

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

out of every six is tribute and would be destroyed.

Let one set of men own the land on which the railroads are built—including the rest of the land owned by these roads. Let another set of men own all that portion of the railroads produced by labor. Who would have the power to levy tribute? The landlords would be the masters. The operators would have all the risk, all the work and all the trouble. They would render the service while the monopolists would collect the rent.

Unless the socialists come to see the real meaning of the difference between capital and land values their plan will fall of its own weight. They propose to begin by socializing the big monopoly corporations. They say they will take them when they get hold of the government. But will they? Not unless they change their programme. Long before public opinion becomes strong enough to take over the industries by confiscation there will be a sentiment strong enough to take them by purchase. If the socialists do not wish to play into the hands of the Morgans, Rockefellers, Hills, Harrimans and other experts at the game of graft, they will have to forestall them by a more cunning device than they have yet proposed.

What is to hinder these men from unloading on the government at good prices before they reach the danger line? From the socialists own standpoint why not clear the way for intelligent, skilful and practical action by destroying at least two thirds of the market value of these monopoly corporations? This can be done by removing all taxes from labor products and taking the annual rental value of land for all the people. This would settle the land question. The socialist admits that it must be settled. Yet, when pressed for a solution he has none. When he debates the question he always talks of farm land worth a few dollars an acre. He never seems to know about land in the cities that is worth millions of dollars an acre, nor the valuable timber and coal lands, the mineral deposits and other natural sources, the most valuable of which are owned by the trusts and monopolies.

To remove all taxes from labor and put land values into the common treasury would be to convert tribute into wages. Who would become the owners of the tools of production then? The workers would soon become their own capitalists. They would also cease to bow in superstitious reverence to the omnipotence of government.

Wm. L. Ross.

---

#### PITTSBURG.

---

DINNER AND RECEPTION TO A. E. ADELMAN OF CHICAGO—THE PITTSBURG CLUB WILL GIVE MONTHLY DINNERS.

---

Mr. Abram E. Adelman, a member of the Chicago Bar and a prominent Single Taxer, was the guest of the Pittsburgh Single Tax Assn. at a dinner and reception on Saturday evening, Aug. 1st in the St. Charles Hotel. After the eatables had disappeared and cigars were lighted, the chair was taken by Pres. F. Z. Schellenburg of the Pittsburgh association, who directed with grace and dignity the feast of reason and flow of soul that followed.

The "Old Guard," of Pittsburgh, including Bros. Chas. R. Eckert and Campbell of Beaver, Pa., was well represented, though the absence of several of the veterans who were unable to be present was regretted. The address of the evening was made by Mr. Adelman on the subject, "The Trend of Current Thought and Events toward the Single Tax Philosophy." This was followed by general discussion and short speeches participated in by all and only the thoughts of last cars and probable curtain lectures induced us to break away before the midnight hour. All the members express themselves as highly pleased with the affair and there is some talk of arranging for monthly dinners hereafter instead of the semi-monthly Sunday afternoon meetings.

I shall be glad to communicate with any one in Pittsburgh who may be interested.

M. M. McNBIL, Sec.

---

THE Second International Conference on State and Local Taxation will be held in Toronto Canada, Oct. 6 to 9, 1908.