

THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 1794740X
VOL. III, NO. 7.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

PERSONAL AND POLITICAL.

The discussion at the meeting of the Brooklyn county committee of the united labor party on Tuesday evening of last week, Dr. McGlynn's speech at the meeting of the down-town branch of the Anti-poverty society on the following Thursday evening, and various utterances and expressions which have since been made through the press, make it necessary, in justice to myself and to my friends, that I should speak of matters thus brought up with greater frankness than I have hitherto cared to use, either in talking through these columns with the readers of THE STANDARD, or in replying by letter to those who have written me on the subject of the coming presidential campaign.

For some little time past an effort has been made, rather by insinuation and innuendo than by direct statement, to put me in the position of abandoning principle, for the purpose of helping the democratic party. In THE STANDARD of the last issue but one I printed two letters from the west, in which I was remonstrated with for turning away from principle, and it was intimated in the "they are saying" style that I was engaged in "making a deal" with the democratic party. I did not feel it necessary in commenting upon these intimations to go further than the obvious considerations which were suggested by their face. In the general review of the political situation from our standpoint, of which I made these letters the text, I merely pointed out that—

If it be assumed that our not running a ticket will be to the advantage of the democrats, it must also be assumed that our running a ticket will be to the advantage of the republicans. If, then, our refusal to run a ticket is to give rise to charges that we have sold out to the democrats, how much more certain is it that, if we do run a ticket, we will be charged with having been paid by the republicans to do so, and thus in the eyes of those who at other times might be disposed to act with us, be placed in the same contemptible position in which the Butler campaign lauded the greenback labor party, that of being a mere jackal and catspaw for the republicans!

This was as far as I cared to go, even under considerable provocation, in alluding to a matter that has been an important consideration in my thought and in the thought of some of us here in New York who have been in a position to really understand what lay beneath the proposition to run a candidate on a don't-touch-the-tariff platform. This was as far as I had expected in any event to go, or to be compelled to go, for I felt, not merely an indisposition to anything like the public "washing of dirty linen," but a very strong reluctance to assume an attitude that should savor of unfriendly opposition to Dr. McGlynn.

That same reluctance I feel now. But since the charges to which the letters of Mr. Williams and Mr. Bailey gave me opportunity in some sort to reply have not only been put in more direct and more tangible form by the gentleman who is managing secretary of the committees that constitute all the state and general organization which the united labor party has, but have been vehemently re-echoed in the Anti-poverty society and through the press by Dr. McGlynn himself, I should do injustice not only to myself but to others if I did not speak more freely and frankly.

Of Mr. Barnes's asseverations of a friendship and intimacy, which, however much they may have existed for a while, have for some time ceased to exist, and of the fly-on-the-chariot-wheel egotism which leads him to claim credit for my nomination for mayor or for my refusal of the offer of a seat in congress, it is not worth while to speak. The statement to which all this was intended to give weight and point, was that in response to a question from him, I had declared that if a united labor party candidate were nominated this year on the Syracuse platform I would not support him. In form this is not true. In spirit it is untrue. For what Mr. Barnes sought to convey, and did convey, to the Brooklyn committee, was the same idea which has since been substantially repeated by Dr. McGlynn—that I was primarily bent on the support of Mr. Cleveland, and for this reason had deliberately turned away from the principles of the Syracuse platform.

With the exception of a few casual words on one of the days immediately succeeding the election, in which I understood Mr. Barnes to express the belief that the result of that election had made hopeless any idea of our entering the presidential campaign, the only conversation in which he could have heard anything like this from me was a conversation in which a number of gentlemen took part. In a communication published in the *Herald*, Mr. Barnes, reiterating the statement, says I made the declaration to him in the presence of Mr. John MacKinn and others. Thus there can be no doubt that it was this conversation he had in mind. And since Mr. Barnes in his course in this matter has the support of Dr. McGlynn and Mr. MacKinn, whatever tacit obligation I might otherwise have been under as to speaking of such a conversation is now removed.

There were present at this conversation,

which took place at 28 Cooper Union, about five or six weeks after the election, Dr. McGlynn, Mr. Barnes and Mr. MacKinn, who constitute the land and labor committee, and (as the majority of the five) virtually the executive committee of the state committee; and Mr. Louis F. Post, Mr. W. T. Croasdale, Mr. J. W. Sullivan and myself. It was a little informal conference or "talk over," called by Dr. McGlynn, at my request, made as soon as I found the serious divergence as to policy that existed between us. If any of us last named have any claim to be considered "leaders" of the united labor party or anti-poverty movement, this is the only conference or consultation that has yet taken place between these "leaders" on this most important matter. If any other consultations have been held, they have not included any of us.

At this informal conference, the talk ran not so much on nominating a presidential candidate, as on what was really the more fundamental and primary question of platform, and on the manner and terms of the call for the nominating assemblage. The plan of the members of the committee as then developed to us was to ignore the tariff question—to declare in the platform and assume on the stump that the masses of the people had no concern either with protection or free trade. It was after my protest against this that I was asked—not by Mr. Barnes, but by Dr. McGlynn—whether I would support a presidential candidate of the united labor party if he were nominated on the Syracuse platform, but whether I would be satisfied to go into the national campaign on the Syracuse platform. To this I responded that I would not. I am not in the habit of sailing under false colors, or of hiding from friend or foe my real sentiments on important public questions; and even if I had deemed the Syracuse platform sufficiently explicit on all points for a national campaign, it would have become unsatisfactory the moment it was proposed to use it to straddle a vital issue.

The plan of the committee as developed to us was, further, to call, not a conference, but a convention, and to make the terms of the call such as would exclude any but those prepared to go into the presidential contest. There was no objection on our part to the calling of a national conference, but there was strong objection to forestalling the proper function of that conference by calling at once a convention, and especially to the proposed exclusion in the terms of the call. It was further intimated that the states in which it was proposed to make a vigorous campaign were New York, New Jersey, Connecticut and Indiana—the four states namely in which we might help to give electoral votes to the republicans. The object of this was not denied. It was asserted that the democratic party was our bitter enemy, and that what we ought to try to do in practical politics was to aid the republicans to beat it. And, lastly, it was suggested that the word labor ought to be retained in the name of the party—the significance of which, while we had some inkling of it at the time, has more fully appeared since.

Instead of reconciling differences, this conversation merely showed the irreconcilable nature of the difference that existed. Messrs. Post, Croasdale, Sullivan and myself left with the clear conviction that what the central committee of the land and labor party were thinking of really amounted to nothing more nor less than the Butlerizing of the united labor party and the turning of the political side of the anti-poverty movement into a republican annex, which might in the coming campaign help to assure protectionism a new lease of plunder and a new opportunity to rivet its bonds on the people of the United States.

I am not to be understood as questioning motives, and especially the motives of a man for whom I have so sincere a respect as I have for Dr. McGlynn. He has no bias toward protectionism and no special love either for Mr. Blaine or for the republican party. He is a free trader, with clear convictions of the absurdity and impolicy of protection, and was a political friend and efficient supporter of Mr. Cleveland in his first election. What is mainly influencing him, as was obvious from his remarks in this conversation, is his not unnatural hostility toward the "ecclesiastical machine," which he seems to think is identified, in our cities at least, with the democratic party, and his belief that a presidential campaign during which, in at least the four states named, means might be found to hold meetings and keep speakers traveling, would afford a good opportunity to preach the doctrine of the "land for the people."

I do not question Dr. McGlynn's motives, but for my part I claim the right to take a different view. There are, to my mind, things of much more importance than the "ecclesiastical machine," and I am not ready to sacrifice principle for the opportunity to preach principle. I am not ready to do what I clearly feel to be evil in the hope that good may come. I am not ready to eat my words and to stultify my record. I am not ready to become the stalking horse and decoy duck of any political combination. I have never quarreled with nor denounced Dr. McGlynn because of his opinions. Yet it is because I have refused to surrender not merely my opinions, but my firm

convictions that he has assumed to excommunicate me from the united labor party and to declare that, if ever permitted to come back, it must be to take a much humbler position. If the doctor will think he will find it difficult to imagine a much humbler position than that which, out of deference to him and an indisposition to have any difference with him, I have for some time occupied—that of an ostensible leader in a party in whose managing councils I have been utterly ignored.

The protest of Messrs. Post, Croasdale, Sullivan and myself, made at the conversation of which I have spoken, against the programme of the committee—and especially the emphatic denials on the part of Messrs. Post and Croasdale of any authority on the part of the committee to issue a call for a nominating convention instead of a conference or to prescribe a test that would exclude those not in favor of nominating—seemed to give the committee pause; and the call, which we were informed was to have been issued in a few days, has not yet to my knowledge appeared. I have had no further information of the plans of the committee or of what they have been doing, but it has been plain from what has since occurred that the disposition to thus turn the united labor party into a republican side show has strengthened, not weakened, though our refusal to lend ourselves has made it much more difficult, and opinions adverse to any attempt to enter national politics this year have been gaining ground. It has been evident from the columns of THE STANDARD that the more thoughtful and influential men of the party all over the country have, even without any knowledge of the inside purpose of the committee, been coming to the conclusion that it would be impolitic for the united labor party to run a presidential campaign this year, and that a very great number even of those who are disposed to stand up and be counted are not prepared to ignore the tariff question. The recent letter of Judge McGuire, who has been much talked of as an available presidential candidate, in which he declared against going into the presidential campaign, must have been to the committee especially indicative of the drift of opinion. It is this consciousness of losing ground which I think led to the open and deliberate attack which was begun in the Brooklyn county committee last Tuesday night. At a previous meeting of the New York county committee a resolution drawn by Mr. Barnes declaring the determination of the party "not to be diverted by any issue of tariff tinkering from exclusive and unwavering support of the fundamental reforms set forth in the Syracuse platform," was railroaded through without the members seeing its real import, and before the committee had, in fact, organized. In the Brooklyn committee, where Mr. Barnes has a seat and Mr. Wilder, a staunch Blaine protectionist, is chairman, it was evidently determined to put forth this policy in stronger form, and to back it up by a formal reading of me out of the party. Mr. Barnes having begun, Dr. McGlynn followed at the branch anti-poverty meeting on Thursday night.

Mr. Barnes and Dr. McGlynn have assumed to put me in the position of one who has turned aside. But is it not really they who have changed? Up to the time when the election returns showed that we had but 70,000 votes when we had expected 150,000, it was assumed almost as a matter of course that we would enter the national field in the presidential campaign; but whatever might have been thought by such half converts as Mr. Wilder, no one intelligently acquainted with the principles we had asserted ever dreamed of ignoring the tariff question in a national campaign. I, certainly, never heard such an idea breathed. On the contrary it was expected that we would be THE free trade party, and as it was assumed that the democratic party would still try to shrink the tariff issue, we believed that by raising the standard of unqualified free trade in the national campaign we would call to its support many from both old parties that we could not at first attract in any other way.

As for the Syracuse platform, I was the chairman of the committee that drafted it and reported it, and no one who knows me will dream that I would have been a party to anything which was in the nature of a compromise between protectionism and free trade in a national campaign. The principle of free trade is stated in abstract in the Syracuse platform, but the campaign for which it was made being purely a state campaign, no one thought it necessary when no question of principle was involved to run any risk of offending any protectionist who might be disposed to act with us by using the terms "protection" or "free trade." It was not supposed at Syracuse that the platform itself was to be made the platform of a national party, but merely that the great principles therein laid down were to be made the framework of a national platform. The notion of ignoring the tariff question in a national campaign was never thought of, even at 25 Cooper Union until some time after the election, since one of the first suggestions talked of (and for a time at least, as I am informed by Mr. Croasdale, received favorably by Mr. Barnes

himself), was that of joining forces with the free traders in running presidential candidates, and I was invited to make an address before the Anti-poverty society on the tariff question—something which could hardly have occurred if Mr. Barnes and Dr. McGlynn had at that time taken their present view of the tariff question.

The proposition to ignore the tariff question arises from the desire to have a party, not from the desire to advance a principle. And to this desire to have and to run a party all things, it is evident, are to be made to bend. Just after the last election Dr. McGlynn made a very strong speech at an anti-poverty meeting at the Academy of Music, in which, with great emphasis, he declared that we must get rid of the word "labor" in our political designation, and declared his preference for the "commonwealth party." Now, what his committee are waiting and hoping for is the formation of one of these "labor parties," composed of politically incongruous elements which have time and again proved utter failures.

Last spring we of the united labor party of New York steadily refused to have anything to do with the attempt to form another "union of all the labor elements," which at a conference of all sorts of "reformers" held in Cincinnati, resulted in the formation of what is called the "union labor party." We (the committee included) not only refused to have anything to do with this attempt to manufacture a party, but we derided its method and the inconsequential platform which was the result of the compromises of such a mixture of heterogeneous "isms" and "isms." Now, in their desire to get up a party of some kind, there are various significant indications that the committee of which Dr. McGlynn is head are planning to make a merger of what they would call the united labor party with the union labor party, the socialists and all the other so-called "labor elements," upon some sort of a hodge-podge platform, giving if necessary the presidential candidate to the union labor party, but of course retaining the position of secretary—one of much greater practical importance in a party when anything might befall the presidential candidate except that he should get an electoral vote.

I have never said that I would support Mr. Cleveland, and whatever report may have been made to this effect is false. What I have said is that IF Mr. Cleveland in the next campaign stands for the free trade side of the tariff issue I will support him. And I say so in advance, as I think every man who so feels ought to say, because the protectionists within the democratic party are striving to defeat Mr. Cleveland's renomination, on the ground that he cannot be elected because of the free trade of his message.

I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Cleveland; I never even set eyes on him. I have had no communication with him or any of his friends directly or indirectly. In the last presidential campaign I refused to make speeches for him when asked to. I would have worked and voted for Butler had it not been evident that he was in the field only to help the republican ticket. As it was, I did not stay at home to vote for anybody, but a few days before the election went off to Scotland, where our friends wanted me. But I first got a Blaine note to agree that if I went he would not vote—because I believed that the quicker the party that had been so long in power was ousted the quicker would the economic question come up and party lines be drawn on new issues. This choice between the parties—that one was in and the other was out—was all I could see in that election.

This year the hope I see of bringing on a general discussion of economic or social questions (for the social questions are at bottom economic) is far clearer and nearer. It lies in doing the utmost that can be done to widen the breach that the tariff question is beginning to make in the lines of both the old parties, and in pushing on the free trade fight even though at first it takes the shape of mere half-hearted tariff reform. That is the reason I shall, under the conditions mentioned, support Mr. Cleveland. I shall support any other man in his stead who shall fulfill this condition, for my support will have in it no personal element. I shall support Mr. Cleveland from the same motives that induced me to run for mayor and for secretary of state—because I see in the pushing forward of the tariff question the best way at present of using national politics, of clearing the way for the great principle which I regard as of most importance, and of moving toward a recognition of the equal rights of American citizens in their native land.

I would, of course, very much rather support a presidential candidate who should stand on the principles of the united labor party as I understand them. But to go no further, it now seems to me idle to hope that if we were to put up such a candidate we could poll our real strength for him; and the very attempt on the part of so many to enter the national field on the basis of ignoring the most important national issues, is, to my mind, evidence that the process of education has not yet gone far enough to enable us to act together in national politics.

Under these circumstances I will support Mr. Cleveland, not as the thing I would best like to do, but as the best thing I can

do. When the wind is ahead the sailor does not insist on keeping his ship to the course he would like to go. That would be to drift astern. Nor yet for the sake of having a fair wind does he keep his yards square and sail anywhere the wind may carry him. He sails "full and by," lying as near the course he would like to go as with the existing wind he can. He cannot make the wind, but he can use it.

In supporting Mr. Cleveland, if he shall stand against protection, and the struggle between him and the republican nominee shall be made on the tariff issue, I shall not be joining the democratic party nor in any way interfering with my liberty to oppose that party anywhere else or in any other thing. Nor for my support of Mr. Cleveland as the representative of the free trade side of the tariff fight will I expect any thanks. The spoils hunting democratic politicians who will have to be kicked into that fight, and who will try to protest that no real harm is meant to the sacred white elephant of protection, will have no thanks for the support of those whose declared object it is to abolish protection entirely, and not merely to abolish protection entirely but to abolish the tariff entirely, and to bring about with the whole world as perfect freedom of trade as now exists between the states of the American Union. It may perhaps even be that the support of radical free traders like myself will not help Mr. Cleveland's election. But I shall care very little for Mr. Cleveland's election. What I care for is to bring on the tariff discussion. For I regard the general discussion of the tariff question as involving greater possibilities of popular economic education than anything else. And as I have often said when myself standing as a candidate, what I care for is not how men vote, but how they think.

In all this I speak only for myself. I never proposed that the united labor party should endorse Mr. Cleveland or any other candidate of any other party. I have never presumed to control any vote but my own or to lead any one, who stands with me on state issues, in any direction on national issues in which he is not inclined of himself to go. My position is and has been this: When we are agreed let us act together. When we disagree let us agree to disagree without prejudice to our acting together at such times and in such fields as we can act together. I shall not accuse Mr. Wilder of going back on the position he took last fall if on the tariff question he supports what I oppose, nor will any opposition in which we may thus be placed on this question of national taxation prevent me from striking hands with him when he comes again into the field where the issue is of state taxation. And so far from wishing Mr. Wilder to make any compromise that will prevent him from advocating protection, I hope, since he cannot yet see his way to oppose protection, that he will do his best to defend and advocate it, and make as many and as strong protectionist speeches as he can. Free discussion sets men thinking and thus brings out the truth. I myself was a protectionist until I heard an honest and able protectionist explain and advocate the system. That made me a free trader.

The same right which I freely accord to others I claim for myself. When I participated in the formation of the united labor party in the state of New York, and accepted its nomination as head of its ticket, I did not surrender my rights as a man and a citizen and agree to allow Dr. McGlynn, Mr. Gaybert Barnes and Mr. John MacKinn to do my thinking for me. Nor am I to be forced by any threat of being denounced as an abandoner of principles into submissive acquiescence in a policy which is opposed alike to my judgment of what is wise and my convictions of what is right, and which would practically make of me but a stalking horse and decoy duck for the benefit of what I would not and could not openly support. If any one has thought this he may have been acquainted with me, but he did not know me.

There is a superficial plausibility in the motive of "going straight on" that at first captivates the impulsive. But when it is seen that what is meant by going straight on is to make a national campaign on what are really state issues; to ignore the issue that is likely to divide the people, and to run off to the territories for some excuse for appearing in a national campaign; and when it is seen that what is to be achieved practically by this is to help one of the two great parties in doubtful states, and to land the united labor party in the same ignominious death trap into which Butler led the greenback labor party, I have no question of what will be the verdict of the majority of our friends.

We have with us those to whom party is everything—those who wish a party on any terms and at any cost, because their connection with it, even if it be a little, will be of a party, may give them position and influence that they would not have without it. But to the great body of our friends party is not an end but a means. They are not to be led to sacrifice principle by any pretended necessity of keeping up a party. Nor are they to be used as tools. When they want to help a republican

president they will vote the republican ticket.

The tendency of those who find power and profit in organization to exalt the means above the end and to regard the maintenance of the organization itself as more important than the securing of what the organization was formed to promote—a tendency to which is mainly due the corruptions of churches and parties—receives a curious illustration in the attitude of the cigarmakers' unions toward the internal revenue tax on tobacco and cigars. Cigar making has been so little affected by machinery that it is in itself one of the few remaining trades in which the workman can easily become his own employer and the concentration of capital gives little advantage. With a board, a knife, a little paste and a few pounds of tobacco a competent cigarmaker has all that is necessary to enable him to go to work, while nothing would be easier, did the law permit him, than for him to find a direct market in the consumer for his product. But the operation of our tax laws is to make it practically impossible for the cigarmaker to avail himself of his own skill and to concentrate the business in the hands of large employers. First comes the tariff tax on imported tobacco and the internal revenue tax on domestic tobacco. The effect of these is to raise the price of tobacco, not only by the tax but by more than the tax, and thus to increase the amount of capital required for providing stock. Then come the internal revenue restrictions on the making of cigars, which not only require the payment of a license fee, but the giving of bonds based on real estate to the amount of \$500 apiece for the first two men engaged, and \$100 apiece for each additional man, the keeping of an elaborate set of books and the purchase of revenue stamps. In addition, a man cannot sell cigars in quantities less than a box, even though he has made them and has paid a tax for the privilege of making them, without first taking out a United States dealers' license and generally a local license as well.

It is very natural that the large cigar manufacturers should be in favor of the retention of this system of taxation, which practically forbids the workman to go into business for himself, and compels him to sell his labor to an employer. Yet all the officials of the cigarmakers' unions seem to be as warmly in favor of the tax as are the manufacturers, and at the national convention of the union, held at Binghamton last October, resolutions opposing the repeal of the internal revenue taxes on cigar making were passed. The explanation is that the laws which forbid cigarmakers to go to work for themselves and mass them in factories or tenement shops in the employ of large manufacturers, compel them as the only way of preventing themselves from being entirely at the mercy of employers to organize unions and occasionally to go on strikes. The officials of the unions favor the laws which prevent workmen from employing themselves, because in forcing them into the factories or tenement shops of large employers, they make more necessary the unions.

Saturday, Feb. 11. HENRY GEORGE.

A Missionary's Report.

OWENSBORO, Ky.—The 550 tracts you sent me while I was in Henderson I have carefully distributed with good effect. This is a city of about 12,000 inhabitants with poor transportation facilities, but there is a movement on foot to have another railroad run through here. The company that proposes to build it only ask the citizens to give them \$75,000 to help build the road, of course on condition that when the citizens wish to ride they will pay this private company three cents per mile. The majority of the people are waking up and commencing to think for themselves, and I hear many of them remark that if the company wishes to build the road they can do so at their own expense. They claim that they are already over taxed and say they intend to vote accordingly.

There is an assembly of the Knights of Labor here. I attended their meeting a few evenings ago and explained the single tax doctrine to them. It was the first they had ever heard of it, and I can assure you they had good appetites for it. I distributed tracts among them, and in three days afterward I met some of the members on the street and they could explain the doctrine to me almost as well as I could myself. Last Monday evening they appointed a committee and instructed them to procure a hall for the truth, and have invited me to deliver a public address on the land question, which I will endeavor to do.

Yesterday one of my newly made converts sent you an order for three of your books, and before I leave here I will try and get some subscribers for THE STANDARD.

F. H. CARROLL.

The Twenty-first Assembly District.

NEW YORK CITY, Feb. 8.—The meeting of the Twenty-first assembly district, united labor party, last evening was largely attended. The subject for discussion, after the routine business, was "Tariff Reform vs. Protection." The general fear expressed was that by keeping out of the presidential contest our party would lose its identity, and could not be successfully reorganized. It was thought by the majority of the members present that the ultimate success of our principles hinged on entering the national contest as a distinctive party. The following resolution was passed: We announce our dissent from the views of Henry George in regard to a presidential candidate, as put forth in THE STANDARD. We do not believe that his views represent the opinions of the united labor party, and we most strongly object to a movement on his part which tends to commit that party to his views in the coming national campaign.

HUZZA H. COLLE, Cor. Secretary.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Effect of the Single Tax in England.

DUNFRIES, Canada.—In an issue of THE STANDARD answering your Dunfries correspondent regarding the land tax, you say you would allow the present owners to retain the fee of the land so long as they paid the taxes on it. Would you kindly let me know how that would affect land monopolists in Britain? If tenant farmers are still to pay their rents to the land owners as before, where are they to derive their benefit so long as there is competition for land?

J. G.

The tenants would have no taxes to pay; the landlords, deprived of their unearned incomes, would soon be obliged to go to work; production would be greater, business would be brisker and wages would be higher. But this improvement, great as it would be, would not be all. While the land of England is more truly all in use than that of America, there is a great deal of land there which is practically out of use. Land which rich landlords have devoted to selfish pleasure, if taxed to its full value, would be too expensive a luxury for lords without other incomes than such as they earned, and it would come upon the market. Then there is a great deal of land in England which is but poorly improved, but under the single tax it would pay better to improve it to its highest point, and that would have the effect of an augmentation of the land of the country. So you may see that, even though the single tax were confined to England, competition for land would be less intense; but if the tax were in force in other countries also, the economic boundaries of England would extend to all those countries. Wherever the single tax is in full force no land can long be much dearer than similar land elsewhere; in fact, if the single tax were in full force in any country of large territory relative to population, it would diminish land values everywhere.

Characteristic of Wealth.

NEW YORK.—(Q) Are there, according to Mr. George, any other characteristics of economic wealth than the following:

- It must have exchange value.
- It must be tangible.
- It must have and retain the power of ministering to human desires.
- It must be the result of human labor on material things.
- It must be an object or substance as modified by human labor.
- Knowledge is not wealth because it is not tangible. And it is not an object or substance modified by human labor. But written words have an exchange value and have all the other above characteristics of wealth. Even spoken words have exchange value (although sometimes consumed immediately upon exchange), are tangible because they can be heard, have the power of ministering to human desires, are the result of labor on air and land, and are the very substance (as modified by human labor). Spoken words even retain the power of ministering to human desires so long as they can be heard—by echo for a few seconds and for years by the phonograph. A bushel of wheat can do no more. Which is the right way to regard the musician as a producer? Does he produce music which has exchange value, etc.? Or does he indirectly produce boots, shoes, clothes, houses, machinery, etc., because music is a civilized community is necessary to the production of boots, houses, etc.?
- Has actual goodness of the product anything to do with economic wealth? I think now that it has not. The question is, in what estimate is the product held? Is there anybody to offer something in exchange? Whisky would cease to be wealth if people ceased to demand it for use.
- What answers shall we give to those people who say that withholding valuable land from use can be no worse than compelling a nation to live on smaller territory, and therefore cannot be very bad as the whole world could suit on the territory of Texas?

E. D. BINKERHOFF.

- I should say not.
- Words are not wealth, whether written or spoken. A book is wealth; but an orator, like a musician, merely performs a service in exchange for which other people produce the wealth that he requires, and which he would otherwise have to produce himself. When, in return for the service he performs he collects clothing and food from the circle of exchanges, he directs labor to the production of more clothing and food; therefore it is virtually clothing and food that he produces.
- Economically the actual goodness of an article does not determine whether or not it is wealth. In this connection the determining fact is whether the product may enter into the circle of exchanges.
- If the whole world could subsist in Texas, no man would be in danger of starvation or be dependent for a living on any other man if equal natural rights were preserved among the inhabitants; but if there were only one man in Texas he would soon be a corpse or a slave if deprived of his natural right to land.

Profits of Land Speculation.

BROOKLYN.—In argument on the tariff, monopoly, the single tax, etc., with a respected friend, a thirty years' resident and tradesman of Brooklyn, I was astonished, nonplussed, "knocked out" by the following assertions he made:

- That all vacant lots are taxed just the same as improved lots, in Brooklyn, New York and all principal cities.
- That vacant lots, even in the heart of the city and growing in value in the ordinary way, are the most unprofitable thing for any man to invest in, as in ten years the value of any vacant lot will be eaten up by the taxes; that the taxes upon them do not compel him to improve them or sell them.
- That no owner of vacant lots can clear anything on them unless by a very rapid rise in value, say, in two or three years, because of the taxes.
- That you could find hardly half a dozen people in Brooklyn who have grown rich by merely buying and selling vacant lots, the taxes are so heavy.
- That the Astors have not, and do not make their money by holding for a rise merely vacant land; that their wealth has been made by improving lots.
- That a man may make a fortune by buying and selling lots in far away towns; but that these cases are isolated ones, and do not occur in cities like New York or Brooklyn.
- Please explain why so many thousands of empty acres are being held if their value is thus eaten up by taxes, and why nobody has thought of bursting up Henry George's false statements before now? F. SCHLESIAW.
- As to New York this is not true. Improved land here is assessed at from 50 to 60 per cent of its true value, while un-

improved land is assessed all the way down to 18 per cent and less. I cannot speak definitely of Brooklyn, but if you write to the Brooklyn Real Estate Review I think you will find that, as in New York so in Brooklyn, unimproved land generally pays a lower tax relatively to its true value than improved land. I am quite sure also that the same fact holds in all the principle cities. It is done on the theory that a man who is getting no income from his land ought not to pay so high a tax as a man who is getting an income from his.

(2) That it pays, on the average, to buy vacant land for a rise is evident from the fact that so much vacant land is bought for just that purpose. Men do not invest their money in a direction that involves certain loss. It may be that a vacant lot in the heart of the city if kept vacant for ten years will yield no profit. That is more apt to happen with a vacant lot in the heart of the city than with one in the suburbs, for the proportion of increase is certain to be less and the rate of tax is likely to be higher. But the value of the lot would not be eaten up unless it was in a retrograding locality. If present taxes do not now compel such owners to sell or improve it is because these taxes are low enough to allow a reasonable expectation of future profit. If the taxes were high enough to remove that possibility a different result would follow.

But the nub of the question is not whether this man or that does or may make a profit from vacant land; it is whether he stands in the way of improvement, for it is improvement that makes business and business that makes prosperity.

(3) That may or may not be. It is immaterial, since the real injury is the keeping of useful land out of use.

(4) I doubt the statement; but it is immaterial. There are more than half a dozen people who have interfered with the prosperity of Brooklyn by holding vacant lots and putting prices on them that prevented improvement, and there are more than half a dozen people in Brooklyn who owe their wealth to land values.

(5) The Astors are not land speculators in the ordinary sense. They do not buy and sell. Their policy is to buy along the backbone of the city, somewhat in advance of the movement of population, to hold or lease until population reaches them, and then to build. Their profits come from the high ground rents which they get in consequence of greater demand for their land. It may be said that their wealth has been made by improving; but the bulk of it has been made out of the rise in their land values, not out of their improvements. If land were taxed to its full value the Astors would not take up land in advance of population and hold it; they would take it up only as they wanted to build. Nor would they accumulate wealth from mere ground rents; their wealth would consist of returns for capital which they kept active, and of nothing else.

(6) Quite likely; but as I have already said, it is not so much a question of whether some men make fortunes by speculations in land as whether many men are kept in a state of dependence in consequence of such speculation. If a dozen men robbed a hundred in some vulgar way, the net proceeds of the robbery might not be enough when divided to make any of the twelve rich, or if they gambled for the loot, all but one might be as poor as before; but that would not console the hundred who were robbed.

(7) I give it up. Don't you?

Tariff Questions.

(1) Is not the statement that the cost of living in this country is increased to the extent of the tariff of forty-six per cent rather exaggerated since there is no duty on most of the products of the farmer, and if there were, it could not make them any higher, since we produce a surplus of wheat, corn, beef, pork, cotton, etc., the price of which is determined in the markets of the world?

(2) Also, has not domestic competition among manufacturers greatly reduced prices of manufactured goods in some cases below what they could be imported for?

E. LUCAS.

(1) I do not understand any one to say that the whole cost of living is increased to the extent of the tariff. It has been said, however, that the cost of "protected" articles is so increased, and it is probably to this that you refer. The statement is correct only as a statement of a tendency. The same idea, accurately stated, is that a product will be higher if protected than if not protected. This furnishes the stock in trade of the protectionist, for it is by making things higher and giving to the manufacturer greater profits out of which to pay wages that the protectionist proposes to increase wages.

(2) If domestic goods are reduced in price, by competition or otherwise, below what they can be imported for free of duty, it is obvious that we can make such goods cheaper than they can be made abroad, even though we pay "American wages" instead of "foreign pauper wages," a fact which goes to prove that it is not cheap goods, but something else, that reduces wages.

The Speculative Rent Line.

PHILADELPHIA.—While admitting the justice and expediency of taking the rental value of land in taxation, it appears to me that it is an unfounded assumption to claim that the private ownership of land produces a "speculative rent line" which is lower than the "actual rent line," as asserted in chapter I, book 5, of "Progress and Poverty."

A STRIDING INQUIRY.

Let us suppose three gold mines; the first of which will with a given amount of labor yield \$10, the second \$8 and the third \$6. If only the first is appropriated its rent will not exceed \$2, for nobody will work them for less than \$8 when he can make \$8 in the second mine. But if the second mine be appropriated and locked up, the rent of the first mine will be \$4 instead of \$2, for the most that labor can then make will be the product of the third mine, which is only \$6. Now it is the system of private land ownership that permits the locking up of the second mine, and as you may see from this illustration, the fact that the second mine is locked up lowers the rent line so as to raise rent from one-fifth to two-fifths of the product. In this case the normal rent line leaves four-fifths to labor while the speculative rent line leaves to it but three-fifths.

LOUIS F. POST.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Benefit for the Striking Pennsylvania Coal Miners.

The forty-second public meeting of the Anti-poverty society was especially for the benefit of the strikers in the Pennsylvania coal regions and on the Reading railroad. Master Workman James E. Quinn of district assembly 49 presided, and with him on the platform were T. B. Maguire of the general executive board, Hugh Greenan, John L. Lee, Dr. McGlynn, James P. Archibald, W. T. Croasdale and others. Mr. Quinn said:

The demonstration this evening in behalf of the coal miners and railroad men, through the courtesy of the Anti-poverty society, is for the purpose of placing before the public of New York an intelligent view of the difficulties by which the miners are surrounded. Workmen are organized at the present time for something above the question of wages. Let the students understand that it is not necessary under the present system of education in our labor organizations to have a college education in order to know what we are after in the shape of the entire control of all the natural elements by which we are surrounded (applause), that the labor organizations to-day are built on that one great principle which guarantees opportunity to every man, woman and child throughout the universe, and that on the general principle that they, like the working classes of our cities and of the country generally, belong to that great body of God's children who have been disinherited of any share in that great and rich estate which God, their maker, has provided for their use. I have traveled through many parts of this and other countries where the injustice of our treatment of land was strikingly apparent; but I know of no part of the world, not even excepting the poorest districts of Ireland, where the cause of poverty is so clearly revealed as it is in the mining districts of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is in natural gifts a rich state. I am sometimes inclined to think for its area the richest state in the American Union—yet in the richest part of this rich state one may see men whose toil brings forth wealth from the bowels of the earth, reduced even in what are called good times to a scale of living but little above that of the poorest Irish peasant. It has been the habit of our people to prate of Irish landlordism, of Irish evictions and of Irish rack rents, but no Irish peasant is or has been so completely wretched as the power or the landlord as are the American citizens, the vast majority of them natives of the state and of the locality, who tenant the mining districts of Pennsylvania. Their houses are mere shanties, generally unpainted and without so much as a flower or a shrub to give to them the qualities of a home.

The land is the absolute property of the individuals and corporations to whom, under the laws of Pennsylvania, it has been given. The people are mere tenants at will. They are not even allowed to buy a foot of land or to build for themselves, but are compelled to live in company houses, on entering which they sign an agreement which permits the employer to evict them on five days' notice. They are compelled in many cases to deal in company stores or to board at company boarding houses, and generally to govern themselves as the lords of the earth in that part of the world choose to dictate.

I have heard stories of oppression and tyranny in the Pennsylvania coal regions which are equal almost to anything I ever heard of in Ireland. These men, who are merely permitted to live on the earth, get for working under ground at the risk of their lives, under conditions which make them old before their time, wages which even in good times and with full work cannot give them that standard of comfort which the poorest American citizen ought to enjoy. They are subject to long spells of enforced idleness, and as a means of keeping from being utterly crushed to the wall and preserving any rights as freemen, are compelled to maintain organizations in their nature tyrannical, and from time to time to resort to long struggles of endurance which are productive of almost as much loss and suffering as actual war.

We of the anti-poverty society are not disposed to deny much that the monopolistic organs have to say about the essential injustice and the injurious effects of strikes, but we contend that there is below all this seeming conflict between labor and capital a primary and monstrous wrong, that wrong upon the earth that their Father in heaven made for them. And we would abolish this fundamental wrong which everywhere robs the laborer, by assuring to every man his equal right to live and to work on the land of his native country.

How clearly the simple adjustment which we propose, of levying all taxes upon land values, would end labor difficulties and give to all who wish it opportunity for employment, can be seen in these coal regions of Pennsylvania. To-day if our system were in operation in Pennsylvania no action of the coal operators could prevent the miners from employing themselves in taking the coal from the veins where the Creator has placed it for the use of men. Both in the Lehigh and Schuylkill regions, as in the other mining districts of Pennsylvania, there are vast tracts of coal land utterly unused. In many cases miners with no other capital than their ordinary tools could go to work taking out coal, but they are prevented, not by nature, but by the laws which make this coal as it lies in the earth the property of dogs-in-the-manger, who, though they will not use it themselves, will permit no one else to use it. It is not possible for the individuals and corporations who own them to hold these unused coal lands as their private property by the laws which impose upon them a merely nominal tax. If they were taxed at the full value it would be impossible for anyone, however rich, to lock up these coal deposits from labor; unless they used them they could not afford to pay the tax upon them, and would be forced to throw them open to those who were willing to use them.

This is the true and only remedy for the wrong of land monopoly, whether in Pennsylvania or in any other state or country. Heretofore these Pennsylvania miners have blindly voted for that system of robbery by taxation which is mislabeled protection, a system which, while it in many ways results to the injury of labor, can never inure to its benefit. The protective duty levied on coal, by enabling the operators to keep up the price, gives them the opportunity, in the higher prices which strikes such as this attract, to recover themselves in some degree, at least, for the money lost in fighting their workmen, while the increased cost of all the necessities of life which protective duties cause makes it harder for the men to stand out against their employers. I rejoice that the superstitious belief in the efficacy of tariffs which has been so prevalent in Pennsylvania is now beginning to pass away, and that all through the coal regions there are men who see as we see that the primary cause of low wages and hard times is our giving to individuals as their private property what the Almighty Creator of the earth intended for all his children.

