

whether as leaders, or for the ranks, who in the battle to establish justice are willing to sacrifice "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

Let us hew to the line of truth, seek to establish the rights of property in securing the rights of man, disregard and denounce "vested interests" where they are vested wrongs, and the command will again be ours. Once the clear sun of reason and of truth shines, the black fogs of present injustice and threatened socialism will disappear.

W. G. SAWIN.

San Anselmo, Cal.

### THE SINGLE TAX IN HAWAII.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

Land value taxation is commanding more and more attention locally, and its friends take every opportunity that presents itself to show up its advantages in comparison with our present system. The local papers are quite liberal in the amount of space allowed to communications of this nature, and we hope to keep Hawaii in the front rank in these assaults on the stronghold of "Privilege."

JOHN EMMELUTH.

Honolulu.

### A CALL FOR JOHN Z. WHITE.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

I am now in my seventieth year. I have been a Single Taxer since I first read "Progress and Poverty," 23 years ago. I have been a persistent and avowed Free-Trader since 1854, from studying Wayland's Political Economy as a school text book. Since then I have availed myself of two opportunities to vote for a free-trade candidate for Congress. I am deeply interested in Single Tax reform, being entirely satisfied that much the larger part of our industrial and economic evils are the direct result of the fundamental error—the private ownership and exploitation of the bounties of nature.

Were it not for THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW and *The Public* I would feel desperately lonely; for I rarely meet a man in this section who knows the meaning of Single Tax.

Permit me to say that the July 15th number of THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW is the best I have read. I have read every line in it and wished there were more.

Is it not practicable to send some such lecturer as Mr. John Z. White to—say Atlanta, Ga., as a missionary? A clean cut, popular exposition of the Henry George philosophy would be a revelation to our people. There are a few earnest, faithful disciples in Atlanta, but they need encouragement and organization. Cannot you help us along this line?

Your review of Hon. Thomas E. Watson's sophomoric attack on the Single Tax is

timely and effective. I know the gentleman personally and have long credited him with possessing a logically acute mind. But I must revise my estimate of him and adopt your paragraphic estimate, to wit: "The marvel is that this Georgian \* \* \* should have acquired so little information as to the fundamental principles of economics."

R. J. REDDING.

Experiment, Ga.

### SOME DEFINITIONS.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

In your Summer Number for 1906 you say: "Certainly the question of private property in land—or rather the terminology involved in our method of treating of property and ownership—the question of compensation, the vulnerable points of Fairhope as a Single Tax colony—even the shortcomings of our advocacy and our alleged failure to rise to the full height of our opportunity—all seem to us legitimate subjects for discussion in THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW." I wish, therefore, to ask some pertinent questions regarding "the terminology involved" in Edward D. Burleigh's article on The Single Tax Philosophy, in the same number, and would like to see replies in THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW from those Single Taxers who feel capable of giving correct answers.

What is the exact meaning of the word "right" as used in the phrases, "the right to control," "equal rights in the land," "equal right of all to life," "a right to the whole earth," etc.?

What is "a non-invasive government?" Webster says that government is "the exercise of authority;" "the ruling power;" and that to "govern is to regulate by authority;" "to direct and control" "either by established laws or by arbitrary will;" "to exercise authority." In other words, to govern is to rule, and government is rulership, as those words are commonly used. How can some persons rule others without assuming greater freedom than they accord those others, and thereby invading the equal freedom of those others? That the Single Tax "includes government" is self-evident, for taxation is appropriation, and appropriation is the exercise of the power to rule, deriving its strength—its "authority"—from the ability to exert the physical force of the soldier and policeman. Is it true that equal freedom must depend upon the exercise of such power? If so, whence comes the "authority?"

Is "utility in exchange" the clearest definition of "value" that Single Taxers can give? In the second paragraph on page 3, I find this statement—after eliminating the unessential intervening words: "The return resulting from the use of the better land is the value of the right to use certain tracts of land." Therefore "the community should take it, all of it." How does that

fit the definition—given in the same paragraph—of value as “utility in exchange?” If “the return” “for the use” “is the value of the right to use,” and “value” is “utility in exchange,” then the return from the use is the utility in exchange of the right to use, and the community is to “take” this “utility” “in the form of a tax.” Is that it?

