

awkward squad, as it were, requiring through handbooks of this character to be drilled into some sort of efficiency. It seems that before giving at all the traditional history of charity, innumerable admonitions, and carefully prepared charts are to be mastered and that these are to be consulted with every recurrence of the charitable impulse, and their application to every individual case to be learned by heart. The practice of benevolence is therefore at once a philosophy and a science, and partakes of the qualities of the speculative and practical.

"Organized charity," said Daniel Cavanagh, of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, one night from the truck in a moment of splendid inspiration, "think of organizing Love."

GOVERNMENT, BY JOHN S. CROSBY.

From the press of Peter Eckler of this city comes "Government, An Inquiry into the Nations and Functions of the State," by John S. Crosby; paper, 25 cents.

We imagine that the chapters of Mr. Crosby's work devoted to Labor, Capital, and Land Tenure will meet with more general acceptance even by non-single-taxers than those devoted to Money and what Mr. Crosby terms "Corporate Privilege." All single taxers will not agree with the conclusions of these two chapters. It does not seem to us that Mr. Crosby has accurately defined in a book that is quite remarkable for its clearness what he calls "The grant of corporate power." If this means the law of limited liability, as elsewhere it seems to mean, then many single taxers will venture to differ with the great orator of our movement as to the results of such law, and the good that would come of its abolition.

Mr. Crosby says: "The excuse generally offered for incorporating private companies is that the public interests demand the prosecution of many enterprises too great for unaided individual effort and capital." If it is the law of limited liability which Mr. Crosby has in mind he has not fully stated the proposition. The "excuse" is that in the absence of the limited liability law men would be deterred, because of the risks involved, from entering into enterprises requiring large capital; hence the conferring of such immunity upon corporations.

It is hard to see what other privileges are included in the grant of corporate power save this immunity, and those special privileges to which single taxers are all opposed, privileges and monopolies which may be as successfully used by individuals working as partners. It is curious that, perceiving, as Mr. Crosby does, the true limitations of government, he should nevertheless advocate more government, that is, the prosecution of the debtor by the State to the last penny of his belongings, rather than the utter abolition of all laws for the collection of debt.

We think Mr. Crosby's proposition is untenable, but little space is left us in this number of the REVIEW for a further examina-

tion of his contentions. This task must be left to some future occasion. Many single taxers, too, will find much to dissent from in his chapter on Money, but with that portion of the book which deals with the true principles of land tenure and the canons of taxation they will be in hearty accord. These are stated with unusual clearness, though we miss the eloquent passages which one might expect to find, and which, united with the bell-like voice, the benign countenance and splendid presence, have so thrilled the audiences that have sat spell bound at the feet of the Wendell Phillips of our movement.

All single taxers should send for this book since it is both interesting and suggestive.

J. D. M.

LOVE'S REVIEW OF "DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM."

Though the *conclusions* of Max Hirsch will gratify every single taxer, I incline to believe that some of his premises hardly justify the conclusions—that he is somewhat in the position of one who, having been led through a wilderness by an able guide, and attempting too soon to be a guide himself, gets confused in the woods. At one place wofully—the Austrian thicket of "Value"—where, by following Boehm-Bawerk, an economic will-of-the-wisp, he falls into a veritable swamp, asserting that value depends primarily, not upon the amounts of labor or equivalents of labor the valued thing will exchange for, but upon its utility, and that it springs from a desire on the part of consumers for the useful thing, a theory that seems plausible to the "economists" he follows. But we must reflect that they do not agree in their definitions of wealth, except in that it is something that has value. "The point," says George, "on which the political economy founded by Adam Smith has been constantly at sea, is that it could not recognize a distinction between two kinds of value—the values of things (products of labor) which constitute an addition to the common stock, and the values of things (land, bonds, slaves, etc.) which add nothing to the common stock, but simply affect the distribution of what already exists in the common stock. It could not be a political economy until it had defined wealth, and it could not define wealth until it had recognized a distinction between the two kinds of value."

At "Interest" is another soft place where he sinks over shoe-tops, saying: "Natural interest is the result of the extension of labor in time"—(apparently making interest coterminous with labor)—and "The capitalist therefore buys productive instruments at the present value of the sum of their ultimate products," etc., also speaking of the "capitalist who purchases productive instruments, materials, tools, and labor." Thus, in using the terms "productive instruments" instead of capital, "buys" and "purchases" instead of exchanges, and specifically including labor in "productive instruments," while at the