

represented and was himself a victim of the policy of tyranny and repression of which this strike was the outcome. He tells the history of the Hannibal strike which, like the strike of 1919, was a bitter defeat for the men, as was a subsequent "walk out." Always and everywhere the men were beaten, with nothing to show for their heroic self-denial, their sacrifice and the sacrifices of those dependent on them.

Though we suspect that Mr. Foster's reputation as a bold, bad labor leader has been deliberately manufactured by the press of the country, it is true that he uses militant phrases in this work. Incidents of the prolonged struggle are referred to as "battles." But what else are they? It is war, and war from which all chivalrous sentiments, so far as the companies and their supporters are concerned, seem to have departed. We have the spectacle of one of the steel trust mayors of one of the towns (Duquesne) challenging one of the organizers of the workers to personal combat. The same mayor said he would not allow Jesus Christ to speak in Duquesne for the A. F. of L. It does not appear from a careful perusal of Mr. Foster's work, though reading like a report from the battle line, that he accepts the analogy that is suggested. Though the workers who raised their voices were discharged, blacklisted, starved, beaten, jailed, and in some cases shot, it does not appear that the evident conclusion drawn from the situation is insisted upon. Though, after all, what can be clearer than that these forces meet for battle, and that the logical apprehension must regard it as a conflict of two forces which must result in the final capitulation or utter destruction of one side or the other?

A WORD WITH MR. FOSTER

May we address these few words to the author of this book. You, Mr. Foster, have told the story of this heroic struggle. It must be a calloused heart indeed whose sympathy you have failed to enlist by this thrilling narrative which, as we have said, reads like a report from the battle line. War indeed it is, but what an unequal war! On one side are all the forces of power, State, courts, police, press and church, and above all (what Mr. Foster does not see) the ownership of the natural resources. On the other hand the "ragged army" of the workers armed with only their power to labor. How unequal the struggle!

And this army of workers—what do they seek as the supreme goal of victory? *The power to talk with their masters as to the terms of wages and hours of employment.* And that is all!

We have said that Mr. Foster has been regarded as a revolutionist. He is supposed to advocate the seizure of all these means of production and distribution. He does not even hint at such eventuality. But if he has no other remedy, if he does not aim at the ownership of natural resources by the workers of the world in the exercise of their rights in the earth, then this is the only remedy he can offer. Victory can come to either side only by the total surrender or destruction of the other. The State, the police, the army must be overcome and the workers seize the power.

The labor struggle is a struggle for power, and therefore not a struggle for right. With victory to the workers and their leaders power passes, but is not changed in kind. Nor is there the faintest assurance that this power will be exercised in the spirit of equity. What is sought is only a transfer of power. For a dictatorship of land and capital we are asked to exchange a dictatorship of labor, plus land ownership and capital.

WHY NOT STRIKE AT THE SOURCE OF POWER?

What interest have the people in a solution such as this? Betrayed by our sympathies we take the side of the workers because it is the weaker side. But change the relations, and where do the people come in? This monopoly of natural resources, the ownership of the coal and iron lands on which the real power of the steel corporation rests—all the ramifications of power possessed by these gigantic combinations based upon the ownership of the earth—remain.

We find no intimations that Mr. Foster, despite his reputation as a bold, bad labor leader aims even at collective ownership of these mills. All he seems to contend for is the right of labor to bargain for better terms of employment. How pitiful it is! The earth belongs to these men and to us. It is the source of power, the only real source. The right to bargain on better terms rests on this power. In place of destroying it, we are asked merely to transfer it. Labor shall now be vested with the exercise of all this great and monstrous power. Or there shall be a compromise in which the power by no means disappears, but is vested in two elements of the people by compromise between labor and capital. Is this a solution that Mr. Foster approves? Is it one that the people when they shall arrive at sane conclusions will sanction?

The New Hero

SURELY, one so characteristically an individualist as the Single Taxer will not begrudge a word of praise for those who by dint of ability and sheer devotion to the cause become its leaders. For forty years the movement has been led by self-sacrificing men and women of ability. We have not hesitated to express our admiration for their bigness of heart and our appreciation of their work.

It is true that some of us differed with these leaders in their selection of methods. And it must be admitted that from the light of later experience the methods employed by our heroes of the past do not seem to have been chosen wisely. For the failure of our movement to progress more rapidly must be attributed only to the means of propaganda employed; it cannot be that our philosophy is unsound. The error, for instance, of temporarily subordinating the Single Tax and urging initiative and referendum measures for limited Single Tax, can only be realized now after the fight was made and it was found that the results did not warrant the effort.

