

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