

are the most effective forces—greatly heightened by persecution and martyrdom.

To win the economic revolution and stop the dominance of man over man, leaving the peoples free to evolve social institutions in harmony with environment and racial characteristics, requires the intelligent employment of some other force than the machine, the sword, or the written and spoken formula. By all these men are coerced and driven; by these they may not gain freedom from Hunger.

King Hunger is the tyrant of tyrants, ruling, despoiling the lives, of all in his kingdom, whether rich or poor. None evade his cruelties, for if one escape penury, the fear of it will flay him. All is ashes at last, one way or another, in his broad domain—now called Christendom!

Only the greatest of all human forces, raised to its highest power, will unseat King Hunger—for he is not a flesh and blood being, but a monstrous creation of human superstition. He is the embodiment of a very crude idea that some men are made of finer clay than others and therefore have the "right" to live in idleness on the toil of others.

This idea is not very strong in the world to-

day. It remains only among the most ignorant and most arrogant—a negligible quantity as to numbers and influence. But the many institutions that have grown out of it are rigid and sacrosanct even to some of the radicals. Thus to suggest that human society might be conducted without money, provided those who composed that society preferred that method of life (as in southern Mexico under the leadership of Emiliano Zapata, as related in these pages last month) raises a storm of protest from seven or four singletaxers who seem to reason that single tax is the goal of progress.

Gadzooks! brethren, it is only the beginning. Since the feudal system of land tenure gained such ascendancy as to obliterate the "commons" of Europe and the accessible free land of America we have been de-voluting. To break that ancient system and make unused land as free as air and sunshine (or words to some similar effect) will only be to release the Prisoner from his dungeon. He will be dazed by the sunlight. He will rub his eyes in amazement at the breadth and brilliance of the horizon—and maybe dash off at some tangent entirely unforeseen at present.

The Inopportunist Reappears

The limits of attainment have not yet been prescribed on a printed page, and of all men I have read Henry George was least inclined to prescribe them. What he sought was a tangible, economic freedom—the overthrow of King Hunger. As to what might lie beyond that he was the least dogmatic of all the great economists—and the most truly religious. Among many things he wrote this:

Give labor a free field and its full earnings; take for the benefit of the whole community that fund which the growth of the community creates, and want and the fear of want will be gone. The springs of production will be set free, and the enormous increase of wealth will give the poorest ample comfort. Men would no more worry about finding employment than they worry about finding air to breathe; they need have no more care about physical necessities than do the lilies of the field.

I call the gods to witness that the lilies of the field have no money, nor any need for a medium of exchange. But you who want money, I doubt not that you will have your way in these United States for several weeks yet—nor is there anything in The Great Adventure demand to say you nay. Read its legal, technical proposal—for a single tax on land values and no other tax. In essence this has never varied. It says nothing about the circulating medium, one way or another. Money is an issue of secondary importance that will settle itself on a free earth, or be ad-

judicated by a free citizenry far more intelligently than we denizens of the feudal system could deal with it. On a free earth the monetary problem will take on quite different aspects, no doubt. We need not worry about it now, until the land is free—but what unconscionable tyranny it is that presumes to forbid anyone the expression of his heart's desire that society might reach such a state of amity as to make money negligible.

Herman Kuehn stated the case succinctly in a recent letter to J. R. Hermann, when he wrote the following:

I see you refer to some of the contents of Everyman as possibly inciting hostility. We are urging the enactment of a constitutional amendment. It speaks for itself. We have no other object than to write this amendment in the constitution of California. We expect the help of every person who is in sympathy with that purpose. We are not claiming the endorsement of any one for any of the personal views of the editorial staff of Everyman. If any person wants to oppose our effort to make single tax the law of California we are not interested in his reasons for his opposition and I suspect you feel the same as I do about that. The philosophical views entertained by any person have no bearing whatsoever on the main issue and I suspect that no one will withhold support from our movement on any other ground than that he does not want single tax to win in November 1918.

