returned soldiers, while vast and valuable areas are in the hands of syndicates and corporations and held out of use, to the prejudice and peril of our whole economic and social structure, is an opera bouffe performance in execrably bad taste. To point to our soldier lads as a possible source of revolution, through an eventual development of large landholdings in their hands out of their petty allotments of swamp, jungle and desert, while covering with fiscal privileges and other benevolent consideration, the existing monopoly of our country's most valued natural resources, is more than opera bouffe; it is more dangerous to the welfare of the country than could possibly be any passionate uprising of social discontent. The statesman who points out a danger, and then persists in ignoring its most glaring manifestations, reveals the very qualities of indecision and lack of perspective that invariably are responsible for revolutions de facto.

Gerrit Johnson's Letter

WE ARE glad to be able to print the letter of Mr. Gerrit Johnson, which appears on another page, despite its apparent confusions and some contradictions.

While believing, as Henry George did, that our appeals should be made to the conscience and emotions of men rather than primarily or exclusively to their intellects, Mr. Johnson evidences a curious distrust of his own theory, for he says that Single Taxers, even though they are right, can go on appealing forever in the hope that the truth they hold will prevail.

There is so much that is true and beautiful in Mr. Johnson's letter that it is an ungrateful task to indicate what seems to us the practical imperfections of his philosophy and the untenable character of both his diagnosis and remedy for the California trouble.

The bill which Mr. Johnson favors for California would carry an exemption clause of $5,000, and he states that ninety per cent. of the homes of that State are probably below that figure. He would tax all franchises, corporations, stocks, bonds, incomes and inheritances. He would at the same time abolish all taxes on personal property. That is, he would exempt all personalty and tax the evidences or shadows of the thing itself. It is curious that Mr. Johnson, who is a moral enthusiast and a believer in going after what we want, should seek to couple his proposal with appeals that we tax franchises and corporations, apparently oblivious to the fact that such taxes are paid by patrons and consumers, and are burdens on industry that tend to defeat the very object we set out to accomplish. It is clear that Mr. Johnson has not yet mastered the practical aspects of the questions with which the Single Tax deals. He is moved too exclusively by his emotions.

Out of the fund derived from land values he would provide for mothers' pensions, old age pensions, women and children's pensions, and out-of-work benefits. He seems to think that this would help to carry the measure of justice for which we are striving. What we have still to learn is this: If men and women are not prepared to accept the Single Tax it is useless to try to persuade them by promises of legislative and governmental favors. Mr. Johnson is trying to associate his proposal with such promises in order to induce them to accept the reform which Single Taxers insist is vital and fundamental. The hope is vain.

Mr. Johnson quotes Henry George, "I am for men," and then defends his proposal as favoring a class, the class that never yet, he assures us, has enjoyed class legislation. He has forgotten Luke North's division of society into "those who care and those who don't," in the light of which illuminating phrase the talk of class distinctions dissolves into thin air.

He is quite certain that there are not more than a hundred men in California who comprehend the philosophy of Henry George. May we not, without offence, say that Mr. Johnson is estopped from pronouncing such an opinion, for he tells us that he has probably read less of Henry George than any other Single Taxer? His numerical classification of the Single Taxers of California is thus deprived of all color of "expert testimony."

Yet we are glad to have Mr. Johnson's contribution. There is much in it to commend. One statement is that the crowd is ahead of us, and that we take ourselves too seriously. Another is that the Henry George doctrine is the most radical ever presented by man. His idea that not ten per cent. of the "professional" Single Taxers, by which he perhaps means professed Single Taxers, realize how dangerous it is, may take its place with other speculations in his letter, rendered dubious by his confession of unfamiliarity with Henry George's writings.

One point in conclusion. Mr. Johnson need not wonder why Single Tax clubs do not grow—they die aborning, rather. It is because a Single Tax club that does not have for its purpose the putting of Single Tax into politics is an anomaly. The Single Tax is primarily a political issue, not merely an educational problem. Its identification with a club spells inevitable degeneracy. Clubs are all right for cults; literary and social and debating clubs will flourish till the end of time. But we soon get tired of talking Single Tax to one another.