In the next paragraph friend Burleigh makes “rental value” equate with “rent.” In these two and the next he says that “those who hold valuable land” “owe this value;” “owe to society an equal contribution,” which would be an “equal share of the rental value of land,”—“the rent he owes the community.” Rent, rental value, and value are thus made synonymous terms. In the next to the last paragraph on the same page he says that “the community should take all of the rental value of land, and that it should take only that, leaving all the rest of the products to individuals.” If “rental value” is the same as “value,” and “value” is “utility in exchange,” and to “take only that” would leave “the rest of the products,” then “products” must be “utility in exchange,” and “value” must be a “product.” If not, why not?

In the same paragraph friend Burleigh says that, “if the community has no right to take any part of a man’s property,” etc., and that “It cannot confer the right to take what is not justly public property.” What, then, is “property,” and how does anything become “justly public property?”

On the same page he says: “If the rent collected should exceed the needs of government economically administered, the surplus should, of course, be divided equally among all the inhabitants.” Just before that, on the preceding page, he said that “the thing to do is to observe carefully, learn the laws of nature and conform human laws, customs and institutions thereto.” Is it possible that conformity to “the laws of nature” would require a body politic to collect more rent than necessary for the maintenance of equal freedom—to which function he says the Single Tax would limit government? Do not all things in nature tend to an equilibrium?—a tendency now known as the conservation of energy? If so, ought not there to be some “law of nature” by conformity to which a natural balance can be maintained between rent and the necessary expenses of maintaining equal freedom?

If the rent of land is merely “the difference,” “the excess of its product over that which the same application” of labor “can secure from the least productive land in use,” would it not be well to go more closely into the study of the source of that “excess” “product?” Henry George defined products as the stored up labor of persons. What persons store up the labor which constitutes that “excess” which the exclusive possession of a location yields over what “the same application” of labor

can secure from another location? Does not the “privilege” or exclusive possession necessitate common ways (roads or “highways”?) If the absolutely necessary expenses of maintaining such free common ways were paid for by the holders of the privilege of exclusive possession of locations, in proportion to the advantages of such privileges, would there be anything else necessary to the maintenance of equal freedom in the use of the earth? If rent is used for any other purpose will it not disturb the normal equilibrium of equity?

Since when has “each person” been a “he”? See friend Burleigh’s article, page 5. Does the spirit of freedom accord with this reduction of all persons, individuals, and “ones,” to the masculine gender? If we think in words, as Max Muller says, and carry our thoughts into actions, is it consistent for advocates of freedom to use language which—to say nothing of its grammatical inaccuracy—eliminates women entirely from any part in the equal freedom of persons?

If all wealth is stored up labor, as Henry George said, how could a state of pure communism, “in which each would work for the joy of working, and all would share in the product as need or inclination prompted,” be equitable? How could there be any equity if some produced more than they got while others got more than they produced? And if each person managed—by some unaccountable miracle—to do the impossible and get exactly as much as that person produced, would not the result be that of equivalence in exchange? Is not equivalence in exchange the essence of equity in the distribution of wealth? Can there be any real harmony not resting on equity? If it is “more blessed to give than to receive,” and all persons want to be “blessed,” who will want to be degraded into the position of receiving more than they give? Would a communism in which “any one could help *himself* whenever *he* wanted anything” be better than an equilibrium under which it would be impossible for any person to appropriate the labor or products of another? Can there be any higher condition of human relations—any higher state of society—than that which fully secures each person’s self-government, limits property to products and ownership to producers, and makes every person entirely independent of either private or public gratuities?

Can there be any “Golden Age” worth working for which involves either more or less than equal freedom, in the economic and political relations of persons? Is pure communism the goal of the Single Tax? \*

WARREN EDWIN BROKAW.  
Pasadena, Cal.

\* [We print this letter, though the replies to some of its inquiries are obvious. Then, too, conclusive answers to some of the points raised are involved in the Single Tax philosophy as taught since the beginning of the movement.