

ests, where the unemployed could have work, and the old and ill could find comfort. One would also think that all the public institutions, all the civic architecture, all the villages and highways would amply and constantly illustrate high intellectual and spiritual ideals working steadily onward and upward. Is there a single county in America whose citizens so love and honor it that they passionately toil for its right government? Why can we not give ourselves the chance to feel towards the counties we live in as did the citizens of Athens and Florence towards those places in the days of their blossoming?



The Road to Industrial Democracy.

A correspondent from Oak Park, Illinois, makes a proposal which may be best considered by our readers if we print it in full:

Why not make Singletax advocates a political force this year by a united determination to aid the Socialist ticket? The Singletax proposal is revolutionary and menacing to the capitalist system. It never will be adopted effectively before the working class is consciously in political power. It is futile to attempt this radical change by means of a propaganda that tries to gain support from the trading class—it is like putting salt on a bird's tail in order to catch it. It is now apparent that one of the first and most revolutionary things that the Socialist Party may do when it gains political power, is to tackle the land question. It probably will use the Singletax as its first step. If this change brings industrial freedom, the Socialist Party and the working class will be satisfied. All sincere persons who desire to see the Singletax applied should vote the Socialist ticket. It is likely that two million Socialist votes would so terrify the plutocratic parties that their representatives in office would try various proposals of the Singletaxers in an effort to allay the unrest of the workers. The Socialist platform is the only one which advocates the Singletax ideals. A vote for the Republican, Democratic or Progressive party Presidential candidates is certainly a vote against the Singletax and against the social ideals held by Singletaxers. A vote for the Socialist Party candidates is certainly a vote for land reform and for the supremacy of the working class, which, of course, is desired by intelligent Singletaxers.

OTTO McFEELY.



That a good many Singletaxers will vote the Socialist ticket this year is by no means improbable, and for the reasons urged by Mr. McFeely. Equally probable is it, however, that a good many others will not do so, and for reasons varying with individuals. Some Singletaxers who will withhold their votes from the Socialist ticket have no interest in the Singletax except as a fiscal reform; some are individualists; some, like most

Socialists, ignorantly think of the Singletax as superficial, and, unlike many Socialists, don't want any social reform that isn't superficial; some are Singletaxers only unconsciously, not accounting themselves Singletaxers at all but favoring things that make for the Singletax; some will withhold their votes from the Socialist Party this year for the very reasons Mr. McFeely urges for their doing otherwise,—namely that they want the substance of the social state that Socialism wants. But they do not want the Socialist form of social state, and they wouldn't expect to secure any form of it by Socialist methods.



What is the social state that Socialism wants? A Labor state, isn't it? And by Labor state is meant, if we understand the aspirations of Socialism, a world-wide industrial democracy in place of the existing "capitalist-class" governments. That is precisely the kind of social state that Singletaxers of the Henry George type also want. But the Socialist form for such a social state differs from the Singletax form. Whereas the Socialist form would have to be one of minute rules and regulations, choke-full of specific "dos" and "don'ts," the Singletax form would uproot industrial privilege and keep it uprooted. The Socialist method, too, differs from the Singletax method. Whereas Socialism aims at establishing industrial democracy through a struggle between employers and employees, as hostile *personal classes*, the Singletax aims at establishing industrial democracy through a struggle between Privilege and Labor as hostile *economic interests*, regardless of class lines. A further difference in method, though logically resulting from the other, relates to partisanship. Socialists of the political group—for "direct actionists," though similarly intent on establishing the Labor state, take no stock in any kind of politics—are party-bound, and expectant of developing their party into the Labor state; but all partisan bonds lie loose on Singletaxers of the Henry George type. The latter do not expect much of any political party all at once. They vote with or to oppose parties, not as partisans, but as an effective way of stimulating, promoting and helping to guide public opinion in the direction of industrial democracy. Such Singletaxers are not very likely to vote the national Socialist ticket this year, although it can be granted that they might "go farther and fare worse."



