THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOL. II.—NO. 20. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1887. PRICE FIVE CENTS

SOCIALISM VS. THE SINGLE TAX.

To the *Independent* of December 22, Professor Richard T. Ely of Johns Hopkins University contributes another article of his series on "Land, Labor and Taxation." Having in his first article admitted the main grounds of the single tax theory, and then rejected it on the plea that society, having acquiesced in the private ownership of land, could not in justice tax the unearned increment without compensating land owners, Professor Ely now drifts into the mild type of socialism which seems to have such attractions for the cultured men who have become conscious of the existence of great social wrongs, yet who shrink from, as "not to be considered," any remedy which would run counter to the prejudices and interests of the powerful class upon whose favor most of them are dependent.

"What guarantees are we now able to offer to labor that it can always find employment?" asks Professor Ely:—

> There is, in fact, nothing which gives cause of greater uneasiness, anxiety and discomfort to the general public than to know that thousands upon thousands of men seek work in vain. It troubles our conscience in spite of all our protests. When the unemployed of London gather together and in parade exhibit their gaunt and distressed faces, this bare fact in itself is telegraphed all over the civilized world and produces a universal feeling of restlessness.

This is putting the case very mildly—so mildly indeed as to make it evident that Professor Ely does not comprehend the importance of his own question. That thousands upon thousands of men seek work in vain is not merely a painful and disquieting fact; it is *the* great fact from which proceed all our social difficulties and dangers. From this difficulty of finding employment comes that fierce competition that in all vocations tends to force wages to a mere living rate, and against which trades unions try to shelter themselves by the establishment of semi-monopolies, sustained by strikes and boycotts. From it come pauperism, tramps, beggars, overcrowded and filthy tenements. From it comes the need for charities, which, while they temporarily relieve the most pressing wants of the body, kill self-respect and all the manly virtues. From it come poverty, and all its attendant evils—ignorance, drunkenness, disease and premature deaths. From it come that fear of want and that worship of wealth, which, even in Christian churches, make "Thou shall not steal!" mean little more than "Thou shall not get into the penitentiary!"

"Thousands upon thousands of men seek work in vain!" This is the truth that makes the stupid fallacies of protection plausible; that leads a nation that boasts of its freedom to fear free trade; that justifies restrictions upon our intercourse with other peoples as necessary to keep our work for our own workers, and gives support to knavish and foolish schemes for creating work by building forts and ironclads with taxes wrung from labor. This is the hell that yawns beneath us all, ready to engulf whosoever loses his foothold in the struggle to escape. If every one who wanted work could find it, then, if all our industrial, social and political difficulties did not vanish, the most important and pressing of them would be gone.

Proceeding with his inquiry as to what guarantees of employment society can give to labor, Professor Ely says:

> The requisites of production are land, labor and capital, and labor in itself can, without suitable implements, no more produce values for exchange than oxygen can in itself produce water. Labor seeks union with other productive factors, but sometimes in vain, and always without any reliable guarantee. The more skilled labor is, the readier it is to turn this way or that and to meet variable and changing demand, the greater the probability of work. If labor always had access to tools and material it might produce values of some sort—at least for actual use. But this access to implements and material is often impossible, and the best we have been able to do is to give the guarantee which the poor house and work house offer, that no one shall starve to death.

"Now the socialists," says Professor Ely, "propose to remedy this, and suggest a cause adequate to produce the desired effect," in proposing that we should all "work together in the co-operative commonwealth, and divide the proceeds of our common labor among all in proportion either to needs or merits." This, Professor Ely thinks, would give a guarantee of work.

> There would always be something which every able bodied member of a great co-operative commonwealth could do so long as any rational human want remains unsatisfied. Any improvement in productive processes would render labor more efficient, and if thereby the special skill of some should become useless, the total product of society would nevertheless increase and the average of comfort, other things being equal, would steadily rise. This is a strong point in the socialistic programme.

But, though he finds the scheme of thoroughgoing state socialism thus alluring, Professor Ely turns away from it as impracticable, because he sees no way in which "a co-operative commonwealth after the pattern of the socialists can be established and at the same time offer guarantees for freedom of action and individual initiative on the part of the gifted."

He fears that in the socialistic state public opinion "would repress as with an iron hand any divergence in belief or action from a low prescribed level;" that "while the few would be pulled down, the leveling up of the many would be too problematical," and that "the exclusive dominance of a single principle in industrial life would cause the final downfall of civilization, and thus in the end benefit none."

Professor Ely thus objects to state socialism in its fullest expression; but it is to be noted that his objection is only to this fullest expression—to the socialism that would put under state control every industrial exertion, and that would make every worker, whether by hand or head, a salaried employee of the state. Nor is his objection a moral one, such as he makes to the simple reform of taking for the use of the community those values which attach to land by reason of the growth and improvement of the community. He strains at the gnat of taxing land values without compensation to land owners, but so far as moral objections are concerned swallows whole the camel of making the state the sole proprietor of all industrial agencies and the sole director of all industry. This feat is made possible to him by the extreme haziness of his views of the rights of property, to which I last week alluded—by his notion that human law is the only source of the right of ownership. But the intellectual bias which disposes him to think so much of the rights of individual property in land and so little of other individual rights, arises from an intellectual haziness—the same haziness which lies at the bottom of socialism in all its degrees. It is this that makes Professor Ely a socialist, though, when it comes to practical measures, one of a mild type.