Thirty years were given by earnest leaders to "boring from within" in the ranks of the Democratic Party. That

has been a miserable failure. And the most deplorable feature of this failure is that the leaders wore themselves out in this impossible venture, so that most of those who are living are so spent in spirit as to be useless to the movement.

They gave to the Single Tax the best that was in them. They wrote, they spoke, they preached the gospel in season and out. They were good teachers. For their good work we praise them; for their errors in judgment we forgive them. To the memory of those who have departed we pledge our earnest efforts to continue the propaganda they so ably conducted; to those who are still living we, who have profited by the experience of their failure, hope that they will be spared long enough to see some fruition from the seed they sowed, through the better methods of the new leaders.

Who are the new leaders? Who is the new hero? He is in the making. The movement is only now emerging from the slough of despond into which it was cast after the failure of one after another of the methods that were employed. So hopeless was the despair that it will take several years of demonstration on the part of those few who have chosen the new course before confidence will be restored and the resulting enthusiasm will sweep the movement to success. To those who have chosen the new course must, regardless of their qualifications, be given the laurel of leadership—for they are showing the way to a movement that had almost lost hope.

There is James A. Robinson, the organizer for the National Single Tax Party. It is to his almost unbelievable self-sacrifice that the party movement progressed so well during the last election, eleven States having Single Tax Party candidates on the ballot. His single-handed fight is almost over, for there is enough party organization now thriving to insure the perpetuation of the movement. But it is to Robinson alone—the man who, as one man puts it, would not stop at anything save the law to advance the Single Tax—that credit must be given for revivifying the cause. An orator than whom there is none greater in the movement, a resourceful thinker, an indefatigable worker—he has given his all to the Single Tax.

William J. Wallace, the staid, earnest, severe and upright chairman of the National Committee; Antonio Bastida, now of Cuba, who had enemies in spite of his extreme amiability simply because he objected to the Single Tax being emasculated; Robert C. Macauley, our recent candidate for President, an evangelist who carries away audiences as only the sainted Father McGlynn could; E. Yancey Cohen, the punctilious National Treasurer; Jerome C. Reis, the apostle of organization; Joseph Dana Miller, one of the most effective writers the movement has had, and surely the foremost of our living scribes; Oscar H. Geiger, the gentle and efficient pedagogue of the street corner; James H. Dix, Herman G. Loew, and a host of others.

The recent election has brought forward a number of new leaders. Leary, of Illinois; John F. White, of Indiana;

M. C. O'Neill, of Massachusetts; John Cairns, of Connecticut; Dr. Plummer, of Maine; Giddings, of Rhode Island; R. C. Barnum and George Edwards, of Ohio; Ray Robson, of Michigan, to mention only a few.

But the new hero—he has not arrived. Nor is it to be expected that the dynamic personality which is to lead this movement to ultimate victory should spring up before the environment necessary for his efforts is barely formed. The Single Tax movement of the past, with its indirection, its hair-splitting propensities, its lack of organization, its discouragement of action—is gone. With it went the leaders who embodied these characteristics. The new movement, demanding first that there shall be no deviation from or compromising of the fundamental principle that all the rent of land belongs to the people, and secondly that the propagation of this principle must come through independent political action, is still in the formative stage, although gaining momentum rapidly. It will not be long before some Thomas Jefferson, William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips or Anna Howard Shaw, attracted by the appeal which a great cause makes to a great heart, will take up the work we have undertaken and lead the Single Tax to victory.

It may be that the new hero will be some convert at tomorrow night's street corner meeting. Perhaps he is a boy in his teens. Or, quite likely there is in some inland town a lone Single Taxer, endowed with all the qualifications of leadership, craving to enlist in the cause which he has heretofore mourned as moribund, who will come forward to head the new militant movement. There is even the possibility that some one from the past, revived by the new hope, will cast aside the heritage of doubt, throw discretion to the winds and mount the steed of party action.

In the meantime we who have undertaken this work must carry on. That is our duty. When the new hero arrives the environment, the organization will be ready for him. Indeed, he may be one of us. Who knows?

MORRIS VAN VEEN.

The Lesson of The Harding Vote

HARDING won because the Wilson Administration was unpopular. So say all the political scribes—even those who in pre-election days sang loud the praise of Harding. Now their lyres lie mute in the garret; the truth is out. The vox populi was raised for Harding because that was the only way of raising it against the administration. The vote was not complimentary to the victor; it was condemnatory of the Democratic Party.

To an Englishman who has studied American politics from books and magazine articles it might be difficult to understand that the tremendous vote for Harding was no indication of his popularity. It merely registered the unpopularity of, not his opponent, but his opponent's heritage. But to an American—one who has played baseball, for instance, and has relished the desire to "kill the