

or agree with them, while state after state and counties by the dozen have been won over to no-license by non-partisan action. Do you suppose for a moment that those who put those sections under no-license could have been persuaded to drop all their other political activities and spend years in trying to build up a new party? It is unthinkable and history proves the contrary. If then the temperance men having such a tremendous following in every state of the Union have failed to establish a new party, what could we hope to do? Other vital reforms are making progress without separate party action—temperance reform, primary reform, direct legislation, etc.—and so will our cause go forward if we do not make this fatal mistake. My views were exactly expressed in a paragraph which you kindly printed in a recent number of *THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW* under the title "Wanted! Three Names!" Let us have a plan like that and our cause will prosper far beyond what it has done yet, and then if ever a real occasion for a new party arises—an event hardly to be expected—the machinery will be ready at hand. Third party action now will arouse much hostility and alienate many Republican and Democratic friends of the cause.—LEWIS H. CLARK, Sodus, N. Y.

---

BELIEVES HENRY GEORGE WOULD  
HAVE APPROVED AT THIS TIME

Editor *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*.

It is asked—"Should the Single Taxers form an organization"? It may not be advisable to put a full ticket in the field for 1912, but the Single Taxers should be in a position to make themselves felt in the matter of issues and policy. We have seen Revenue from Land Values put on trial and triumphantly win against the combined influence of England's "special interests" and exploiters of labor; we have seen the grandest men England ever produced rally to the "George Standard," and with a statesmanship worthy of the name, with a courage and patriotism worthy a Spartan, stand in bold unflinching purpose and compel a complete recognition of their

demands for political and economic justice. Then why should we falter? Rather should we blush that our democracy found first a fruition in a foreign land. The fact that so many answered the call for a Single Tax party who had previously absented themselves, proves that apathy has set our cause back—we know not for how long—and bids us now get in position to become a factor in the making of platforms and the advocacy of true principles in government. But it is said that many of our strongest and best known men do not favor organization and much weight is given to the fact that Tom. L. Johnson is not in favor of it and his policy in the administration of Cleveland's government is mentioned. But Tom. L. Johnson never pretended to be the whole thing. No one more than he recognizes that there are other pebbles on the beach and he is the last man, in my opinion, who will stand idly by when a Single Tax organization has its shoulder to the wheel for a move forward, and proves its reason for being.

Organize? Why of course, we have already delayed too long and were our martyred hero, the grandest man of all the race with us today, he would be in the van of this new movement with Johnson and Post at his side.—E. C. CLARK, Bernhards Bay, N. Y.

---

LAY STRESS UPON THE MATERIAL  
BENEFITS.

EDITOR *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*:

I have read the pros and cons in the *REVIEW* on Independent Political Action, and there seem to be plausible and valid arguments on both sides.

All Single Taxers want the cause to grow as far and fast as possible. The question of tactics is therefore important. As a general thing, self-interest governs us. Everybody is engaged in earning a living or accumulating money. There is a good deal of truth in the doctrine of "economic determinism." Henry George in *Progress and Poverty* recognized its existence.

I do not argue that Single Taxers should discard the ethical features of our argument, but we should emphasize the mater-