To the socialistic mind capital seems the prime factor in protection—the great robber of labor. Nothing will avail to improve the condition of laborers and stop the tendency of wages to the lowest possible level unless laborers are in some way provided with capital. The charge which socialists bring against the single tax theory is that it does not sufficiently take capital into account. This charge Professor Ely, after lauding state socialism as suggesting "a cause adequate to produce the desired end," thus goes on to make:

> Now, what does Henry George have to offer the laborer in the way of guarantees of permanent and remunerative opportunities for toil? It is when we attempt to answer this question that we come upon the weakest point of his scheme of social reform. His promises are abundant, but I so far fail to see any adequate cause for the effects desired to be produced, that, in spite of myself, I am reminded of the admirable fantasies of a Fourier when I contemplate his bright picture of the future. . . . It is inconceivable to me that any Christian man could fail to indorse the reform proposed by Henry George if it, and it alone, would accomplish all that he claims for it. But where is the sufficient cause? It is easy to say if you do so and so, this or that will follow; but rational men want to be shown such a connection between the proposed course of action and predicted consequence that the one necessarily implies the other.
>
> Capital is to remain private property, and employers and employed are still to confront one another in their present relations in the society of the future as conceived by Henry George. Capital and labor, he tells us, are friends, not enemies; naturally there is no antagonism between the two. Right here I take issue with him. What he says is a cheap platitude, but like many another smooth saying it fails to portray facts as they are. Capital and labor, of course, in themselves, can have no antagonism, but there is a necessary divergence of interest between capitalist and laborer in their roles of employer and employed, and the sooner this is recognized the better. It may be an unpleasant fact, but as it is a fact it is well that it should be known. They are both interested in a large and good product, as a result of their joint efforts; but when it comes to the division of their products it is manifest that their interests are antagonistic. If the product be represented by a value like $1,000 it is evident that if A, the employer, takes $400 only $600 is left for B, the employed, and he cannot give them more without diminishing his own share. A plain recognition of the facts of the case, good will and good sense and good feeling, a Christian endeavor to base the division of the product on some equitable principle—all these and still other forces may and generally do prevent an outbreak of antagonism, not infrequently, indeed, prevent its being even recognized. But there it is all the same; it lies latent in the nature of things, and may at any moment bring about open conflict, hate, bitterness, violence.
>
> The controversy about the division of the product is one of the most marked features of our industrial situation throughout the entire civilized world. Why close our eyes to it? Now, Henry George does not propose to alter this fundamental relation of antagonism. He does not propose to unite capitalist and laborer in the bonds of partnership. He does not point the way to such changes in industrial organization as to bring about a union of economic interests. This the socialists, going deeper, do.

Now, instead of socialists going deeper, the trouble with socialism is its superficiality. The socialistic view is the view of industrial relations as they appear on the surface in those centers where they have assumed their most complex and most highly developed form—where, as pavements obscure the ground and tall houses obscure the stars, the prominence into which the finishing processes of industry are brought obscures the absolute dependence of man and all his works upon mother earth. Socialism could not develop in Western Ireland, in the Hebrides, or in any new settlement where industry is in its primitive conditions. But to the factory operative in a great city, whose work is but the tending of costly machinery, who sees his employer growing rich while his own poor wages can only be maintained by labor organizations and their restrictions, and by industrial wars in which labor is pitted against capital in a struggle as to which can suffer longest without giving in, the natural surface view is that capital is the oppressor of labor, and that the labor question is, as it is so often called, a struggle between capital and labor. And so to professional thinkers and teachers, who in their studies take the same standpoint, this superficial view may seem the real and the "practical" view. But it is for all this just such a view of industrial relations as that of the Chinaman, who observing that a steamboat went ahead when her wheels turned around, endeavored to construct a steamboat whose wheels should be turned around by the tide.

Professor Ely is a good example—perhaps the best because the ablest—of those men spoken of by Judge Maguire, who see the ears of the cat, and the eyes of the cat, and the mouth and the tail and the feet of the cat, but who yet do not see the cat. It is because he does not see the relations of things, which by themselves he clearly perceives, that he does not see in our simple proposition to take economic rent by taxation "any adequate cause for the effects desired to be produced," while he does see an adequate cause in impossible state socialism.

The connection between the appropriation of land values by taxation and the opening to all of opportunities for labor is that such taxation of land values would bring land speculation to an end and make impossible the withholding of land from use by those who will not use it themselves.

