

Spring for occupancy and were quickly taken by encouraged and happy people, able to secure properties at reasonable rental or purchase price. The landlords in the city proper, who had taken advantage of the house shortage and exacted high rents, have empty houses and apartments this Spring and are forced to make radical reductions in rental charges. Their effort to hold tenants comes too late. In the days when demand for property was beyond the supply they lost sight of one important thing and raised their rents beyond reason, and many families suffered hardships because of their action. They could not hope to hold tenants when conditions changed and new homes could be secured at lower rental.

Youngstown (Ohio) *Vindicator*.

A Privilegist System

THE monopolies or privileges are not given to Labor and Capital, but to individuals, who are thereby enabled to take wealth they do not produce. Let's get that straight., and think clearly. These individuals hold up Labor and Capital until they pay the price. Our laws discriminate against workers, both of hand and brain, and favor the grabber. Isn't that so? Sometimes the grabber is poor; sometimes he's rich; but the effect is the same on society. We know a man who had nothing but nerve and a strong distaste for work of any kind. He induced a city council to grant him a street railway franchise. Labor and Capital had to give him \$1,000,000. or guarantee him interest on that amount, before they were permitted to build and operate the line. There was a poor man who secured title to some cheap land, which was later found to be full of the choicest iron ore. His descendants are among our wealthiest citizens. Surely, it is an abuse of words to say that that land privilege was given to Labor and Capital. The privilege made it harder for both, and rewarded and encouraged idleness. Large fortunes are mainly due to legalized monopoly or privilege. Joseph Dana Miller points out that our industrial system should be called the "the privilegist system" rather than "capitalist system."—HOWARD M. HOLMES, in *Cleveland Citizen*.

Single Tax More Than Fiscal Reform

IN the May-June number of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW, Joseph Dana Miller, editor, has a strong editorial entitled "The Single Tax is more than a Fiscal Reform; a call to those who believe in Henry George's message of freedom." Mr. Miller, while giving due consideration to the merits of the Single Tax as a fiscal reform—a means of securing public revenue—exalts its first and more important purpose to secure "a free earth for free men." He says in part, which the *Courier* most heartily endorses:

"The Single Taxer's creed is that the earth is the birth-right of mankind. That the Rent of Land belongs to the people. That one man has as much right to land as another

That this right must be restored to all the people. That this can be effected by a simple change through the taxing machinery that will enable us to abolish all taxation and take the rent of land by the present established methods of revenue collection. This is our creed, and that of every Single Taxer who knows his "Progress and Poverty."

Fairhope *Courier*.

BOOK NOTICES

AN EXAMINATION OF MARX*

Nothing can exceed the keen analysis with which Mr. William indicates conflicting socialistic claims. His examination of Joshua Wanhope's various statements is noteworthy for its sharpness and incisiveness. We do not know where we shall find anything quite so neatly done.

Socialists have been fond of asserting that social reforms and forms of state socialism under present control represent no gain to the working class, though they have often denied this by working for these reforms. The author instances the Hillquit campaign for the mayoralty in which Mr. Hillquit stood for a programme of municipal nurseries, more and better schools and meals to be supplied by the city to the children of the poor. So the question of social reforms considered in the light of the teachings and practice of socialists remains, as the author says, in "enshrouded mystery."

Mr. Williams, however, does not subject the Marxian economies to the same searching analysis which he brings to the Marxian interpretation of history, the Marxian theory of class struggle, the Marxian theory of the methods to be used to effect the triumph of socialism. All these he dismisses after a most triumphant refutation. But the Marxian theory of "surplus value" he accepts without modification.

He says: "Through their ownership of the means of production, the capitalist class is in a position to compel the laborer to produce beyond the value of his wages, the difference going to the capitalist class as surplus value or profit."

The author sums up many of his conclusions epigrammatically, like shots out of a gun. "Marx," he says, "made two predictions (1) Capitalism must soon collapse; (2) there can be no real progress as long as capitalism exists. What are the facts? Capitalism has not collapsed, and there has been social progress under capitalism."

But we have said that the author's economics are still entangled in Marxian subtleties. Rejecting much of Marx he clings unconsciously to what is really at the basis of the errors he is attacking. He says that what is called "surplus value" is really a social product, and he talks as if "capitalism," so-called, really conveyed any clear conception.

Suppose Mr. William had subjected this "surplus value" of Marx to the really powerful analysis he brings to bear on other parts of his teachings. How does "surplus value" originate and why, and how does it happen that the laborer is dependent upon capital for employment when it is labor that creates all capital? Granted that many ramifications exist, what is the original source of labor's dependence?

He quotes Mr. Morris Hillquit: "The main forms of capital revenue, rent, interest and profit, spring from the same source, the 'surplus value' of the producing capitalists." What kind of an economic formula is this? What clear idea can one extract from it? The rent of land, the profits after all charges are paid, and interest upon money invested—all "surplus value" in the hands of the producing capitalist. How did it get there? And why is it assumed that all of this is the result of "exploitation?" And "exploitation" of whom? And why? And how?

There is this to be said in conclusion. If there was need to show that Marx had erred previously in his historic interpretations of economic

*The Social Interpretation of History, by Maurice William. 12 Mo. cloth, 327 pp. Price \$3. Sottery Publishing Co., Long Island City, N. Y.