

bearing lands in the world. The price paid was the tidy sum of forty-five million dollars; but John Moody estimates that the Birmingham district is worth to the trust more than its one billion six hundred millions of capitalization.

That knowledge of the inherent monopoly value of the Birmingham district is not confined to the trust magnates, is evidenced by a rising stock market in the face of falling profits. The net earnings of the trust during the hard times of the first nine months of 1908, were only \$65,601,035, as compared with \$128,430,432 during the good times of the same period in 1907; still the price of U. S. Steel shares is higher than it was when its profits were twice as large. So Wall Street gamblers, as well as trust magnates, have "seen the cat." They see that, tariff or no tariff, in hard times as well as in good times, he who controls the natural opportunities of the world, controls the people who live in the world.

Perhaps it may be well to refer again to the testimony of Judge Gary. "Remove all steel duties," said he, "and we will still dominate the American market, but we will dominate it as a monopoly." The "but" refers to his contention that the removal of the duties will make it impossible for the small independent manufacturers of steel to compete with European manufacturers. Never before, I believe, has a soulless corporation expressed solicitude for the fate of its competitors. Such touching altruism should silence the jeers of those who claim that American ideals are measured by dollars.

But I do not doubt that Judge Gary is right in this. Without a cent of tariff tax the trust would still be able to fix the price of iron and steel the world over; but with a Single Tax levied on the land values of the Birmingham district and its other ore-bearing land, the steel trust would fall to pieces. This will happen when the majority of Americans outside of Wall Street have also "seen the cat."

FREDERICK CYRUS LEUBUSCHER.

You cannot help the Single Tax in any more effective way than by increasing the circulation of the REVIEW.

THE "UNGRATEFUL" MASSES.

It is often said that the masses are ungrateful. Mr. Thomas W. Lawson says they are and so he decided to abandon his self-imposed task of giving all a square deal in the gambling art and go back to "gambling", as he frankly designates his business, solely on his own account.

I am inclined to discredit the notion that the masses are ungrateful. What has society ever done for the masses for which they should be grateful? What have the men in power ever offered for the relief of the restricted activities of the unprivileged? What do the leading statesmen of to-day even propose for the material betterment of the masses? Will "tariff reform", that old, worn out party shibboleth, be of any avail; or government regulation or control of railroads? They have had in England a greater "tariff reform" for years than is even considered on this side of the water, yet there is no amelioration of destitute conditions in England.* They have government ownership of railroads in Germany yet there is increasing poverty and destitution there also. The masses are not so ignorant of contemporary history that they do not know this. And in this connection it is most important that those of us who believe in *true* reform keep constantly in mind this fact, viz.: Given several forms of monopoly based on one fundamental monopoly, there is no escape from the conclusion that the elimination of one or more of these dependent monopolies serves only to strengthen those which remain.

Monopoly is tyranny, and tyranny never knows when to cease pressing its advantage. Now and then at long intervals, it seems to get the worst of it, but it soon recovers and pursues its secret

*It is not quite correct to say that "British free trade" has brought no amelioration to conditions in that country. As compared with conditions on the continent of Europe where protection is in force there is relatively higher wages and a higher standard of living. And these date from the beginning of those measures for the removal of excessive tariff duties. That much of this gain however, has been absorbed by the landlords in increased land values is by Single Taxers well understood.

—Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

undermining and exploitations. When threatened with too much thinking, or the disposition to think on the part of the masses in matters pertaining to their economic welfare tyranny secretly manufactures pretexts for quelling free speech, free publication and free assembly. Blindly surmising that a cry of spurious patriotism will stave off peaceable discussion, tyranny seeks to arouse the war spirit. Such was a condition preceding the war with Spain. Economic discussion was then getting too ripe. Now, economic discussion is coming to the front again and as Japan war talk seems to be "played out" the old cry of "anarchy", the last resort of the tyrant, comes again into play and the policeman's club is declared to be "bigger than the constitution."

The masses, at least the majority, may not know what ought to be done, but they do know instinctively that the proposals our leading men in power offer for their relief are only makeshifts for keeping the privileged firmly seated upon their backs. Before you call them ungrateful, gentlemen, please get off their backs.

JOSIAH EDSON.

GOVERNMENT BY CONSTRUCTION.*

In an opinion lately rendered by the supreme court of the United States, through Justice Holmes, it was held that E. H. Harriman and banker Kuhn should not be required to answer the interstate commerce commission's questions concerning dealings in stocks between the Union Pacific and other roads to which they refused to make response when the subject was under investigation in New York a short time previously. Justice Day, in constructing the decision of the court in a dissenting opinion, expressed

*The writer of this editorial has been a Single Taxer for many years. Was editor of the *Daphne*, Alabama, *Standard*, a bright weekly publication until its recent suspension. Was National Committeeman from Alabama in the early days of Single Tax organization. Is a writer whose work is distinguished by calm, logical precision of statement that has made him a formidable advocate of our principles. In this editorial contribution Mr. Norton raises a somewhat novel point.

—Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

the opinion that "the construction given the interstate commerce law takes from it all power of investigation."

This nullifying of the acts of the Congress of the United States, calls to mind the decision of the Supreme Court in the Legal Tender Act, by which decision the financial policy of the government was invalidated.

Later, and after a change in the personnel of the court, this same act was validated, and then again invalidated. The income tax had for over one hundred years been held constitutional, when by the decision of this court, by a single deciding vote, it was declared unconstitutional, its provisions set at naught, notwithstanding the law had passed congress almost un-animously, after a thorough discussion on the part of both branches of the government, in which were many lawyers more able than members of the court, and especially so than the vacillating judge whose one vote nullified the acts of several hundred representatives of the people.

These decisions of the Supreme Court, together with a score or more of other decisions handed down within a few years, should set the people thinking. They should cause the people to inquire as to whether or not we in the United States, have even a representative form of government.

The earliest form of government adopted in this country, as evidenced by the New England Town Hall plan, was democratic. The people had a voice in the government, each locality governed itself, and where its interests were joined with the interests of other localities, they were cared for by representatives. Of late the congress has not even represented the people, since the Senate is notoriously composed of those who represent special interests, and the House is controlled absolutely by the Speaker and the committee on rules.

This latter feature of government monstrosity, should receive the attention of all thinking citizens, but the immediate object of this article is to discuss the question as to whether or not the Supreme Court itself is constitutional, and a brief review of the history of the court, with reference to this question, may enable the reader to form a correct conclusion.