

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

be our true friend unless he fearlessly comes out as did J. H. Carruthers, "by this question will my Ministry stand or fall." Result, two successful general elections and a surplus this year of £1,676,00; over £1 a head! Here landlords have already made huge increases of demands under last year's holdings Act, which so far has created no "holders" (save for the rise): and the Pensions Act, equally desirable in itself, has no lasting merit so long as the cost of the pension is levied on the pensioners' kin, by robber taxes. But all may go well when the key stone, which should have been the solid foundation stone, is laid in place. If not! Meantime the Protectionists are winning all the bye-elections, usually thanks to vote splitting Labor candidates, and the doughty suffragettes. If the Government adopt the "Effective Vote" the Whig power will be broken and a solid Radical Labor party take control. If all goes on as now, a Tory Minister will return shortly. If Asquith takes up the Single Tax he saves his Whig allies for a generation. 1918 can have no more prospects than continuance of the last 3 years' temporising tactics.

MERVYN JAS. STEWART.

FALMOUTH, Eng.

FROM MICHAEL FLURSCHEIM.

Editor Single Tax Review:

I am glad to meet in Mr. Peter Aitken a man of common sense who speaks out what he thinks of the most ridiculous and pernicious name the movement has ever adopted. I could add another important reason to those he has given: the fact that it is very unlikely that we ever shall have only one Single Tax. Who knows whether we shall not continue to tax pernicious products such as tobacco, alcoholic drinks, etc? Who knows whether we shall not wish to increase our public revenue beyond the amount received from land value tax? Are there not many public expenditures which we should wish to see largely increased, such as those for education, disease, invalidity, old age, etc? The movement in England formerly had a far better name, better even than land nationalization

(inadequate, because we also might have land municipalization, provincialization, etc.,) and this was "Land restoration." The English Land Restoration League" was the title formerly adopted by the English Single Taxers. Which shows that nothing is so contagious as a folly, a fact which any new fashion proves.

To me the whole thing might be indifferent, because I am a land nationalizer, believing that the nationalization of the rent is not sufficient and harder to attain than the full nationalization of the land, but, though I do not agree with the abandonment of my departed friend Henry George's original idea of full nationalization, I loved him enough to wish to see his final idea presented in the best light and not to see it ruined merely because of a crazy name. There are plenty far better ones. Why not rather "Rent Nationalization"?

MICHAEL FLURSCHEIM.

CORONADO, Calif.

A SUGGESTION.

Editor Single Tax Review:

An article that would be of great interest to me and perhaps to other readers of the REVIEW would be one showing industrial conditions in New Zealand as compared to the abounding prosperity of the rest of the world.

DR. CHAS. K. HALB.

SANTA CRUZ, Calif.

SUPERFICIAL REFORMS MORE
EASILY UNDERSTOOD.

Editor Single Tax Review:

Some time ago you sent me a copy of your Single Tax REVIEW, with which I was much pleased. I cannot just say that I am a Single Taxer, although I have read considerable literature along that line, but whether the average reader is a Single Taxer or not, when he reads Single Tax literature he inevitably comes to the conclusion that conditions in this land of the free and home of the brave (so-called).