Henry George has nothing "to offer the laborer in the way of guarantees of permanent and remunerative opportunities for toil." Professor Ely is right enough in that. For Henry George and those who think as he does on such matters do not believe it to be the business of either individuals or governments to guarantee to laborers opportunities for toil, any more than it is their business to guarantee that the sun shall shine and the rain shall fall and the earth shall circle in her orbit. The Almighty has done all that. He who, by whatever process, brought man into this world, and made the maintenance of his life and the satisfaction of his wants dependent upon his labor, has provided abundant opportunities for the exertion of that labor. As the human eye is constructed to see things, so is the human hand constructed to mold things. And there is in this world no more lack of things that human hands may mold to the satisfaction of human wants than there is of things for human eyes to see. There is to-day in the civilized world no country in which there are not natural opportunities of work for every willing hand. While just as advancing civilization, by the microscope and the telescope, and in the closer observation of difference and relations, opens new and illimitable fields to the eyes of man, so does it, by developing new wants and arousing new desires, open new and illimitable fields for man's constructive powers.

Professor Ely and the socialists generally are like those who would teach a blindfolded man to read by raised alphabets, and provide for him a staff with which to painfully grope his way. We, on the contrary, would simply remove the bandage and let him see.

The connection which Professor Ely fails to perceive between what we propose and what we claim that it would accomplish, lies in our belief in the harmony of God's laws; in our belief that right and wrong, mine and thine, are anterior to and superior to all human enactments; that social laws are coincident with moral laws, and that these have the same ever pressing sanction as have the physical laws. What we propose is not a mere fiscal change; not a mere clever scheme of equalization—it is a conforming of the most important and most fundamental of all human adjustments to the supreme law of justice; a recognition of that natural right of property which exists irrespective of what kings or emperors or parliaments or legislatures may enact, and which is attested by the clear perceptions of the moral sense. What we seek by a simple change in taxation is to put all men on the plane of equal opportunity. We would not take from one to give to another; we would not beg one class to relieve by their alms another class. But by abolishing all taxation upon labor or the products of labor we would leave to the individual the full rewards of individual industry, skill and thrift. By taking for the community those values which attach to land by reason of the growth and improvement of the community we would take for the benefit of all that which is brought forth by the presence and effort of all. In all things we would follow freedom. Where freedom of competition is possible, there we would leave everything to individual action; where freedom of competition becomes impossible, there we would have the state step in, so far and only so far as may be necessary to secure individual freedom.

If there be any Christian man who fails to see in the simple reform that we propose a cause sufficient to abolish all poverty, save such as may result from individual misconduct, then it can only be because he has failed to understand it, or does not in reality believe in the sort of God his religion proclaims.

When I declare that there is no natural and necessary antagonism between capital and labor; when I refuse to join the socialists in their denunciations of capital and capitalists; when I tell workingmen that the real fight for the emancipation of labor is not with capital, but with monopoly, I am not giving utterance to cheap platitudes, but to a profound truth, which every man who loves peace, who values social order, and who would avert a fight in the dark in which blood may flow and cities burn, ought to do his utmost to make clear.

I have not failed to note, as Professor Ely will readily see by reference to the books in which I have treated this matter, the obvious fact that there exists between the individual capitalist and the individual laborer, "in their roles of employer and employed," that divergence of interest which must always exist between the correlative parties to any exchange. But does Professor Ely soberly think that this turns my assertion that there is really no antagonism between capital and labor into a cheap platitude, and justifies the socialistic doctrine that capital or capitalism is the thing workingmen must fight; and that the only way to secure fair wages is for the state to become the sole capitalist or for laborers to be furnished with capital either by the exertion of governmental power or by the benevolence of individuals?

The "divergence of interest between capitalist and laborer in their roles of employer and employed" is simply that divergence of special interest which exists between every buyer and seller. When one banker buys of another banker a bill of exchange, when the housewife buys of the milkman a quart of milk, or when a newsboy exchanges a nickel for peanuts, this divergence of interest exists just as truly as it exists between the buyer and the seller of labor. But is this divergence of interest an antagonism? Does it justify the one party in regarding the other party to a transaction, in which neither would engage if it were not to his interest, as his natural enemy? Does it justify a demand that the state shall step in to draw exchange, serve milk or sell peanuts? or does it even justify us in calling on Christian bankers, milkmen or peanut vendors to charge less for their exchange, their milk or their peanuts?

And while there is this divergence of immediate and special interest between the buyer and seller in every particular transaction, is it not also true that there is a consensus of larger and more permanent interests? Is there not a point—constantly varying, it may be, but still a point—to which it is best for the interest of buyers as a class and sellers as a class that the price of things, whether bills of exchange or peanuts, should conform? If price be arbitrarily forced below this point, exchange will cease to be drawn or peanut stands to be maintained. If price be arbitrarily forced above this point, demand will diminish and supply will increase, and a reaction in the other direction be produced. And, further than this, is not the point at which exchange can be drawn or peanuts sold to the best interests of both buyers as a class and sellers as a class fixed by conditions outside of each special transaction—by general conditions as to which the interests of both are mutual, not antagonistic?

