

A year and a half ago our attention was arrested by internecine strife in a "savage" nation on our southern border. "Bandits," "guerillas," and "adventurers" sprang up on every hand. Every American who had a dollar invested in Mexico demanded that we go in and restore order. Many would have us stay there to keep order. And not a few gloated over the Jingo maps showing the United States extended to the Panama Canal. The soldiers and sailors were eager to go, and the chauvinistic patriots clamored for action. It would have been a popular war. There was every justification that underlay any foreign war. But a firm hand was on the helm; and despite the abuse of the Jingo press, and the nagging of the Little Congressmen, he steered serenely on. Mr. Wilson's handling of Congress in a way to secure constructive legislation marks him as a clever politician; his management of the Mexican problem proclaims him a great statesman.



Americans can congratulate themselves on the fact that their country has vindicated itself in the eyes of the world; but in a deeper sense they can rejoice in the thought that their country has opened the way for a sorely stricken neighbor to find justice. Had we recognized General Huerta's government, and aided him in raising money for war purposes there might have been temporary peace; but it would have been the peace of an armed camp, to be broken by the next bloody-minded adventurer, or by a new generation of groaning peons. Justice was absent from every department of government, and from every phase of society. Permanent peace was impossible. Now we see the head of that government a fugitive from his own country, seeking asylum abroad where, if report and circumstantial evidence be trusted, a fortune awaits him. At no time during his exercise of authority did he betray evidence of capacity or inclination to do aught but serve the parasitical oligarchy that has so long ridden on the backs of the peons. He had the dogged determination of the soldier, and might have repeated, had he been permitted to make terms with foreign capital, the regime of Diaz; but President Wilson stood in his way.



People are asking, What next? After Huerta, what? To begin with, too much should not be expected. When we consider the amount of injustice in our country, despite fifty years of internal peace, it is unreasonable to expect ideal conditions to follow immediately the incoming govern-

ment in Mexico. Liberty is not a thing made to order. It cannot be imposed upon a people from without. It must grow. Not until a people has learned to know its rights, and to exercise the self-restraint necessary to stop at those rights can a just government be established. General Carranza may or may not be the man of the hour; but the spirit back of him gives hope of success. Madero had the right impulse, but he lacked the strength to withstand the influence of vested interests. Animated by high ideals in the field, he was helpless when confronted with the beneficiaries of privilege in Mexico City. The Constitutionals hope to avoid Madero's mistake by confiscation, repudiation, and execution. This is the crucial test. It remains to be seen how far they will be permitted to go in completing the revolution before outside interference takes place. Moderation may well be counselled by our government, but no exercise of force should be used to deprive the people of their triumph. Mexico must be restored to the Mexicans.

S. C.



Inconsistent Land Grabbers.

Advocates of wholesale land grabbing will be the ones to utter the loudest protests against proposed confiscation of the big estates in Mexico. Hearst, Taft, Otis and others, who want to make the Panama Canal the southern boundary of the United States, do not relish the idea of having their own logic applied by the new Mexican government to their haciendas. It is all right, say these reactionaries, to grab land that does not belong to us, but all wrong to restore land to the people who have a natural right to its use. But it is not reasonable to look for consistency in reactionaries.

S. D.



The Extent of Land Monopoly.

The exact extent of land monopoly in the United States has not been officially determined. While the census of 1910 showed the extent of ownership and tenantry of farms, it went no further. Whatever may have been the reason for this limitation, its effect has been to shut off from the people official information regarding concentration of land ownership. But there is much reliable information on this matter which the census does not give. A year ago the Department of Agriculture issued a report showing only twenty-seven per cent of the tillable land of the country to be in use. This year a report issued by Commissioner Davies of the federal Bureau of Corporations shows that of the timber lands of the United States 105,600,000 acres are owned by 1,694 holders. That is, one-

twentieth of the country's area has but 1,694 owners. That such concentration is not confined to timber lands seems certain. The next census should gather complete information concerning that matter. In the meantime such investigations as Commissioner Davies has just made are to be commended and should be extended to take in all classes of land ownership. s. d.



Methods of Propaganda.

Mr. C. B. Fillebrown presents in the *Christian Science Monitor* of July 11, under the caption "Thirty Years of Henry George," a review of the *Singletax* movement of the world, and endeavors to show why the idea has made so little progress in this country, and how the difficulty can be overcome. The alleged lack of progress, he charges, is due to the unwise course of the American *Singletaxers* in connecting the idea of Henry George with numerous kindred ideas, and particularly to their efforts to ally with various current political movements. "The political method, as a means of putting the single tax on the statute books," he says in conclusion, "has been abundantly tried and found wanting. . . . Voters cannot be persuaded to decree an important legislative innovation which they do not fully understand and concerning which it is easy for the opposition in the heat of the campaign to deceive or confuse." And he declares "that the sum total of experience in the 30 years under review enforces the conviction that persistent education of the masses and the classes—by word of mouth and still more effectively by the printing press—upon the pure issue of the single tax as the normal and just basis for obtaining public revenue, is the true means and method of advancing this or any other great reform."



Thus is raised again the old question as to the relative merits of an independent movement, or a joining hands with political movements most nearly in accord. Theoretically, the question might be debated indefinitely; practically, it insists upon settling itself. The way has been open for an independent, purely propaganda movement ever since the first appearance of "Progress and Poverty," and some strong and forceful individuals have persisted in that course; but the mass continually resorts to the other method. But is it not possible that Mr. Fillebrown has made a distinction without a difference? He would persistently educate "the masses and the classes . . . upon the pure issue of the single tax as the normal and just basis for obtaining public revenue." Is

not this the very purpose of the political-action advocates? Instead of trying to teach the masses and classes in the way they ought to be taught, they have undertaken to teach them in the way they are accustomed to being taught, which, presumably, is the way they wish to be taught. In short, it is a question of rubbing the fur the right way. Proclaim a naked truth bodily, and it will be instantly accepted by a few whose minds are ripe for it. But when all those advanced minds have been reached, there is an end of converts. No more will accept it until they have reached that higher plane. What is the most efficient method of procedure?



If the independent course be chosen it involves the presentation of an idea to a man who does not wish to consider it. And when prejudice and obstinacy and indifference have been overcome and the man has been converted there must be political action to put it on the statute book. On the other hand, if the advance be along the line of political action the idea enjoys the advantage of a ready-made organization and a sympathetic disposition on the part of the radical party. It may not be known for certain that this is the better method, but it is the one men persist in following. When Mr. Fillebrown speaks of Canada as being at the head of the single tax column, he doubtless means Western Canada. Eastern Canada shows no more progress than the United States. Western Canada enjoyed the advantage of opening government land for settlement after the single tax was widely known. And when he summed legislative progress in this country in the one half exemption of improvements in Pittsburgh and Scranton in 1925, he overlooked the emphatic vote of Pueblo, Colorado, on the straight issue. But the sum of progress is not to be measured in this way. Both the Democratic and the Progressive parties are permeated from top to bottom with the single tax; and there is a good deal of it in the Republican party. It has in fact become a part of the thought of the day. Men still hesitate to take such a radical step, but the logic of events compels them to it, and they cannot much longer delay. Finally, the field is so large that there is room for all to labor; and the need is so great that neither Mr. Fillebrown nor the political-actionists should waste one ounce of energy in discussing the relative merits of methods. s. c.



Progressive Victory in Winnipeg.

There will be at least one thorough representative of democracy in the newly elected legislature