

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