

It would be hard to crowd more amusing errors in a single sentence.

A RECENT visitor to these shores was Rev. Studdert Kennedy, who is chaplain to Britain's King. The literary chap who makes hurried visits to America and goes away to write books about us, usually composed of mush and hokum, might be spared for a few of the type of Mr. Kennedy. He did not threaten us with a book some time in the future. Instead he had something more important to say, and from a recent interview in the *World* is quoted as saying:

"Our God is the God of everything or He is nothing. He is not the God of the church alone; He is the God of the factory, the skyscraper and the lamp post just as truly as He is the God of the stars. Any one can believe in the God of the stars, but get men to believe in the God of the factory and the mine, and our Christianity will amount to something.

"The church that does not concern itself with men ground down, impoverished, in rags, but only talks of men's souls has no right to exist. The civilization which produces at the top men decaying in selfish luxury and at the bottom men ground down in rags is rotten. It must perish.

"Business men are the apostles of Jesus Christ among the nations, and commerce is either a holy communion or a damnation. Your nation is the strongest in the world. May you lead us aright! The only hope lies in reason, but reason must have a vision as its basis."

And he concluded as follows:

"Let us have one supreme passion, which shall harmonize and unify all our impulses—the passion for humanity. What we need is a passionate humanitarianism which makes men patiently reasonable. What was the secret of Lincoln's glory and power? That he was humanitarian, touched with the fire and passion of God, who believed that men were the children of God."

Pretty good for the King's chaplain! But what is he willing to do about it?

THE CONSUMER'S UNION

ALARMED at the steadily increasing cost of living, the consumers followed the example of the labor unions, and formed organizations for their mutual benefit and protection. By buying food, clothing and other necessities at wholesale prices, and selling to themselves without profit, they found at the end of the first year that they were able to save about twenty-five per cent. of their incomes. This was fortunate, for about that time the Landlords' Union raised rents just twenty-five per cent.

WHIDDEN GRAHAM in *Life*.

WHY should organized labor champion old-age pensions and similar devices? The Bismarcks and Gladstones will give them to us when it is necessary to allay discontent.

The Futility of Side Issues

DURING the land war of the early eighties, which was waged as the result of the efforts of Irish tenants to secure their holdings, the story goes that a certain Irish Peer, entering his club on Pall Mall one morning, was accosted by a member with the remark, "Well, I see they have been taking pot shots at your agent in Connemara again." To which the Peer replied, "If those fellows in Ireland think that they can intimidate *me* by shooting at my agent they are jolly well mistaken." The story illustrates, as well as another, the mental attitude of people who are entrenched in the central and fundamental privilege of land monopoly, towards the efforts made at various times to attack the outlying redoubts of the central fortress.

How many of our associates, during the past forty years, have expended their energy in attempts to reform subsidiary evils in the hope that, when the minor positions fell, they would find their method of approach to the fundamental evil made easier. How many of us thought that Free Trade would be an admirable rallying cry, which would enable us to gather together the forces opposed to special privilege. To how many did the shibboleth, "Municipal Ownership and Operation," seem to promise possibilities worthy of achievement? How many worthy men, whose memories we now revere, thought that they found in electoral reform, whether of elections or primaries, the key to emancipation?

In favor of the proposals of these groups there was much to be said, but their theories were based upon a supposition now demonstrated to be erroneous. They believed public opinion was intelligent enough to declare itself in favor of so obviously correct a policy as the public appropriation of land rent, and that it was only the machinations of the politicians who thereby control the election of candidates and determine their legislative policies, which prevented public opinion from voting as the reformers would have them vote. Now we know that this was nothing but a baseless delusion. We know that on the whole, the elected representatives of the public are more enlightened and intelligent than the average of the voters. We know that the elective representatives do not enact the measures which we think that they should enact, not because they are inherently opposed to them, but because the people had given no expression of any desire of wanting them. Hence it is rather difficult to grow indignant any more over the prostitution of the ballot to partisan desires. Even the case in a New York Assembly District, under our carefully guarded ballot, in which three judicial candidates got three hundred votes apiece on the toll sheet, no more and no less, and none of the other candidates got any, fails to arouse public interest. It may be possible that the election inspectors will be fined or will go to jail; but even this is not certain, because the law, while well intentioned, was so loosely drawn, that it is extremely difficult to bring

any personal guilt home to anyone except possibly the chairman of the local board of elections.

