

solely by the intellectual standards of their political leadership, our estimate of their intelligence would be a humiliating one. At a time when the country faces an industrial depression, when all signs point to hard times coming for the wage earner and business man, they accepted the leadership of two candidates, neither of whom showed the faintest comprehension of what underlies the industrial problem.

## Economic Origin of Race Prejudice

IT may lead us into a profitable train of thought to reflect that much of race prejudice has for its basis the economic condition that separates men into classes and groups. That this prejudice is often unconscious or sub-conscious, does not affect the matter. The prejudice against the Jew entertained by many, and shared often by men whom we would little suspect of harboring feelings against the race, is not distinctively a religious prejudice, since it was manifested by some of the most enlightened Romans—as, for example, Seneca and Tacitus, years before the death of Christ. In the Jewish people the Romans found themselves confronted, not with a different religious faith, for of this they were tolerant enough, but by a different body of economic teaching and different economic habits.

In more modern times the exclusion of the Jews from certain trades and professions, the ostracism which may have had its origin in the first instance in religious prejudice, was extended and strengthened by the economic division that made the Jews traders and money lenders, thus establishing classes dependent upon them. Their very unusual ability in this direction, due not at all to any affinity with these vocations, for the Jew is by tradition and taste an agriculturist, but rather to a greater natural quickness of intellect, operated to strengthen the original religious prejudice and unconsciously to assimilate it with the later-born economic group antagonism. It was now, if we may so speak, a property prejudice rather than a religious or racial one.

We are disposed to regard the antagonism of the South to the negro's exercise of political power with tolerance because of certain aspects which the economic problem has for the people of that section. The fear that the Southerner entertains in States where the blacks greatly outnumber the whites that if the negroes are allowed to exercise political power they may be despoiled of their property, seems reason enough for disfranchising the illiterate colored voter. (We need not touch upon the desire of the South to keep the races socially apart.) We cannot but believe that this fear is exaggerated, since the effect of almost all our land laws and tax laws is to despoil all our people of their property, but the fear has rational grounds nevertheless. In a country where the rights of property are meaningless terms, where the unnatural division of the landed and landless distort the perceptions, what can be expected

but unreasoning prejudices based upon property distinctions, which in this case take the form of racial distinctions?

With the recognition of the equal rights of all men, black and white, to the soil on which and from which they must live, it is not a violent or groundless hope that most of the feeling against the negro would disappear. There would be no longer the fear of invasion of any real property rights by black majorities that form the excuse, if not the justification, of negro disfranchisement in the Southern States.

## The Vote and Some Reflections Thereon

AMONG the reflections suggested by this election is that the so-called Farmer-Labor Party, which inherited the votes garnered by the Committee of 48 in a campaign of more than a year preceding the Chicago conference, cannot hope to win votes from the Socialists who will continue their adherence to the party that more nearly represents them.

Another fact that stands out is that the Socialists can never hope to become formidable rivals of the two old parties. For this there is a reason. America does not furnish an indigenous soil for the growth of Socialism. The party representing this doctrine has probably attained the apex of its achievement, and will now steadily decline. It rallied a large portion of its support in this election because of the lovable personality of Eugene V. Debs. It could not hope to do as well with a less attractive personality.

The fundamental division in economic thought, as far as men reason on the subject at all, is between those who incline to Socialism and those who incline to Individualism. Of course, the rational ground is between the extremes that meet in what for a better term we may call social individualism. The rational economic thinker is a social individualist, for the State has functions that are of its own by right. But the division between the Socialist and Individualist is convenient, for it is a sufficiently real distinction. Men will incline to one or other of these doctrines in their conviction, and the point we wish to make is that these men can be made to divide *politically* as they divide *economically*. There is no possibility of a reconciliation between them in a single political party to oppose or reform the existing order. This experiment was tried at Chicago and resulted disastrously to the experimenters.

The natural political division is the same as the economic division. The two great parties do not so divide, because each is a political anachronism, or an economic anachronism, and does not depend on the reasoning but the unreasoning prejudices of the voters—in other words, upon their delusions. It is a mark of intellectual distinction not to belong to either, for the men and women who do not so affiliate have begun to think, at least. Then there are vaster numbers only loosely affiliated. The economic convictions of the latter are latent, and when successfully appealed to they will divide politically as they divide economically—into the socialistic or individualistic camps.