Yours very truly,
HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George having been announced to speak wrote a letter to Mr. Croasdale, chairman of the executive committee, explaining

that engagements in the west rendered it imperative that he should leave town on Sunday morning and expressing his sympathy with the objects of the meeting. Mr. Quinn, chairman of the meeting, informed Mr. Croasdale that he would call for the reading of this letter immediately after Dr. McGlynn's speech. For some reason Mr. Quinn did not do so, and no opportunity was given for explaining to the audience the absence of that speaker. The speakers announced to be present, though Mr. Croasdale waited two hours and a half to perform that duty. Mr. George's letter is given below:

NEW YORK, Feb. 11, 1888.

W. T. Croasdale, Esq., Chairman Executive Committee of the Anti-Poverty Society—My Dear Sir: When first requested to speak on the anti-poverty society's platform to-morrow evening I was under the impression that I could do so, but I have found later that in order to keep a long standing engagement for Monday evening next I must leave town on Sunday morning instead of Sunday night, as I had supposed. The speakers, as I informed Mr. Michael Clarke when he spoke of using my name in the advertisement, I must be contented with sending you a letter instead of making a speech which it would give me pleasure to make.

I am called on as a member of the anti-poverty society to express my sympathy with the striking miners of Pennsylvania. I do this without reference to any particular dispute that they may have with their employers, but on the general principle that they, like the working classes of our cities and of the country generally, belong to that great body of God's children who have been disinherited of any share in that great and rich estate which God, their maker, has provided for their use. I have traveled through many parts of this and other countries where the injustice of our treatment of land was strikingly apparent; but I know of no part of the world, not even excepting the poorest districts of Ireland, where the cause of poverty is so clearly revealed as it is in the mining districts of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is in natural gifts a rich state. I am sometimes inclined to think for its area the richest state in the American Union—yet in the richest part of this rich state one may see men whose toil brings forth wealth from the bowels of the earth, reduced even in what are called good times to a scale of living but little above that of the poorest Irish peasant. It has been the habit of our people to prate of Irish landlordism, of Irish evictions and of Irish rack rents, but no Irish peasant is or has been so completely wretched as the power or the landlord as are the American citizens, the vast majority of them natives of the state and of the locality, who tenant the mining districts of Pennsylvania. Their houses are mere shanties, generally unpainted and without so much as a flower or a shrub to give to them the qualities of a home.

The land is the absolute property of the individuals and corporations to whom, under the laws of Pennsylvania, it has been given. The people are mere tenants at will. They are not even allowed to buy a foot of land or to build for themselves, but are compelled to live in company houses, on entering which they sign an agreement which permits the employer to evict them on five days' notice. They are compelled in many cases to deal in company stores or to board at company boarding houses, and generally to govern themselves as the lords of the earth in that part of the world choose to dictate.

I have heard stories of oppression and tyranny in the Pennsylvania coal regions which are equal almost to anything I ever heard of in Ireland. These men, who are merely permitted to live on the earth, get for working under ground at the risk of their lives, under conditions which make them old before their time, wages which even in good times and with full work cannot give them that standard of comfort which the poorest American citizen ought to enjoy. They are subject to long spells of enforced idleness, and as a means of keeping from being utterly crushed to the wall and preserving any rights as freemen, are compelled to maintain organizations in their nature tyrannical, and from time to time to resort to long struggles of endurance which are productive of almost as much loss and suffering as actual war.

We of the anti-poverty society are not disposed to deny much that the monopolistic organs have to say about the essential injustice and the injurious effects of strikes, but we contend that there is below all this seeming conflict between labor and capital a primary and monstrous wrong, that wrong upon the earth that their Father in heaven made for them. And we would abolish this fundamental wrong which everywhere robs the laborer, by assuring to every man his equal right to live and to work on the land of his native country.

How clearly the simple adjustment which we propose, of levying all taxes upon land values, would end labor difficulties and give to all who wish it opportunity for employment, can be seen in these coal regions of Pennsylvania. To-day if our system were in operation in Pennsylvania no action of the coal operators could prevent the miners from employing themselves in taking the coal from the veins where the Creator has placed it for the use of men. Both in the Lehigh and Schuylkill regions, as in the other mining districts of Pennsylvania, there are vast tracts of coal land utterly unused. In many cases miners with no other capital than their ordinary tools could go to work taking out coal, but they are prevented, not by nature, but by the laws which make this coal as it lies in the earth the property of dogs-in-the-manger, who, though they will not use it themselves, will permit no one else to use it. It is not possible for the individuals and corporations who own them to hold these unused coal lands as their private property by the laws which impose upon them a merely nominal tax. If they were taxed at the full value it would be impossible for anyone, however rich, to lock up these coal deposits from labor; unless they used them they could not afford to pay the tax upon them, and would be forced to throw them open to those who were willing to use them.

This is the true and only remedy for the wrong of land monopoly, whether in Pennsylvania or in any other state or country. Heretofore these Pennsylvania miners have blindly voted for that system of robbery by taxation which is mislabeled protection, a system which, while it in many ways results to the injury of labor, can never inure to its benefit. The protective duty levied on coal, by enabling the operators to keep up the price, gives them the opportunity, in the higher prices which strikes such as this attract, to recover themselves in some degree, at least, for the money lost in fighting their workmen, while the increased cost of all the necessities of life which protective duties cause makes it harder for the men to stand out against their employers. I rejoice that the superstitious belief in the efficacy of tariffs which has been so prevalent in Pennsylvania is now beginning to pass away, and that all through the coal regions there are men who see as we see that the primary cause of low wages and hard times is our giving to individuals as their private property what the Almighty Creator of the earth intended for all his children.

Yours very truly,
HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George having been announced to speak wrote a letter to Mr. Croasdale, chairman of the executive committee, explaining

that engagements in the west rendered it imperative that he should leave town on Sunday morning and expressing his sympathy with the objects of the meeting. Mr. Quinn, chairman of the meeting, informed Mr. Croasdale that he would call for the reading of this letter immediately after Dr. McGlynn's speech. For some reason Mr. Quinn did not do so, and no opportunity was given for explaining to the audience the absence of that speaker. The speakers announced to be present, though Mr. Croasdale waited two hours and a half to perform that duty. Mr. George's letter is given below:

NEW YORK, Feb. 11, 1888.

W. T. Croasdale, Esq., Chairman Executive Committee of the Anti-Poverty Society—My Dear Sir: When first requested to speak on the anti-poverty society's platform to-morrow evening I was under the impression that I could do so, but I have found later that in order to keep a long standing engagement for Monday evening next I must leave town on Sunday morning instead of Sunday night, as I had supposed. The speakers, as I informed Mr. Michael Clarke when he spoke of using my name in the advertisement, I must be contented with sending you a letter instead of making a speech which it would give me pleasure to make.

I am called on as a member of the anti-poverty society to express my sympathy with the striking miners of Pennsylvania. I do this without reference to any particular dispute that they may have with their employers, but on the general principle that they, like the working classes of our cities and of the country generally, belong to that great body of God's children who have been disinherited of any share in that great and rich estate which God, their maker, has provided for their use. I have traveled through many parts of this and other countries where the injustice of our treatment of land was strikingly apparent; but I know of no part of the world, not even excepting the poorest districts of Ireland, where the cause of poverty is so clearly revealed as it is in the mining districts of Pennsylvania.

Pennsylvania is in natural gifts a rich state. I am sometimes inclined to think for its area the richest state in the American Union—yet in the richest part of this rich state one may see men whose toil brings forth wealth from the bowels of the earth, reduced even in what are called good times to a scale of living but little above that of the poorest Irish peasant. It has been the habit of our people to prate of Irish landlordism, of Irish evictions and of Irish rack rents, but no Irish peasant is or has been so completely wretched as the power or the landlord as are the American citizens, the vast majority of them natives of the state and of the locality, who tenant the mining districts of Pennsylvania. Their houses are mere shanties, generally unpainted and without so much as a flower or a shrub to give to them the qualities of a home.

The land is the absolute property of the individuals and corporations to whom, under the laws of Pennsylvania, it has been given. The people are mere tenants at will. They are not even allowed to buy a foot of land or to build for themselves, but are compelled to live in company houses, on entering which they sign an agreement which permits the employer to evict them on five days' notice. They are compelled in many cases to deal in company stores or to board at company boarding houses, and generally to govern themselves as the lords of the earth in that part of the world choose to dictate.

I have heard stories of oppression and tyranny in the Pennsylvania coal regions which are equal almost to anything I ever heard of in Ireland. These men, who are merely permitted to live on the earth, get for working under ground at the risk of their lives, under conditions which make them old before their time, wages which even in good times and with full work cannot give them that standard of comfort which the poorest American citizen ought to enjoy. They are subject to long spells of enforced idleness, and as a means of keeping from being utterly crushed to the wall and preserving any rights as freemen, are compelled to maintain organizations in their nature tyrannical, and from time to time to resort to long struggles of endurance which are productive of almost as much loss and suffering as actual war.

A SERIOUS CRISIS.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY THREATENED WITH DISRUPTION.

The Executive Committee Packed—Many Members Withdraw on Account of Despotism—The Attacks on Mr. George.

The dissension and discontent that have for some time past threatened danger to the cause represented by the united labor party came to a head on Monday last in an unexpected manner, when a serious rupture took place in the executive committee of the Anti-poverty society. The meeting was the regular one, and no business of importance was to be transacted. There was, however, on the part of Dr. McGlynn, apprehension that the committee would take some action in relation to his recent attack on Mr. George, and by way of preventing any censure of his conduct he took the precaution to appoint ten or twelve new members of the committee before the meeting took place. The story of what followed will be found in the card below:

NEW YORK, Monday, Feb. 13, 1888.

To the members of the Anti-poverty society: The undersigned members of the executive committee, who felt compelled to withdraw from the meeting of the committee this evening, feel that it is due to the society that we should give our reasons therefor.

At a meeting of the down town branch of the anti-poverty society, at Pythagoras hall, on Thursday evening last, Dr. Edward McGlynn, president of the society, made remarks disparaging to Henry George, vice-president of the society, the purport of which was familiar to the society and the public. These remarks caused general excitement among members of the anti-poverty society and the united labor party throughout the city; and there were rumors, printed in the papers, that some action in relation to them would be taken at the meeting of the executive committee this evening. When we arrived at the committee room in Cooper Union we found present a number of persons not members of the committee.

Before the meeting was called to order, Dr. McGlynn announced that as president of the society he had appointed a number of gentlemen, mostly members of St. Stephen's parish, as additional members of the committee. Mr. E. J. Shriver, treasurer of the society, at once protested against the appointment of the new members as an act of arbitrary power on the part of the president, under the circumstances. Mr. Post followed with a similar protest, when Dr. McGlynn interrupted him, insisting that he could not proceed because the meeting had not yet been called to order. The chairman of the executive committee, Mr. Croasdale, ruled that as Doctor McGlynn had spoken before the meeting was called to order, Mr. Post might proceed. Mr. Post then protested against the appointment of new members under these circumstances, manifestly for the purpose of packing the meeting.

The meeting was then called to order and the reading of the minutes dispensed with, the following members being present: Gaybert Barnes, Dr. McGlynn, John MacKinnon, Dr. Coughlin, A. J. Steers, Louis F. Post, Benjamin Urner, Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost, T. L. McCready, Michael Clark, William T. Croasdale, Everett Glackin, Rev. John Anketell, William McCabe, John R. Waters, E. J. Shriver, Jerome O'Neill, James W. Sullivan, besides six of the new appointments. During the early part of the meeting several other new appointees came in, as did also some of the bona fide members of the committee, including Father Huntington, Dr. Gethel, Edward Johnson, James O'Flaherty and James P. Archibald.

In view of the arbitrary action taken, Mr. Shriver moved that the president of the society be suspended for grave cause until a meeting of the society, in accordance with section 6 of the by-laws. The motion was seconded and an excited debate followed. In the course of this debate Mr. Post referred to the fact that various members of the committee had frequently urged upon Dr. McGlynn the appointment of some of the St. Stephen's parishioners. He was interrupted by Dr. McGlynn, who raised the point of order that his motives in making appointments could not be questioned, declaring that he "had despotism power" to appoint whomsoever he pleased. Before any ruling could be made John MacKinnon raised the point of order that "the whole proceeding was out of order," but yielded to Gaybert Barnes, who made the point of order that the original motion was out of order, because the right of the president to appoint could not be questioned. The chair ruled that the committee had a right to call the president to account for improper exercise of his power and that the motion was in order.

Mr. Barnes appealed from the decision of the chair, declaring that the president had full power and that his exercise could not be questioned. The vote on the question of sustaining the chair was taken by roll call, and as soon as all of the bona fide members had voted the chair announced that the decision was sustained without waiting for the call of the names of the strangers present claiming to be members. A motion was instantly made to adjourn, which, counting only the votes of the bona fide members, the chair declared carried. The undersigned thereupon left the room.

This is the culmination of a difficulty of long standing in the committee. At the organization of the society the officers alone were elected and the president was given power to appoint the executive committee. This was done as a matter of courtesy to him and to avoid any chances of involving him in further difficulty with his ecclesiastical supporters.

Dr. McGlynn has uniformly opposed the appointment of members of St. Stephen's parish, or of ladies, to the committee, and for several months the holding of any public meetings of the society. A proposition to incorporate the society was referred to a committee consisting of Dr. McGlynn, chairman, Gaybert Barnes and William T. Croasdale as it was discovered that it would be necessary to give the members of the society the right to vote for directors. This committee has never been called together, though one of its members, the chairman of the executive committee, was privately informed by the secretary of the society that "the matter of incorporation had been dropped."

Similar acts of arbitrary power have been frequent of late, but in all cases the committee has yielded to the dictation of Dr. McGlynn with a view to avoiding difficulty or dissension. A point has at last been reached, however, when this "despotic" rule has become intolerable; and as a majority of the bona fide members of the executive committee present at this evening's meeting we feel bound to lay this statement of facts before the society. We regret, as much as any of those members can, that this crisis has arisen, and we have made every effort to avoid it. Even during the excitement of the proceedings of this evening Mr. Sullivan suggested that the doctors' words at Pythagoras hall might have been hasty and asked him if he would

not reconsider them so far as to admit that the question of a presidential nomination by the united labor party was still open, and that he did not know that Henry George had done anything for which he deserved to be humiliated. The doctor said in reply, that he had said nothing which he wished to withdraw or for which he wished to apologize; but intimated that he had been incorrectly reported by the newspapers. Mr. Sullivan's summary of his remarks, however, was not founded on any newspaper report, but was taken from a verbatim stenographic report.

From the tyrannical exercise of despotic power by Dr. McGlynn we appeal with confidence to the members of the society.

WILLIAM T. CROASDALE,
EDWARD J. SHRIVER,
HUGH O. PENTECOST,
BENJAMIN URNER,
T. L. MCCREADY,
A. J. STEERS,
LOUIS F. POST,
JEROME O'NEILL,
J. W. SULLIVAN,
WILLIAM WATKINS.

Though not arriving at the meeting until after the withdrawal of the members whose names are here given, I entirely concur in the action by them taken.

JAMES O. S. HUNTINGTON.

Further Details.

The above report was hastily prepared by those signing it for the morning papers, and there are several matters of detail that ought to be added. When Dr. McGlynn announced his appointment of new members he declared that his action was due to a desire, in view of recent events, to give the St. Stephen's parishioners a representation on the committee somewhat proportioned to their numbers and activity. It was this statement that called out Mr. Post's declaration of the fact known to every member of the committee, that Dr. McGlynn has been urged again and again to appoint some members of that parish on the committee and has persistently neglected to do so. The reason that the branch of the anti-poverty society that includes St. Stephen's parish was not organized weeks ago is that Dr. McGlynn, in order to avoid naming a chairman from among his old parishioners, has been negotiating with a Catholic gentleman in another parish to take the place. This explains the anger he displayed when Mr. Post stated the facts in the hearing of the new members.

The members who protested against the packing of the meeting do not deny that the by-laws lodge the power of appointment in the president's hands. The society was organized before Dr. McGlynn's excommunication and when his relations to the church were delicate and difficult. He strongly insisted that he would not speak every Sunday evening or do anything that would give the appearance of a church. The power of appointment was, therefore, entrusted to him, as a guarantee that he should not be forced into any unpleasant position by any action of the executive committee. The society was very small at the time, but when its membership jumped from less than fifty to more than a thousand Dr. McGlynn was given power to add to the executive committee from time to time. There was probably not a single instance where he did not, before exercising this power, first consult with the members in a meeting at which a quorum of the committee was present. No one ever dreamed that Dr. McGlynn could become capable, through the mere apprehension that he might be censured, of using the power thus lodged in his hands to pack the committee in his own interest and on the open plea that his power was despotic and not even to be questioned. No self-respecting man could act in the committee under such conditions.

It reported that after the regular members had retired, one of the new members moved that the president have power to appoint or remove members at his pleasure. Even Dr. Coughlin raised some objection to this, but Dr. McGlynn declared that he would have it so, and it was so.

After the protesting members had left the room Dr. McGlynn proceeded to exercise this power by ordering their names to be dropped. This will have no effect. The by-laws regulate that matter and they can only be changed by the members after notice at a previous meeting. The same remark is applicable to the vote declaring the office of treasurer vacant and electing a new one. It requires a vote of the society to change the treasurer. One must be elected at the annual meeting on March 26.

some of whom had never attended a meeting in this room. The hostile intent of these men and their scheme to control the committee having been made manifest even in the newspapers, the president, Dr. McGlynn, in the best interests of the society and the exercise of his undoubted constitutional right, appointed several of the most active members and workers of the society to be members of the executive committee. The disaffected members at the meeting this evening showed their intent by endeavoring to get control of the committee, even going so far as to try to pass a vote of censure on Dr. McGlynn and to suspend him from his office.

"After some wrangling, finding they could not succeed, they retired in a body, and the committee then conducted the business in a quiet and orderly manner. The following gentlemen were dropped from the executive committee: Benjamin Urner, Edward J. Shriver, Louis F. Post, Thomas C. Cready, William T. Croasdale, Jerome McNeill, the Rev. Hugh C. Pentecost, William McCabe, A. J. Steers, Henry W. Sackett and J. W. Sullivan. Five of these were connected with THE STANDARD. In justice to Mr. Sackett it should be said that he was not at the meeting to-night, and that in dropping him from the committee we practically accepted his resignation, which was handed in a few days ago. The position of chairman of the executive committee, held by Mr. Shriver, were filled by the unanimous election of Jeremiah Coughlin and Sylvester L. Malone."

