

Some men will say that it is easy enough to tell what ground rent is by consulting their ledgers. As to whether rent is an earned or an unearned increment it matters little to those who pay none, though it may be interesting to economists.

As for the question raised by Prof. Carver, How does urban rent differ from agricultural? it would seem to be a matter to be settled between city and country landlords.

In fact, the whole range of problems growing out of the single tax question is too intricate for the lay mind. They will ultimately have to be settled by the college economists. Meanwhile all success to their endeavors.

MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.

(Springfield Republican.)

The New England Single Tax League, under the direction of C. B. Fillebrown, is still hammering away at the problem of bringing its aims within reach of the popular understanding. Its dinner at Boston last evening is noteworthy for the number of scholars in economics brought together for an exchange of views on the disputed question in economic theory of the nature of ground rent. The discussion constitutes a real contribution to the science as it is now being developed, and the substance of the papers is accordingly given in other columns. They merit attention from the general reader who would inform himself on what is to become in the length of years a far more practical question than it has so far come to be considered.

(New Bedford Mercury.)

In the course of a discussion of the difference between ground rent and the annual value of franchises at the dinner of the Massachusetts Single Tax League the other evening Dr. C. W. Mixter of Harvard made an isolated statement which we deem worthy of attention in view of a discussion which has prevailed from time to time in these columns. Dr. Mixter attributed the lack of progress with rapid transit in London to the socialistic tendencies of the people, which, he said, made the masses in London desperately afraid of somebody's making something. Professor Carver, likewise of Harvard, was loth to permit this suggestion to pass unchallenged, and doubted if socialism in England can account for the lack of progress in matters of street transportation. He pointed out the situation in Berlin, where transportation is farther advanced than in our own large cities, and where socialism is especially rampant, as a refutation of the theory quoted by Dr. Mixter. Dr. Mixter farther defended the practice of public utility corporations in taking big dividends out of the people.

It seems strange to hear a university professor emphasizing material gains as essential to progress, since it is a fact that no college or university conducted as a private institution aiming at pecuniary returns amounts to much. We can doubtless get along very well without the inducement of pecuniary gain, substituting that emulation which leads Hobson to do brave deeds, which inspires John Jacob Astor to devote time and effort to an invention which he gives to the world—the ambition which inspires the soldier to fight for a ribbon, the motive which led the athletes of old to devote their lives to secure the crown of wild olives—the inspiration which led Dr. Mixter to apply himself to the preparation of a paper to be read before the Massachusetts Single Tax League without compensation in money. This motive, which has inspired the men of all ages, is the desire for what the professors call “social esteem”—the aspiration for approbation and honor. Pecuniary inducement is

not the *sine qua non*. In comparison with the impulse of social esteem, it is mean.

GROUND RENT AND THE SINGLE TAX.

(*The Boston Beacon.*)

It is rare that one finds in this country a band of reformers so persistent and enthusiastic in their advocacy of an idea and yet so uniformly broad minded and good tempered in carrying on their agitation as the members of the Massachusetts Single Tax League. One rather fancies that this agreeable combination of earnestness and optimism arises very largely from the mental attitude of the president of the league, Mr. C. B. Fillebrown, who has been for years a pioneer in economic reform and who has won to his side a group of vigorous thinkers made up of men of quite varied callings. The methods of the Single Tax League are educational and not revolutionary. Its members are sincere believers in the mechanical power of the wedge as being in the long run superior to dynamite, and they believe in getting in the small end of the wedge first. Notwithstanding the tendency of college professors to lend their support to the single tax idea, it will not do to call the movement academic. As far as it appeals to thinking men at all it appeals on the basis of common sense. At the conference of last Monday night, in which eight professional economists took part, the discussion turned on the question of ground rent and much that was illuminating was said on the possible distinctions between land and other forms of capital, and between rent and interest. All this was interesting, instructive and suggestive, but in the end we come back to the basic fact that land is the one form of capital which may lie utterly idle and yet enhance in value to the benefit of the individual owner simply through the co-operative activities of the entire community. It is this unearned increment in the value of land that is the disturbing element in the theories of the economists, and although numerous efforts have been made to account for it and at the same time to class land as productive capital, the attempts have not on the whole been successful. Once grant the premise of the advocates of the single tax, that land, like air and sunshine, is the common inheritance of the human race, and that land has been made a monopoly simply because of its tangible quality and through the ability of the strongest to seize and hold it,—once grant this, and the logic of the single tax irresistibly follows. Upon this much at least every reasonable person is agreed, that our existing tax system is about as bad as it can be and that almost any kind of a change would be a change for the better. The suggestion made some time ago that the General Court grant to all towns and cities in the Commonwealth the privilege of local option in matters of taxation is still worth considering. It is barely possible that if this privilege were granted some community would experiment with the single tax as a relief from existing extortions and inequalities, and in that case we should get some very significant data for legislators as well as economists to consider.

In the past our great and all inclusive economic problems have been studied in the light of certain theories which have maintained their sway in part because very few practical people gave them any attention, and in part because those who have tried to cope with the complex and knotty questions involved failed to reach a surety of conviction which made them venture to break away from the thrall of well grounded opinions. To study conditions in the light of long accepted theories is not the most progressive and scientific way of getting at things, and this habit may have contributed to that confused and unsatisfying thought regarding this subject which has won for it the name of the Dismal Science. And yet this same subject is bound up with all our most important