How many ardent supporters has Municipal Ownership and Operation now out of the thousand enthusiasts who marched under its banner in the happy days before Mr. Hearst made the cause his personal property? The ideal has been examined more closely, and it is found to be stuffed with straw, which protrudes from various sections of its anatomy. From being a matter of principle, it has fallen to the low level of expediency.

And what about Free Trade? But one moribund organization even carries the name. Probably the reason why it is so nearly dead is because of the indisputable fact that Great Britain, which came nearer to realizing the free trade ideal than any other country in the world, proved that of itself it could accomplish no miracle for the welfare of the masses. Of course in any strict sense, Great Britain never had Free Trade, but it had a system which did not permit the home manufacturer to increase his prices, because the importer was obliged to pay a heavy fine for the privilege of bringing goods into the country.

In one sense these facts may be regarded as indicating among our growing youth a lack of interest in right and wrong; a lack of ability to become aroused over questions of abstract principle. On the other hand, they but confirm the off-expressed belief of middle-of-the-road Georgists, that no policy is worthy of the expenditure of any energy which does not keep in view the central problem that until the relations of man to Mother Earth are based upon the highest conceptions of justice, all attempts to patch up the social order must of necessity fail.

J. A. H. Hopkins as a Tax Reformer

OUR old and still undaunted friend of the 48ers, Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins, is out with a pamphlet on Taxation. An endorsement on the first page by Mr. Wilbur Eastlake says that "this tax brochure should be in every school, college and university not only in this country, but in Canada, Australia and Britain, and in the office room of every United States Senator and Representative in Congress."

With such a recommendation we sat down prepared to be enlightened. The reading of it brought keen disappointment. It is a fine example of loose reasoning. Mr. Hopkins comes to no very definite conclusion on anything. He would retain nearly all the taxes we now have. Even the excess profits tax (which was repealed as a national nuisance, and which he declares worked disadvantageously,) he would nevertheless restore when we have determined what are "normal" profits. Mr. Hopkins has a new method of arriving at this. "Normal profits" would be ascertained "by fixing a fair percentage of the net earnings upon the volume of business transacted," and he seems to

think that this would be analogous to the fixing by many of the states of the rate of interest!

We are familiar with the log-rolling by representatives of special interests before tariff committees when the preparation of tariff schedules is in progress, but here is an opportunity which would develop infinitely greater possibilities when these great industries send expensive legal counsel to appear before committees entrusted with the fixing of "normal" profits. We think our readers will see, too, where the small business man would "get off" under such an arrangement. But of course the suggestion will appeal to every bureaucrat, as adding a million more government officials charged with the duty of investigating "abnormal" profits.

Mr. Hopkins utters a few kind words for the Single Tax, which he says may come to prove the answer to our existing problems. Then he suggests a literal enforcement of present tax laws so that "every taxpayer must declare the value of real estate and personal property (especially stocks and bonds) which he possesses." He even suggests an amendment to the Federal Constitution so that those particular sources of revenue may be used for both federal and state purposes. This amazing non sequitur is a curious method of coming to what Mr. Hopkins has declared may prove to be "the answer to our existing problems," the Single Tax on land values exclusively.

Are Capital and Labor Enemies?

ASPIRING to the high ideal of becoming a journal for the intelligent minority, the *American Mercury* has set forth its aims in an editorial article representing the combined thought of its two thoughtful editors. Hastening to deny the unkind rumor that they are radicals, the editors roar as gently as any reactionary, and announce that they are not opposed to what they term the "the capitalistic system." In this they are in accord with the great unintelligent majority, so it is found necessary to explain that there really are "class barriers" in America, and to brand as a delusion "the doctrine that the interests of capital and labor are identical." This notion, it is asserted, is equivalent to saying that the interests of landlord and tenant, of cat and rat, are identical, a notion that the editors sadly admit permeates all American thinking.

This view of the essential antagonism of interests between capital and labor may not be radical, but it is clearly Socialistic, and is, indeed, the basis of the confused and confusing theories of Karl Marx. According to that exponent of economic determinism, the capitalist, or property owner, is engaged in a ceaseless struggle to exploit labor by robbing it of all its products above what is necessary for the workers' bare existence. Capital is a predatory monster that oppresses labor by forcing it to work for a minimum wage, and uses the surplus wealth wrung from its victims to forge new chains for the wealth-producers. That explains why what he calls "capitalism" is the fundamental on which the