

and capital values do not arise except through the labor of particular persons expended directly, or indirectly, by the use of particular capital, upon natural opportunities.

The Socialists would socialize all these values regardless of their origin; the Single Taxers would socialize all ground values and all franchise values, and would individualize all labor values and all capital values. Under the Single Tax the laborer and the business man, as such, would be benefited without the loss of industrial and commercial independence.

In addition to the four values enumerated above there is but one other—monopoly value. This value arises from the possession of a differential legal privilege, as in case of a patent or a protective tariff. It is wholly artificial, having no natural economic basis whatever. Single Taxers would utterly destroy and prevent all monopoly values, having other means, if need be, of conserving the uses of patents and copyrights. Socialists would destroy all monopoly values in private hands; but unlimited socialism would tend to develop governmental monopoly of all things now having any form of value.

It will thus be seen that between that socialism which ignores all economic distinctions and puts itself at once upon an artificial and experimental basis, and that individualism, which is only another name for Bourbonism, the Single Tax (with public ownership of public utilities) is the only logical ground. Whether viewed from the standpoint of property, of business, or of values, it applies the essential virtues of both socialism and individualism, having always a reason for limiting the one with the other. It is socialistic without communism, and individualistic without anarchy. In economics the Single Tax is the golden mean.

OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE.

[The writer of the foregoing editorial is the well known author of "Bisocialism," the work published by the Public Publishing Company (Chicago, Ill.), which has been favorably received by press and critics and continues to have a gratifying sale. This editorial and the contribution of Mr. Ernest Crosby, on another page, show the points of difference between the two schools of Single Taxers—the bisocialistic wing (if we may so characterize the members of this group), and the ultra individualists among us. It was not so long ago that Mr. Crosby might have been properly classed with the first group, but he now appears to have accepted unreservedly the extreme individualists' position. Mr. Trowbridge, on the contrary, thinks it his duty to lay continued emphasis upon those points on which Socialists and Single Taxers are agreed, and

in this we think he is more in accord with the teachings of Progress and Poverty, in which work there is rather more socialism than has been prominently set forth in the teachings of Mr. George's later day disciples.—Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.]

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP.

Public ownership of railways is no longer an academic question; it has all at once become one of the definite issues of the day. To one, who can remember the seething indignation of the Granger movement a generation ago, the rapidity with which that died away and was discredited, the present soberer, more steadfast determination to curb the power of the railroad barons over the industries of the country, must come as a revelation. But the seed that was sown, blindly and ignorantly, albeit, in the Granger times, has been germinating all the while; and when George pointed out the radical distinction between railroads and competitive enterprise, he gave the stimulus to the public mind which is aiding it to reach a logical conclusion, so that it was scarcely a matter of surprise that sentiment in favor of municipal operation of local means of transit is probably already dominant in most of our larger communities. It only needed then the pronouncement of a popular leader like Bryan to bring the broader proposition into the field for immediate consideration.

That the undoubted growth of paternalistic tendencies, taking the form of socialism among the moderately poor and of latter day republicanism among the well-to-do, has had much influence in this direction, cannot be denied; but it is a wholesome feature of the current discussion that so much of its motive is the desire to remove the obstacles to individual freedom, rather than to turn over this or any other branch of industry to the government, on the theory that simply because it is the government, it is better able to conduct them. The old distrust of putting anything into public hands that private hands can deal with as well, seems for the most part as strong as ever, and one indication of this is the indifferent contempt with which has been regarded the sop given by the last Congress in the shape of a rate bill—a device that has all the evils of meddling with private enterprise, and none of the good of insuring protection from private monopoly; that is certain to produce only one result—in the power of blackmail which it would confer on the governmental machine, whether or not this should be exercised. Already this power of underhand interference by public officials with railroad management, and its correlated feature of underhand control of political affairs by railroad officials, is one of the worst elements in private ownership.

