

ameliorate the world's evils that its advocates fondly hope cannot be proven in advance of its establishment. But its justice has never been assailed save from the standpoint of vested interests, and its simplicity, its logic and its coherence are clear to every one who will look at it. Not all the attacks of the college professors, muddle-brained or sycophantic, have availed to shake it.

The George philosophy, too, affords a meeting place—the only one—for the individualist and the socialist. In times past the reformers and the radicals have been sturdy champions of individualism. "Equal political and legal rights to all men, and then let alone," has been their shibboleth. To-day in the democracies of the world these rights have been attained, and the individualist who looks about him finds his faith shaken. Yet he is reluctant to admit that his inspiring creed is a mistaken one, and that he must look to the colossal system of State socialism if his object is to be attained. He does not wish to dethrone the plutocracy that has entrenched itself on the ruins of overthrown systems merely to set up in its place a new kind of bureaucracy. Nor does he need to. Henry George has incorporated in his philosophy all that is true in the dogmas of socialism and has added to the individualism of the past the one thing that it lacked. On the broad and unshaken platform that he erected these opposing forces will some day unite, and from it privilege will receive its death blow without the surrender of a single hard won individual right.

FRANK C. WELLS.

THE NEW SOCIALISM OF AN EMINENT JURIST.

Declaiming against socialism, United States Circuit Judge Peter S. Grosscup in a much advertised article in the December *American Illustrated Magazine* on "Who Shall Own America?" like many of the controlling legal minds to-day advocates what in effect is the embodiment of that principle in an effort to solve the great economic problems of our time.

Urging his readers to "see through appearances to the thing behind appearances," this eminent jurist himself fails to do this. He assumes that there is comparatively equal distribution of wealth, but that the trouble lies in its concentrated corporate control through bad State corporation laws. He sees no help but through the suspension of such laws by a national incorporation law, carrying with it a "constant watch" by the government to see that "the trust" involved in such incorporation "is executed." Also "provision should be made for a government exchange, or a private exchange under government supervision, through which the securities of national incorporations could be bought and sold." Moreover, the learned jurist thinks that "provision

should be made to interest labor in ownership" of the securities of such national incorporations, by "dividing equitably between the capital invested and the labor put in" all securities "issued on account of increased value." He would do this in order to give labor an interest in what the Socialists call "the tools of production," since, as the judge says, "with few exceptions, the man who works with his hands [to-day] does not even own the tool that is in his hands. On top of all this he would have "the corporation of the future deal fairly with the people in the matter of prices," although whether he means the prices of corporate securities or the prices of such corporations' productions is not clear.

All told, Judge Grosscup professes to solve the great social problems of our time by substituting a national for a state incorporation law, have the national government regulate the construction and operation of all national corporations, and have the stock artificially distributed, to the end that labor should possess some ownership in the tools of production; while he would also possibly have the government regulate prices in production.

This is what he calls the *peopleization* of corporations, the *peopleization* of trusts. It would, in effect, be nothing less than the using of the national government by the few to exploit to still greater degrees than they do to-day various forms of privilege around which incorporation now occurs.

For the main evil about corporations to-day is not in the nature of the corporations themselves, but in the privileges they are organized to use. The vital part of the coal trust is not the incorporation but the ownership of coal-bearing lands and railroad franchises; of the steel trust, not that its charter was drawn under the New Jersey corporation act, but that it has a monopoly of the Connellsville coking-coal fields, that it possesses great advantages in ore and natural gas fields and transportation advantages through ownership of roads or possession of secret rebate contracts. Bereft of such privileges, these trusts would go to pieces despite the supposed privileges of their corporation laws.

The fact is that Judge Grosscup, whether consciously or unconsciously, does not heed his own words and "see through appearances to the thing behind appearances." "Appearances" are that the trouble lies with corporation laws, whereas the real evil "lies behind appearances"—the monopoly of natural opportunities, the ownership of public franchises and the unjust advantages arising from the taxation of production and its fruits. There are other forms of privileges, but these are the chief ones. With the whole taxation burden shifted from production to land monopoly, and with public franchises in public hands, the great demand for vast incorporation powers would be gone. Corporations then would operate for the most part not in fields of exclusive-

ness, of monopoly, but in fields of competition; in which case any suspicion of corporate manipulation would operate against a particular corporation precisely as would suspicion of honesty in any of its head officials.