In several respects it is difficult to see how this statement can be made to correspond with facts. All the members of the committee who retired and those who have since resigned have been on its roll for months, and with two or three exceptions, were among the founders of the society. No election of officers is possible until the annual meeting of the full society in March. The doctor's statement of the intentions of members of the committee opposed to him is as far from being correct as are the reasons he gives for their opposition. The men from THE STANDARD whom he accuses of packing the meeting have been on the executive committee from the start, and the one who had not attended the meeting in room 30 was McCready, whose reasons for not doing so are given in another column. Mr. Sullivan had not been at a meeting in perhaps six weeks, as, though not a Catholic, he disapproved of Dr. McGlynn's indiscriminate attacks on the Catholic church and his making the anti-poverty platform a vehicle for airing his personal grievances and diverting the land reform movement to one of hostility toward men whose sympathies might be won for the movement. It is true that Mr. Sackett sent in a letter of resignation some time ago, on the ground that he was unable to attend the meetings; but it is also true that his resignation was declined by letter. Thus Dr. McGlynn is put in the position of accusing the regular working members of the committee of packing a meeting to which he called fifteen men never before connected with the committee. The members of the committee whose names were on the roll at the previous weekly meeting stand as follows: With Dr. McGlynn, Messrs. McCrackin, Coughlin, Michael Clarke, Barnes and O'Flaherty. Messrs. Archibald and Whoriskey arrived at the meeting late and remained with Dr. McGlynn's friends. Mr. Archibald saying he wished to know more about the matter before taking final action. Mr. Edward Johnson also remained, though he had refrained from voting to support Dr. McGlynn on the test question. Opposed to Dr. McGlynn's action are Hugh O. Pentecost, Rev. J. O. S. Huntington, Rev. John Anketell, Benjamin Urner, A. J. Steers, John Waters, E. J. Shriver, Everett Glackin, Charles F. Wingate, H. W. Sackett, W. T. Croasdale, Louis F. Post, T. L. McCready, William McCabe and J. W. Sullivan. The absentees were Messrs. Carr, Cranford, Redpath, W. B. Clarke, Henry George and J. V. George.

Comments of the Press.
Dr. McGlynn objects to a despot in Russia, but he doesn't at all object to a despot in the Anti-poverty society, provided he can be a despot. After all there is a good deal of human nature in most men.—[Tribune.]

The good Dr. McGlynn is showing himself to be "no slouch" of a politician.—[World.]

Whether any one will blame the doctor depends upon whether he regards him as an inspired savior or as a straightforward example of human nature. Those who have thought of him in the latter light will not be surprised at the facility with which Mr. George's followers were left. Probably Dr. McGlynn himself would say that the view of these latter observers was correct.—[Sun.]

Politicians, as we have often said, are, as a rule, honorable and fair in their transactions; but when novices undertake to reform the world by the propagation of creches through the action of volunteer committees, they are very apt to find themselves descending to methods that the educated self-control and well defined rules of established political organizations preclude. This has proved no less true of various ephemeral "citizen" associations during recent years that it now does of the "anti-poverty" experiment.—[Star.]

Two Members of the Executive Committee Resign.

Rev. John Anketell writes as follows: NEW YORK, Feb. 14.—I have just mailed to the secretary my resignation as the chairman central branch and member of the executive committee anti-poverty society.

J. ANKETELL.
Mr. Charles F. Wingate also informs THE STANDARD that he has sent to the president a brief but emphatic resignation from the executive committee.

HOW IT ALL BEGAN.

Last week an attack, manifestly prearranged, was made on Henry George with a view to making effective here in New York a campaign of slander that has been actively carried on by mail for some months. The reports appearing in the city papers are here reprinted in order to afford our readers throughout the world the fullest knowledge of the series of events that culminated in the rupture in the executive committee of the anti-poverty society on Monday evening.

The Attack in Brooklyn.

The united labor general committee of Kings county met in Everett hall, No. 396 Fulton street, Brooklyn, last night, with Victor A. Wilder in the chair. John J. Clancy, who ran for mayor on the united labor ticket, offered a resolution calling for a conference of delegates from the various labor organizations of the county, with a view to united political action in the future, which was adopted.

Mr. Wilder then left the chair, which was taken by John B. Muir of the Tenth ward, and the former moved the following resolution:

That this committee still keeps in view and adopts as its principles the political reforms embodied in the declaration made in convention of the united labor party at Syracuse in August, 1887.

Resolved, That at the time of the adoption

of this platform the present issue of free trade and protection was fully understood, and, as it was the deliberate act of that convention in refusing to take sides upon the issue, we but reaffirm the position then taken in declaring that we refuse to be diverted from the fundamental issues of that platform by now dividing upon the lines of a tariff or no tariff issue. The fundamental issues on which we could contest for political supremacy were then plainly stated and we now denounce the effort to force the party to proceed on other lines or to disband. We have nothing to do with free trade, protection or tariff reform otherwise than as mere incidents in the contest, and we disapprove the effort now being made to make it appear that we are essentially a free trade or protective party. We are neither. We are for land reform.

"I am a protectionist," said Mr. Wilder, in supporting the resolution. "Mr. George has declared that he and others were going in for free trade and Cleveland, but I, who am an anti-out protectionist, will vote against Blaine if he be a candidate and will support the labor ticket—the united labor party. (Applause.) While according to Henry George due credit for honesty of principle and sincerity of purpose, he must not be allowed to escape responsibility for his acts or words. We must take a decided stand in this matter, and never forget the principles of our party, which have nothing to do with the issue Mr. George is raising."

"The resolution says nothing about Henry George, but I personally denounce him with all my force for his efforts to split what promises to be a magnificent party in twain." Mr. J. O. C. Hennessy opposed the resolution. He said that Mr. Wilder misunderstood the scope of the opinions expressed by Mr. George in an interview with a newspaper, and condemned his action.

John J. Clancy spoke in favor of the resolution. He said it was Mr. Cleveland Henry George wanted, he had heard already. He was president of the United States already, and Mr. George should be happy.

"I am a democrat," said Mr. Clancy, "and have been one, but I know it was the saviors of society belonging to that party that traduced us and Mr. George and called us communists. I believe Henry George is going bodily into the democratic party, but he does not take me with him—(cheers)—and I doubt if other ex-demos like myself will go into the Cleveland ring to please Henry George. While he remains a united labor man we are with him, but we decline to form a tail for him when he severs his connection and marches into the democratic camp. (Applause.)"

"I suggest," said Mr. Clancy, in conclusion, "that the labor men of New York oppose the democrats in this state and to the labor men of Pennsylvania to defeat the republicans. Henry George as a theorist is honest and successful, but as a political leader he is, par excellence, the great failure of the age we live in."

John Keenan of the Twentieth ward, said Henry George was right; it was no use in going into a national campaign; they should stick to state issues.

John E. Edelman of the Sixth ward spoke against the resolution. He said Mr. George in the sum commits no one but Henry George. Mr. Delany supported the resolution. He said it did not matter a straw whether protection or free trade obtains in so far as the workingman is concerned. He did not believe in Mr. George's idea of action in the state and being passive in national affairs. Let Mr. George retire from the party if he pleases—he has a right to do so.

After a heated discussion a vote was taken, with the following result: In favor of the resolution, 30; opposed, 18.

ANOTHER REPORT.

Daily News, Feb. 8.
There was uproar for nearly three hours last night at the meeting of the Kings county general committee of the united labor party over a resolution introduced by Victor A. Wilder which, without mentioning Henry George's name, censured him for expressing his opinion that the party should not go into a national campaign this year.

Mr. Wilder is an ex-protectionist and admirer of Mr. Blaine, and last night vigorously declared that he was a protectionist and that Mr. George was trying to lean the party toward free trade and Cleveland.

John J. Clancy, who ran for mayor in Brooklyn last fall, and who last night declared there ought to be a union of the socialist, union labor party and every other labor party, also denounced Mr. George, who he said was trying to lead the united labor party into the democratic camp.

Gaybert Barnes, while professing excessive friendship for Mr. George, saying that he had slept in the same bed with him on one occasion, dealt his friend some very hard blows nevertheless.

"Mr. George will not be with us next election," said Mr. Barnes, "and I know it. But we will have a presidential candidate just the same. How Mr. George will not be with us because he told me so. He told me that if a united labor party candidate was in the field this year on the Syracuse platform he would not support him."

This statement was received in amazement by the meeting, but Mr. Barnes showed himself to be a good hand at remarkable statements in the next breath, when he said:

"What did we nominate him for mayor of New York for but to spread the light on the land question? I know this is so, because I can tell you that if it hadn't been for me he would never have been nominated." C. O. C. Hennessy, John H. Edelman, John Keenan and others fought hard against the resolution, and finally tried hard to stave off action until the ward associations could be heard from, but Mr. Wilder's friends were in a majority, and cheered lustily as the resolution was passed by a vote of 30 to 22.

Mr. Barnes's Explanation.

Daily News, Feb. 8.
Sir: I beg space to say a few words in relation to your report of Tuesday night's meeting of the Kings county general committee of the united labor party.

Your informant colors his report when he says I "professed excessive friendship" for Mr. George. I said merely this: That Mr. George and I had been intimate friends for years, that I had supped and slept with him, and might, therefore, be expected to know him well, to be familiar with the whole course of the united labor party movement and to speak advisedly of both.

If my assertion that but for me Mr. George would not have been a candidate for the mayoralty of New York is, as your report calls it, "amazing" or "remarkable," it is, nevertheless, true. It was my good fortune to be able to frustrate the anxious endeavors of the democrats to side-track Mr. George by a congressional nomination in 1886, giving, for Mr. George, an absolute and final guarantee to that proposition when it was made to me by the agent, whom I met at their joint request.

It is true that Mr. John H. Edelman spoke against Mr. Wilder's resolutions, but it is also true that he voted in their favor, stating that his remarks had given him some new life.

The resolutions were adopted, not as your report has it, thirty-six to twenty-two, but by a vote of thirty-six to eighteen, and several who voted in the negative told me that they did so only from reluctance to publish to the

world what Mr. George is publishing in his party every week. GAYBERT BARNES, Secretary State Committee United Labor Party.

AN INTERVIEW WITH HIM.

New York Herald, Feb. 10.
Several versions of Mr. Barnes's remarks have been published, and in speaking of the matter yesterday he made the following statement:

"The report of my remarks, as made in an evening paper, contained colorings and inaccuracies which I have partially corrected in a published letter. These colorings may be accounted for by the fact that a member of the general committee who opposed Mr. Wilder's resolution is attached to the evening paper referred to. It had been declared that the resolutions were 'a slap in the face for Henry George.' This, when I took the floor, I disclaimed, stating that I had been a friend of Mr. George, had eaten, drunk, slept and worked with him, and therefore knew him well, and was closely familiar with all the matters of which I was about to speak. None of the statements of fact made by me in the course of my remarks have been contradicted; but I said some things that have not been reported, and that it may be worth while to repeat."

"I said that the democratic party is everywhere in alliance with the liquor interest; that it is the party that expended hundreds of thousands of dollars in this city alone in a concerted endeavor, once and for all, to wipe out the labor party, the party that had slandered, persecuted and boycotted the devoted men who, without hope of reward and by days and nights of hardest work, had built up our organization; that it is the party that is in every city in the United States, in league with the Roman ecclesiastical machine, against whose monstrous pretensions of a right to interfere in our politics Dr. McGlynn had made such vigorous and self-sacrificing protest."

"And especially I called the attention of my fellow members of the general committee to a signed editorial of the general committee in August last, in which, denouncing the defection of Patrick Ford from the cause of land reform, which he had supported in 1886, but was in 1887 abandoning on the pretense that ours was a free trade party, Mr. George said: 'Could I have written the Syracuse platform as I pleased I certainly would not have declared in it either for protection or free trade, as Mr. Ford and the Evening Post understood the terms. For while I have never hesitated to avow myself an out and out free trader, I have at the same time always declared that I consider any question of tariff as of trivial importance as compared with the question of restoring to men their natural rights to land, and it would seem to be little short of treason to the greater principle to provoke any division in its support by thrusting forward the smaller principle. . . . Let Mr. Ford attach to the tariff question what importance he may. What does it amount to as compared with the question of the continuance of the injustice which he has over and over declared in the language of Bishop Nulty to be a crime and a blasphemy? . . . Let him ask himself whether the man and the paper that have preached the gospel of the land for the people on two continents so long and so well shall now, when the tariff is raised and the issue is joined, stand patting about the tariff?'"

"I contrasted that utterance with the recent extraordinary articles and interviews of Mr. George. I declared, for my part, that I had come into this movement, not to discuss so trivial a question as that of the tariff, which had its ups and downs, for generations past and would likely have them for generations to come, but to oppose the continuance of an injustice which, in the language of Bishop Nulty, is a crime and a blasphemy."

"I denounced the present scheme of the enemies of the united labor party to split and sidetrack us by tariff disputes. Finally I said that not one of the letters received at the headquarters of the party was opposed to national action; that a great majority of the letters published in THE STANDARD favored such action; that resolutions against teaching the tariff at all had been passed by the county general committee of New York; that so far as I knew, every member of the state committee favored a presidential ticket, and that the committee charged by the Syracuse convention with issuing the call were unanimous in favor of carrying out the plain intent of that convention in adopting resolutions about the national ticket."

Mr. Barnes further stated that Mr. George some time ago had said to him, in the presence of John McCluckin and others, that he would not support an independent candidate for president nominated on the Syracuse platform. When John McCluckin was asked to express an opinion he said that Mr. George could not take a corporal's guard away from the united labor party, and that the party was not the personal property of any one. He thought that the party would be benefited, for, with the tariff question on one side, the party could unite with the union labor party in the west and nominate a national ticket."

The Attack in New York.

At the opening meeting of the down town branch anti-poverty society held in Fyithagoras hall on Thursday evening Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn was the speaker. He was seconded by Dr. Jeremiah Coughlin, chairman of the branch, presided. Dr. McGlynn's address was on the "Aims and Objects of the Anti-Poverty Society," and he devoted the greater part of an hour and a half to an exposition of the principle that the earth was made for all mankind, and of the application of the single tax on land values. He maintained that the absorption of groundrents by the government for public uses was the only important reform, and in reference to the free trade issue stated that Mr. George had taught in his book, "Protection or Free Trade," that free trade was of comparatively trivial importance and its introduction in place of protection would be of no up to the laboring masses.

"At the Syracuse convention," said Dr. McGlynn, "it was resolved that the committee should co-operate with the central and labor committee of New York in issuing a call for a convention in response to the request of our brethren of Ohio and Illinois, who in Cincinnati in July last asked that in view of the near approach of the presidential contest the central land and labor committee be requested to call a national conference. This conference was to be for the formation of a national party."

"It was only months afterwards that anybody began to quibble about the meaning of this. The New York county committee adopted resolutions precisely for that purpose. The Kings county committee adopted the other day resolutions to the same effect. The central land and labor committee are fully determined to call this convention. The members of the state committee are unanimous in favor of doing so, so far as we have heard from them."

"It is idle to say that the united labor party is divided on this issue. It is no divided party. Although some letters have been received and printed Mr. George's paper, THE STANDARD, opposing a national campaign, and although several writers on that paper, editorial writers, have done their best to side-

track this party, I am glad to say they will miserably fail, and the enormous majority of the letters printed in THE STANDARD have been in favor of a national ticket."

"It is the full determination of the central land and labor committee at an early day to call a national conference for the purpose of reasserting the Syracuse platform and nominating presidential candidates. (A voice in the audience: 'Don't let them side-track you.' Applause.) Right you are, we are not going to allow ourselves to be side-tracked. We are not going to allow ourselves to be made the wretched little bit of a tail to the democratic kite. And so far from going in to elect them, if the corrupt democratic machine should be badly defeated and smashed we should not put any crumple on our hats. But it is the work of our society is chiefly missionariness. We are, yes, suppose it is; what better opportunity has there than a presidential contest? (Applause.)"

"It is an enormous mistake to say that your platform has nothing to do with federal legislation unless you enter into the tariff question—a huge mistake. Has not the federal government almost despotic powers in the government of all the territories? And these territories (Wyoming, Montana, Alaska, etc.) occupy a very large part of all the land of the United States. Now what is to prevent us, in a national platform, from demanding that congress shall make laws to the effect that land in all the territories shall be taxed to its full rental value and the proceeds taken for the public treasury? Is not that a good federal question? (Applause.)"

"Did not the anti-slavery party demand the very same things—take the same course of action? Did they not demand that slavery be abolished in the territories first? (Applause.) Again, does not the United States government hold hundreds of millions of acres of land still as public land? Why should we not demand that the United States government shall never give away or sell another single foot of our land? (Applause.)"

"So we are going to have a national conference. We are going to reaffirm our platform and we are going to nominate candidates for president and vice president; and we know that we will have plenty of excellent material. (Applause.)"

"There was something said in some paper to-day about Mr. George's not wishing to be a candidate. Well, I am not aware of Mr. George ever having been asked to be a candidate, and I am happy to say that we can get along abundantly well without Mr. George as a candidate. If he comes back into the party again, even if he does not support Mr. Cleveland and the democratic party, he will have to take a much humbler position in the ranks than he has heretofore held. For my part I don't want Mr. George for my candidate. I think he would be rather a hurt than a help to us. We have many good men in the party willing to be our candidates."

The Text That Dr. McGlynn Garbled.

In order that our readers may judge of the fairness of Dr. McGlynn's assertion that Mr. George declared in "Protection or Free Trade" that free trade is of comparatively little importance the full text of the passage alluded to is here given:

To abolish private property in land is an undertaking so great that it may at first seem impracticable.

But this seeming impracticability consists merely in the fact that the public mind is not yet sufficiently awakened to the justice and necessity of this great change. To bring it about is simply a work of arousing thought. How men vote is something we need not much concern ourselves with. The important thing is how they think.

Now the chief agency in promoting thought is discussion. And to secure the most general and most effective discussion of a principle must be embodied in concrete form and presented in practical policies, so that the people, being called to vote on it, shall be forced to think and talk about it.

The advocates of a great principle should know no thought of compromise. They should proclaim it in its fullness, and point to its complete attainment as their goal. But the zeal of the propagandist needs to be supplemented by the skill of the politician. While the one need not fear to arouse opposition, the other should seek to minimize resistance. The political art, like the military art, consists in meeting the greatest force against the point of least resistance, and to bring a principle most quickly and effectively into practical politics, the measure which presents it should be so moderate as (while involving the principle) to secure the largest support and excite the least resistance. For whether the first step be long or short is of little consequence. When a start is once made in a right direction, progress is a mere matter of keeping on.

It is in this way that great questions always enter the phase of political action. Important political battles begin with affairs of outposts, in themselves of little moment, and are generally decided upon issues joined not on the main question, but on some minor or collateral question. Thus the slavery question in the United States came into practical politics upon the issue of the extension of slavery to new territory, and was decisively settled upon the issue of secession. Regarded as an end, the abolitionist might well have looked with contempt on the proposals of the republicans, but these proposals were the means of bringing to realization what the abolitionists would in vain have sought to accomplish directly.

So with the tariff question. Whether we have a protective tariff or a revenue tariff is in itself of small importance, for, though the abolition of protection would increase production, the tendency to unequal distribution would be unaffected and would soon neutralize the gain. Yet, what is thus unimportant as an end, is all-important as a means. Protection is a little robber, it is true; but it is the sentinel and outpost of the great robber—the little robber who cannot be routed without carrying the struggle into the very stronghold of the great robber. The great robber is so well entrenched, and people have so long been used to his exactions, that it is hard to arouse them to assail him directly. But to help those engaged in a conflict with this little robber will be to open the easiest way to attack his master, and to arouse a spirit that must push on.