Had there been a political organization in California there might have been differences, but there would not have been permanent differences, nor would such tempo-

rary divisions as might have arisen interrupted the progress of the cause. The death of Luke North would have been felt as a serious loss, but the movement would not have suffered immediate paralysis, as was inevitable upon a disorganized movement held together by the genius of one man.

Mr. Rockefeller Still Progressing

WE HAVE had occasion in previous issues of the REVIEW to commend some of the recent utterances of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. In a pamphlet just received he gives us reason for further favorable comment.

The pamphlet is entitled "Representation in Industry." We meet the same appeal to the humanizing spirit, the same intellectual hospitality, and the same generous willingness to listen to the other side.

But the most significant utterance is the one in which Mr. Rockefeller answers his own question, "Who are the parties to industry?" He says they are four in number; Capital, Management, Labor, and the Community. He says that the list usually comprises only three, with the fourth, the Community, whose interest is vital, too often omitted.

For fear the reader may jump to the conclusion that Mr. R. is unconsciously inclining to the socialistic conception of the community, we hasten to give his language that there may be no mistake on this point.

"The Community's right to representation in the control of industry and in the shaping of industrial policies is similar to that of the other parties. Were it not for the Community's contribution, in maintaining law and order, in providing agencies of transportation and communication, in furnishing systems of money and credit and in rendering other services—all involving continuous outlays—the operation of Capital, Management, and Labor would be enormously hampered, if not rendered well nigh impossible."

We do not desire to read into this more than Mr. Rockefeller implies. But nothing in this address justifies the assumption that, in admitting the Community as the fourth partner in industry, he has failed to appreciate the full significance of that admission. The Community is recognized as creator and contributor of values, and is to be credited with a corresponding share in the total product of industry. The wages of the Community as co-workers with Capital, Management, and Labor are not defined by Mr. Rockefeller, nor is the method of payment. But perhaps it is enough for the present to have recognized the right of the Community to the values it has created.

We are ready to give Mr. Rockefeller full credit for sincerity and courage in facing the consequences of the programme of conciliation and justice above outlined. We believe that, among our great industrial leaders, he will not stand alone. We believe that, under its present leaders, American labor will co-operate with a large patience and understanding. We believe that all have had a vision of the better time and know that its achievement will outweigh all present sacrifices.

A Condition, Not A Theory

TO THE increasing number of men and women in the Single Tax movement now enrolled for political party action is to be added Dr. Walter Mendelsohn, of this city. This old and intimate friend of the George family, whose letter appears in our Correspondence column, announces his conversion to the only method by which the Single Tax may become a living reality—the method provided by the institutions under which we live, and especially designed for the use of American citizens who entertain any theory having relation to the public good. That institution is the ballot.

We are fond of declaring that the Single Tax is our religion, but that is no reason why we should keep it with us as a denominational creed. We are a communion of saints —but a close communion. We guard our faith as closely as a priest would guard the Eucharist—as something too sacred for careless human handling.

But the Single Tax is not a religious dogma. It cannot become a reality through the methods by which great faiths have been established. If this were the case all that it would be necessary to do would be to build a tabernacle. The Single Tax is a political principle to be translated into political action and established as law by political bodies known as legislatures. We can lecture all sorts of bodies and buttonhole men everywhere with arguments coldly rational or intensely fervid. But until the question is before the people as a political issue, nothing has been accomplished.

Perhaps some of our readers may still cling to the notion that there may be some way of getting this question over in the legislature ere it has been presented to the people. The hope is vain. We know the weakness at all legislative hearings (from the legislators' point of view) of all arguments, however intelligent or convincing, that have no votes behind them. The quiet of a legislative committee's office may be an excellent place to plunder the public of a valuable franchise or extend private privilege, but Single Taxers have no similar objects and should not employ such means.

But suppose that such a measure should by some chance be put over in the legislature? With no educated sentiment behind it, such a law has small chance of being even intelligently applied. Laws derive their effectiveness and their character of permanence from an intelligent and adequately informed public opinion. The only way to create such an educated public sentiment is by having the question brought before the voter for his consideration. That, too, is the quickest way.

The Single Tax is a political issue. Where, therefore, should we expect to find it save in politics? It is one of the strangest anomalies that some Single Taxers should be found who hesitate to accept the logic of the situation. This question being to them a religion—and we have no inclination to treat this conviction lightly—they seem