Professor Ely's illustration involves the socialistic mistake of looking on capital and labor as the two factors of production, and the two parties to the division of the produce. As a matter of fact, there are in our highly developed industrial system three parties to production, and always four and generally five to distribution. In addition to A, the employing capitalist, and B, the employed laborer, there are C, the land owner, D, the tax collector, and generally E, the representative of monopolies other than that of land. What A and B can divide between them is not the product of their joint efforts, but such of the product as C, D and E leave to them.

Now, what we propose is to choke off E, the minor monopolist, to abolish D, the tax collector, and to appropriate what now goes to C, the land owner, a mere blackmail which he levies on the produce of capital and labor, for the purpose of making up so far as necessary what D now collects and for such other purposes as may be useful to A and B. Is it not clear that the common interest of A, the capitalist, and B, the laborer, in doing this is far more important than any divergence of interest as to the division between them?

Consider what this divergence of interest really amounts to. Either A or B may give or take a little more or a little less; but these variations are comparatively slight. What the capitalist (monopoly, of course, eliminated) can take and what the laborer can get, depends upon those general conditions which determine a certain normal rate of return to capital and a certain general rate of wages, toward which the competition of capital with capital and of laborer with laborer tend constantly to bring the earnings of both. It is only as workingmen in any particular trade can shelter themselves from this competition by means of trades unions, etc., that they can force their wages up, and it is only as they can, by making the advance general in the trade, shelter the employer, that he can afford to have them do so. Yet the more wages are raised in this way the stronger the pressure from outside competition, and the greater the tendency to a break. And as experience shows, it is only in some occupations and to a comparatively small extent that wages can in this way be raised.

Now, on what depends the intensity of the competition for employment? Evidently upon the opportunities to find employment, and ultimately upon the opportunities which are open to labor to employ itself. When "thousands upon thousands of men seek work in vain" we must expect to find wages in the occupations most easily entered forced down to the level of a bare living, and in other occupations only kept above that rate by the difficulties of entering them. These thousands upon thousands of unemployed men tend constantly to force down wages—both by increasing the market supply of labor and by diminishing the market demand for labor; since, as they are earning nothing, they have nothing to offer for the commodities which other laborers produce.

Without entering upon the reasoning that shows that the relations between the return to capital (as capital) and the earnings of labor are sympathetic, not antagonistic, is it not clear that the way for workmen to raise wages generally, largely and permanently, is not by fighting employers, but by massing their forces for the removal of the conditions which cause "thousands upon thousands of men to seek work in vain?" And is it not evident that in the doing of this both employers and employed are alike interested?

Professor Ely objects that I do not propose to alter the fundamental relation of antagonism between capital and labor. This he says, "the socialists, going deeper, do, and the co-operators likewise do." Rejecting the socialistic remedy, he declares the co-operative remedy hopeful.

> They propose to remove the antagonism between capitalists and laborers by removing the distinction between them, by making all laborers capitalists, managing their own affairs in their own way. Both likewise propose a co-operative commonwealth, but the co-operators, unlike the socialists, wish it to be a gradual and voluntary growth. Thus they hope to bring about the longed-for era of industrial democracy.

Professor Ely is indeed a hopeful man. In the face of a condition of things in which thousands upon thousands of men vainly seek work at any price that will enable them to live; in which great masses of men who do find work live only from hand to mouth, and in which great fortunes are rolling up more rapidly than they ever did in the world before; in the face of an antagonism between labor and capital which he tells us is natural and inevitable, and which is every day becoming fiercer, Professor Ely is hopeful of "making all laborers capitalists, managing their own affairs in their own way"—by the establishment of co-operative societies and profit sharing!

How long does he expect it is going to take to thus make all laborers capitalists? And what is to become of the unemployed men in the mean while, and what of the "antagonism between capital and labor?" The utter failure of "the co-operators" to get people to co-operate is notorious. The *Sun*, which has for some time been amusing itself by advocating the panacea of co-operation, recently made by means of correspondents in various parts of the country an investigation of the history of co-operative enterprises. It says:

> The experiments were followed through a long series of years, and the lesson taught seemed to be uniform and conclusive. The attempts had failed in every instance where the experiment had been long enough continued; and in the few instances of alleged success, the report, it is to be presumed, was derived from the new managers, who found it for their interest to give a rose colored representation of their yet incomplete adventures.

The truth is that to entertain the slightest hope in co-operation one must shut his eyes not only to all experience, but to all economic principles. A general system of co-operation or profit sharing, if in the nature of things that were possible, would simply amount to a change in the form of wages from a sum certain, as now, to an uncertain "lay" as whalemen call it; and the same causes which now operate to cut down wages to the living point would operate then. Passing such questions as, how in this hopeful scheme it is proposed to induce laborers to give up wages certain for wages uncertain? how it is proposed to get the thousands on thousands who can find no employment to co-operate with their employers? and how is it proposed to make employers who have no profits share their profits with their employees? I would like to ask Professor Ely what, when the antagonism between capitalists and laborers is removed by making all laborers capitalists, is to become of the land owners? Surely, the united capitalists and laborers are not to try to get along without land?

To give permanent and remunerative employment to every one of the "thousands upon thousands of men who now seek work in vain" it is not necessary for society to give any guarantees; it is not necessary to nationalize capital, as the socialists would have us do, nor yet to coax employers to benevolently give a larger share of their earnings to their workmen. It is not necessary to call on Christian endeavor to base a division of the product upon some equitable principle. That equitable principle already exists in natural laws, which, if left unobstructed, will with a certainty that no human adjustment could rival, give to each who takes part in the work of production that which is justly his due, and leave to be taken by the community and applied to purposes of general benefit, and to the assurance of all against the accidents of life, that "unearned increment," which can be justly claimed by no individual, but is due to the growth and improvement of the community as a whole. By simply abolishing all the taxes that now hamper enterprise, discourage investment, fine industry and punish thrift, and thus leaving to the individual what properly belongs to the individual, while taking for the community in lieu of such taxes what properly belongs to the community, we shall make the monopoly of land impossible. No one under such circumstances will want land except to use it, and when land is wanted only to those who wish to use it labor will find access to the abundant opportunities for employment that the Creator has actually given to man.

It is a mistake to think that it is necessary either for the state or for individuals to furnish labor with capital before the thousands now unemployed can find work and the cut-throat competition that now tends to force down wages can be stopped. There is no need of our bothering ourselves about capital, as the socialists do. Professor Ely is wrong when he says that the requisites of production are land, labor and capital. The requisites of production are simply land and labor. These are the two primary factors in all production. Capital is but a derivative factor, formed from their combination. And even if we grant that in the present stage of the industrial arts some capital is necessary to any form of production, this would not prevent very many, probably the large majority of the men now unemployed, from employing themselves if land were open to them. If not among the tramps and paupers, there are certainly in the ranks of the unemployed—for the unemployed run through all gradations of industry—many who have or could command, if they could see profitable use for it, considerable amounts of capital, and many more could command at least some capital. Could such men go to work for themselves they would not only lessen the pressure upon the labor market, but, by producing wealth which they would seek to exchange for other forms of wealth, increase the demand for wage workers. Nor is it necessary that we should confine our idea of the relief to the labor market that would result from making the holding of unused land unprofitable, to the opportunities which would be opened for men to employ themselves. Such a change would give an enormous stimulus to the investment of capital in productive enterprises requiring the employment of labor.

If Professor Ely will come to New York, I will show him a piece of land that nobody is using, nor ever yet has used; that although within the city of New York, is to-day in the same condition as it was when the first white man put his foot on our shores. If that land can be had without the payment of a blackmail price to the dog-in-the-manger who now holds it, I will within fifteen days furnish a capitalist who will agree to put upon it a quarter of a million of dollars' worth of improvements and establish a factory that will give employment to several hundreds of the willing hands that are now looking for work in vain. And not only in this city, but in every city, in every town and every village throughout the United States similar cases may be seen. Why should a man, much less a professor of political economy shut his eyes to such facts, which everywhere stare him in the face, and go meandering around impossible state socialism or the still more impossible establishment of "the co-operative republic" by means of co-operative societies and profit sharing? The co-operative republic will, I trust, some day come. But its foundations must be laid on justice. To try to build it on any plan that ignores the right of any child of God to the use of the natural opportunities his Creator has provided is to build upon the sand and to invoke the storm.

I have spoken at such length of Professor Ely's article, because it is really instructive. If we trace socialism to its roots we will find one of the strongest of them among the very class that most hate and fear it. Professor Ely is a representative of a large number of "men of light and leading," who, turning away from the simple plan of doing justice, preach a sort of rosewater socialism which "good society" listens to as contentedly as to a charity sermon. But innocuous as "good society" may think it, this starting out with an inevitable conflict and winding up with an injunction to "profit sharing" is a dangerous diversion. Its effect is not merely to turn men away from the true path, but to urge them on a false one.

When Professor Ely calls the statement that there is no real antagonism between capital and labor a cheap platitude, does he expect men who feel the bitterness of low wages and want of employment to wait patiently until capitalists shall be

converted to the beauties of co-operation? When he lauds state socialism in its most thorough going form as adequate to furnish all men with employment and give all fair remuneration, does he expect men who feel the grinding weight of social injustice to turn away from it with him because "it does not offer guarantees for freedom of action and individual initiative on the part of the gifted?" In this Professor Ely, though of course unconsciously, suggests the English demagogue, who, after lashing his audience into a frenzy of fury against an opponent, advised them not to duck him in the horse pond.

The last number of *Harper's Magazine* contains a notable article on the tariff—notable not only by reason of its author, Henry Watterson of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*, but still more notable from the fact that an article taking the free trade side of the tariff question is printed in *Harper's Magazine*. Nothing, perhaps, could better show what the American press is so generally showing that the tariff question has at last come up to stay, and that the efforts of democratic politicians to avoid making an issue on it in the next election will be futile. The article is probably as good a one as can be written from the illogical standpoint of a tariff for revenue only, which Mr. Watterson does himself the injustice to take. Revenue reform, however, is doubtless as much as *Harper's* or the majority of the readers of *Harper's* are yet ready for, and will in time, as the struggle goes on, lead to better things.

Mr. Watterson makes use of the land movement as a sort of bugaboo with which to scare protectionists into a notion of the worse things that may befall them if they reject a revenue tariff. This is all right, for from the protectionist standpoint we do aim at worse things than a tariff for revenue only. We not only propose to abolish the tariff, root and branch, and to make trade between the United States and the whole world as free as trade now is between New York and New Jersey, but we propose to abolish all indirect taxation, and all taxation of whatever kind that falls upon production.

But Mr. Watterson, in his zeal, goes on to identify us with those who wish to make capitalists divide, and by quoting from a speech of Speaker Carlisle, with socialism and anarchism. He says:

> If protectionism had not established in its theory of paternal government the right of the workman to claim that which the capitalist has received, where would Mr. George find a warrant for his argument?
>
> Thus we see, in spite of the extremism of their superficial differences, a present bond of union and co-operation between the party of protection and the party of free land, on which the protectionists rely to make a breach in the party of revenue reform wide enough for them to pass through to victory.

If protectionists rely on us they are reckoning without their host. But where has Mr. Watterson learned that we assert "the right of the workingman to claim that which the capitalist has received." Professor Ely can tell him better than that. We would take nothing from the capitalist except what does not belong to him, and that we would take, not for workingmen, but for the whole people.

HENRY GEORGE.

What the Scotch Crofter Finds When He Emigrates to Canada.

Hamilton, Ont., Times.

To illustrate the contention that toryism on this side of the Atlantic does not differ in essence from toryism in Great Britain, however the name may be changed to hide the fact, let us quote again from the *Spectator*:

"Those crofters of the Isle of Lewis who have been poaching on a grand scale would be a fine class of men to transplant to the northwest. They want land, and the northwest wants men just like them."

The dissatisfaction of the Scotch crofters arises from the fact that the laws of the country permit the landlords to take in rent so large a proportion of the product of the crofters' industry, without giving value in exchange, that the crofters have not enough left to support themselves and families in comfort. Suppose those crofters arrived in Manitoba, and went to work under the institutions of Macdonaldism, what would they find? That they must pay a speculative price (rent) to the favorites of the government holding titles to land, or else be isolated from each other and compelled to labor to make other men's land valuable. That they must pay tribute to the Canadian Pacific monopoly, in excess of a fair charge for carriage, on every bushel of wheat sent out and on every pound of goods brought in. That they must pay tribute to protected manufacturers on a great share of their purchases. These items, taken together, are almost as formidable as a heavy land rent, hence the crofters bear the ills they have.

Where Is It That All This Can Be Done?

Correspondence New York Tribune.

A hired man on the farm who has only himself to provide for can save enough in ten years to warrant him in buying an improved farm if he be economical all along. The interest on his money earned, judiciously invested, will soon be more than sufficient for clothing and other necessary expenses. This is the way many farmers worked their way up. By faithfulness and economy as hired men, they became owners of farms, and are hiring others to work for them. This has not been done at any undue sacrifice, for most of the boys, if they will, may obtain a good common school education, and often more, before they begin their term of service. The working hours are generally no longer nor the work different in nature from that performed by the farmer himself. By moving further west he may get an earlier and, in many cases, a more advantageous start. But this is not necessary, nor is it advisable. The road to independence may not be so rapid in an older settled country, but it is generally surer, and if the reward be less the privations are fewer. If there be drudgery on the farm, as there must be everywhere, it is because man is born to labor. But it loses its terrors when performed with cheerfulness, and this is the state of mind in which both master and servant should dwell.

The Sort of Argument a Pro-Poverty Advocate is Reduced to.

Kansas City Journal.

The anti-poverty people do not want farming land. They want to live on improved property, and what they really think should be given to them is fifteen or twenty residence blocks in New York city, with board, heat and light thrown in. Then they would skirmish around to supply themselves with clothes and beer.

THE CAUSE AND THE "STANDARD."

With this issue THE STANDARD ends its second volume and accomplishes its first year. The first year is generally the trying year, and if a new paper lives through that without heavy loss and on an ascending scale it is good indication that it has found a place and is "here to stay." This, I think, is the case with THE STANDARD.

I started THE STANDARD not because I wanted to start a paper, but because I thought a paper ought to be started to advocate the principles THE STANDARD has advocated, and because, since I was well known, it seemed as if I could most readily do it. I knew enough of the newspaper business to regard every new venture as an experiment, and while I thought it would be a success and hoped it would be a great success, I would not have been surprised at failure. The best proof of its success is that it is here, for I did not have money enough to sustain any heavy loss, such as new papers are generally obliged to bear.

My first idea was to make its price three cents a copy and one dollar a year. This I am glad I did not do, for I do not think it could have lived. It is necessarily a paper that only appeals to the more thoughtful; that has from the first had to encounter strong prejudices, and that cannot be pushed by mere cheapness, as papers of a different class can; and it does not so readily get the advertising on which cheap papers must rely. I had hoped with the beginning of the new year to reduce its price, but its business does not warrant it, and we must be content for a while longer at least to have it go along as at present. For some time after it started we thought it was doing a much better business than it really was, as we sent out large numbers through the news company, and comparatively few of them at first came back; so that after some weeks we came to the conclusion that THE STANDARD had a paying circulation of 40,000 copies, and so stated. This proved to be a delusion, however, as returns began to come back in almost swamping numbers, and we were finally obliged to withdraw the return privilege outside of a few cities, and to send out only such papers as were actually bought. When bottom was reached the actual paid circulation of the paper was about 15,000. Then, in May and June, it began slowly but steadily to climb up. This increase went on through the summer months when we naturally expected a falling off. Curiously enough, though, as it seemed, and certainly contrary to our expectations, this increase ceased during the political campaign, and toward its conclusion the circulation began to fall off. This movement now, however, seems to have stopped, and another increase has begun, the actual sales of THE STANDARD being now a little under 20,000 copies.

I speak thus frankly to the readers of THE STANDARD because—more, perhaps, than can be said of any other paper in the country—I know its readers are its friends, to whose unsolicited and unpaid efforts it owes its success. I want to ask a little more of them. It looks as though THE STANDARD could live as it goes; but to enable it to live comfortably and to make it the paper we all would like it to be it needs a few thousand more subscribers or buyers.

There are few papers I think that have so many readers in proportion to circulation as THE STANDARD, and there are none that have stronger friends. It has been utterly impossible for me to answer the many friendly letters I receive. These letters testify to the work THE STANDARD has been doing. A weekly paper of this kind, with its constant reiteration of principle and its constant freshness of illustration, reaches people who could not be reached in any other way; and wherever it goes, there it soon forms a little nucleus of friends of our cause. And one of its chief services is that it brings the consciousness of support and companionship to those who otherwise could not but feel isolated.

THE STANDARD'S circulation is pretty well diffused, and some copies go to all parts of the world where the English language is spoken. Our friends in Great Britain seem delighted with the paper, and promise during the coming year to get it a large circulation there. We send quite a number to Australia—400 copies weekly to Sydney alone, notwithstanding the fact that two cents postage must be paid on each copy—and have subscribers in India, in China, in Mauritius, in the Cape of Good Hope, and in a number of the South American countries. This is as we all would wish it to be. Ours is not a national movement; it is a movement for the world.

But the good that THE STANDARD has done and is doing is not to be measured by its subscription list, nor yet by its readers; it has startled many other papers into greater or less attention to the principles it advocates, and articles from it are largely reprinted. The establishment of the Land and Labor Library is, moreover, a great agency for good. Some millions of these tracts have been circulated through this country and a considerable number abroad, and several of the issues have been reprinted and largely circulated on the other side of the Atlantic and in Australia. The good seed is being widely sown, and though some may fall on stony ground, and some may fall by the wayside, and some may be beset with tares which will choke it, much is certain to come up and yield manifold increase.

This much is now absolutely certain, that the agitation has reached such a point and has taken such a hold that it never can subside, but must keep on steadily extending.

It is impossible of course to please everybody, even one's friends. All that one can do is to follow the guidance of principle as he sees it. This I have done. Some who supported THE STANDARD when it started did so without full understanding of its principles, and have fallen off, some for one reason and some for another. But the great majority are still its friends, and as shown by expression and by act, regard it with personal interest and affection. And they are constantly making new friends for it.

I receive many letters, from all parts of the country, asking, "What can I do to help the cause?" It is impossible to point out to each individual what he may do best, but something like a general reply to such inquiries may prove suggestive.

To help the cause we must awaken thought and arouse discussion; then the truth will take care of itself. To set people thinking in directions which will finally lead them to see the essential injustice of treating land as private property, and to recognize the relations between this wrong and the social and political evils of which the masses of men are already sufficiently conscious, is a work in which every one, no matter how or where placed, may do something.

If you can speak in public, take every opportunity you can get to explain our doctrines, or, at least, to allude to them. If you can write, do the same thing in that way. Every one can at least write well enough to send occasional short letters to local papers. If these communications are published they will surely set some one else to thinking, and if they provoke replies so much the better. Anything said against us—even abuse and misrepresentation—is better than nothing. And even if not published, such communications have their effect upon editors and publishers as showing the drift of public sentiment and indicating that our doctrines are not so unpopular after all. The papers will be with us as soon as their publishers feel that their patrons are with us. And the greater strength we show the better the treatment we shall receive from the press.