Or is this only the reappearance, in a new guise, of the Inopportunist? We have heard a good deal of the opportunist, who lays in wait for his chance and will not strike until the

moment seems ripe: he will not breast the popular current, or seek to make headway against the tide. Much has been said for and against him. From one view he is right, from another he is wrong. Individually it is probably a matter of natal endowment.

The Great Adventure seems to have smoked out from his hole an entirely new animal, the Inopportunist, to whom no time is ever ripe, who is as fecund of reasons why this is not just the right time to enact the thing he has been preaching for thirty years as the shad is of—caviar. He has lived, dreamed, and worked, for single tax—as a theory—but now when the opportunity offers to apply it, when The Great Adventure in California is almost certain to enact it at the coming election as a war measure to open twenty million idle acres to the immediate production of food and supplies, he has a thousand excuses for not being interested.

His first "reason" against The Great Adventure's one tax constitutional amendment was its inhibition of the gross earnings tax on public utilities. Demanding only one tax, it was therefore not single tax and should not be supported by singletaxers!!

The memory of that serio-comic fiasco—car-

ried to the daily plutocratic press by a single-taxer of considerable prominence, in the name of single tax, on the eve of election—should charitably be obliterated from the annals of single tax; but while the single tax Inopportunist continues to function against the first and only chance ever offered in America of immediately enacting single tax; how can his ludicrous, albeit damnably effective, original objection that "one" is not single, be forgotten?

Two life-long singletaxers met at Kansas City late in the summer of 1916. One was of national public renown, the other widely known in the midwest and generally known in the single tax world. Said one to the other, "That Great Adventure bill in California is away ahead of its time. People won't vote for so radical a measure."

"Of course they won't," said the other. "I don't believe they will poll 50,000 votes."

"Fifty thousand!" smiled the first. "They won't get 10,000 votes."

That was pessimism talking. The names of the speakers will be supplied to anyone interested. The answer was 260,332 counted votes and—as we have reason to believe—a good many more uncounted.

A New Program of Inaction

Passing innumerable other single tax objections to the immediate abolition of all taxes but the one on land values, we arrive at what seemed to be the last stand of the single tax Inopportunist—harmony!

"You people out in California get together; then we'll be interested. While there are two proposals, how can we decide between them? Sink your differences. Harmonize tax elimination and single tax. Pull together."

The logic of this was not so good as its sound. "It means," wrote Charles H. Ingersoll to Daniel Kiefer, "that you are waiting for the tail to wag the dog."

It was about the same as an attempt to hold up war supplies until the minority in congress ceases to oppose the administration. But it sounded well, a year ago, and offered a plausible excuse for singletax lukewarmness or hostility to the California campaign.

Last fall it became apparent, thru sheer logic of world events, that the California minority opposition to The Great Adventure had practically ceased.

In face of the Russian revolution, the bottom fact of which was the opening of the land to 180,000,000 people by the mere penstroke of Nicholas Lenine, without a day's warning to the landed aristocracy, the California proposal

for the concentration of all taxes on land values lost its drastic appearance; it was seen to be mild and patient enough for these hours of world changes.

Intestinal differences gone in California, but one single tax demand pending and that with every reasonable prospect of winning—a new Inopportunist appeared in the single tax world, two of them, in fact. One shouted: "This is no time to embarrass the prosecution of the war by proposing to change the land system. We must kill prussianism first; then we will consider single tax again. All bets are off now until the war is won."

"Food will win the war!" rang thru the land.

The Great Adventure in California adopted the cry as its own. "The stars in their courses" are battling for a free manhood on a free earth. Destiny comes with outstretched hands to Single Tax, bearing the one thing necessary for its complete immediate application—an Obvious national need producing a popular psychology ready to embrace it!

And Daniel Kiefer rises and says: "Don't do that. You mustn't put over single tax as a war measure. This terrible war is the thing to fight now. When peace has been declared then we'll apply single tax." And he writes to Henry Bool, of Somerset, England, as follows: