

later to take the taste of it out of the mouths of some of the more fortunate among us. And in this way the recollections of the dinner were covered with a merciful oblivion. As the management assured one of our guests later in the evening that it had all been a deplorable mistake we must accept the explanation, and assure him it shall not occur again.

About a hundred sat down. Mr. George R. Macey, vice president of the club, acted as toast master. The speakers were Charles Cook, Dr. Montague R. Levenson, Mr. Beechler, James F. Morton, and Joseph Dana Miller. There might have been more speakers, but as the last gentleman sat down a burst of triumphal music promising indefinite continuance, drowned the rattle of knives and forks and plates, and heralded the complete victory of matter—in violent motion—over mind. The management had triumphed, and the Single Taxers withdrew, acknowledging themselves defeated for the first time in their history. It was indeed "a deplorable mistake."

The following greeting to Count Tolstoy was presented and adopted, and will be forwarded by the Secretary:

"The Single Taxers of New York assembled to celebrate the birthday of Henry George send their felicitations for the eightieth birthday of his distinguished and worthy disciple, Leo Tolstoy:"

ANARCHISM, SOCIALISM, AND THE SINGLE TAX.

(For the Review.)

Recent excitements make it necessary for men with pretensions to intelligence to understand what anarchism means, and this they cannot do without considering its relations as a social philosophy to socialism at the opposite extreme, and to Single Tax principles at the balancing point between those extremes.

As a propaganda of violence, anarchism is not within the limits of the discussion. There is no such thing, primarily. In so far as violence is ever advocated by anarchists, it is as the ancestors of the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolu-

tion advocated violence—not as an end, but as a means to an end. As those patriots sought national liberty even at the cannon's mouth, so some anarchists seek individual liberty with bombs. Others seek it through non-resistance. There are some who, in countries where fighting is done with ballots instead of bullets, fall back upon the ballot to promote their object, thereby resisting governmental aggression with a weapon appropriate to time and place.

But it is characteristic of all anarchists, whatever their mode of propaganda and action, and whatever their sociological varieties, to oppose the coercion of individuals by organized government. The only kind of social organization that anarchism tolerates is voluntary organization. Its theory of organic society rests upon contract, nothing but contract, actual and not implied, and enforceable against any individual only in virtue of his own voluntary assent. In a word, then, anarchism means what the term suggests etymologically,—the opposite of archism, absence of self-perpetuating government everywhere and in every relation. This is the extreme concept of individual sovereignty.

Socialism, on the other hand, is the extreme concept of social sovereignty. It would in all things subordinate individual activities to the will of the whole. Of course there are varieties of socialists as there are varieties of anarchists; and most socialists vaguely recognize individuality, just as most anarchists vaguely recognize sociality. But as to sovereignty, socialism and anarchy are at opposite extremes.

Between those extremes are the essential sociological principles of the Single Tax. Distinguishing social from individual functions, these principles assign social sovereignty to social functions and individual sovereignty to individual functions.

The exact line between the two is not always clear. But this is true also of the line between other differences. Who, for instance can locate the line exactly between vegetable life and animal life? At the margin of contact, where the character-

istics of individuality merge into those of sociality, it may often be impossible to agree, as to either the one or the other, upon which side of the line it falls; but beyond this margin, the difference in either direction is obvious. And there are so few things in human affairs which lie within the marginal region that no practical difficulty need be anticipated in assigning social and individual sovereignty to their respective places with substantial justice.

On the economic side, at any rate, there is seldom any difficulty whatever in distinguishing social functions. The artificial object which any individual shapes from natural sources or material is clearly his individual property. If many individuals co-operate in producing it, it is clearly their individual property in undistributed shares. If all but one of their number voluntarily sell their undistributed shares to him, the whole product is as clearly his; and if he voluntarily sells to a stranger, the whole product is as clearly the individual property of that stranger. It makes no difference how many have co-operated, nor how they have done so, provided it be voluntary. If each co-operator—whether he works on the construction of the necessary instruments of production, or in shaping or transporting or selling the final product, and whether as employer or employe, —if each of these co-operators voluntarily sells his interest in the joint product at any stage of production, his interest becomes the individual property of the purchaser, who may do with it as he wills provided only that he refrain from using it invasively. In that connection and to that extent the concept of anarchism should prevail. The individual should be sovereign. Government should keep its hands off. There should be no interference with the individual except to prevent invasive conduct.

But this is not true of the natural source and site of production. The use of the planet, whether in forest or mine or soil or city, and whether for planting or digging or storing or transporting, must be regulated by social wholes, in order to prevent individual aggression and to

keep open the door of natural and social opportunity fairly for all. Here, then, is a social function as clearly marked out as is the individual function described above.

Socialism confuses this distinction by subjecting artificial machinery as well as the natural planet to governmental ownership and management. Anarchism confuses the distinction in the opposite direction by insisting that government shall in no way interfere with the use, either of machinery or of the planet. While socialism would make government sovereign over industry, alike in its natural field of operations and in the activities of artificial production, anarchism would make the individual sovereign in both. The Single Tax, standing between these two extremes, proposes governmental sovereignty over the natural field of industry, and individual sovereignty over the productive operations of men.

LOUIS F. POST.

TO OUR FRIENDS THE SOCIALISTS.

(For the Review.)

The greatest source of confusion in the minds of socialists is the fact that they do not separate the value of capital from the value of franchises and other forms of land monopoly. The one is produced by labor, the other by unjust laws. One originates in useful service, the other in its power to demand tribute.

As the great monopoly corporations grow larger and larger, their land values become greater and greater. Investigate the steel trust and other such organizations, and what do we find? We find that land monopoly is at the bottom of the great bulk of their income.

The socialists say we must socialize the trusts because they own the tools of production. The steel trust is the world's greatest industrial organization; yet the value of its land alone is over fifteen times the value of its capital. Socialize the annual rental value of this land by taxing it into the common treasury, and what becomes of the power of the steel trust to rob the community? At least five dollars