

"Capital does not strive to look at questions at issue from Labor's point of view, and Labor does not seek to get Capital's angle of vision. When employers put themselves in the employe's place, the remedy for industrial unrest will have been found."

Is this any the less true because the relations of Labor and Capital are considered without reference to a third partner in the business of production, the great silent partner, Monopoly, not the monopoly that comes from mere combination and stands or falls by virtue of its inherent qualities, but the monopoly of the natural resources to which is diverted silently, almost imperceptibly, the great stream of Rent. This is the life-giving, nourishing spring intended to replenish and strengthen those functions of the State which are its own by right and essence. Instead, industry is bled to yield the State its sustenance; Labor and Capital grow anæmic through this cupping process that the State may be supplied with the needful, life-sustaining blood corpuscles. And all to what purpose? That the individual who is neither capitalist nor laborer may be enriched by the same life-giving stream. That the great natural resources from which production of all wealth proceeds shall lie idle and unused. That Monopoly, bloated and swollen, may tower, a fat Colossus, over Labor rendered helpless by denial of access to those resources save on exorbitant and ruinous terms to which both Labor and Capital must accede.

This is the riddle, the answer to which must be sought if the Brotherhood of Men and Nations which Mr. Rockefeller seeks to realize is to be ushered in. But he is right in believing that in the spirit of Brotherhood the solution of these questions are to be found. He does not argue that the realization of Brotherhood as a mere theoretic abstraction is sufficient. Men must live as brothers; it is not enough that they merely profess the relationship. The formal acceptance of the theological conception is again not enough; it must find its practical application to the affairs of life and to all social adjustments.

Mr. Rockefeller is right in believing that in this spirit must be sought the solution of the problems that beset us. We may not hope to find them in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust.

JOSEPH LARONGE, a Cleveland lot speculator, writes in Cleveland *Leader* that it's easy to acquire the best of home environments. Another in same city wrote that "raw land" is becoming so costly, it would be necessary for people to live in small brick terraces, and that the one-family dwelling must disappear." Still another advertised that no one with red blood in his veins would live in dust and smore of a city.

DR. PAUL ROHRBACH, famous in Germany as a traveler and writer, advocated, in 1915 a German protectorate over China, and said: "Of course, one should take all land which one can get, for land is always valuable."—See "Germany's Annexationist Aims," (p. 131), by S. Grumbach.

To the Single Taxers of the Nation

NOW that peace has come, and a great shadow has been lifted from the world, we face new problems and new responsibilities. Upon Single Taxers especially do these problems press.

When the war began in 1914 the followers of Henry George experienced the humiliation of beholding how strangely blind were so many of our leaders to the catastrophe which threatened the world from a recrudescence of strange savagery and barbaric forces suddenly called into being by the Teutonic powers for the overthrow of neighboring peoples. It seems an immeasurable pity that the first of those to recognize the grave import of this phenomenon were not the men who had so long figured as leaders of a movement potentially powerful though numerically unimposing, but rather those whom for a long time we had regarded as the foremost conservatives. Whether the leaders of the Single Tax movement lacked the vision, or whether the natural love of peace had blinded them to the fact that there are times when peace means death, cannot now be determined. But the opportunity was not seized. As the old European civilization shuddered in the throes of dissolution, and a new spirit awakened that showed the Allied Nations leagued against Germany to have been born anew and purified by fire, our own so-called leaders were silent, some were swayed by conflicting impressions, and some at best were doubtful. Save Louis Post and a few others there were none who voiced the responsibility that all should have felt, nor saw with the vision that should have been theirs who had derived their inspiration from Henry George, foremost champion of human liberty.

This chapter is now written history. It has passed as a deplorable but completed episode in the movement. Nothing remains for us but to put the record by. That we shall be able to live it down under more inspiring and militant leadership, not so much of men as of new ideals, seems probable, and it is to this great task we must now address ourselves.

In one great crisis Single Taxers have failed. Let us not fail in the greater crisis that is to come. Not only is society to be reconstituted, having been in large part destroyed by the storms of war, but the whole world is to be built anew. Nothing can now happen even in the most distant countries of importance to their social and economic welfare that does not touch us to the quick. The great dead who died that a world might live have established a new fraternity of liberty among the peoples of the earth. Old race hatreds, old animosities have largely disappeared in the melting pot the great war has created.

We are hearing much of a League of Nations to conserve peace. We are told that the war through which we have passed must be the last. It is through the establishment of this League that peace is to be assured. This is very

much like decreeing that boilers shall not burst. As long as the economic conditions of war are retained, no artificial arrangement like a League of Peoples can permanently guarantee the maintainance of peaceful relations.