The attitude of Singletaxers of the Henry George kind toward the Socialist objective and

Socialist methods may be best understood on all hands from reading chapters xviii and xix of Henry George's "Social Problems," and chapter xxviii of his "Protection or Free Trade."



The Last Argument in a Bad Cause.

When bad eggs are used for arguments in any cause it is a sign not only that the cause is as bad as the eggs but also that those who thus defend it know how bad it is. From which it may be judged how poorly the land monopolists of Missouri feel that they are making out in their efforts to convince farmers that it would hurt them to have their improvements and personal property go free of taxes. The place was a school house near Cedar Gap, Missouri. The time, August 24, 1912. The speakers for the Missouri tax amendments whose oral arguments brought the bad-egg reply, were John Z. White of Chicago, and Judge Pittman and R. Gratz Brown of Memphis. But the egg-throwers were not farmers. They were hoodlums from a neighboring town. And they "took to their heels" as soon as they had done the job in egg-oratory for which they had apparently been hired by land monopoly interests.



Labor Cost.

One of the large facts proved before the Stanley committee of Congress in its investigation of the Steel trust, cannot be too strongly or too often emphasized. The committee's report puts it in these words: "A most important economic fact brought out and too often overlooked is that the true measure of a man's work is the tonnage produced per man per day, and not the mere amount of wage paid. The true economic unit is the tonnage produced per man, and not the wage paid per man." This is essentially true of every other industry, as well as steel production. The number of bricks laid, the yards of cloth woven, the pairs of shoes turned out, etc., etc., and the wages per unit (quality of work considered, of course), determine the cost of labor. For that purpose the statistics of *time wages* are not at all significant. Yet Protection statistics of labor cost are based upon time wages and not upon wages of production. When statistics of wages of production, in contradistinction to time wages, are considered, it will be found that in all industries appropriate to our natural conditions, *American wages are the lowest wages.*



And American wages, when subjected to that

test, fall with increased productive power. An illustration in connection with the steel industry is given in the Stanley report—"Report No. 1127, 62nd Congress, 2nd session, House of Representatives,"—at pages 126 and 127. The labor cost of producing pig-iron in Pennsylvania fell from \$1.25 a ton in 1902, to 82 cents a ton in 1909. Yet the realized value of the pig-iron output was \$15.64 a ton in 1902, whereas it was \$17.44 in 1909. In other words, wage-workers in 1902 got \$1.25 for producing only \$15.64 worth of pig-iron, and in 1909 only 82 cents for producing \$17.44 worth. In 1909 they produced \$1.80 more in pig-iron value than in 1902, and for 43 cents less in wages. For every additional dollar's worth of product which they turned out, their wages fell a quarter of a dollar.



THE THRESHING FLOORS OF ETERNITY.

All of the great philosophies of life conceive of Time as only an eddy in the currents of eternities; we are living in and working in That which Is—forever and forever.

All of the greater prophets and seers love the symbol of the Threshing Floor, where the wheat and the chaff are separated. It remains in literature, as the sword and a thousand other things remain, because it eternally sets forth the truth behind the fact, the hope beyond the event.



The reason why history must ever be written over, and told in the light of new comprehension, is because of the dust and the noise of the Threshing Floors of eternity. After awhile the wheat is swept together, the chaff is winnowed and cast out; millions of great reputations perish in an hour; men recognize another Liberator, and for a moment there is a silence on earth and in the heavens. Then is it understood that, as in the shaving of Shagpat, the Destinies have at last shaped The Event.

Once the hidden, the ill-read issue was human slavery, and for some seventy years every man and woman in America was being sifted to the uttermost though they knew it not, on that mighty Threshing Floor. When the dust cleared, we saw Lincoln and Garrison and Whittier, and a little group who had stood fast, had kept the faith, had worshipped the Truth behind the Veil.

On a greater Threshing Floor, under wider skies, all the children of men, far and near, are being hammered even now; and when the dust