

The Labor party has also pledged to put Proportional Representation upon the Statute book, and as this system of voting will give to every section of the community that share of representation to which it is justly entitled, the inclusion of this plank captured the votes of the democratic section of the community.

We shall now await with interest the effort of the Labor party to give effect to their proposals, and trust they will not disappoint the people in the same manner as the Liberal government did.

In addition to the elections, there was a referendum taken on the question of the early closing of liquor bars. Those for reform urged six o'clock as the hour, whilst the liquor interest fought to retain eleven, the present hour of closing. There was fierce fight and the temperance party won. The figures were: for six, 95,614; for eleven, 59,711. An Act of Parliament is now necessary to give effect to the will of the people. It is rumored that the Legislative Council will refuse to pass same.—  
E. J. CRAIGIE, Secretary.

---

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

---

#### TAKES ISSUE WITH MR. BASTIDA.

---

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Dear Sir:—You invite opinions on Mr. Antonio Bastida's article, "Emasculated Single Tax." Here are mine. We must take human nature as we find it with all its prejudices and ingrained habits of thought and state our case accordingly.

As Buckle says in "History of Civilization in England," "The great enemy of knowledge is not error but inertness. All that we want is discussion, and then we are sure to do well no matter what our blunders may be. One error conflicts with another, each destroys its opponent, and truth is evolved." . . . "In ordinary minds association of ideas, if firmly established, become indissoluble; and the power of separating them, and of arranging them in new combinations, is one of the rarest of our endowments. An average intellect, when once possessed by a theory,

can hardly ever escape from it. . . . Theories which they have once heartily embraced, they can hardly ever get rid of, and they often dignify them with the name of essential truths, and resent every attack upon them as a personal injury. Having inherited such theories from their fathers, they regard them with a sort of filial piety, and cling to them as if they were some rich acquisition which no one has a right to touch." . . . "If in any civilized nation, two men, equally gifted, were to propound some new and startling conclusion, and one of those men were to defend his conclusion by reasoning from ideas or general principles, while the other man were to defend his by reasoning from particular and visible facts, there can be no doubt that, supposing all other things the same, the latter man would gain the most adherents. His conclusions would be more easily diffused, simply because a direct appeal in the first instance, to palpable facts, strikes the vulgar with immediate effect; while an appeal to principle is beyond their ken, and as they do not sympathize with it, they are apt to ridicule it. Facts seem to come home to everyone and are undeniable. Principles are not so obvious, and, being often disputed, they have to those who do not grasp them, an unreal and illusory appearance which weakens their influence." . . . "An immense majority of mankind, even in the most advanced countries, are, by the constitution of their minds, incapable of seizing general principles and applying them to daily affairs, without serious mischief, either to themselves or others." . . . "For one person who can think, there are at least one hundred who can observe."

I think that most propagandists will agree with the above. Preach the idea to the observers and their prejudices take but a firmer hold. Work on their powers of observation—show them the absurdity and injustice of taxing the improver and producer and encouraging the with-holder of natural resources, and by discussion, if not by thought, their own intellects will act on their own prejudices, uprooting them one by one.

The idea or principle acts like a charge of dynamite and they naturally object to it.

In my own case I bought a second-hand copy of "Progress and Poverty." When I came to "We must make land common property," the pull on my sense of justice and old habits of thought was pretty severe. I then found that from that chapter onwards the rest of the pages were uncut, showing that, probably, he who had first owned the book had found the pull too severe and had read no further.

Mr. Bastida says, "To many of us 'Progress and Poverty' is the bible of our only religion—humanity." Yes, but many are so constituted that, with the best possible will, their intellect and imagination cannot get beyond their own immediate surroundings. To them it is useless to preach general principles. We must appeal to their power of observation.

Further on he says, "Go to a Socialist meeting and observe the enthusiastic young men there. Why are they there and not with us? Because in our fiscal teaching there is nothing to enthuse over." Here again, I think, it is because they are attacking something that is nearer their observation—that which pays them, fires them, shuts down works—that which they call capitalism. The Socialist includes land in capital and reasons from and to half way up the tree. Many have not the intellect and many have not the time to reason inductively down to the roots. How many could find time to read "Progress and Poverty"? How many could follow its reasonings if they tried?

And how many or how few have sufficient imagination to follow the gaze of the Prophet into the visions of the future—to see the "Star in the East" which leads us on?

Mr. Lloyd George's Lime House speech raised a storm of protest some years ago. I imagine that a similar speech, delivered now, would be much better received. Since then discussion has been uprooting prejudice. Let us sow pure seed in virgin soil—amongst the young. The older ones are mostly "sot," as Mark Twain calls it, and are scared by their sacred prejudices, and yet we must have them with us if we

are to carry on to fruition the glorious teachings of Henry George. — MATHER SMITH, Barberton, Transvaal, So. Africa.

---

### IS OPTIMISTIC.

---

#### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I think the article by Mr. Antonio Bastida in the Jan.-Feb. REVIEW a most commendable one. He raises an emotional question to which there is a more encouraging answer than his remark would suggest. I refer to his exclamation: "Where, oh! where is the army of young Single Taxers which shall replace us?"

My business keeps me traveling over several of the central States. I meet school-men, business-men, traveling men and farmers. From these the Single Tax army is gaining recruits every day.

These men do not make much noise in giving expression to their Single Tax thoughts, but you may depend upon it the election returns from year to year will show an increasing progress in the intelligence of the electorate because of them.

Socialism, I think, appeals to the emotional side of men; indeed enthusiastic youths are found at their meetings. Our idea of revolution in taxation appeals more to the intellect, and if the young men and women are not found in great numbers at our meetings, I am sure that thinking and informed men are accepting the Single Tax doctrine in great numbers.

I can name many men who have become Single Taxers during the last year. Solid, substantial, creative salesmen fired with triumph; devoted, conscientious, school-men intent upon their duties; young, splendid-muscled, freedom-loving, information-seeking farmers glowing with stain of sun and soil; barbers who discriminate between men of small talk and men of ideas, and think some for themselves—from all these ranks, and others, I find men seeking taxation information and light. Their pencil scratches will register this progress on the ballot.

So, Mr. Bastida, you and your associates who are veterans in the service, you are our inspiration, and to you we "uncover"—