

its own resemblances of which the wise man said, "All is vanity."

The perfect Mind, God, has conceived and sent forth the Single Tax, the true government, without imperfection on earth as it is in Heaven. The imperfect mortal mind has sent forth its own resemblances in all the various abortive forms of government so productive of widespread overwhelming poverty, resulting in hideous sin, sickness and death. Well did the wise man say of them, "All is vanity."

JULIA GOLDZIER.

A COLORADO FAIRHOPE.

Editor Single Tax Review:

In the October number of *THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW*, last year, I made some mention of this place as being a Single Tax colony on the Fairhope plan. In one respect Fairhope is closer to the Single Tax ideal. Here the State and county taxes on personal property are paid by the individual owners and only taxes on real estate paid by the Nucla Town Improvement Co. *in toto*, and apportioned among the lessees according to the value of their holdings.

The people here are mostly socialists, and few have a clear understanding of the Single Tax.

When the lots were to be leased for 99 years to members of the company on conditions of paying the annual tax or rent only (besides the initial membership fee of 5, or 10 dollars per lot, according to location), many were seized by the spirit of speculation and leased lots they had no use for. Now they find that taxes cut off all the "unearned increment" and that the initial payments are useless investments. Some would rather forfeit their leases than to pay the taxes, and they decry the Town Co. organization for having invented this scheme to enrich the town. But this is exactly what may be expected. Under the Single Tax system no one has any business to lease or occupy more ground than he has use for. It is intended to hit land speculation on the head, and hit it hard, and when hit of course there is a howl. But on a small scale like this it is impossible to fully exemplify the Single Tax. In the first place where the land for a town site has to be bought and a membership fee charged, or shares of stock sold for the payment of same, it deviates considerably from the Single Tax idea. Under a strictly Single Tax system the land is really common property, and nothing whatever is paid for except the annual value of the privilege of occupancy, that is, the annual rental value.

Then again, where population is sparse and land values low, the benefits derived from this system are correspondingly small. The Single Tax system will not show its beneficial results to a very great extent before it is applied where population is dense and land values are high.

But whether on a large or small scale the Single Tax is the only solution of the social problems that confront us. To this point our friends, the socialists, are pressed with increasing force.

The Colorado Co-operative Co., which was organized here a few years ago by a number of socialists for the purpose of irrigating the desert lands of this valley, was intended to be a strictly co-operative company on the socialistic plan. But like so many socialistic organizations of the kind, it has proved a failure, both as to practical economy and co-operation, and whatever success the enterprise has attained is really due, not to socialism or to co-operation, but rather to the elimination of those elements and a return to sound business principles. Co-operation that ignores the difference in value of each individual as a producer, and consequently ignores individual rights, runs up against the inherent consciousness of such rights in spite of all theorizing, and hence arise dissensions and the breaking up of such organizations. Co-operation, in order to be successful, must, like other institutions, be based on perfect justice. Under such laws co-operation will come as it were spontaneously and without government interference in private concerns. This is what experience is teaching socialists here and elsewhere as fast as they are able to learn.

GUNNAR NAUMAN.

Nucla, Montrose Co., Colorado.

THE GREAT MORAL ISSUE.

Editor Single Tax Review:

Is it not possible that the "rank and file" are now abreast of the leaders in our movement? The thought occurs that it may explain the exodus to worship false gods at the shrine of Socialism. I think we are much to blame for this condition because of our failure either to realize the great wrongs in society, or our cowardice in denouncing them.

When I consider the basis of the rights of property and observe the millions upon millions that are going into the pockets of those that do not earn them, the masses robbed of their wages and their patrimony; when I recall that this is many times more than has been stolen by all the thieves in the penitentiaries; when I see all the churches silent on the great evils, and not only tolerate but honor the thieves in their congregations, it appears time to stop splitting hairs over definitions, stop talking about lessening the percentages of theft, and call for its eradication. If we do not recognize this condition as existent we are deficient Single Taxers, and if we do and denounce it not, we are unworthy of trust.

The material issues are great enough, the moral issues are so tremendous as to justify the casting of political parties or the founding of religions. The times demand men,

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