

a Socialist as well. That would have made of him an intellectual monster such as the world has not yet seen.

THE discontinuance of the *Freeman* is announced. The last number will appear on March 5th. We regret its suspension. It will be missed for its admirable discussion of the Single Tax, its discriminating literary criticism, and its "English undefiled." But it deliberately courted the fate that has finally overtaken it. Ill-natured and censorious, it repelled those who would have been glad to welcome a journal of its independent and fearless character.

The National Commonwealth Land Party Convention

WHATEVER may be the final outcome of the action taken by the Commonwealth Land Party Convention in disassociating the movement for Land Restoration—the real Henry George Doctrine—from other movements for tax exemptions, tax reductions, tax reforms, et al, it is certain that it clarifies our aims and lifts the standard out of the hands of those who, intentionally or otherwise, through ignorance or fear, or honestly from motives of mistaken expediency, would minimize the message.

We have no quarrel with those who are at work reforming our tax system in the direction of the goal that Henry George aimed at. But it is not our fight. If this process is hurried sufficiently it may save our civilization. We may not indeed get what we are after all at once. But we will get it sooner and more completely by openly avowing what we are striving for.

The trouble has been hitherto that all offers of compromise have come from Single Taxers—never from the other side. And this is inevitable since our attitude has been one of compromise. We have approached the powers "in forma pauperis," and we have got what beggars always get—crumbs, and usually not even those.

That day is forever ended. The party has done a great service to the cause which future historians of the movement writing of this period will note. Those who for reasons of necessity or predilection of one sort or another have not joined the party, will yet acknowledge the signal service it has rendered to the cause at this time.

And the advertising publicity is certain to be enormous. The metropolitan papers which have hardly mentioned the Single Tax in the last few years, featured the convention in notable headlines. The *New York Times* printed the salient parts of the platform; no paper here failed to give the two days convention adequate notice. News dispatches of the event appeared in every important paper of the country. A great news agency supplying material to over 600 western papers will feature the candidate's portrait with an account of his life and work. The local papers of Newark where Mr. Wallace lives gave long interviews with the candidate.

When the committee of notification visits Mr. Wallace his speech of acceptance will be radioed. Arrangements are under way to have this event reproduced on the screen in the moving picture theatres of the country.

And in addition to all this the executive committee of the party will print at once a half million copies of the platform to be placed in the hands of every newspaper editor, legislator, and file leader of opinion in the United States.

The opponents of the party must be prejudiced indeed not to realize that this wide and useful publicity can not be attained by any other method than independent political party action.

A Tornado in a Teapot

CAT-A-CORNER from Cooper Union in New York City stands a monument which has received more votes as the most inartistic statue in the United States than any other within our ken. Having visited Statuary Hall in the Capitol and seen many soldiers' and sailors' memorials, we are doubtful whether it really deserves this bad preeminence. Many lines of surface cars pass the monument and the story goes that all the new motor men stop instinctively on coming near the statue, because they mistake the eloquent gesture of the bronze effigy as indicating a desire to board the car.

But the hero who is thus commemorated was a man of mark forty years ago, a Democrat in the days when the Democratic party professed opinions which made it distinguishable to the naked eye from its titular opponent. In those days it was possible to tell from policies themselves whether they were launched by Republicans or Democrats, something no longer possible. Samuel Sullivan Cox was a Congressman, an Ambassador, a free trader and the champion of the letter carriers. To the latter fact he owes the monument. He was moreover something of a wit, which seriously impeded his political preferment. His sense of humor was too acute for him to take the political hierarchy seriously. No one is more uncomfortable than an orthodox politician in the presence of a humorist. Though Cox never reached those pinnacles of fame to which his substantial qualifications entitled him, he said some things apt enough to be permanent contributions to our political criticism. For instance he made one statement in an argument for tax reduction which might be inscribed on the walls of all legislatures. "It is as easy to run a powder mill in hell as to keep an honest government with a surplus in the Treasury."

This was a primitive utterance which bears on its face all the marks of a simpler age, but it contains the germ of an idea now capable of universal application. As long as we maintain a system by which, in a quiet legal way, federal officers can turn over to individuals or corporations franchises or titles to land, which will enrich the recipients to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars, is

there any reasonable hope that officials will remain honest? Human nature has its limitations. Its power of resistance is not boundless, especially at a time like this, when money can purchase more luxuries than at any other time in the world's history.

