

awakened. Given a practical aim to which the Single Taxers of America can turn their faces; enlist them in the battle for its attainment and there should be no lack of willing volunteers. Now how can this best be accomplished?

I agree with the opinion given by Keir Hardie at the reception to Louis F. Post in Glasgow on Aug. 14., that the phrase Single Tax has been a handicap to the movement and an obstacle to its development because it has prevented a full appreciation of its scope and meaning. The substitution in Great Britain of the term "Land Restoration" has proved to be of substantial advantage. Under the banner of the Single Tax we who know the breadth, beneficence and practicability of the Georgian philosophy have certainly not gained the following to which it is entitled. The growth of interest in the socialist movement despite its absurd claims and illogical deductions, indicates that there is a widespread recognition of the necessity of a radical social change and a desire for its accomplishment. But the socialists' scheme is so repugnant to the intuitive sense of the right of individual initiative and the right to the exclusive ownership and disposition of one's products that the general acceptance of their propositions does not seem to be even remotely probable.

Why, then, cannot we who are able to direct attention to a just and logical method of social re-adjustment, command the interest of the thinking public? We are unquestionably neglecting the rare opportunity offered by the industrial crisis through which we are now passing and in which we are likely to remain for several years. The platform of the democratic party certainly does not meet the exigency of the situation and, greatly as I admire Mr. Bryan, even he does not arouse my enthusiastic support, neither am I hopeful of any substantial and permanent advance in the direction of our desires should he be elected.

I am familiar with the aversion of Henry George and of the majority of our leaders to the formation of a Single Tax political party and I have shared this sentiment. But can we not do something to show our

patient and long suffering people the easily removable causes of their misery? It sometimes seems hard that we, at least, who long labored so hopefully to spread the knowledge of our new found truth, many of us rapidly approaching the end of our stay upon the field of action, should see so little actually accomplished and so slight a promise for the future.

You will naturally ask me what plan of action do I offer. I confess that, at this moment, I am at a loss, and only write in the hope that if a discussion of the subject is opened in the REVIEW some suggestion may clear a pathway to the solution of the problem. The New York conference last November, though delightful as a social reunion, failed to answer this grave question. Single Taxers who habitually read the REVIEW and the other periodicals of their movement, retain their interest if only in a perfunctory fashion. Give the believer a sword, point out the enemy and organize him for the battle and he will not fail to join in the onslaught and induce others to help. Now, what shall be the weapon, where the first point of assault and who shall lead the host?

ALFRED J. WOLF.

FAIRHOPE, Ala.

---

#### SINGLE TAX AND SOCIALISM IN COLORADO.

---

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

The Village of Nucla is in the midst of a socialist colony of farmers, but the village itself was, as a separate organization, founded upon Single Tax principles after the pattern of the Fairhope Colony. In two important points, however, this organization is at variance with the Fairhope plan and with Single Tax principles. One is the provision that no member is permitted to hold more than one business lot, two residence lots, or one block in the suburbs. Under a Single Tax system, such a restriction is not only unnecessary, but inconsistent with the very aim and purpose of the Single Tax, which would give to each individual full liberty to use as much of the natural resources of a com-

munity as he possibly could, provided the annual rental value be paid to the community. The very essence of the Single Tax forbids the idea of restriction, because under such a system no one would want to hold more land than he could use. That this provision is wrong is shown also by the fact that there is neither any way nor any need of enforcing it. There is no difficulty to circumvent the law by holding lots in the name of some other party.

The other mistake is in not including personal property with other values on which state and county taxes are paid by the community. Here only taxes on land and improvements, *i. e.*, real estate, are paid in common.

When this colony was organized, it was socialistic in its purpose, but as to the Town of Nucla the Single Tax plan was adopted as being the most practical to carry out the wishes of the founders, *viz.* to build up a community where speculators could not pocket the values that arise with the increase of population and public improvements, but where all such values would remain as public property. Very few, if any, of the members of this colony did or do now, realize the full import of the Single Tax, but supposed it to be a sort of a stepping-stone to socialism. Now the time is at hand for a reversal of this sentiment. Many of the brighter intellects of the socialist school, begin to see the fallacies of socialist doctrines,—and those who do not see will have to learn by experience, as exemplified in this and other colonies of the same kind. The socialist movement, therefore, will prove to be only a means of approaching the ideal of genuine social democracy.

While living in this colony for the last three years, I have had an excellent opportunity to discuss the merits and demerits of Single Tax and Socialism, with all sorts of socialists. With this experience added to that of a leader, for many years, in the Single Tax movement among the Swedish population, writing letters and articles for the Swedish papers, I consider myself fairly well prepared to meet any argument against the Single Tax, or to show exactly wherein the errors of socialism consist.

For the purpose of fitting myself for this task and at the same time from an earnest desire to know the truths in such important matters, I have made a close study of both Socialism and Single Tax, as well as of political economy generally. I often tell socialists that we are not opposed to their endeavors toward higher social attainment. In this respect we agree. But as to the means of reaching this higher or ideal order of society we hold that they are deeply in error.

In every true system, political or other, all truths harmonize, and cohere. But every system that is wrong contains within itself a mass of contradictions. I will mention only a few inconsistencies in the socialistic system.

Socialists claim that under socialism every individual worker will get the full value of the product of his labor, (just as we claim that he would under Single Tax), and at the same time they teach that all capital should be the common property of the people, state or community. How can these two doctrines be harmonized? Capital, *i. e.* all means of production except land and labor, is produced by labor, and, according to their own teaching, belongs to the producer thereof. Why, then, should it be made public property?

Another inconsistency is their doctrine of "competition" or "the competitive system."

They say that competition is wrong, and they must admit that monopoly also is wrong. But if monopoly strangles free competition and if free competition kills monopoly, which are evident facts, how can both be bad? The facts which they fail to see are; that we have no competitive system now, except a forced competition among the downtrodden class; that free competition would be equal for all on the same terms and would wipe out all class distinctions; and that we now have a system of monopoly based entirely on special privilege, which would be bad even when taken possession of by the government.

Another error of socialism is its doctrine of interest, and it is to be regretted that some Single Taxers also have fallen into this error.

They want to abolish interest by law.

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