Judge Grosscup's proposal does not lessen, it conserves, privilege. But perhaps it is because he has been one of the chief molders of the deadly injunction principles used by Privilege against labor unions, that he is blind to this, and that he uses his large abilities and commanding position to advocate not what will simplify, but what will complicate, social problems, and make more desperate the struggle to restore the Republic to its natal principle of equal rights.

HENRY GEORGE, Jr.

IS THE SINGLE TAX MOVEMENT MAKING PROGRESS?

Many of its good friends share the not uncommon notion that the Single Tax movement is decadent. But those who have been active in it from the beginning know that this notion is erroneous.

Since the inspiring days of the Henry George campaign, out of which the *Standard* and Anti-Poverty Society came, the Single Tax movement has grown immensely; and at the present moment it is larger and more influential than the socialist movement, with which its progress is sometimes disparagingly contrasted.

This statement depends, of course, upon one's standards. If the present state of the particular form the movement took in 1886-87 is the test, then the Single Tax movement is indeed decadent. So, also, if the test is the number and condition of its distinctive organs and organizations. For the fine ebullitions of those early days have passed away, and outside of the *REVIEW* in America, *Land Values* in Great Britain, and the *Volkstimme* in Germany, there is hardly a distinctive organ of the movement anywhere.

But the question is not whether those forms of the movement are decadent; it is whether such is the condition of the movement itself.

As to that question the reasons for believing in substantial progress are abundant. Though there is no longer a Single Tax party, and all efforts to organize one are futile, the movement in politics is more influential than ever, even if less exhilarating than when it was in its infancy. One of the two great parties is honeycombed with Single Tax principles, and in the other the same principles are not uncommonly discussed with favor. What is true in this respect of the United States is true in greater degree of Great Britain, where the parliamentary electioneering over free trade and land values taxation is now surging about the Single Tax idea; and in Australasia, before

the same rising wave of free trade and land values taxation, socialism is receding. These are but indications of the progress that may be observed on all hands, if one look for substantial growth instead of looking for spectacular demonstrations.

Who is there that would surrender the advances of the Single Tax movement as indicated by these conditions, for the Single Tax movement as it was in the '80's? If those who were thoughtfully active in the movement then, could have foreseen the movement as it is now—a vital force unobtrusively but steadily influencing the trend of affairs—they would have thought of the seed of their sewing well planted then—and well grown now.

If we have few organs, the accession of papers of the general press has reduced the necessity for organs. Probably no other movement of our time is so well represented by papers of the general press. Many daily and weekly papers, both in Great Britain and the United States, are under Single Tax control, and many more are responsive to Single Tax influences. They preach Single Tax doctrines, not only academically, but, better yet, in practical connection with the municipal, national and world movements, and as part of them.

These things mean progress such as no degree of party success, no extent of distinctive organization, and no possible number of organs could mean. They imply progress in the minds and hearts of the masses of the people; not so deep nor so clear as to apprehension of principles as in the isolated Single Tax groups of the earlier days, to be sure, but deep enough and clear enough for practical purposes, and vastly more extensive than ever.

Working among ourselves in the ebullient times of George and McGlynn, we favorably affected only the few outsiders who touched the edges of our groups, and astounded the masses by what they mistook for insanity. To-day our movement has so far progressed that its influence permeates public opinion and gives hopeful and wholesome direction to municipal reforms and national politics.

LOUIS F. POST.

THE SHORT-CUT OF THE SINGLE TAX.

It is a sign of the times that the *Denver Republican* should devote an editorial to the "Growth of Socialism" and state its conviction that a socialist tidal wave is among the possibilities of politics. Incidentally it declares that Socialists and Single Taxers are at one on the land question. This is a common error, for clearly the management of the land from a central office as the common property of the people (as Socialists propose), and the mere raising of the tax on land to its full annual value, after deducting all improvements, are very