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 disapointment. 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 Even the excess profits tax (which was repealed as a national nuisance, and which he declares worked disadvantageously,) he would nevertheless restore when we have determined what are "normal" profits.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 thinkful 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