

rary divisions as might have arisen interrupted the progress of the cause. The death of Luke North would have been felt as a serious loss, but the movement would not have suffered immediate paralysis, as was inevitable upon a disorganized movement held together by the genius of one man.

Mr. Rockefeller Still Progressing

WE HAVE had occasion in previous issues of the REVIEW to commend some of the recent utterances of John D. Rockefeller, Jr. In a pamphlet just received he gives us reason for further favorable comment.

The pamphlet is entitled "Representation in Industry." We meet the same appeal to the humanizing spirit, the same intellectual hospitality, and the same generous willingness to listen to the other side.

But the most significant utterance is the one in which Mr. Rockefeller answers his own question, "Who are the parties to industry?" He says they are four in number; Capital, Management, Labor, and the Community. He says that the list usually comprises only three, with the fourth, the Community, whose interest is vital, too often omitted.

For fear the reader may jump to the conclusion that Mr. R. is unconsciously inclining to the socialistic conception of the community, we hasten to give his language that there may be no mistake on this point.

"The Community's right to representation in the control of industry and in the shaping of industrial policies is similar to that of the other parties. Were it not for the Community's contribution, in maintaining law and order, in providing agencies of transportation and communication, in furnishing systems of money and credit and in rendering other services—all involving continuous outlays—the operation of Capital, Management, and Labor would be enormously hampered, if not rendered well nigh impossible."

We do not desire to read into this more than Mr. Rockefeller implies. But nothing in this address justifies the assumption that, in admitting the Community as the fourth partner in industry, he has failed to appreciate the full significance of that admission. The Community is recognized as creator and contributor of values, and is to be credited with a corresponding share in the total product of industry. The wages of the Community as co-workers with Capital, Management, and Labor are not defined by Mr. Rockefeller, nor is the method of payment. But perhaps it is enough for the present to have recognized the right of the Community to the values it has created.

We are ready to give Mr. Rockefeller full credit for sincerity and courage in facing the consequences of the programme of conciliation and justice above outlined. We believe that, among our great industrial leaders, he will not stand alone. We believe that, under its present leaders, American labor will co-operate with a large patience and understanding. We believe that all have had a vision of the better time and know that its achievement will outweigh all present sacrifices.

A Condition, Not A Theory

TO THE increasing number of men and women in the Single Tax movement now enrolled for political party action is to be added Dr. Walter Mendelsohn, of this city. This old and intimate friend of the George family, whose letter appears in our Correspondence column, announces his conversion to the only method by which the Single Tax may become a living reality—the method provided by the institutions under which we live, and especially designed for the use of American citizens who entertain any theory having relation to the public good. That institution is the ballot.

We are fond of declaring that the Single Tax is our religion, but that is no reason why we should keep it with us as a denominational creed. We are a communion of saints—but a close communion. We guard our faith as closely as a priest would guard the Eucharist—as something too sacred for careless human handling.

But the Single Tax is not a religious dogma. It cannot become a reality through the methods by which great faiths have been established. If this were the case all that it would be necessary to do would be to build a tabernacle. The Single Tax is a political principle to be translated into political action and established as law by political bodies known as legislatures. We can lecture all sorts of bodies and buttonhole men everywhere with arguments coldly rational or intensely fervid. But until the question is before the people as a political issue, nothing has been accomplished.

Perhaps some of our readers may still cling to the notion that there may be some way of getting this question over in the legislature ere it has been presented to the people. The hope is vain. We know the weakness at all legislative hearings (from the legislators' point of view) of all arguments, however intelligent or convincing, that have no votes behind them. The quiet of a legislative committee's office may be an excellent place to plunder the public of a valuable franchise or extend private privilege, but Single Taxers have no similar objects and should not employ such means.

But suppose that such a measure should by some chance be put over in the legislature? With no educated sentiment behind it, such a law has small chance of being even intelligently applied. Laws derive their effectiveness and their character of permanence from an intelligent and adequately informed public opinion. The only way to create such an educated public sentiment is by having the question brought before the voter for his consideration. That, too, is the quickest way.

The Single Tax is a political issue. Where, therefore, should we expect to find it save in politics? It is one of the strangest anomalies that some Single Taxers should be found who hesitate to accept the logic of the situation. This question being to them a religion—and we have no inclination to treat this conviction lightly—they seem