

That they will do so is doubtless true, as long as they remain in ignorance. But every one who understands the single tax knows that it would be beneficial to all farmers who farm farms; and farmers themselves are beginning also to find that this is true. Here and there a farmer may be found who grasps the matter; and at Bellingham, Washington, the county Grange has voted unanimously for the adoption of the single tax. A little more of this, and the whole structure of farming opposition will collapse.

+

A favorable opportunity for promoting the single tax movement is opening in Washington. The people of that State are to vote in November on an amendment to the Constitution permitting differential taxation. Under the Constitution as it has stood, all property must be assessed alike; but the proposed amendment allows discriminations as to classes of property, the restriction of uniformity of rate being limited to property of the same class. The amendment was proposed in order to enable the legislature to exempt bank deposits; but when adopted, as it probably will be, exemptions of other classes of property will be allowable, and the single taxers are not unlikely to succeed in exempting all personal property and real estate improvements, thereby casting the burden of taxation where it justly belongs—upon the monopoly value of land. This movement will be facilitated by the fact that in western Washington the improvement values of farms are very large relatively to the monopoly value of their sites; and by the additional fact that the labor unions there are already favorable to the single tax idea.

+ +

The "Gentleman" Farmer.

In the industrial society of the United States to-day there are two kinds of farmers. There are the farmers who farm farms, and the farmers who farm gentlemen. A good representative of the latter class is the Country Gentleman of Albany, New York. This paper stands for the interest in farming which goes not to the men who sweat in the fields but to those who sit in the shade and collect the rent or the interest on purchase money mortgages. Naturally enough it is opposed not only to laws that may increase earned wages at the expense of unearned advantages in connection with farming, but also to laws that would enable the earners to dictate laws to the mere appropriators. The referendum, for instance, is particularly objectionable to this journal which represents the farmers who farm gentlemen. There lies before us

a copy of a letter from its editor written to a Granger who had advocated the referendum. It opposes the referendum as applied to anything involving either directly or indirectly the expenditure of public money, because this would play into the hands of the "non-tax paying element" (as if there were any such element except the class that pays taxes with money it doesn't earn), and into the hands of the labor element, "whose purposes are always directly opposed to the interests of the farmers" (as if the interests of any kind of labor could be opposed to the interests of any kind of farmers, except those that farm farms and whom the Country Gentleman represents). In this connection the editor of the Country Gentleman is especially hostile to eight hour laws because they make "everything dearer that the farmer has to buy, while not enhancing by a single mill the price of anything the farmer has to sell." A singular appeal this, to a class which has given in its adhesion to a protective tariff in a country whose farming products get their prices fixed abroad, tariff or no tariff. But that aside, the editor of the Country Gentleman has slippery notions of the relation of prices to earnings. High wages don't mean low farming profits—not low profits for farmers who farm farms; for the profits of working farmers and the wages of all other workmen are of one kind. Both of them rise as monopoly profits fall, and fall as monopoly profits rise. It is not the farmer who farms farms that loses by high wages, but the farmer who farms gentlemen. Naturally, therefore, no "country gentleman" is favorable to the referendum, for on referendum the workers would largely outvote the workers' parasites.

+ +

The American Press Censorship.

As the American press censorship under the new law grows more drastic, let it not be forgotten that when this law went through the Senate last winter, Senator Hale gave warning. "I hope," said he, "that the Senators here fully understand that the effect will be to suppress freedom of the press."

+ +

The Voice of Grover Cleveland.

It is not easy to see why Republican partisans should make so much of the late ex-President Cleveland's posthumous paper in behalf of Mr. Taft. Democrats who followed Mr. Cleveland's leadership blindly are already lined up behind Mr. Taft, along with the plutocratic Republicans who have somehow satisfied themselves that Taft will not be a Roosevelt. The Cleveland document can