It is scarcely worth while any longer to spend time in pointing out that true competition in the railroad business is an impossibility. That has come to be almost universally recognized, even though it may be evaded by the advocates of private ownership. Their pet argument now, that public management would not be economical, is of little more force. Whether their contention is correct is extremely doubtful, for very many of the economies most insisted on as illustrations are of the kind that are really extravagant—such as have been practiced by roads like the Baltimore & Ohio or the Long Island, notoriously unprofitable because of their niggardly policy, or like the New York Central, whose enormously valuable franchise alone saves it from similar results. But even if it is true that privately owned roads are managed more cheaply than public ones would be, that is a matter of small consequence to the public at large, so long as all the benefits of economy—that are not absorbed by the managing officials—go to the stockholders and are not enjoyed by the patrons. One feature in this connection is often lost sight of—that the stimulus to good service, to the inventive spirit that leads to improvement, which competition affords, in a business where competition is possible, must be seriously deadened as private monopoly increases, without responsibility to its patrons; while a condition in which railroad officials, high or low, would be public servants, subject to the criticism or approval of those who use the roads, could not but awaken a spirit of eagerness to meet public approval; and in the most conspicuous instance for comparison we have yet had in this country, outside of the postoffice service—the Staten Island ferry—the very men who were most indifferent and overbearing under the old regime are now showing the most eagerness to please the passengers, whom they recognize as their employers.

But, after all, the chief thing to be considered is, the taking out of private hands the enormous power which means of transit have for oppression of those who do not control them. The tribute paid by the public to stock and bondholders of railroads is not in the aggregate so great. It is the opportunity to discriminate which is enjoyed by those in control, and who often actually own only a small part of the capital. It is this which would be destroyed by public ownership, because they could not tell us then, "We will run our business to suit ourselves;" for it would be our business and not theirs.

E. J. SHRIVER.

Frank Stephens was unanimously nominated on Sept. 19th for Congress from Philadelphia, against ex-Congressman John Reyburn, Republican, and is free to make a free trade campaign.

A REMARKABLE JUDICIAL OPINION.

An action was recently brought in Wisconsin entitled *Nunnemacher vs. The State*, and was decided June 21st, 1906. The plaintiff sued to recover from the State an inheritance tax which had been paid under protest. The question of law arising was decided in favor of the State, and the complaint was dismissed. We need not go into the precise questions involved. Those with a legal turn of mind who wish to do so may readily find the case for their own perusal. Justice Marshall, in a concurring opinion used the following somewhat remarkable language, which shows that even the bench, the most conservative body in the country, is being impregnated with the great and vital truths set afloat twenty-five years ago by Mr. Henry George; and now slowly but steadily working such a wonderful revolution in social, political and economic conceptions. The language of Justice Marshall follows:

"I concur in all that is said in the opinion of the court written by my Brother Winslow. I choose to add a few words, more by way of emphasis than for any other reason.

It should be cause for much gratification to all who appreciate the principles of constitutional liberty, now so signally vindicated, that, rising above the influence of mere precedent, the court has the courage to cut loose from a judicial error that has been almost universally proclaimed by the courts of this country for many years—again demonstrating that:

'Truth crushed to earth shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But Error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies amid his worshippers.'

As we face and try to measure the limitless significance and importance of the conception of that great change in civil government from the old order to the one under a written constitution, we are utterly unable to harmonize it with the idea, inconsiderately expressed at first, and followed, thereafter, without original thought upon the subject, as it seems, that the transmission and taking of property through inheritance, blood or by will rests in sovereign grace and not in right, and that it is competent for the law-making power to abolish all regulations on the subject, leaving property upon the circumstance of the death of the owner liable to be seized upon and enjoyed by the first taker or to escheat to the people as a whole. How that relic of a system recognizing a personal, earthly sovereign as the source of all power and opportunity to acquire and enjoy and transmit the fruits of individual energy, could have been regarded as the light to guide judicial footsteps under a system dignifying former so-called privileges or graces, as rights, puzzles the mind. True, it has been affirmed over and over again by judges and courts of the highest respectability. Emi-