

vincing power that is often lacking in the most brilliant logical deduction. Henry George was great because his love for mankind was great and kindled love in return in minds who would never have listened to any theoretical reasoning. If we fail to follow him in this, then we shall have the latter without the spirit, our efforts will be in vain and our work will be taken up by others more worthy of the task.

I think I have said enough to point out where in my opinion the fault is to be found. I have not said it with the clearness and force I wished to give it. Still I hope to be understood by those who feel in this matter as I feel. It is hardly necessary to say that I do not mean to blame anybody. I only wish to give an explanation of a problem that must have perplexed many who have been working for a cause that is as dear to me as to them.

It is as certain as a mathematical axiom that our cause is good and true, and must win in the long run. The question is only if we are in earnest in the cause, if we can, for the sake of our cause, sacrifice not only money and time, but also our bad feelings, our prejudices and our vanity. If we cannot do this, then we are merely playing with fine words and sounding phrases are deceiving ourselves. However clear our theoretical conceptions are, they will be of no avail if we cannot live up to our ideals in every method of propaganda that we adopt.



REPLY BY THE EDITOR.

We print the foregoing article by Mr. Büscher, not because we are able to endorse every line of it, but because it is in many respects an important and valuable criticism of the movement. We cannot take the pessimistic view of the progress of the cause that Mr. Büscher does; considering all that the Single Tax means—its far reaching and revolutionary character—the advances it is making are not such as to discourage us, and if not all that could be desired, are everywhere to be discerned.

Nevertheless, our contributor, who has had exceptional opportunities for observation, seems to us correct in his contention that our agitation should occupy a higher plane, and that we fall short of our opportunities by failing to remember the call to human sympathy that is so great a part of the message we bring. Something of the old spirit of the Anti-Poverty days we have certainly lost—and we are not of those who think the movement is a gainer by the loss. Undoubtedly the tone of our agitation is in some respects saner and quieter—but there is less, too, of that sympathy which attracts, and which Mr. Büscher is right in believing makes converts more rapidly than logical demonstrations. In this respect, if in no other, the article of our contributor is deserving of more than passing consideration.

Some of the minor points which our author makes are no doubt open to question. Of such is the assumption that the comfortable classes—whose social standing may be dependent more or less upon the servile condition of labor—are of necessity impervious to our appeal. The erroneous nature of this assumption is easily proven by the fact that the workers in the Single Tax movement have been drawn from all classes regardless of social position. Nor is it true that “the middle and upper classes are satisfied with things as they are.” Such a sweeping statement must call into question the impartiality of our critic. For it cannot be said with entire truth of the upper classes, and surely not of the middle classes, from whose ranks the vast majority of Single Taxers have been drawn.

Mr. Büscher appeals to history. But history does not sustain the contention that great democratic movements find their origin among the subject classes, or that among them or by them successful revolt has been instituted. Rather is the reverse of this true. It is not too much to say that those in subjection have more often been the last to respond to appeals for their deliverance. The consciences of the comfortable classes are more easily reached than the intelligence of the enslaved. Arguments addressed to the former are by no means so hopeless as Mr. Büscher would have us believe—and our appeal is again to history.

But we repeat that Mr. Buscher's contribution is a valuable one. We leave him and his main thesis to readers of *THE REVIEW* among whom he will find many eager and ready to couch a lance.

Our author on his departure from the United States sailed for Liverpool, and in London and Glasgow met many of those who have succeeded in making the principles for which we stand a force in public life. He is at the present writing in Westphalia, and will ere long visit Russia, and pay a visit to Tolstoi at Yasnia Polviana. Mr. Büscher will not return to his home in Zurich for many months. He will have accumulated an experience already supplemented by wide reading and extensive travel which will help to enrich the contributions he proposes to make to the forces of reform among his co-laborers in the Republic of Switzerland. Among the work that he contemplates, and for which he gathered material while in this country, is a *Life of Henry George*.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

WHAT SHALL WE DO TO BE SAVED?

(For the Review.)

By JOHN HARRINGTON.

I was much interested in, and instructed by Mr. Trowbridge's article in the last number of the "REVIEW," entitled "What shall we do to be saved?" I have not yet time to conclude whether I fully agree with Mr. Trowbridge, or to what extent I may disagree with him.

I do believe, however, that there is no more important study at the present time than "What to do to be saved;" that is, the best means to accomplish results, to do something tangible. We are all groping for the "path of least resistance."

I do not share the opinion of Tolstoy, nor of Mr. Crosby, that the teachings of Henry George have fallen into neglect in this country. I have never known one converted to the Single Tax belief who ever recanted. Some have become inactive or less active; but they never cease to be Single Taxers. We may say, "once a Single Taxer always a Single Taxer." As the work of propaganda has gone on and is going on, there are always more and more Single Taxers.

The apparent subsidence of interest, it seems to me, is due rather to a sort of "let up" in the study of the Single Tax, and a looking around for something concrete to do. It is like a boy who is busy and enthusiastic in making a bow and arrow; when they are made he straightens up, draws a deeper breath, gathers himself together, and begins to look around for something to shoot at.

We are now at the "looking around" stage. We are taking a few tentative shots. A few of us are doing something in the way of experimentation. Others