

But while the land question is not the whole problem, it is an indispensable part of the problem; and unless it is disposed of, the solution—no matter how attempted—will be incomplete. Tariff reform, free trade, scientific currency, co-operative banking, and all the multitude of social reforms, each has its place in the achievement of human progress. The land question is not only basic and fundamental, but it is so close to us, and is so subtly interwoven in our thought and practice with present methods that it is difficult for some to realize that it is a problem at all.

s. c.



**Getting Together.**

The Coast Seamen's Journal, in commenting upon George W. Perkins' remark that an aviator approaching this country, and seeing its fertility, and its unemployed, would think it inhabited by lunatics, goes on to enumerate the various schemes that have been advanced to cure social wrongs. And after naming the Protectionist, the Free Trader, the Singletaxer, the Socialist, the Anarchist, and suggesting an infinite number of other "ists" and "ers," it asks why the Singletaxers, Socialists, Anarchists, and Trade Unionists do not get together and tackle the problem of unemployment. How can they get together when their beliefs are based upon contradictory and opposing principles? How can the Catholic, the Methodist, and the Mormon unite on the question of salvation? How can the Allopath, the Osteopath, and the Christian Scientist get together on the question of healing?



The Singletaxer would make the earth accessible alike to all labor and capital, and regulate their relations by the freest possible competition. The Socialist would eliminate competition, abolish production for profit, and arbitrarily apportion the rewards for labor. The Anarchist would do away with all compulsion and depend upon voluntary association. The Trade Unionist would strengthen organized labor, until it has the power to regulate industry. How can these various elements, holding as they do such opposing views, come together, and act in unison? While, however, it is impossible for these several schools to unite in a common belief, there are certain principles common to them all. The land question, for instance, is as essential to the Socialist, Anarchist and Trade Unionist as to the Singletaxers. And while the various reformers cannot unite in a single political party, they can and will if they are wise, incorporate in

their several platforms those things that are common to them all. The time is not far distant when the power of direct legislation will be available to the people. Then it will be possible for all those persons who believe the land question can be solved by taking land values for purposes of public revenue—though they be divided among a variety of parties, each having a small representation in the legislative body—to vote directly upon the common article of belief. Direct legislation is not likely to supersede representative legislation, but it will serve to make effective a majority sentiment, divided among minority parties.

s. c.



**THE RIGHT TO WORK.**

It is a distinguishing characteristic of what is known as the re-actionary mind to start from a premise born of abnormal conditions extant and reason, more or less logically, to a conclusion as abnormal and indefensible as the conditions which it contemplates. Thus, the Saturday Evening Post in a recent editorial, sees first that there are hundreds of thousands of men in the country who are not laboring; that these men would like to be able "at any time to step up to the window and say, 'Here's my day's work, give me two dollars,'" that we are obliged to ask, "But where is the window?" and, therefore, in conclusion, the Post asserts, "Of course, nobody has any more right to work than to do anything else." This is not unlike saying, "we are in a very mischief of a pickle. Those who got us into it are not legally bound to get us out of it. Therefore we have no right to get out." It is starting in a brier patch, scrambling around in a very small circle, and winding up at the point of beginning, with the loss of very little breath, and some cuticle, but no privileges. To lend additional weight to its conclusion, the Post adds the inquiry, "Who is under the least obligation to give you a job, or can rightfully require you to take any job you do not want?" Who, indeed; no one, absolutely no one. And yet the men who approve of just the sort of philosophy that runs through this Saturday Evening Post editorial referred to, arrogate to themselves the privilege of "giving" you a job—in the sense of permitting you to work if it suits them to let you do so, or withholding the job from you if that pleases them better. And, therefore, also they do arrogate to themselves the privilege of requiring you "to take any job you do not want"—or go hungry. More than that, for some reason, they insist upon retaining that privilege as "chosen