To secure to all the free use of the power to labor and the full enjoyment of its products, equal rights to land must be secured.

To secure equal rights to land there is in this stage of civilization but one way. Such measures as peasant proprietorship, or land limitation, or the reservation to actual settlers of what is left of the public domain, do not tend toward it; they lead away from it. They can affect only a comparatively unimportant class, and that temporarily, while their outcome is not to weaken land ownership but rather to strengthen it, by interesting a larger number in its maintenance. The only way to abolish private property in land is by the way of taxation. That way is clear and straightforward. It consists simply in abolishing, one after another, all imposts that are in their nature really taxes, and resorting for the revenues to economic rent, or ground value. The full abolition of land, and the complete emancipation of labor, it is of course, necessary that the whole of this value should be taken for the common benefit; but that will inevitably follow the

decision to collect from this source the revenues now needed, or even any considerable part of them, just as the entrance of a victorious army into a city follows the rout of the army that defended it.

In the United States the most direct way of moving on property in land is through local taxation, since that is already to some extent levied upon land values. And that is doubtless the way in which the final and decisive advance will be made. But national politics dominate state politics, and a question can be brought into discussion much more quickly and thoroughly as a national than as a local question.

Now to bring an issue into politics it is not necessary to form a party. Parties are not to be manufactured; they grow out of existing parties by the bringing forward of issues upon which men will divide.

We have, ready to our hand, in the tariff question, a means of bringing the whole subject of taxation, and, through it, the whole social question, into the fullest discussion.

As we have seen in the inquiry through which we have passed, the tariff question necessarily opens the whole social question. Any discussion of it to-day must go further and deeper than the anti-corn law agitation in Great Britain, or than the tariff controversies of whigs and democrats, for the progress of thought and the march of invention have made the distribution of wealth the burning question of our times. The making of the tariff question a national political issue must now mean the discussion in every newspaper, on every stump, and at every cross roads where two men meet, of questions of work and wages, of capital and labor, of the incidence of taxation, of the nature and rights of property, and of the question to which all these questions lead—the question of the relation of men to the planet on which they live. In this way more can be accomplished for popular economic education in a year than could otherwise be accomplished in decades.

Therefore it is that I would urge earnest men who aim at the emancipation of labor from the shackles of the past, to go to the front, to throw themselves into the free trade movement with might and main, and to force the tariff question to the front. It is not merely that the free trade side of the tariff controversy best consorts with the interest of labor; it is not merely that until workingmen get over thinking of labor as a poor thing that needs to be "protected," and of work as a dole from gracious capitalists or paternal government, they cannot rise to a sense of their rights; but it is that the movement for free trade is in reality the van of the struggle for the emancipation of labor. This is the way the best must go to untie his rope. It makes no difference how timorously the issue against protection is now presented; it is still the thin end of the wedge. It makes no difference how little we can hope at once to do; social progress is by steps, and the step to which we should address ourselves is always the next step.

Nor does it matter that those now active in the free trade movement have no sympathy with our aims; nor that they denounce and misrepresent us. It is our policy to support them, and strengthen them and urge them on. No matter how soon they may propose to stop, the direction they wish to take is the direction in which we must go if we would reach our goal. In joining our forces to theirs we shall not be putting ourselves to their use; we shall be making use of them. But these men themselves, when fairly started and borne on by the impulse of controversy, will go further than they now dream. It is the law of all such movements that they must become more and more radical.

Thus it is that when men take up the principle of freedom they are led on and on, and that the hearty advocacy of freedom to trade becomes at length the advocacy of freedom to labor. And so must it be in the United States. Once the tariff question becomes a national issue, and in the struggle against protection, free traders will be forced to attack indirect taxation. Protection is so well entrenched that before a revenue tariff can be secured the active spirits of the free trade party will have far passed the point when that would satisfy them; while before the abolition of indirect taxation is reached, the incidence of taxation and the nature and effect of private property in land will have been so well discussed that the rest will be but a matter of time.

An Echo at St. Stephen's.

The regular weekly meeting of St. Stephen's parishioners was held at an international hall on Friday evening of last week. The meeting was opened with singing by Miss Munier and part of her chorus, after which Secretary Rorty read a set of resolutions expressing the determination of the parishioners to cease holding any more meetings. This was in conformity with Dr. McGlynn's request. The resolutions were carried unanimously.

Mr. Cuffrey of Greenpoint then spoke of the affection they all had for Dr. McGlynn and said that although the Friday night meetings were stopped, yet he knew they would still continue to hold some kind of an organization. This was received with great applause. Referring to the anti-poverty movement he said: "You have seen there has been trouble in the ranks last week. There has been uneasiness. There is uneasiness in the minds of some who are too anxious for power (applause), some who don't fully understand the principles and the movement. (Applause.) But you are the representatives of one who, I believe, sees the goal and knows how to get there." (Applause.)

Mr. McDermott, one of the members of the parish, then made a short and effective speech on the cause of Dr. McGlynn. He also touched on the question which has been most in the minds of the members of the united labor party and the anti-poverty society, saying at one point, "I will do all I can to injure the democratic interests, and no one can carry me back to the democratic party on the tail of free trade." (Applause.)

Mr. George Smith followed Mr. McDermott, and confined himself almost exclusively to the question of ecclesiastical tyranny. Previous to his speech, Mr. W. T. Croasdale, who had entered the hall, took a seat on the platform at the request of Chairman Feeny. In response to calls from the audience, Mr. Feeny then introduced Mr. Croasdale, who spoke of the devotion of the parishioners to Dr. McGlynn. He then said: "I had no intention of making a speech here to-night, but, accidentally happening in here, and hearing two of the speeches, I should be false to myself if I did not say that I regret exceedingly that the influences around him have led Dr. McGlynn to make the statement he made the other night. I regret that any influences should have been exercised that led one of our principal leaders to separate from the other."

Dr. Coughlin was the next speaker. He spoke substantially as follows:

"Follow the doctor, no matter what he tells you to do; no matter what man stands in the way. (Applause.) The doctor sees the pres-

ent emergency clearer than any other member of the united labor party. (Applause.)

"Any man who really believes in the doctrines of the anti-poverty society cannot have the movement turned back. Way, it is so powerful that it seizes every member of his body and every fiber of his soul. What are we to stop when the politicians are praying that our party should be divided? Were Henry George to direct the party; were Dr. McGlynn, even as an individual, to direct the principles, the principles would remain. As long as Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn advocate the grand and noble truth that God gave the earth to mankind, so long will we follow both of them. (Applause.) But there is no moving backward, only onward and forward, on the part of men who believe in principles and are ready to stand up for them."

"Let me tell you, ladies and gentlemen, there is no man who can lead Dr. McGlynn. (Applause.) It may seem as though this gentleman led him or that gentleman led him, but when the emergency comes Dr. McGlynn thinks for himself. (Applause.)"

"Dr. McGlynn has made sacrifices that no other man in the anti-poverty society or the party has made. Then let us follow him. He is after good men for the anti-poverty society; men who will not sacrifice the anti-poverty society for themselves. (Great applause.) You know we have been organizing branches of the anti-poverty society in this city; we organized one down town last night. Now you have in this part of the city hundreds and hundreds of noble hearted men and women. You can organize here a great association. You can form here a branch of the anti-poverty society. (Applause.) Then the doctor can come to speak to you, whereas, he could not very well come to your parishioners meetings."

"Our doctrines are simple and easily understood. I learned the land question from the lips of men who did not know how to read. But there are other economic questions, such as the tariff question and the money question, which are complex and hard to understand."

Here the speaker gave an explanation of the rights of all to land and the taking of ground rents for public uses. Then he said:

"Do not hiss the name of any one who may be with us in great part. They will all be with us by and by. A year or two hence they will run and try to catch up with us."

"I may have my own opinions on many matters, but when I find a person who knows more than I do, and he says, 'This is right; do this,' I take his advice. No matter what anyone else says, do what Dr. McGlynn advises you to, and in doing that you will do what is right."

The chairman then made a few remarks, and adjourned the meeting sine die.

The Dr. McGlynn Fund.

The publisher of THE STANDARD acknowledges the receipt of \$3 from 'hammer, hammer' for the Dr. McGlynn fund.

True, Every Word.

NEW YORK.—The Eleventh assembly district organization of the united labor party has adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this assembly district that opinions expressed by any member of this party in advance of the general consent and endorsement of the party are mere individual opinions, and should be freed from the appearance of favoring partial tax reform as well as a seeming conflict with ecclesiastical authority.

Resolved, That no one man or dozen men can ever be greater than the whole party.

J. T. DARLING, Secretary.

The Canton, Ohio, Anti-Poverty Society.

CANTON, Ohio.—I may interest your readers to know that the application for a charter for the anti-poverty society of this city contains eighteen names. A majority of the applicants are mechanics, with two school teachers and one painter. Some of the ladies are very proficient musicians.

I should like to give my ideal of an anti-poverty certificate of membership. It should be the work of an artist who has seen the cat, and would show, in sharp contrast, the evils of poverty and the blessings that may be hoped for from the adoption of the single tax. A picture of Brown's meadow before and after the marble deal, or some equally striking object lesson would be a good idea.

A. E. KESSELY.

THE STANDARD.

BENNY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
3 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers in every office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1888.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Thursday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

PLATFORM OF THE UNITED LABOR PARTY.

Adopted at Syracuse August 19, 1887.

We, the delegates of the united labor party of New York, in state convention assembled, hereby reassert, as the fundamental platform of the party, and the basis on which we ask the cooperation of citizens of other states, the following declaration of principles adopted on September 25, 1884, by the convention of trade and labor associations of the city of New York, that resulted in the formation of the united labor party.

"Holding that the corruption of government and the impoverishment of labor result from neglect of the self-interest of the people, and that the only remedy is a republic that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, we aim at the abolition of the system which makes men pay their fellow-men for the use of God's gifts to all, and permits monopolizers to deprive labor of natural opportunities and employment, thus driving the hand with tramp and pauper and bringing about an unnatural competition which tends to reduce wages to starvation rates and to make the wealth producer the industrial slave of the non-producer."

"Holding, moreover, that the advantages arising from social growth and improvement belong to society at large, we aim at the abolition of the system which makes such beneficial inventions as the railroad and telegraph means for the oppression of the people and the aggrandizement of an aristocracy of wealth and power. We demand the right of government to be the maintenance of that sacred right of property which gives every citizen an opportunity to employ his labor, and secure the fruits of his industry, and to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and the unscrupulous from robbing the honest, and to do for the equal benefit of all such things as can better be done by organized society than by individuals, and we demand that all laws which give to any class of citizens advantages, either judicial, financial, industrial or political, that are not equally available to all others."

"We call upon all who seek the emancipation of labor, and who would make the American union and its component states democratic commonwealths of really free and independent citizens, to ignore all minor differences and join with us in adopting a grand national party on this broad platform of natural rights and equal justice. We do not aim at securing any forced equality in the distribution of wealth. We do not propose that the state shall attempt to control production, conduct distribution, or in any wise interfere with the freedom of the individual to use his labor as he pleases in any way that may seem proper to him and that will not interfere with the equal rights of others. Nor do we propose that the state shall take possession of land and either work it or rent it out. What we propose is not the disturbing of any man in the holding of title, but by adjusting all the rights of property to its products, to leave to the producer the full fruits of his exertion and by the taxation of land values, exclusive of improvements, to devote to the common use and benefit those values, which, arising not from the exertion of the individual, but from the growth of society, belong justly to the community as a whole. This increased taxation of land, not according to area, but according to its value, must, relieving the working farmer and small homestead owner of the undue burden now imposed upon them, make it unprofitable to hold land for speculation, and thus throw open abundant opportunities for the employment of labor and the building up of homes."

"While thus simplifying government by doing away with the burden of offices required by the present system of taxation and by its incentives to fraud and corruption, we will further promote the common weal and further secure the equal rights of all by placing under democratic control such agencies as are in their nature monopolies. We would have our monopolies supply their inhabitants with water, light and heat; we would have the general government issue all money, without the interference of the banks, and we would have a telegraph system and postal savings banks to the postal service, and would assume public control and ownership of those from roads which have become the highways of modern commerce."

"While declaring the foregoing to be the fundamental principles and aims of the united labor party, we are fully conscious that no reform can give effectual and permanent relief to labor that does not involve the legal recognition of equal rights to natural opportunities. We nevertheless, as measures of relief from some of the evils of the present system, favor such legislation as may tend to reduce the hours of labor, to prevent the employment of children of tender years, to avoid the competition of convict labor with honest industry, to secure the sanitary inspection of tenements, factories and mines, and to put an end to the abuse of conspiracy laws."

"We desire also to so simplify the procedure of our courts and diminish the expense of legal proceedings, that the poor may be placed on an equality with the rich and the long delays which now result in scandalous miscarriages of justice may be prevented."

"As one of the means by which we aim at the removal of the political and social grievances which are so sorely felt, we especially and emphatically declare for the adoption of what is known as the 'Australian system of voting,' in order that the electoral process of the ballot and the relief of candidates for public office from the heavy expense of the present system, may prevent bribery and intimidation, do away with practical discriminations in favor of the rich and unscrupulous, and lessen the pernicious influence of money in politics."

"In support of these aims we seek the cooperation of all patriotic citizens who seek the degradation of all parties, desire by constitutional methods to establish justice, to preserve liberty, to extend the spirit of humanity, and to elevate humanity."

THE UNVANISHED TRUTH.

Recent evidences of differences between prominent members of the united labor party in this city have caused general regret among friends of the movement everywhere and profound sorrow to many of those immediately concerned. A desire to avoid an open rupture has caused many warmly devoted to the principles of the party to maintain silence, even under misrepresentation and abuse. The time has come, however, when the interests of the cause demand that the truth shall be plainly told.

In order to understand the situation we must go back to the early days of the party in this city. The organization accepted its defeat in 1886 as a great moral victory. It held a mass meeting to celebrate that victory in Cooper union on November 6. At that jubilee meeting it was resolved that steps should immediately be taken to begin the formation of a national party to represent the principles of the Clarendon hall platform. A resolution was adopted by acclamation ap-

pointing John McMackin, Rev. Edward McGlynn, D.D., and Professor David B. Scott a central committee for the purpose. This committee organized with Dr. McGlynn as chairman and it employed Gaybert Barnes as secretary and established itself at No. 28 Cooper union. Professor Scott withdrew from the committee.

Mr. Barnes devised a scheme of organizing land and labor clubs throughout the country, and thought that a charge of \$5 for a charter followed by a small per capita tax on the members would bring in a fund that would meet the expenses of the committee. This hope was not realized, and it has long been an open secret that the expenses of room 28 have been met out of the pocket of Dr. McGlynn, aided by the receipts of such lectures as he has delivered for pay. This central committee had no jurisdiction over the united labor party in New York city, and drew its only authority from the mass meeting held after the election in 1886. Nevertheless, some members of the county committee of the united labor party claimed the right to exercise some measure of supervision over the committee, and a formidable movement to attack Mr. Barnes was threatened by A. A. Levey, esq., and others in the county committee early in 1887. Mr. McMackin, who was also chairman of that committee, sat down on this effectively by refusing to recognize the member who proposed making the motion. After the withdrawal of Professor Scott, James Redpath was chosen by the other members to fill the vacancy, but he has been an invalid ever since his appointment and his attendance at its meetings has always been irregular. Practically the committee consisted of Dr. McGlynn, John McMackin and last, but by no means least, Gaybert Barnes. These gentlemen considered it astonishing impudence on the part of the united labor party of New York city to make any attempt to inquire into their affairs, since that party contributed nothing to the support of this "land and labor committee."

When the time came for calling a state convention the county committees of New York and Kings invited the land and labor committee to join with them in the call, and agreed with it as to the representation in the convention of the land and labor clubs it had organized in the state of New York. The socialists, after they were ousted, complained that this committee had used its authority to pack the convention against them, but an examination of the votes will show that they got more support from those brought into the convention by this committee than they received from New York and Brooklyn.

The convention met at Syracuse on Aug. 17, 1887, and remained in session three days. It adopted the present platform of the party and nominated a full state ticket, headed by Henry George for secretary of state. Mr. George strenuously objected to becoming a candidate, and Dr. McGlynn insisted that it was his duty to accept. Finally, yielding to the unanimous demand of the convention, Mr. George accepted, and Dr. McGlynn being loudly called for, mounted the platform and said:

"I am not here to congratulate our leader, our teacher and our apostle upon the unanimous nomination by this convention for the highest office for which the people of this state are to vote in the coming election. It is no matter of congratulation with Mr. George except in the sense in which we might congratulate a martyr whom we had seen going smiling on, tenacious of his purpose, to the stake or to the block. (Applause.) I think I know the man whom you in placing in nomination have thereby exceedingly honored yourselves. I think I know him as well as any other man knows him, and I know that there is no selfish aim in that heart of his. (Applause.) I know him as if he were a true friend of a true friend of him, that whatever office man could hold in this world, if he shall ever hold it, the office will have to seek him."

Among the resolutions adopted by the convention, but forming no part of the platform, was the following:

"Whereas, At a conference of members of the united labor party of the states of Ohio and Indiana, held in Cincinnati on July 4, resolutions were adopted urging the central land and labor committee to take steps for calling a national conference; therefore, be it resolved, That, in view of the near approach of the national contest, this convention joins with our brethren of the west in requesting the chairman of our state committee to co-operate with the land and labor committee to issue a call for a national conference of such organizations of citizens of other states as may be disposed to act with the united labor party of New York, in forming a great national party."

In the course of the proceedings a communication was received from a committee representing the union labor party asking a conference. It was received with a storm of hisses and laid on the table without reading, and it was with great difficulty that this motion was reconsidered. The communication was then read and the chairman of the convention, John McMackin, was directed to return it to those from whom it emanated with the information that the united labor party refused to treat with them.

Before adjournment the convention elected a state committee. After the convention adjourned this committee met and elected J. H. Blakeney chairman and Gaybert Barnes secretary. At the same time it chose an executive committee consisting of Dr. Edward McGlynn, John McMackin and Hugh Whorisky of New York, and Victor A. Wilder and Gaybert Barnes of Brooklyn, and since that time the state committee has held but one meeting.

The executive committee organized by electing Dr. McGlynn chairman and treasurer and Gaybert Barnes secretary, and it established its headquarters at room 28 Cooper union, hiring the adjoining room during the campaign for clerks. This committee managed the canvass of 1887. It will be noted that Dr. McGlynn, John McMackin and Gaybert Barnes, who practically constitute the land and labor committee, also constitute a majority of the

executive committee. There was much grumbling about the close corporation character of the party's management and at the failure of those concerned to consult with any other members of the party. Henry George, though the head of the ticket, was not consulted as to the management of the campaign, and the state committee was ignored.