Teapot Dome is not by any means the greatest steal in American history but it happens to have been exposed at the psychological moment when the issue of a national election is in the balance. The sad thing about the incident is that public indignation is aroused over the charges of personal corruption which is the minor matter, and not excited at all about the expropriation of the public property for private exploitation, which is the major thing. Suppose all the participants in alienating the oil deposits had been models of fastidious official conduct, it would still be true that the public domain would have been looted. Indeed Fall in becoming the sacrificial scapegoat, driven into the wilderness by associates, whose chief regret is that they did not have his opportunity, may be rendering a great public service by calling attention to an evil practice, which must be stopped if all government is not to sink under the crushing load of public contempt.

The effect of the revelations has been to shake popular confidence in government in places which have been immune from suspicion in the past. If we would save it, we must adopt a system which will compel all holders of natural resources to pay to the people the full annual value of their holdings after deducting costs of production and a fair return on the capital invested. The report is in circulation that hereafter no man not committed to the so-called conservation policy will ever again be made Secretary of the Interior. But this suggestion really means nothing at all. The people are entitled to use and enjoy the natural resources of the United States, and those who wish to develop them with due economy have a right to protest against obstruction, provided of course that they pay the annual rent of the special privileges which they enjoy.

One other consideration arises out of these revelations. Can great fortunes and democracy coexist? Public opinion is betraying that cowardice which is the earmark of the employe's mind. The public press under the same influence is falling into fewer and fewer hands so that expression of opinion hostile to the great industrial interests is stifled, if not totally suppressed. Even as conservative an economist as Professor Taussig concedes that the main source of the great fortunes of the United States is the private appropriation of ground rent. With a mole-like blindness public sentiment is seeking a remedy for the evil by means of crushing income and inheritance taxes, not realizing that the true cure lies in the prevention of excessive accumulation and not in taxing it after it has grown to such proportions and power as embolden its holders to challenge the power of the Republic to regulate them.

The Communism of Privilege

The Political Economist, official organ of the American Protective Tariff League, is much disturbed because THE REVIEW asserted in a recent issue that the farmers are robbed by the high protective tariff, and devotes two columns of its valuable space to a recital of all the alleged benefits conferred on the farmers by oppressive taxes that greatly increase the prices of practically everything they buy. The source of this criticism does not justify an extended reply, and, indeed, no reply is necessary. The simple facts are that so-called "Protection" is essentially a Communistic scheme for taking the property of the great mass of American people and giving it to a few rich owners of protected industries. Between the Red Communism of the Third International, and the black Communism of the tariff, there is little choice. One robs the rich to give to the poor. The other robs the poor to give to the rich. Protection violates the fundamental principles of American liberty, justice and equal rights, just as the rights of the Russian people were violated by the Soviet Republic.

If Stanwood S. Menken, James M. Beck, Attorney-General Dougherty, Ralph M. Easley and other alarmists over the dangers of Red propaganda, want to catch enemies of America institutions, let them get after the men who are stealing billions of dollars annually with the aid of our tariff laws. To take money from the farmers and workers and put it in the pockets of protected manufacturers, is robbery, though done under the forms of law. Editor Wakeman of the *Economist* may, if he chooses, do some more talking for his meal-ticket to explain why it is all wrong to take the rich man's wealth and give it to the poor, but all right to take the poor man's scanty savings and give them to the rich.

Mr. Smith Moves

MR. SMITH—Milton H. Smith—is closing his men's furnishings shop on Upper Broadway, New York City. He has been on that same corner for a dozen years or more; has worked hard and built up a good business, but now he has to leave. When he opened his shop there were not so many people living in his neighborhood as there are now, so he paid a rent of only \$2,500 a year. Gradually new big apartments went up all around; other shops were opened nearby, but Mr. Smith's careful attention to his customers' needs kept old patrons and brought new ones. As business increased so did rent. Up to \$3000, \$4000, \$4,500, \$5,000 it climbed, and Mr. Smith worked harder and managed, just managed, to pay the increase. Now the shop owner wants \$7,500 a year, and Mr. Smith gives up the struggle. He is through. Try as he may, he can't keep up with his landlord's demands for more money. He is thinking over what it was that the landlord did to make that store worth such a great increase in rent, but hasn't yet found the answer.