

SOME of the less discerning opponents of Single Tax party action point as illustrating its futility to the small vote cast for Macauley for president in the eight States where we were on the ballot. It is true that the vote was disappointing, though to it is to be added the 229,000 votes cast in Ohio for judicial candidates, the 9,000 in New York city, and the votes in other cities and States. It would be well for those critics to inform themselves on the political history of the country. Many political parties in this nation which have accomplished their purpose and then ceased to exist, as well as some still existing parties—the Republican Party, for example—have had far less formidable beginnings than the Single Tax Party.

IT may be that Single Tax Party action is not the best nor the only way to get the Single Tax. But the number of votes cast is not the only indication of the value of such a method. Criticism of party action based upon the election returns loses sight, it seems to us, of much more important considerations. We like best the candor of our old friend, John B. McGauran, of Denver, who is among those who do not subscribe to the party. Mr. McGauran says of himself: "I am a pussyfooter, an out-and-outer, and a one hundred percenter." Yet Mr. McGauran says: "Nothing in two decades has resulted in such publicity for the Single Tax as the Single Tax Party convention in Chicago. I was amazed on taking up paper after paper in the west to read articles from a column to a stick-full on the first page featuring the Single Tax." May we indicate to the sincere opponents of Single Tax Party action that such advertising publicity for the Single Tax could not have been bought for millions of dollars—indeed it could not have been bought at all.

AND now comes a signal testimony to the value of party action in the invitation extended to the late candidate of the party, Robert C. Macauley, to lecture on the western circuit of the Chautauqua. This invitation comes unsolicited and will carry with it a flattering honorarium. For years we have been going down in our pockets to keep our lecturers in the field. Think how we would exult if our speakers, hitherto employed and paid for with Single Tax money—Louis Wallis, James R. Brown, John Z. White, and James F. Morton, Jr.—could occupy the position of Mr. Macauley as a paid Chautauqua lecturer. Also consider this: During the three months course on the Chautauqua Mr. Macauley will address perhaps over one hundred thousand persons, more than will listen to all four of the eminent men who have been named for an entire year. And this is the direct result of Single Tax party action and the publicity attained for the movement by Mr. Macauley as candidate of that party. Surely the sincere opponents of the Single Tax Party will be willing to concede that this incident alone makes it really worth while.

THE DUKE OF NORTHUMBERLAND, who owns many thousand acres of land is horrified at the pro-

posal of the British Labor Party to impose higher death duties and surtaxes to force land into use, says: "We are informed that the Labor Party, having dispossessed the landowners, will continue to feed and clothe them if they work, and for this small mercy I suppose we should be grateful."

Surely the eminent Duke does not expect to be fed and clothed if he doesn't work.

IN COUNT WITTE'S MEMOIRS, published in the *World's Work*, some remarkable comments are made on social and other customs of the benighted Americans. These comments make a very unfavorable impression, even to the extent of throwing doubt upon the competency of the observer. Therefore, when one reads the following statement, in the April number, page 590, some question remains as to the correctness of the quotation. Evidently the Count does not favor the Single Tax. This is unfortunate, since it offers the most effective means to remedy the distressing conditions in his own country.

THE Count's statement is: "While examining the economic division of the the library at Columbia, I remember, I asked the professor of Political Economy whether he expounded to his students Henry George's Single Tax doctrine. He assured me that Henry George was studied in his classes very carefully. 'In the first place,' he said, 'Henry George is one of our most gifted writers. Besides, I consider it useful to acquaint my students with his views on the land problem, for the purpose of exposing its fallaciousness.' Many of our home-spun economists and also our great writer but naive thinker, Leo Tolstoi, would do well to go to school to that American teacher."

IS it true that a Columbia Professor of Economics does bring up the Henry George teachings concerning land ownership "for the purpose of exposing its fallaciousness?" Some of us would like to know how this achievement in exposure is accomplished. If the principles we suppose to be sound, which have found such world-wide acceptance, are false, cannot the professor who has discovered a means to expose their wrong be induced to share his knowledge with the readers of this REVIEW? So far as we are acquainted with the subject, those principles have never been shown to be fallacious although very widely published and printed in all languages. If the professor is right, then the REVIEW ought not to continue to mislead its readers. The professor should let us have the truth as he gives it to his students. But if, as may be possible, he is himself in error, he should feel morally bound to cease misleading his students. One may justly wonder to what extent a serious student of Henry George can be influenced to a conclusion adverse to his teachings, by any class-room instruction. However, college students are not usually able to qualify for argument against professional "authority."

WOULD a man who lived at the North Pole fight for his home?