To the political autocracy that is fast being destroyed, as well as the Bolshevism now threatening so many of the countries of Europe, Single Taxers have the only answer. Socialism shades into one or the other; it is all autocratic or all Bolshevik. If socialism were a tenable economic theory, if a stable society were possible under State socialism, with its inevitable tyranny over the individual, socialism might provide a refuge from both autocracy and that strange form of disintegration which we have learned to label Bolshevik. The rule of the Huns and vandals of our cities which Henry George indicated as a danger to civilization, and who include great numbers of the disinherited, might involve the ruin of the world. Such ruin could be postponed but not definitely halted by a socialism with an army to keep in check the violent disciples of disorder.

For Bolshevist and socialist are alike in this, that to neither is there a philosophy of a natural order. To the socialist every ill requires a law, and as these ills appear to be countless, the remedies must also be countless. Bureaus and departments of control, regulation and adjustments, everywhere multiplied, until the individual staggers into limbo, lost in the State! This, or Bolshevism, make your choice!

Happily there is yet another choice. Single Taxers would trust the natural order. But they would first open the earth, and they would remove the burdens under which industry staggers. They would abolish that form of privilege on which nearly all privilege rests, and from which—as Karl Marx in one of his lucid moments declared—all exploitation proceeds. What is the use of all these laborious artificial social adjustments that are proposed if the earth be not free to man? And how little need for them with a free earth!

Bolshevism is not a phenomenon of the viciousness inherent in men; it is not born of the malformed intellect of minds like some of the Russian leaders. It is a manifestation of energy misdirected by poverty, insufficient food, and lack of opportunity. It is the consciousness of the disinherited let loose in anger. It is the anger of the propertyless against property—but of men made propertyless through no fault of their own, but by reason of institutions. Let us not forget that. The product of this anger is Lenine and Trotsky—the Marats, not the Dantons, of the economic revolution. And let this be remembered, too,—we are preparing the soil for other and more dangerous Marats than these questionable figures that dominate the Russian situation. They are the Vandals from within whom Henry George prophesied might come.

What should Single Taxers do, and do at once? We must first declare a policy of aloofness, standing aside from the

political squabbles and contests over non-essentials. We must declare our political solidarity. We must fight for our own—*politically*. In States where it is possible State-wide Single Tax measures must be introduced. These must in all cases make our demands *in full*. Let not the timid fear. We are not likely to win with these. But they will call out the full strength of the movement, and will enlist new strength. Where the vote is large, as it is certain to be after a few contests, measures conceding some degree of our demands, will originate in the legislatures of the States. For their is nothing politicians fear so much as votes, and there is nothing else they so much respect.

In the national field we should urge the adoption of a Federal Land Valuation Act. We have been told that there are seventy-five Single Taxers in Congress. Let us know who they are—since their identity seems not to have been disclosed to date. Voting as a solid body they would be enough to secure for us what even newer countries like Australia have and what Great Britain started out to do when the war interrupted.

We should ascertain what is their stand on Lane's Land Settlement scheme for the returned soldiers, and we should keep up a continuous fire on this and like plans to camouflage the great social question. Whether there are five or seventy-five Single Taxers in Congress their influence can be exerted. We refrain from what might seem like an unkind comment that at a time when there were only six Single Taxers in Congress they made a noise like seventy-five—not the seventy-five silent ones we hear about.

This should be our immediate programme in State and nation. Everything else should be subordinated to it. That there are at the same time means and methods of propaganda goes without saying, and in another column we summarize some of these. It will give enough to occupy the thought and activity of every worker. But these are only means to feed a movement that must be considered from now on as *political. and which if not political, is nothing.*

A Word with Mr. Gompers

WASHINGTON is reported to be greatly agitated over the declaration of Samuel Gompers, as President of the Pan-American Labor Conference at Laredo, Texas, on Nov. 16th, that American labor would defend the economic advantages it had gained during the war. It is significant that Washington was not at all agitated by the declaration, two days before, of William H. Barr, President of the National Founders' Association, that the eight-hour day would have to be abolished and wages materially lowered from their present scale. Washington lost an excellent opportunity for anticipating Gompers in his defense of the interests of labor, and thereby justified the prompt and energetic challenge of the labor leader.

The incident has revealed Washington for what it really is, reactionary and out of sympathy with economic readjustments in favor of labor and all productive forces of the nation. We fervently trust that the leaders of the labor