

But why trouble themselves about interest? If they can, as they propose, give to the laborer all that he produces, each laborer will become a capitalist in proportion to his ability to produce and set aside capital, and what harm then will interest do? And if the state appropriates all the capital, all the interest too will of course go to the state as more capital or more wealth. To abolish interest entirely is simply an absurdity, because it would be the same as to destroy capital itself. It cannot exist without being productive, because there would then be no use for its existence. Money represents capital and interest on money represents the product of capital. For this reason interest is a natural product; or it is a real value because by the use of capital we make the forces of nature work for us and thereby save labor. The fallacy of socialism in this respect consists in taking interest for a cause of exploitation instead of special privilege, which causes an unjust appropriation of capital and wealth.

GUNNAR NAUMANN.

NUCLA, Colorado.

FROM WILLIAM RILEY BOYD.

Editor Single Tax Review:

There is little or no movement in the Single Tax Camp in our vicinity. Few of our people have given the matter thought but there is no opposition, and many have unconsciously wandered into our fold by the logic of existing conditions. The need being great, some day the Single Tax will be the rule and practice. It is well to move slowly, but then it is needful to move.

WILLIAM RILEY BOYD.

ATLANTA, Geo.

FROM A SINGLE TAXER IN MANILA.

Editor Single Tax Review:

There is a lot of public land here, and probably always will be, as the government has limited the amount that anyone may take up, and corporations are also limited as to the amount of land they may

own. Many Americans say the country will never attract any capital as long as this policy is continued, and as long as Chinese are excluded, but the government will give anyone all the land he really needs for his own use, that is, about 40 acres. The natives are not sufficiently industrious for other folks' benefit to enable any corporation to get much out of them, as they need very little, and can easily get that, consequently do not save, and will not work except when they need money.

There is a lot of good gold country up in the hills of Benguet Province about 150 miles north of here, but so far all that has been found is low grade ore, which is not a proposition for a man without capital. There are four stamp mills running there now, and several more are planned, also those that are there are going to enlarge as soon as they can get the capital. So far no outside money has come into the mining country, all they have having been earned on the spot, but there is plenty of good ore up there, and when they get a little further along the islands will turn out producers of gold.

THEODORE SIDDALL.

MANILA, P. I.

A DISCIPLE OF ANARCHISM TAKES
ISSUE WITH MR. POST.

Editor Single Tax Review:

In the article on Anarchism, Socialism, and the Single Tax by Louis F. Post in the *Single Tax REVIEW* of September, 1908, it is stated that all anarchists oppose the coercion of individuals by organized government. But as Mr. Post has not defined coercion and government, this is misleading. Stated truly, he would have to say of philosophical anarchists that they are not opposed to the restraint of invasive individuals by an organization embodying no element of government other than defence.

It is also stated that anarchism would enforce contract only upon those individuals who voluntarily assent. But this erroneously leaves the impression that anarchists would not seek to punish those

who refuse to contract, in the sense of persisting in invasive conduct outside of contract.

Mr. Post says that socialism would subordinate individual activities to the will of the whole. Oh! no, it is anarchism that subordinates individual activities to the will of the whole (through jury rule). Socialism subordinates the individual to the rule of the bare majority.

Again Mr. Post claims that the Single Tax, between the extremes, assigns social sovereignty to social functions. Not so. It is anarchism that assigns social sovereignty to social functions, for instance, the tenure and subdivision of land. The Single Tax assigns social sovereignty to many functions that have never been proved to be social, as street cars; or at least collection of the unearned increment.

The article takes the ground that the use of the planet must be regulated by social wholes. This is just what anarchism does, by referring disputed land questions to juries that represent the whole people. The Single Tax refers these questions to the majority, which is less than a social whole.

The statement is made that anarchism insists that government shall in no way interfere with the use of the planet. But with anarchists government is another name for injustice. They do not want injustice to rule the planet.

Lastly Mr. Post argues that anarchism would make the individual sovereign in both the natural field of industry and the artificial field of industry. But he is mistaken as to the natural field of industry, for in anarchy the social whole (jury) limits the individual as to the quantity of land he can hold, and in other ways refuses to recognize his sovereignty over nature. As to the artificial field, he is, of course, right in saying that the individual sovereignty over the product of one's labors is recognized by the anarchist. And sovereignty over the product of the community's labor (unearned increment) does not apparently enter in on account of the limitations upon the quantity of land to be held.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

N. Y. CITY.

TO A HIGHER TYPE FROM A LOWER.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Being a Single Taxer—and an Englishman in England—the first copy I saw of the *Single Tax REVIEW* induced me to become a subscriber.

The second para. page 60 of Sept.-Oct. number gives what appears to be Jan. Stoffel's opinion that the fault of a part of the English movement for land reform is, "that it sees land reform only in the light of municipal housing reform, and the shifting of taxes from weak to strong shoulders." There is some truth in this criticism but paradoxical as it may appear, in this fault on the part of a part, of the English movement lies the strength of the English movement as a whole. The English Single Taxers have the courage of their convictions, and accept and welcome such aid, knowing that when the initial difficulty is overcome and the method or machinery is laid, it will be a comparatively easy matter to extend the tax bill till the whole of the value of the land is at the service of the State.

Henry George said, "Great changes can best be brought about under old forms. We, who would be free men should heed this truth. It is the natural method. When nature would make a higher type, she takes a lower one and develops it. This also is the law of social growth. Let us work by it. With the current we may glide fast and far. Against it, it is hard pulling and slow progress."

Our rating system is the "lower" type and it is being developed into a "higher" one—Single Tax.

JAS. ERVING.

PORTSMOUTH, Eng.

LIBERALS TEMPORIZING.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Our great movement is paralyzed just now, hanging on the decision of Asquith, whose honesty I yet believe to be absolutely level. He is a master of arts in keeping our men and our foes in equal doubt as to where he stands but he cannot