Some time after the disastrous defeat of last year a correspondence began in the columns of THE STANDARD as to the expediency of entering the national canvass. At about the same time Henry George delivered in the Academy of Music, at the joint invitation of the Seventh assembly district and the executive committee of the anti-poverty society, an address on the president's tariff message, Mr. George warmly commended this message as a step, however short, in the right direction. Dr. McGlynn was present and made a few remarks commendatory of Mr. George's speech. Up to that time there was little thought apparently of a national ticket, and Dr. McGlynn was strongly in favor of changing the name of the party.

Suddenly there was a change of sentiment in room 28, and Mr. Barnes began to openly lament that the labor party was cursed with such leadership as that of Henry George, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. George had for a long time been excluded from all share in the management of the party. There were strong hints that Mr. George was going over to the democrats. The great importance of retaining the word "labor" in the party's name was urged, and any declaration for or against free trade in a national platform was deprecated. At last, a few weeks ago, Mr. George, after a previous talk with Dr. McGlynn, was invited to come to room 28 and bring some friends with him. He invited Louis F. Post, James W. Sullivan and Wm. T. Croasdale to accompany him, and Dr. McGlynn, John McMackin and Gaybert Barnes were found there. An informal conversation followed. There was no objection made by any one present to the calling of the national conference provided for by the Syracuse resolutions. There was comparatively little talk as to the expediency of nominating a national ticket, though that subject was considered. The main discussion was as to the propriety or possibility of making a national platform without some declaration on the subject of the tariff. Finally, Dr. McGlynn asked Mr. George if he would not be satisfied with the Syracuse platform in a national canvass. Mr. George said he would not without the addition of a plank relating to the tariff, which nothing could now stop from becoming a national issue. This is the remark which Mr. Barnes has since perverted in his declaration that Mr. George had said to him that he would not support a candidate running on the united labor platform.

The discussion was inconclusive, and finally Mr. Post asked Mr. Barnes what they proposed to do. Mr. Barnes replied that they would go right on and call a convention and nominate a ticket. Mr. Post asked where that would leave those who had not yet made up their minds as to the expediency of nominating a ticket. Mr. Barnes replied that they would be left out, that no one opposed to the object of the convention "had" any business in it. This proposal to leave out Messrs. George, Post and others on the mere dictum of three men in room 28 excited the ire of Mr. Croasdale, and he told them that they had no right or authority to take such action. The Syracuse resolution provided for calling a conference, not a convention, and the representatives of the party from all parts of the country must attend that conference and decide for themselves as to whether a convention should be held, and it was not in the power of those gathered in that room to decide such an important question in advance.

Mr. Barnes and Dr. McGlynn objected to the great expense of two national gatherings, and Mr. Post said there need not be two. If the conference decided on nominations it could turn itself into a convention and nominate candidates. The question of expense being thus brought up, the talk turned in that direction, and Mr. Barnes remarked that it would only be necessary to make a vigorous campaign in those states that were "anybody's states." On being asked to name them, he replied Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Indiana. The remark was then made by some one that that would be obviously a campaign in aid of the republican party. Mr. Barnes did not deny this, but declared that it was necessary to our cause that the republican party should win. If the democratic party wins this year, he said, it would be useless to propose any reform. Dr. McGlynn followed with the declaration that the democratic party was so thoroughly identified with the Roman Catholic machine that its defeat was imperatively necessary. Mr. George and his friends then withdrew.

Since that time systematic inspired attacks have been made on Mr. George. Again, proposals have been put forth tentatively to make a union with the union labor party and even with the socialists. A party believing nothing in particular is wanted to hold the balance of power in certain states, for the unaccounted purpose of electing the republican candidate for the presidency. Yet Henry George is denounced, first secretly, and then openly, for trying to sidetrack the issue that he taught these very people and for seeking to deliver the united labor party to the democrats. He has talked out openly in the columns of THE STANDARD, inviting a free discussion of the matter,

while those denouncing him have plotted in secret. He has never proposed that the united labor party shall endorse or assist the democratic candidates, while his accusers have deliberately planned to run it in the interest of the republicans. Hoping the foolish scheme originated by Secretary-General Barnes would fall through, Mr. George has silently submitted to secret misrepresentation rather than take the initiative in provoking a rupture that every friend of the principles enunciated in the Syracuse platform will deplore. Now that the open charge has come, Mr. George is bound to speak, and in justice to him and to the cause that he above all others represents, the truth must be told.

Let the hasty and ill-informed who are swift to judge without knowledge ask themselves a few questions.

Have any three men, however good and great, the right to sit in room 28, Cooper Union, and, without advice or consultation with others, to speak and act for the united labor party of this city and state?

Have those three men under the terms of the Syracuse resolution the power to decide the momentous question of nomination or no nomination for the whole country?

Have those three men any right to refuse to speedily call a conference to settle just such questions?

Remembering the treatment of the socialists and union labor men at Syracuse, would it not be a usurpation of power without parallel for these three men to attempt to join the united labor party with those organizations in a national convention?

Is it not sidetracking the united labor party and all that it represents to deliberately plot its ruin forever by making it play the Ben Butler farce of '84 in the coming campaign?

Let honest men who have sense as well as enthusiasm stop their paroxysmal howl about the importance of maintaining a great principle by a national canvass long enough to think over these questions and calmly answer them, and then they may begin to see that the man who taught them the land doctrine, and who was so recently saluted by Dr. McGlynn as "our leader, our teacher and our apostle," in whose heart "there is no selfish spot," has again been "going smiling on, tenacious of his purpose," though wounded in his tenderest affections, seeking, without scandal, to save the party he has twice led from going down in everlasting infamy amidst the jeering ridicule that overwhelmed the Butler fiasco four years ago.

Let our friends throughout the country remember this: Mr. George and his friends have never for a moment opposed the calling of a conference of representative men to decide the question of the nomination and all other questions, but they have insisted that no three or more men in this city shall decide so important a question. They have never advocated any alliance with the democratic party, but they have resisted a deliberate conspiracy to make the united labor party the cat's paw of the republican party in the coming canvass, conducting a campaign that must be carried on with republican money, if at all. They share Dr. McGlynn's resentment against the shameful alliance between the democratic and ecclesiastical machines in this city, but even this is not sufficient to make them assistant republicans for the sake of putting some such man as Chauncey Depew in the White house, and still further confirming foolish workmen in the high tariff delusion, which has kept so many of them from seeing the true cause of the evils that beset them. Mr. George and his friends want the party held together on local lines, leaving its members individually free in the national contest; and, knowing all they do, they believe that thus, and thus only, can corrupt alliances with one or the other of the two old parties be prevented.

WM. T. CROASDALE,
LOUIS F. POST,
J. W. SULLIVAN.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

There are certain matters connected with the formation and history of the Anti-poverty society regarding which it seems to me desirable that the readers of THE STANDARD should be informed.

After Dr. McGlynn had been expelled from the pastorate of St. Stephen's in January, 1887, and while he was still confined to his house by the illness which followed that expulsion, it occurred to me that the doctor's announced purpose to devote his life to the furtherance of the cause of industrial emancipation would be largely added if there could be organized a society devoted to the advocacy of the religious principle involved in the doctrine of the single tax—the principle of the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man—as distinguished from the purely economic principle. Having sufficiently matured my ideas I submitted them first to Henry George and Louis F. Post, and next to Dr. McGlynn, and finally, on March 2, to a meeting of a few gentlemen at the office of THE STANDARD. The result was the formation of the Anti-poverty society, the name being of my selection.

Between the organizing meeting on March 26 and the first public meeting at Chickering hall on May 1, weekly meetings of the society were held, at which plans of action were discussed. Although none of us anticipated the marvelous success which the society actually achieved, we all felt confidence in its future, and were anxious to surround it with safeguards which might prevent its being "sidetracked" from its original purpose.

Dr. McGlynn, who had been chosen

president of the society, pointed out to us that as soon as the society should commence its public career there would be an immediate influx of members from St. Stephen's parish. He desired above all things to avoid doing anything that might look like the founding of a new church, and to be assured that the society would do nothing which might further complicate his already very complicated relations with the Roman Catholic church. It was felt by the members of the society that if the election of the executive committee were left to the society, the zeal of the new members from St. Stephen's might outrun their discretion, with the effect of placing Dr. McGlynn in an embarrassing position. It was decided, therefore, that the executive committee should be appointed by the president, and a provision to that effect was inserted in the constitution. Dr. McGlynn thoroughly understood that this was done, not for the purpose of clothing him with despotic, irresponsible power, which I, for one, should never have thought of assisting in doing, but simply to afford him a reasonable security against being forced into a false position. In the appointment of the original executive committee, and in subsequent appointments for months following, Dr. McGlynn consulted the members of the society and appointed on their nomination. The only nominations which in the early days of the society he declined to ratify were those of members of St. Stephen's parish.

I was appointed chairman of the executive committee, and in that capacity had frequent consultations with Dr. McGlynn in regard to the affairs of the society. When the first meeting at Chickering hall was followed by a wave of enthusiasm sweeping over the whole country, and it became evident that the society had a magnificent future before it, it was suggested to me by several members of the executive committee that the committee might very properly be enlarged, and especially that it would be improved by adding to it several of the ladies who in New York and elsewhere were giving evidence of their devotion to the cause. I communicated this suggestion to Dr. McGlynn, first privately, and afterward at a meeting of the committee. On both occasions he approved of the idea, and at the committee meeting where it was mentioned he promptly appointed three ladies as members of the committee, and requested that the committee would consider and suggest other names.

None of the ladies so appointed ever appeared at a committee meeting. When several weeks had passed without their appearance, I inquired of the secretary, Michael Clarke, if they had been duly notified, and was informed that the doctor had rescinded their appointments, and decided to place no women upon the committee.

I called upon Dr. McGlynn for an explanation at the earliest possible moment, meeting him by appointment in the hallway of Cooper union, after the close of a meeting which he had been addressing.

To my astonishment Dr. McGlynn denounced women in general as chatterboxes, "who were always shooting off their mouths," and as unfit for such positions; and in particular he spoke abusively of one of the women whom he himself had appointed, urging as a crowning reason for rescinding her appointment, that her husband had spoken disrespectfully of Mr. Gaybert Barnes.

I ought perhaps to have brought matters to a head at once by making a statement to the executive committee and demanding that action be taken. I blame myself now that I did not. But I foresaw that such a course would involve the ruin of the society and I indulged the hope that Dr. McGlynn's devotion to the cause would be sufficient to restrain him from indulging his personal animosities and prejudices any further. The incident produced a profound impression on me, however, and was one of the reasons which decided me to resign the chairmanship of the executive committee, which I shortly afterward did.

At a subsequent meeting of the executive committee the treasurer, Mr. Benjamin Urner (having of course no knowledge of my experience), brought up the question of lady members again, and moved that the president be requested to appoint a certain number of ladies—I think three—as members of the committee, supporting his motion with a temperate and dignified speech. One or two other members spoke to the motion, myself among the number, when Mr. Gaybert Barnes proposed as an amendment "that the president should at the same time be requested to nominate new members to take the place of those who would immediately resign if such a motion should be carried, among whom would be Edward McGlynn, John McMackin and Gaybert Barnes." I quote the amendment from memory. Before any one else could speak Henry George interposed, rebuking Mr. Barnes, and the amendment and original motion were both allowed to drop. But it was from that moment evident to my mind that the Anti-poverty society was regarded as the property of Dr. McGlynn, and that Mr. Barnes felt himself secure in his control over the doctor. Having already resigned my office as chairman of the executive committee, I therefore ceased to attend the meetings of the committee, being present at none up to that of last Monday evening. Had I been disposed to attend, however, it would have been impossible for me to do so, as the time of meeting of the executive committee was immediately changed so as to render it impossible for me to attend without neglecting my duties to THE STANDARD.

T. L. MCCREARY.

BENJAMIN URNER'S STATEMENT.

ELIZABETH N. J., Feb. 14.—I was one of the original organizers of the anti-poverty society, and was elected treasurer at its first meeting. From the first I apprehended evil results in the future work of the society from that feature of its by-laws which made the president elective by the society and gave him the appointment of its executive committee. The reasons given for this unusual feature never seemed to me to have any weight to overbalance the serious danger to the society, but I nevertheless accepted the views of those better acquainted than I was with Dr. McGlynn, and was reassured by the intention that the society should be incorporated, in which case the objectionable feature would be necessarily removed.

At first the by-law limited the committee to fifteen. Subsequently it was altered so that the number might be increased. The intention of this was to give the president the opportunity to appoint a few desirable persons who had been omitted in the first appointment of fifteen, of which persons it was certainly expected by many that some should be women.

In common with a considerable majority of the members of the executive committee, I was extremely desirous that some of the many earnest and able women of the society should participate in its active work and direction. As Dr. McGlynn continued to disappoint us in the matter, in July I brought it before the committee. It was under discussion at several meetings, during which Mr. John McMackin expressed extremely old-fashioned sentiments as to the functions of women, denying them any place in affairs outside of their households; and on Aug. 11, I made a motion "that the president be requested to appoint three ladies as members of the executive committee." This was strenuously opposed by Mr. Gaybert Barnes, who asserted that if the motion prevailed he would resign from the committee, and that he had good reason to believe that Dr. McGlynn and John McMackin would resign also. This prevented the passage of the motion. On the next day I addressed a letter, of which the following is the copy of a portion, to Dr. McGlynn:

My Dear Sir: At yesterday's meeting of the executive committee of our society, the committee having under consideration a motion "that the president be requested to appoint three ladies as members of the executive committee," Mr. Gaybert Barnes made a statement that he knew that you were strenuously opposed to the appointment of ladies on the executive committee, and that he felt very confident that if the motion prevailed you would resign the presidency of the society. As the member of the committee who has been urging the wisdom of the appointment of women to the committee managing a work which so largely appeals to the sympathies and best efforts of women, I think that it is proper and not at all presumptuous for me to inquire whether Mr. Barnes spoke "as by authority" from you in making the statement mentioned, and whether you would, in fact, have resigned had the motion prevailed? . . .

It seems to me, permit me to say, extremely unfortunate that Mr. Barnes should have forced this matter to such an issue by making the statement relating to yourself, and adding that he himself, and he was very sure Mr. McMackin also, would resign from the committee if the motion prevailed. It would seem that if Mr. Barnes took that position after consultation with those whom he assumed to speak, and spoke as by authority, that an alternative is clearly forced upon the supporters of the motion to the same extreme conclusion as the threat of the other side. I have thought it well to inquire of you privately in the matter rather than risk an excited discussion by bringing it up in committee. Yours, very respectfully,

BENJ. URNER.

To this letter Dr. McGlynn made no written reply, but about two weeks later, in THE STANDARD office, he called me aside, earnestly apologized for not having made a written reply, and said that of course Mr. Barnes had not been authorized by him to make the statement about his resigning in case my motion prevailed. I then called his attention to the fact that our cause appealed strongly to the sympathies of women by its charity and simple justice, so easily applied and to be so largely beneficial in uplifting the poor and the distressed, said that we greatly needed the woman quality in our work; that they were a large portion of the membership of the society, and that simple justice required that they should share in its management. I also said that by doing this act of justice to the women of the society we would not only be doing right to them and good to the society, but we would show our sympathy with the general cause of the advancement of women. To all this he replied that he sympathized with the views which I expressed, but that certain members of the committee would not stay in it if women were admitted, and that he thought we had better not force them to resign. Upon my asking if he knew the grounds upon which such persons opposed the measure he stated that the presence of women in the committee would probably restrain the freedom of the male members by compelling them to keep their coats on and not smoke! He further said that women were very jealous creatures, and if a few were appointed the rest would be disappointed, also that the women who would expect the appointment were not those he would prefer to appoint. I mentioned to him the names of several ladies whose high standing and character would win for their appointment the approval of all members of the society, both male and female, but did not shake his final decision.

The doctor's action in this matter convinced me that he was not actuated by the highest motives, that he was largely controlled by Messrs. McMackin and Barnes, and that he was determined to conduct affairs, not subordinate to the will of the executive committee, but by

his own arbitrary saw from this the Anti-pov from its inde the reforms come a mere of which Dr Mackin and ors, and that sense of duty mere tool t honesty of w determined i the commi selves to t off the th for evil. While waiti that the soc many things conduct of n these were D tency in bu sent to him d reported, and were not rep quiry and cor charging any in this matter lieve, grew o inattention t office, such as of members noyance. B been very ca convinced c in the u in other v ciety more a carry out no really to carr parties, whic selfish. In r tained my r thinking that that members the cause, an in which I ha in forcing the fully display that course.

ANXI

The merch many to be : luxuriously a the best of a almost fanati conditions a contempt on i it is a questi reason than t fied with t situation. T menace to al individual enter to the care t sands of the their dispos forced to lea and to enter speculation. stantly on tl between high

Here is a \$20,000 in or business in a He sends for he wants \$20 That is, the n promissory m and indorsed mon method city, and if t fair reputati ports that he per cent per mission of on the merchant at the end of probably exte He may be ea his investme two and one and turn ov year. Under well afford to money he nee perity makes such circums count would diminish.

In course of man a period perhaps rival cut into his ti money becau on it over and he now has n maturing ob and worth v present usual He sends for individual is He says: "I aloot on thi that I cannot name paper a back present per cent is merchant ha to the loss e market.

If there is prices rise the be new rates myself, will a cry that In prices ca actually had things do not He will have twelve per ce measure and on all his oth to get than t per cent. U or the bett till. The m ver by mon is paper goe

his own arbitrary authority. I thought I saw from this and other indications that the Anti-poverty society would be diverted from its independent work of propagating the reforms which we advocated and become a mere annex to a political machine of which Dr. McGlynn and Messrs. McMackin and Barnes were the manipulators, and that it would not accord with my sense of duty or self respect to become a mere tool to carry out purposes the honesty of which I suspected. I therefore determined that unless the members of the committee would rouse themselves to the necessity of throwing off the things which were making for evil, I would resign my office. While waiting, in hope and expectancy that the society would be incorporated, many things conspired to annoy me in the conduct of my important office. Among these were Dr. McGlynn's utter incompetence in business matters. Remittances sent to him directly were not immediately reported, and in one or more instances were not reported at all, causing much inquiry and correspondence. I am far from charging any dishonesty upon the doctor in this matter; the difficulty, as I fully believe, grew out of his carelessness. His inattention to the clerical duties of his office, such as delay in signing certificates of membership, was another cause of annoyance. But all these things could have been very easily endured had I not been convinced of a constant tendency, in the use of its funds and in other ways, to make the society more and more a mere machine to carry out nominally political objects, but really to carry out the purposes of a few parties, which I believed to be entirely selfish. In resigning as treasurer I retained my membership in the committee, thinking that a time might come when that membership might prove of use to the cause, and the events of last evening, in which I had a very minor participation, in forcing the evil element in the society to fully display itself, justify the wisdom of that course.

BENJ. URNER.

ANXIOUS MERCHANTS.

