

that can be taken toward the making of a real Single-Taxer is to induce him to read carefully Henry George's masterpiece. Next in importance is putting the elementary truths of our movement in such simple, clear and attractive form that they will be read, and will sink into the mind of the reader. No two writers are likely to state the same propositions in the same way; and I assume that constant iteration and reiteration of the same truths in different languages by different people will gradually impress the truths upon the public mind.

DIRECT LEGISLATION MUST COME FIRST.

(For the Review)

By W. J. STEWART.

In the Review of October 15th, 1906, Mr. Garrison concludes his "Impressions of the Movement in England" with this statement: "The cheering consolation of Single-Taxers is the obvious fact that no social reform can advance until the obstruction of land monopoly is removed. . . The sad thing is that so much wasted energy must be expended on palliatives before the cause of the disease is recognized and eradicated."

That no other economic reform could amount to much while land monopoly continues unabated, the Single-Taxer will not question; nor that every effort to bring about recognition of this truth is well worth while. But that no important reform can advance meanwhile is certainly far from true. On the contrary it may be said that the constant thought of Single-Taxers should be that land monopoly cannot be removed until other reforms have advanced.

In the first paragraph of the article immediately preceding Mr. Garrison's just referred to, Judge Brown endorses the statement "that the necessary political reform which must be the advance courier of the Single Tax is 'Local Option' or 'Home Rule' in taxation. . . . All progress toward practical application that the principle has made anywhere in the world has been on that line and so it must continue to be." That *political* reform must come first is here clearly recognized.

And that such reform must go even deeper than securing self-government by municipalities—instead of State government as at present—is logically certain; it must secure self-government by the people, both of State and municipalities.

We cannot reasonably expect to get "Home Rule" any more than the Single Tax itself through political machine action; even if we did get it, it could not be counted on for much if controlled by machine methods; and finally we will certainly have machine methods so long as we have government by so-called "representatives" who can do as they please. The logical conclusion is that Direct Legislation—the "Initiative and Referendum"—is a more fundamental reform even than the Single Tax, even than the Home Rule.

Following Mr. Garrison's statement, it seems to me that the sad thing is that so much energy must be ineffectively expended before the Single Tax question can be submitted direct to the people. For not only would that be by far the most effective educational means, but it must be the road to success. Let us not put the cart before the horse. Political reform, the attainment of real government by the people through Direct Legislation, must come first; and it is also in the line of least resistance. Should not Single-Taxers more fully recognize this fact?