

acting in sympathy with the middle class element, is certain to affect profoundly the mental outlook of the Labor party, which, under the influence of these new forces, will become more moderate, staid, respectable. Against this, however, there will be revolt, and the political kaleidoscope will become more many-colored and perplexing than it is today. In all probability there will be bitter disputes and desperate efforts for conciliation; incessant discussion and much tinkering with programmes; out of all which may come some clarification and growth of thought. For these reasons the new partnership seems to us rather an exhibit of tendencies well worthy of analysis than a mere political re-shuffle.

IT is inconceivable that the British Co-operative movement, which has attained such immense proportions, should be swallowed up by the Labor party, or that it should contemplate the effacement of those principles and policies which are among the very essentials of the co-operative movement. For though the British Labor party is only a union of incoherence, and though a speaker of the Labor party recently declared that there are 120 definitions of socialism, more than double the amount of the fifty-seven varieties supposed to exist in the United States, there is nevertheless something which is common to all socialistic proposals, and the British Labor party is definitely socialistic. That common characteristic is the minimizing of individual initiative, the extension of the powers of the state, and the consequent abridgement of the principle of voluntary co-operation on which the Co-operative movement depends.

IT is true that the British Labor party is not definitely socialistic any more than it is definitely anything else. But to the degree that it is socialistic its aims and purposes are opposed to the Co-operative movement. For that movement is "capitalistic," if you will—is profit sharing, and "profits" is a term abhorrent to your thorough going socialist. Above all it is not revolutionary, for its success is dependent upon orderly processes and recognized business methods. It has grown amazingly conservative—hence our very natural astonishment at the vote of the Congress even if the Co-operative movement were not adequately represented there.

WHETHER the Co-operators will now affect the policies of the Labor party, or whether the Labor party will react on the Co-operative movement, we shall have much interest in observing. It is an ill-assorted partnership and should trouble Ramsay Macdonald not a little. But he and his party will probably adopt what politicians call a middle "ground," which means that their principles will be "watered" a little while they indulge in friendly and acquiescent nods to co operators, trade unionists, Marxians and communists.

IN the meantime the Land Question grows ever more insistent. Politicians will ignore it as long as they can. The Lloyd Georges and the MacDonalds may keep it out of the political arena for a time, both being too cowardly to face it. They are wise in postponing its consideration as long as they can, for when the question of the centuries comes to be really an issue, when the hour strikes for the resumption by the people of their rights in the land, the politician and the deserter in their respective parties will find their occupations gone. They will be remembered only as politicians who played their minor parts in the prologue to a drama marking the death of an old civilization and the birth of a new.

A CORRESPONDENT takes us to task for calling Canberra a Single Tax city and points out that the twenty year re-appraisal of land values permits speculation in leases. This is true. But speculation under this system will hardly be as flagrant as under the freehold system. For under the leasing system of Canberra use must be made of the land.

Canberra is only a Single Tax city in intention—in actual practice it falls far short of the ideal. We should have preferred of course that freehold titles had been granted subject to a full rental tax in place of the leasehold system. Nevertheless, it is the nearest approach to ideal Georgism anywhere in the world. The government has done well according to its lights. It has fallen just short of the real principle. As Mr. Huie says in the *Standard*, of Sydney, Australia, "Our local reformers are not yet capable of teaching Henry George anything." They are not indeed.

IF you were asked what is the purpose of education would you not answer that its office was to enable you to minister to the minds of others, to enable others to share in all cultural advantages, to be able to convey to the young food for such intellectual hunger as you might be able to arouse in them? Would you not answer that the object of education was to enable you to participate more intimately in those indefinite yearnings for truth and justice which stir in the hearts of multitudes, to get at the secret of things, and to point the way to those that stumble in darkness for want of the guiding light that education of a real sort supplies?

BUT it appears that education is not at all that kind of thing, according to Prof. Hummer, Principal of the Binghamton, N. Y., Central High School. At the annual commencement exercises last June he told the pupils what education is: "It is the bootstrap by which you lift yourselves above the common herd." So education is to begin by teaching us to despise the commonality of mankind. In place of sympathy we are to preserve an intellectual aloofness; in place of knowledge of the latent aspirations of the average man, we are to seek