The merchants of New York seem to many to be men to be envied. They live luxuriously and appear to regard this as the best of all possible worlds. They are almost fanatical upholders of the existing conditions and look with either alarm or contempt on the discontent of labor. Yet it is a question if they have any better reason than the working people to be satisfied with the political and business situation. The "trust," that gigantic menace to all private business and individual enterprise, looms up to add terror to the care that already oppresses thousands of them. No matter what may be their disposition they find themselves forced to leave the old and beaten paths and to enter more or less the field of speculation. Many of them are constantly on the ragged edge alternating between high hope and utter despair.

Here is a case that is largely typical: An apparently successful merchant needs \$20,000 in order that he may extend his business in a perfectly legitimate way. He sends for a broker and tells him that he wants \$20,000 on single name paper. That is, the merchant proposes to put out promissory notes drawn to his own order and indorsed by himself. This is a common method of borrowing money in this city, and if the house be a solvent one of fair reputation the broker probably reports that he can get the money at eight per cent per annum and his own commission of one-eighth of one per cent. If the merchant wants these notes renewed at the end of three or four months he can probably extend the loan at the same rate. He may be earning far more than this on his investment. He will probably make two and one-half per cent on his goods and turn over his capital eight times a year. Under such circumstances he can well afford to pay eight per cent for all the money he needs, and his manifest prosperity makes it easy to obtain it. Under such circumstances his bills payable account would probably increase rather than diminish.

In course of time there comes to such a man a period of stagnation in business, or perhaps rivals, by more pushing methods, cut into his trade. Instead of borrowing money because he can make a good profit on it over and above the interest he pays, he now has urgent need of a loan to meet maturing obligations for goods on hand and worth what they have cost, but at present unsalable without a great sacrifice. He sends for his broker again, but that individual is not so cheerfully confident. He says: "Mr. Blank, you have \$60,000 about on this market, and I greatly fear that I cannot float any more of your single name paper at eight per cent." He comes back presently and declares that twelve per cent is the best he can do. The merchant had better pay that than submit to the loss of forcing his goods in the market.

If there is now a turn for the better and prices rise the goods will probably go off, the new rates be met and the merchant, himself, will have no hesitation in telling a story that at such a time a certain fall in prices caught him so badly that he actually had to pay twelve per cent; but if things do not change the case is different. He will have to renew this last loan at twelve per cent. His credit falls to that measure and he must pay twelve per cent on all his other loans, and money is harder to get than it was when he paid but eight per cent. Unless there is a speedy change for the better his credit will fall lower still. The merchant begins to be talked over by money lenders. Some one holding a paper goes to one of the lenders who

take big risks for big profits and asks what he will give for \$10,000 of Mr. Blank's paper. The answer is probably eighteen per cent off. The holder thinks Blank will do better than that himself, and probably, if alarmed, offers it to him at fifteen. Blank cannot take it then, but sends for his broker to borrow \$10,000 at any rate he can under fifteen per cent. And so the process goes on until Blank must pay eighteen per cent a year for ever dollar he borrows. After this has gone on for a little time he is compelled to "make a statement." His creditors look through his affairs so that they can judge for themselves the risk that they are taking, and they either force a suspension or help the man through. They wish to help him through if possible, for their money is at stake.

Nor is this situation, fraught with care and anxiety, confined to the merchants whose capital has been impaired. Twenty years ago two young men had a business, partly manufacturing and partly mercantile. They enjoyed wonderful prosperity, and in a single year made \$68,000 profits on a capital of \$70,000. Of course others were promptly attracted into the business, and though their trade doubled during the following five years, they did not make during the whole period as much profit as they had made in that single lucky year. Then came another good time, and though profits did not proportionately increase, the demand necessitated the erection of a costly factory building. The firm was a prosperous one, but it was now more difficult for it to make a profit of \$15,000 on a capital of \$165,000 than it had previously been to make \$68,000 on \$70,000.

Trade was good, but the cost of doing business was greater. The new building and more costly plant increased rent and taxes. Rivalry demanded of the firm new efforts to keep their own goods before the public. Thousands of dollars were spent in advertising and in the employment of traveling salesmen. The business continued to grow, but so did the necessity for its growth. The partners had to keep an eye on the market. A corner in certain metals would seriously affect their business. They had to buy largely of such metals in anticipation of a rise. The same was true of certain other raw materials. They could, of course, have bought for future delivery in the market, but a future bought of a broker who might burst would not meet their wants. At the right season they must have their raw material in their factory at any cost, or cease to do business. They were a solid firm with a large capital, yet exigencies like these might cause them to become large borrowers. If prices of materials thus bought remained high they would make money, but if they fell their smaller rivals in trade who bought materials as they needed them would undersell them because of this fall. It would be easy to imagine conditions under which such a firm might have to pay unreasonable prices for a renewal of its paper, and thereby be led into the difficulties first described.

This is no fancy sketch. A majority of the business men of New York pass through such experiences several times in their career, and an enormous proportion of them are never out of difficulty. The matters claiming their attention become more complex from year to year, and the drain of rent and interest is continuous, the former ever increasing and the latter constantly fluctuating. It is very doubtful if one-third of the business houses in this city could meet their obligations to-day if suddenly called on to do so. Care and anxiety is the rule, and the dread of bankruptcy has for thousands of seemingly prosperous men all the terror that the dread of starvation has for the very poor. Is it any wonder that we read of suicides among those living in wealth? Is it any wonder that, where it is possible, those engaged in one line of business seek security from the fluctuations of the market by forming combinations, pools and trusts?

Yet certainty of a steady business would obviate the main cause of this uncertainty and maddening anxiety. Give labor unrestricted access to natural opportunities and there will never be a dearth of raw materials. Give to the workmen thus kept busy the full fruits of their toil and we shall never fail to see a market for all the desirable things that ingenuity can fashion and skilled labor produce. Mistakes of judgment might be made, but they would have to be enormous mistakes in order to work disaster to every one—such mistakes as never yet have been seen, for there never have been more manufactured goods in this country than could have easily found a profitable market if the people wanting them had had money, and there have never been crops too big to find profitable exchange had trade been free.

Have merchants not more reason than some of them imagine for considering on their own account the remedies for the evils that shut labor out from production and at the same time curtail the purchasing power of the people? Let them ask themselves if they also are not ground between this upper and nether millstone of land monopoly.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE REAL ESTATE BROKER.

The Chicago real estate board recently had its annual banquet, and, if the pictures with which the Chicago Herald garnishes its report of the proceedings are accurate likenesses, the real estate brokers of that city are a jolly, well fed and prosperous body of men. There were speeches, of course, and some of them were more interesting than the speakers themselves intended.

Ex-Governor Hamilton said that during the early days in Illinois real estate brokers

were known as "land sharks," and he congratulated them on their improved position. Alexander S. Porter, a real estate broker of Boston, said that in the old days a real estate broker was that and nothing more, but that to-day he is a leader in almost every enterprise throughout the country, be it a building syndicate, a railway line or a water company. "He is," said Mr. Porter, "the promoter and director of capital, and has done more than any one else to build up our great cities and towns." Waxing eloquent he said: "Gentlemen, I believe we have just begun; the play is not half over, and I predict for you an even more brilliant and successful future."

All of this must have been highly gratifying to the prosperous professional gentleman who has within the memory of men still living been evolved from the despised "land shark." The latter was the man who ran ahead of the pioneers in the early days of settlement and grabbed the choice places in order that he might make the less nimble settler pay for the privilege of using them. Things have changed since then, and the descendants of the emigrants who cursed the land sharks are anxious, as capitalists, to employ the services of the shrewd specialists who can point out to them (for a commission) the opportunities constantly opening to gain over those still coming here, through birth or immigration, just precisely the advantage that the land shark obtained over the original settlers; and so the real estate broker is the promoter of everything that tends to raise the rental value of land in order to give his clients the power to tax every form of that industry which constitutes or creates what we call our wonderful modern progress.

As the real estate broker reaps large profits from this system he naturally wants it continued, and it is not surprising that in response to a toast declaring that the strength of a republican nation "is in its humble, but well ordered homes" Colonel R. C. Givens should protest against any questioning of the sacredness of the right of private ownership in land. Colonel Givens' statement of what he called the Henry George theory was as remarkable as his history of the experiences of the Pilgrim fathers in the common ownership of land and as truthful as his declaration that in this country ownership of land is almost thrust upon its citizens, and that the ordinary laborer is the owner of a humble but happy home. Such post prandial eloquence at so late an hour naturally begot courage, and the gallant colonel gave reasons why the progeny of the ancient land shark "cannot permit the Henry George theory to flourish in this country."

Yet somehow it does flourish like a green bay tree, and the speeches at this Chicago banquet are not in our opinion likely to check its growth.

EXIT BLAINE.

James G. Blaine has formally announced in a letter to B. F. Jones, chairman of the republican national committee, that his name will not be presented to the coming republican national convention as a candidate for president. Mr. Blaine says that he is constrained to this decision by reasons purely personal to himself, of which he advised Mr. Jones more than a year ago. He predicts an easy victory for the republican party, and bases his hope on the introduction of the tariff bill by Mr. Cleveland's message. Strangely enough, Mr. Blaine nowhere in the letter discusses the contingency that his name may be put before the republican convention without his consent, and he fails to say that, if nominated under such circumstances, he would not accept the nomination. Yet such a contingency is not only possible, but probable.

Owing to this omission some of the newspapers hostile to Mr. Blaine treat his letter as a bid for the nomination, a his enthusiastic admirer, the *Tribune*, one of the letters as one in which Mr. Blaine "withdraws his name so far as it is his power to do so." This friend and supporter to unite in doubting that the withdrawal in February will prevent the convention from nominating Mr. Blaine in June.

The probability is that the withdrawal will prove effective. There have been late numerous symptoms of republican impatience with the clamor for Blaine renomination. John Sherman and others are actively seeking the republican nomination, and whatever other effect Mr. Blaine's letter may have it will, at least offer to any of his former supporters an opportunity to join their fortunes with those of some other candidate. The effect of this may readily be so great that an attempt by Mr. Blaine to reconsider his determination may prove futile.

The disappearance of Mr. Blaine from the political field will be a distinct gain to good morals and sound politics. His nomination would at once thrust questions of personal character into the canvass. His possible flighty and erratic foretelling, and he declared that he emphatically policy would likewise be made an issue. If the republicans want to try the strength of the protective idea they should play the city. While mayor of Brooklyn, aside everything that promises to complicate the situation and nominate a man of unblemished reputation on a high tariff platform. Again, Mr. Blaine's retirement opens up to them a more creditable and hopeful course. If the present lagging congress fails to do anything effective toward tariff reform, the republicans who are committed to tariff revision and reduction in their platform, might suddenly remember their broken pledges and come out to fight reform themselves. The change of front would be no greater than that which they made with perfect ease on the greenback question.

Nothing of the kind is likely to happen, however. No dodging or cowardice on the part of the democratic majority in the house of representatives can save their party from responsibility for President Cleveland's message, and the protected monopolies will see to it that the republican party shall still champion their interests. The democrats may as well prepare to face the attack to be made on them as free traders, and the absence of Mr. Blaine from the contest will compel them to defend tariff reduction on principle instead of attacking the personal character of the opposing candidate. Mr. Blaine's act is another in a series of events that prepare the way for a great contest on an economic issue, and nothing so quickly as such a contest can educate the great mass of our people into a readiness for the vastly greater economic question on which they must divide before the march of monopoly shall be ended.

"BREWSTER'S FOLLY."

The property on Broadway, once known as "Brewster's Folly," has recently been sold for \$248,500. There was erected on it a fine marble front five-story building, which stood vacant for thirty-three years. It covered lots 627 and 629 Broadway and extended through to Mercer street, the whole lot being fifty feet in width with a depth of 200 feet. Mr. Brewster was an eccentric old bachelor, who had an idea that it was worth a higher rent than any one would pay for it. He accordingly shut it up and held it vacant. The effect was injurious on other property in the block and the owners of adjacent property stormed and swore, and even talked of bringing suit for damages against Mr. Brewster. They apparently forgot the logic of their own position and seemed to think that, somehow, land ownership does not after all entitle a man to do what he will with his own. It is now believed that Mr. Brewster's freak has permanently injured the neighborhood, and after his death the executors found difficulty in renting the building even at a reasonable price.

It is said that Mr. Brewster paid his taxes heartily, and took comfort out of the wrath of his neighbors. He must have possessed considerable other property to enable him to occupy comfortable bachelor quarters at the New York hotel during the thirty-three years that he indulged his peculiar whim. The papers say that during the time he paid twenty thousand dollars in taxes. He must have paid very much more than that, as the property was assessed in 1853 at \$166,000, and is now assessed at \$174,000. A good many other occupants of land must have been pretty heavily taxed by Mr. Brewster's tenable him to pay the taxes on his "folly."

The property, it will be noted, sold for \$248,500, and is assessed for \$174,000. This is very near to two-thirds of its auction value, which is \$175,696. Any examination of ordinary Broadway property shows that, as a rule, the assessment is just about the selling price of the bare land, and it is entirely safe to assume that the land in this case is worth \$170,000.

Experience shows that plenty of men can be found who will gladly lease bare land at five per cent on its selling value and contract to pay the taxes in addition. This demonstrates that the full rental value of bare land is .0716 on its selling price. Suppose that Mr. Brewster's land had been taxed to its rental value on \$170,000, does any one suppose that he would have been ready to pay for his folly \$12,172 a year? Under such circumstances his only profit on the property would have been from the hire of the building, and he would doubtless have been very glad to obtain a tenant who would pay him a reasonable profit on his investment. Buildings are the product of labor and their cost is easily ascertainable, so that the craziest old bachelor in the land is not likely to overvalue them. Under the single tax system the tax or ground rent would always be a known quantity, and merchants could erect buildings for themselves or else find plenty of men ready to erect them on the promise of a fair return on the capital thus expended. The cranky Brewsters and the numerous smaller obstructionists who now maintain unsightly buildings on our leading streets would rapidly disappear under such a system and merchants would not find their rents increased, though they would be relieved from all taxes other than those levied on land.

A committee appointed by the New York chamber of commerce attended the meeting of the committee of railroads of the board of aldermen on Friday of last week and informed the aldermen that Mayor Hewitt's message concerning rapid transit had been indorsed by the chamber of commerce. Morris K. Jesup, chairman of the visiting committee, declared that he was in favor of having the city undertake the work. Seth Low, ex-mayor of the city, was a member of the committee. His possible flighty and erratic foretelling, and he declared that he emphatically policy would likewise be made an issue. If the republicans want to try the strength of the protective idea they should play the city. While mayor of Brooklyn, aside everything that promises to complicate the situation and nominate a man of unblemished reputation on a high tariff platform. Again, Mr. Blaine's retirement opens up to them a more creditable and hopeful course. If the present lagging congress fails to do anything effective toward tariff reform, the republicans who are committed to tariff revision and reduction in their platform, might suddenly remember their broken pledges and come out to fight reform themselves. The change of front would be no greater than that which they made with perfect ease on the greenback question.

No Light Spreading in the Coal Regions.

REELAND, Luzerne Co., Pa.—I would be too happy to send you double the number subscribers this year that I did last, and, indeed, hoped to do so, but the strike, which been in existence in this neighborhood for

five months, makes it impossible. One or two have informed me that they have renewed, but the rest are unable to do so. I purchase as many copies every week as I can and send them where I think they will do the most good. In this vicinity, *The Standard* has indeed done a noble work. The good seed which it has sown is bearing fruit. Men are thinking to-day who never thought before, and the "cranky" notion of abolishing all taxation save a single one upon land values" row finds defenders wherever it is attacked. The present strike, while deplorable because of the immense damage it is doing to business and the untold suffering which it inflicts upon innocent men, women and children, is nevertheless not without an encouraging aspect. The fact that the operators have refused the just demands of the most oppressed, but best organized, body of coal miners in this country, and have for five months successfully resisted the men without apparently losing to themselves, while the miners have been compelled to depend upon their toiling brethren, has opened the eyes of many, and they are asking themselves how it is that, although thirty years ago the operators and their employees were equally poor, to-day the employers have scores of millions while the miners who risked life and limb in order to bring this great wealth from the bowels of the earth, and who have undoubtedly been oppressed beyond all endurance, find themselves so poor that they could not have stood this strike for two weeks save for the charity of others! Aided by *THE STANDARD* and the truths which we have been distributing, they are beginning to "see the cat." They have discovered this vast accumulation of wealth in the hands of the operators to be due, not to their superior intelligence and business tact, but to the stupidity of the masses in permitting them to monopolize natural opportunities and acquire franchises contrary to the spirit of our institutions. Whether the miners receive the advance they have demanded or are compelled to return to work at the old rates, this strike will be a success, because it has awakened thought and aroused discussion which will not cease until the true solution of the industrial problem is found, which is, the securing to all men of their equal rights to natural opportunities provided for by their Creator.

W. B. ESTELL.

A Plan for a Single State Campaign.
PROVIDENCE, R. I.—The aim of the anti-poverty society and of the united labor party is to get their views thoroughly understood by a majority of the thinking, reasoning people of the United States. And as Mr. George clearly shows, the tariff issue now coming into discussion between the two old parties may be made the means of bringing the principles of the Syracuse platform before the country, without injury to the infant organization of the united labor party. It seems to me it would be well for all earnest workers to take advantage of the situation.

The anti-poverty society has got on its seven league boots, and is making tremendous strides, not only in this country, but all over the world. During the coming campaign on the tariff issue, the advocacy of its principles will strengthen the wavering ones who are in a fair way of soon seeing the cat, and will start a hundred thousand men on a pilgrimage of thought.

It seems to me as though the political machines that have heretofore plowed and harrowed and sowed the seeds of political disaster in our country, at last propose to mix a trifle of wheat with the other seeds; and the united labor party will do well to go over the ground with the seed sowers and see to it that at least an even quantity of wheat is put in. In this way our principles will gain a firm footing all over the country, and when the next presidential campaign comes round we shall have no groping in the dark, no fear of casting away our votes, but can present our ballots at the polls with as much certainty as we would a \$1,000 certified check at the United States treasury.

In the meantime we can, if we wish, mass our forces on whatever state will enable us to put the single land tax into operation with the least expenditure of time and money. In my native state, Rhode Island, there are 15,000 to 16,000 voters, who could be supplied with *THE STANDARD* for one year for say \$30,000. A sufficient fund would be raised to keep our best speakers steadily at work in the state. And the flame of agitation once lighted would sweep over the whole state and enable us to capture it within a year.

J. NORMANDY.

Virginia Considering the Australian System.
RICHMOND, Va.—A bill has been introduced into our legislature which is an attempt at adjusting the election laws of Australia to elections in Virginia. The passage of such a law would be gratifying to those workingmen whose bread depends on their voting as their employers dictate. Immediately after the recent election in this state several employers discharged those of their employees who had voted the "reform" ticket. Although not a "reformer," in the sense in which it was used at that election, I am most mightily opposed to the political or religious rights of any one being abridged by those who deem themselves the especial favorites of divinity.

I could not get a *STANDARD* in town last Saturday. The newsdealer said there had been a great demand for them. Heretofore I have been able to get them, and those which I have had have been worn so thin by borrowers that they are not able to hold themselves together, and those who borrow them do not fail to "see the cat" and make the most earnest advocates of true democracy and absolute individuality. After all, it is not, as remarked by a most eminent gentleman, "only a question of intellectual development?"