It is for this reason that the argument for a Single Tax Party rests upon a profound philosophic basis. Before either the Single Tax or Socialism can win, this division must be made politically. Because the two old parties are mere organizations for office—because to them politics is a business rather than an economic conviction, unless we dignify their delusions as convictions—we cannot hope, or at least the hope is dubious as an expectation, to convert the old parties save only in so far as we are able to *influence them by political pressure*.

Again the individualistic philosophy cannot halt half-way in a half-hearted opposition to Socialism. These men and women are seeking a political home that shall accord with their economic convictions. The Single Tax offers the logical resting place for their feet. But where shall they go politically if they find no party pledged to the Single Tax? Those who incline to Socialism will find a party that offers them a refuge. To them a door is open. But the Individualist is without a home. He is an Ishmaelite. He thought he might be at home in the Committee of 48. He strove for such a platform as could be reconciled with his economic convictions, and failed. He recoiled from the Socialism of the Farmer-Labor Party. If he voted at all on election day he did it as a choice of evils.

May we not modestly hazard the statement that here is a reason for the Single Tax Party that will appeal to those who desire to make converts to the Single Tax—a reason seldom given its due importance in the consideration of a political party pledged to the social-individualism of the great teacher, Henry George.

## The Truth Not Revealed To The Learned

THE author of that astonishing, but very unpleasant and depressing work, "The Education of Henry Adams," speaks of a book of Stallo's as having been "deliberately ignored under the usual conspiracy of silence inevitable to all thought which demands new thought machinery."

Is not this in large measure the explanation of the silence of the press, the pulpit and the educational classes on the philosophy of the Single Tax movement—namely, that its acceptance calls for new thought machinery? To accept the Single Tax, and to continue talking about the subjects that have hitherto occupied men whose business it is to address the public as mentors, advisors or instructors, calls for entirely new tools of thought and the abandonment of nearly all the old tools—the old mental machinery. Much of it must now be relegated to the junk heap; all of it must be recast.

We can no longer think in the terms of Charity; a new thought machinery is now necessary in order to correctly appraise the functions performed by that much misunderstood virtue. New mental processes must now be brought into play in our consideration of the State and the necessary limitations of its functions. We cannot think in the same

terms of Property—we shall find that subject lifted so immeasurably in sacredness and inviolability above our old conceptions that new processes of thought are needed to consider it in its new relations. The new meaning that the word Liberty will now take to itself will not be satisfied with the old thought machinery and its out-worn conventions.

It is a great deal to ask of men that they begin anew the process of education, for this is almost what it amounts to to be told that their favorite mental machinery will no longer answer for the new fabric that must be woven out of the new material. They have come to think that while there is much still to learn there are at least a hundred or so postulates that must still continue to serve. To be told that hardly any of these are longer servicable is too violent a shock for most minds; it is only natural that the instinct of self-protection calls for opposition or a deliberate ignoring of the new demands.

No reform meaning so much as ours—not simply a change in taxation limited to the collection of the necessary revenue from the rent of land, which might, if that were all, find ready acceptance, but a great readjustment of the economic relations of men through the freedom of the earth—can hope to secure the favorable verdict of the professional educators taught in a wholly different school. Therefore our appeal must be to the young.

It is for this reason again that to limit our propaganda to its fiscal aspects is likely to be fatal to the movement itself. Taxation is simply the dry bones of the movement; taxation is the skeleton. To revitalize it, to endow it with the breath of life, we must introduce the spirit without which no great reform was ever yet established in this world, and without which our appeal will meet with faint response.

And it is to the people we must appeal. The lecture room is useful. All effort to present the doctrine in any way to any sort of audience is useful. But nothing is surer than this: The people cannot be made to take any interest in taxation—not the kind of interest, at all events, that makes crusaders, the converts worth while. But let them be urged to regard taxation as the instrument by which they may effect their economic emancipation—that is a different matter.

Doubtless there are many who will take an interest in the Single Tax as a reform in taxation, but those who consider it only as a substitute for the present onerous and oppressive system of taxation will contribute little that is of lasting value to the cause. We learn that Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade respond favorably to the arguments of our friend, John Z. White, and we are glad to learn it. But Chambers of Commerce and Boards of Trade do not make economic revolutions. Business considerations may be usefully appealed to, but they are the least of the social stimuli that result in the abolition of evil institutions or the remodelling of defective ones.

Let us not deceive ourselves. The completeness of our