CHARLES LEDDY.

Has to Work for a Living and So Dare Not Sign His Name.

OLYMPIA, Washington Territory.—I first heard of *THE STANDARD* about a year ago, when there was but a single copy to be found in the town. As yet we have no formal organization, but a few of us meet on Sunday afternoon to talk and read and argue with one another, and we try our best to get people to discuss the question. Monopoly is well illustrated here by the concentration of our magnificent timber lands in the hands of the large mill corporations. As I am a laboring man, and depend on some of the officials for part of my work please don't publish my name.

WEBFOOT.

The Lesson of a Mitering Tool.
NORWALK, Conn.—I have upon the table on which I am writing a mitering tool which cost me seventy-five cents in New York, while my co-laborer has one of the same style which he bought in England costing nine pence, or eighteen cents. Now I would ask Mr. Victor A. Wilder or James Byrnes how I am benefited by paying fifty-seven cents more than my neighbor? Does it go to increase my wages? If so, what good is it to me? How much longer would my pen be should you cut an inch from one end and add it to the other end? And, as "time is money," would I not be wasting money by doing such an unreasonable act? In adding or making believe add to a few industries are you not taking from

others? I should say that the more you charge me for necessities or luxuries the more you take from my wages.

What have the workings of to-day made by the high prices in land? But a few have made and many have been crushed. Some think that an advanced price benefits the workman. If so, why do wages tend to a minimum, while land, gas, oil, coal, etc., are at the top of the pole? This is the part of the "cat" that I saw first; now myself and about twenty of my friends see the whole of it, and I am going to point it out to every one I meet, and if they can't see it at first I will chase the cat around them till they do.

JAS. H. BABCOCK.

The United States as a Landlord.

NEW YORK CITY.—In Dr. McGlynn's recent speech at Pythagoras hall he suggested that we demand that congress should tax all land in the territories to its full rental value, and take the proceeds for the public treasury. The good doctor evidently needs to read "Progress and Poverty," or attend Mr. Post's class in political economy. To turn the United States government into a gigantic landlord, exacting rack rents from its tenants and robbing them besides with tariff and internal revenue taxes would be rather a curious step in the way of economic reform.

J. F. LOEFFNER.

Land and Labor in Akron.

AKRON, O.—The land and labor club here is flourishing and gaining new members at every meeting, and there are many sympathizers here outside of our ranks. Rev. C. E. Nash of the Universalist church has delivered several Sunday evening lectures on "The Land for the People," and on last Sunday he made an admirable reply to the speech of Mr. Horr. Dr. McGlynn's lecture here on January 13 did much good, and we owe to it much of our success. At a recent meeting of the club a resolution was adopted declaring in favor of a national convention for president and vice president.

J. L. SHUCK, R.S.

Land and Labor in Denver.

DENVER, Col., Feb. 4.—At the regular weekly meeting of the land and labor club, held at Harmony hall, 1517 Lawrence street, on last Friday evening, Charles G. Buck delivered a lecture on the land question. At the conclusion of his remarks several persons in the audience availed themselves of the invitation to ask questions of the speakers. Tracts, kindly furnished by J. W. Harvey, were freely distributed. The meeting was the largest and by far the most enthusiastic yet held, and the active workers are very much encouraged.

G. H. FIELDS, Secretary.

Never Fear! The Principles are Living and Moving.

DENVER, Col.—I noticed in the *Toledo Blade* of Jan. 5, an article to this effect: "The Henry George party is practically as dead as a Pharaohic mummy." Thirty years ago the air was full of the like predictions concerning anti-slavery people. Probably all of the out and out abolitionists in the United States did not number then half as many as the united labor party in New York alone now. We think our principles will be living long in this country long after the *Toledo Blade* is out of print.

WILLIAM HOLMES.

George Ripley on Land Monopoly.

In Frothingham's "Life of George Ripley" occurred the following quotation from one of Mrs. Ripley's articles: "Gerrit Smith is one of the increasing number who, with Moses, Jefferson and Fourier, believe that the monopoly of land is at war with the principles of divine justice; that the usufruct of the earth belongs to the living generations of the race, but its absolute proprietorship to no one but the creator. This principle is capable of demonstration."

Louis F. Post in Hartford, Conn.

HARTFORD, Conn., Feb. 13.—A lecture on "Free Trade and Free Men" was delivered by Louis F. Post, esq., of New York, on Sunday evening, in the auditorium of Mr. Kimball's church. There were about two hundred and fifty in attendance. This was the initial lecture of a course which it is intended to give on social and economic subjects.

Interesting to Michigan Readers.

Labor societies and others in Michigan who may wish to obtain a lecture from Rev. Albert Walkley of Manistee on labor and tariff questions are invited to address W. R. Hall, 105 Pine street, Manistee, Mich.

A Suggestion for a Tract.

WHITMAN, Mass.—I would like to suggest that President Cleveland's message and Mr. Blaine's manifesto be printed side by side for use as an anti-poverty tract. C. P. BOLIN.

Absurd? Not Much! It's Good Protection—1st Argument.

Toronto Globe.
Now, Montreal wants another pot of public money spent to make Montreal a free port.

What for? So that freight charges can be reduced.

Why? To reduce the cost of European goods laid down in Montreal, to stimulate exports, to facilitate trade.

With what object? So that we can import more and export more.

But is not the chief object of the protectionists to make us import and export less? Yes, but we want to increase importations in order that we may discourage them by increasing customs taxes which we will spend in encouraging imports on which we will levy more taxes to discourage imports, so that we shall have to spend further money in encouraging imports on which we can levy more taxes to discourage imports—and so on ad infinitum.

Now, is not this absurd? We do not mean the next foregoing paragraph—the absurdity of which we cheerfully admit to be undeniable—but the situation. Here we are taxing ourselves black in the face for the purpose of encouraging our import and export trade. Then having added millions to our customs taxation, we propose to add millions to our debt in order that we may reduce freight rates in order that we may offset customs taxation.

What do our lords the manufacturers say to this insidious attempt to place the "pauper labor" of Europe in a position to "ruin" this country by flooding it with cheap goods?

No Landlords Yet on the Rivers.

Burlington, Iowa, Justice.
The laborers of Burlington, and the merchants and citizens and other parties whom these laborers patronize have reason to be thankful that the "trusts" have not yet secured from congress or some other usurping authority the exclusive ownership of the Mississippi, otherwise the surface of that stream would be like that of the earth, private property, whose owners would neither cut ice nor permit others to do so without paying rent for the privilege. While the river is free to all a man can work for himself or for someone else as he chooses. But were the river owned the owners would demand all they could get as rent, the ice men would cut down wages, the men would compete for employment and both sides would combine to keep the employees would combine and the laborers conspire; strikes and lock outs would take place on the river and the ice lords, water lords, untaxed or lightly taxed, would draw their rents regularly and enjoy the conflict between the capital and labor as the landlords do under the present tax system.

A LETTER WORTH READING.

Among the many signs of the progress which the anti-poverty cause is making there are none more encouraging than the aggressive energy with which its advocates are compelling attention to it through the columns of the press. The exchanges of THE STANDARD show that in scores of places believers in the single tax are becoming prompt to expose erroneous reasoning, to point out illustrations, and to criticise false economic doctrines, by means of letters to the local papers. The letter republished below from the Toronto Mail is a specimen in point:

The fourth canon—that taxes should fall equally on all—would be observed in the land value tax. Men say, fallaciously, that taxation should be laid on those best able to pay it, but they overlook the fact that so long as taxes are put on the products of the middle and upper classes pay the most money in taxes, for it is the consumer who is reached by the tax at last. The land value tax is one imposed on a privilege according to its value. It makes no difference what a man earns, he should pay for that privilege. Fairness and justice would require that if possible he be left with all he earned above the price of his privilege. The lecturer had once been asked if it would be fair that the owners of the lot, \$300,000—the structure, \$3,000,000, the lot, \$1,000,000—should pay no more than a building near by—worth \$2,000,000—the structure, \$1,000,000; the lot, \$1,000,000. The reply was that the owners of each were getting from the community an opportunity created by the needs of the community that had been capitalized at \$1,000,000. Each ought to pay that value surely. All agree that the present system of taxation, under the present system of taxation, fall on the tenants.

A levy on the products of labor not only permitted a manufacturer to make a profit on the tax, but in some industries it enabled a monopoly to be established. When there was an internal revenue tax on matches the supply fell under the control of a monopoly. It was enabled by buying \$100,000 worth of stamps from the government to procure a discount on them sufficient to make and sell matches at cost and still have a profit, and thus drive out competitors. That done profit abundantly followed from a rise in the price. The tendency in the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes is toward a monopoly from the same causes. For the purpose of destroying monopoly such taxes should be abolished. As people would see the inequity or the unfairness of each form of taxation, as compared with that on land values, they would move to abandon it. Necessarily, then, the movement toward a single tax must be step by step—unless a revolution were to take place. There is now a movement to centralize taxation on real estate. Let it be done, and when it is accomplished none will see more quickly than house owners that houses should be as exempt from taxes as any other of the products of labor. If a tax on land values alone were established, it would be difficult to begin to tax any one product of labor to the exclusion of the rest. The measure would thus be a first step toward a single tax.

After a summary of his lecture Mr. Post called the roll of his class, which now numbers 160 persons, and as their names were called several members rose and interrogated him or made suggestions relative to the questions discussed in the lecture.

A gentleman said he believed it would be well for those who are interested in bringing about the single tax if inquiries were instituted as to the assessments on vacant lots. If they were caused to be assessed at their full value they would soon be put to use, which would show that the advocates of the tax were right, and an interest would be exerted in their work.

A gentleman inquired if a shanty town on unpaved lots would be possible under a land value tax. Mr. Post said that land being free to access, nobody would be lured to live in a "shanty town," which is an evidence of a deprivation of opportunities.

A gentleman said it was not an unknown trick for an owner of a building erected for business purposes to hold it vacant at a high rental, rather than rent it low, so as to bargain for a price from a buyer based on a rental somewhere near that at which it was held. Mr. Post said this was merely a form of land value speculation.

A gentleman inquired whether the social organization ensuing upon the abolition of all taxes on land would be associated would not be a form of co-operation. Mr. Post replied that it certainly would for healthy, voluntary forms of co-operation.

A gentleman desired to be made clear as to the distinction between selling value and rental value of land. Mr. Post said that he used the term selling value simply because it is generally applied. The single tax would eventually be made on rental value. The selling value of land is now only the rental

A gentleman asked if a landlord could be a square tax collector. Mr. Post explained that circumstances, especially the general increase in the value of land, would oblige him to be so. In the period of transition, before a station of land values reached near the point of full rental value, the landlord would have some of his present advantages. He would always, as a matter of fact, have a small margin as insurance and as compensation for collection. It must always be remembered, however, that the primary purpose of the proposed land reform and of the single tax was not the collection of a fund from the unearned increment, but was the freeing of men by restoring to them their rights in the natural sources of wealth.

A gentleman explained the growth of the sugar ring. He said that if it were not for the colonies that there would be thousands of sugar mills in all cane growing countries.

Other members of the class made references to the coal combination, trusts and socialism.

Mr. Post announced that on February 13 he would review the entire subject of the main inquiry of "Progress and Poverty," "Why, in spite of increase of productive power, do wages tend to a minimum which will give out a bare living?" This would end the regular course. On February 22, Washington, D. C., there would be no meeting. On February 29, there would be a supplementary lecture on "Money" and on March 7 another on "Protection and Free Trade." On March 14 Mr. James R. Brown would deliver an address on "Rent," which would be followed by a debate. On March 21 Mr. James B. Sheehan would speak on "Interest," a debate to follow. After that Mr. Post would retire from the desk of lecturer.

Studying Political Economy.
DENVER, Col.—Professor G. S. Robbins, A. B., a graduate of Hamilton college, New York, has organized in Denver a class in political economy and social science, which meets every Saturday evening at the rooms of the Scott-Strickland college in the Tabor opera house block. The professor delivers a lecture, at the conclusion of which he answers any questions that may be asked pertaining to the subject of the evening. The class now numbers twenty-five persons, among whom are some of the most prominent professional and business men, as well as several of the leading ladies of the city. Professor Robbins has recommended to the class Mr. George's "Progress and Poverty" as the most scientific treatise on political economy. At the first lecture in the proposed course of four months, which was delivered this evening, a lively interest was manifested and promise given of a healthy growth.

Toronto, January 20.

To the Editor of the *Mail-Star*: That is a very touching story from Hamilton referred to in your editorial, headed "Home Mission Work," in last Friday's issue, and your remarks with reference to the poverty and distress in Toronto certainly deserve more than ordinary consideration. You tell us, what we know is true enough, that "these poor people have had to live through the necessities of such people could tell harrowing tales of cold and hunger, patiently borne, practically in the midst of plenty." It does seem strange why there should be such poverty and cruel suffering among the poor of the city while many hundreds of dollars were absolutely squandered in providing for the eight hundred or the thousand of Toronto's well-to-do people who spend at a pleasant event at the grand ball at the Casino at the house last week. It may be true that a ball of this kind now and again is a necessity to give the requisite *clat* to the society season, but to the minds of many the thought will occur that such scenes are a terrible satire on our society, which can thus enjoy itself while, to use your own words, "were they to make a tour of the poorer localities their hearts would bleed, and their souls would thirst for pockets for the unhappy poor." It brings me to consider three other questions, namely: What is the cause of this bitter poverty? what is the best way to relieve poverty? and why are these poverty-stricken people herded together in all large cities in "poorer localities?" It is generally admitted that the cause of poverty is the scarcity of opportunities to labor. If this is so, the best way to relieve poverty is to create more op-

Now, how best to secure this very desirable object is one of the most important questions of the day. A great many theories which it was claimed would solve the problem have been put forward, but have proved inefficient; the latest theory, that of taking the taxes off income, personality and improvements, and concentrating them on land values only, is attracting a great deal of attention. Its leading advocate, Mr. Henry George, has advanced his arguments with ability and courage; while all over the land believers in the doctrine are advocating their claims with a persistency which shows that they are thoroughly convinced of the righteousness of their cause. If, by taxing land values only, people who are at present holding parcels of vacant land would be compelled to either use the land themselves or to throw it on the market, so that any who wanted to build houses, or to engage in any other business, could do so, the poverty now struck at the primary cause of the poverty; because, with all this land open for use, or opportunities for labor would be open for thousands of people who under our present system are condemned to poverty because there is no work for them to do. It is likewise now very generally conceded that the "unearned increment" should go to the community, and not into the pockets of private individuals. Hence, the strongest argument in favor of the "single tax" theory is that under that system the poor localities of large cities would disappear, for land would not then be so scarce as it seems to be at present, and there would then be no need of building houses on the rear as well as the front of lots, to the detriment of religion, virtue and morality, as is done right here in this good city of Toronto; nor of building the tenement houses of the larger cities—these being the identical evils which the Christian brotherhood in the midst of our boasted civilization

I would ask if our present system of allowing men to hold parcels of land, and sell this land only with the proviso that the buyer will build a house to cost not less than a specified sum, is not direct class legislation, and a menace to the well-being of the community.

Under such a system there is an evident tendency to draw a sharp distinction between the rich and the poor—keeping the rich to the ownership of necessary goods, and the poor to certain sections, where their sufferings will not be brought too prominently or too frequently under the notice of the well-to-do.

Surely the idea of the single tax, which would give the death blow to this state of things, should commend itself strongly, on this point at least if on no other, to Christian and philanthropist alike. This is the mission work to which the adherents of the new crusade have set themselves—to carry to their brethren, not themselves alone, the belief in the universal brotherhood of man.

Otherwise, if a man being born free and equal is entitled to an equal right with all to the use of the bounties of nature which an almighty God has so mercifully provided for his children; but this can never be realized so long as our present system of taxation is in force, a system which enables one class to withhold from us vast proportions of that most indispensable of all requisites to life—land.

Yours, etc.,
R. T. LANCEFIELD.

Honesty Rewarded.
Chicago Herald.

The enormous scope given to the taxing power of the assessor," said a real estate agent, yesterday, "makes it possible to charge an annual tax upon the property in the state of Illinois, should they so elect, of more than ten per cent of its assessed valuation. The limit is: State tax, no limit; county tax, seventy-five cents on \$100 of valuation, which can be increased for the payment of interest on indebtedness acquired prior to the adoption of the constitution of 1870; city and town tax is two per cent of \$100 valuation, and a proportionate part for school, education and for building purposes. In addition to this there are the ferry, bridge, toll, license and other kinds of taxes, different in part and other localities throughout the state. A valuation is known, the tax collector always able to spend all the money raised and more; the only barrier that stands between the rapacity of the office holder and the people is the election of an assessor who will waste his cattle, who will not do his duty, and which is now the state of Illinois. An illustration of the point was made recently in Lake View. An honest old parson took his tax schedule and filled out the amounts of valuation on his personal property and on his real estate, and assessed himself \$2,000 in railroad bonds drawing six per cent interest. Just here let it be said that there is \$100,000,000 in bonds owned in the state; there is less than \$10,000,000 returned for interest. The assessor assessed the parson in his whole \$2,000, and took at the result. The list went to the town assessor, and from there to the county board, where it was raised twelve per cent, going to the state board of assessment, where it was raised another twelve per cent. Where was the parson's profit now? Twelve per cent made the bonds \$2,240, fifty-two per cent made them \$3,400, and the rate of tax was eight per cent, making a tax of \$275.20, or nearly three per cent interest. Where there is need of reform here.

Some of these officials are clerks if they are property owners, and laughing at the obliged map." "Is it this office map?" I asked. "Yes," he answered, lowered to as is necessary at a map of property.

This substantial exhibition that the Indians or real estate owners determined, a more attentive religious certain group have been than a clergyman's privilege on certain.

The way a man but in a across a show that is not of has this to public than this of the state power over affairs.

For some much over this city Trinity Indians, bignations by a copal church Trinity v are known low church Thomas church, sch policy of high church any aid v ever g added to of Trinity, sheriff's was further that Trinity advances that through practical all questions, my presence dispute the was such a committee that the

In the ponents in Trinity church a of the people were me church. all the pr original merely i yard and original property inhabitant and in New York. Protest of the inhabitants and the wardens votes of colonial in an language inhabitant in 1705 g and incorporation the revolution the New old char ally ma stitute t "church cluded i the city munion

There 1814, with the title church v church i fining H vestrymen who, for the elect gregation The opment of 1814 v original of New or meml they peteal of t right to trymen lians res to vote petition against estate a The reg one of t controver sion of Trinity the inv the jur nounced

The Democrat advocates Land Resumption and those reforms which are necessary to make the English people a free people. It asks "compensation" not for those who have benefited by unjust legislation, but for those who have suffered thereby.

For one dollar the Democrat is supplied for 13 months to any address in the United States or Canada.

Address: New Bridge Street, London, E.C.