Whether you have or have not opportunities for public speaking or writing, take every opportunity of talking to those you come in contact with. A word, a question or a comment will frequently start a train of thought in the mind of man or woman that will bear fruit even though its effect may not at once be perceptible.

Keep on hand a supply of land and labor tracts or of such of them as you may think most useful. You will find in our list tracts adapted to various minds. Give or send these to people you may have talked with or whose attention you wish to attract, even if you do not know them personally. These tracts may also be readily inclosed in your private letters, even when you have not time or do not care to mention the subject yourself. Recruit subscriptions to THE STANDARD also offer an excellent means of reaching persons who may be disinclined to talk upon the subject, and will bring to the reader a greater variety of argument and illustration than the tracts.

If it is possible to start an anti-poverty society in your vicinity, do so, and hold weekly or fortnightly meetings. If you are only few in number, get a small hall and trust to growth for larger things. If you cannot get well known speakers, do the speaking yourselves. It is important for the cause that its friends should develop this talent. There is already an urgent demand for speakers who understand our doctrines, and this demand will rapidly increase. Permit no one to become a member of the society unless he is thoroughly with us; it will be a source of weakness if you have to convert your own members. But invite all to your public meetings, and also occasionally invite addresses from those who oppose us, taking pains to have some one present to make at least a short reply to their objections or criticisms. Where no speakers can be had, read at the meetings a tract, a chapter from a book or some one of the speeches or articles that are being constantly published in the STANDARD. If you can, organize a quartette or a chorus, as it will add to the interest and pleasure of your meetings. Some songs may be found in the land and labor tracts, and Miss Munier's book, "Anti-Poverty Sounds," will furnish you with songs set to music. Make a point of taking up collections at each of these meetings, and use the proceeds for missionary work if they are not needed for current expenses.

Form small associations for reading and discussion, such as the Progress and Poverty club which has done such good work in New York. The plan of this club was to read a chapter from "Progress and Poverty" at each meeting and then to discuss it. The original club has gone through that work in this way and is now going through "Protection or Free Trade?" A number of similar clubs have been formed in New York and vicinity, some of them being composed of men alone, some of men and women, and some exclusively of women. These little clubs (and they are most useful when kept within a dozen members) need not have anything formal about them, but may be made up of any two or more persons who will agree to meet on stated evenings at one another's houses.

Where it is practicable, get into such little associations women as well as men. If women do not have votes they do have influence, and in some directions their influence is more important than that of men.

If you belong to an assembly of the Knights of Labor, a trade union, an auxiliary society of a church, a young men's christian association, or a debating society, endeavor to bring up discussions of our principles, and if possible to have regular times set for such discussions.

Seek to arouse all, men, women and children, but make a special effort to attract to our doctrines the attention of clergymen, teachers and others who by their talents or position wield influence. Whether you may be able to bring them to our views or not, any effort you may make to get them thinking about our doctrines is certain to have beneficial effects. Even if you arouse them to oppose us you will do good. Opposition is only somewhat less useful to us than advocacy. Those who contend that some people really own the land on which all people must live, those who argue that society ought to suffer some individuals to grow rich by appropriating values that the whole community creates, are doing missionary work for us. Everything that tends to put people upon inquiry—everything that advertises the fact that there are people in the world who believe that all men have equal rights to the use of land and that public expenses ought to be met from that fund which is created by the growth and improvement of the community, instead of by taxes on labor and the proceeds of labor, will help our cause. Our work is really not so much to educate men as to uneducate them—to bring them back to natural perceptions and first principles. The monstrous injustice involved in attaching to land the same rights of property that justly attach to things produced by labor, where it is not upheld by absolute force, can only exist where accepted as a matter of habit, and people tolerate it because they do not think about it. Argument in defense of such a system will weaken and kill it as certainly and almost as quickly as argument against it.

The impending general discussion of the tariff question will open great opportunities for exciting thought in our direction. The tariff question has the land question beneath it, and cannot really be understood or logically argued to a final conclusion without reference to the land question. A careful reading of "Protection or Free Trade?" will show you this connection, and will arm you against all the fallacies which are urged on both sides of the controversy.

Send to THE STANDARD brief accounts of the formation of any societies that have our ends in view, and of notable meetings or of events or things in your vicinity which may be encouraging or instructive to our friends in other parts of the country. In doing this study brevity, for our space is limited. Write in black ink and leave wide spaces between the lines, for much reading of manuscript is very trying to the eyes of editors. Write only on one side of the paper, as it must frequently be cut up for the printers. Unless you have good reason to the contrary, sign your name, as it shows that you have the courage of your convictions, and also adds to your influence by making you known to others. Send us facts rather than essays.

As to my books—a question that I am frequently asked: "Progress and Poverty" is the most thorough, but it is in reality a scientific book, and although in writing it I did my utmost to make its reasoning as clear as possible, there are yet parts of it which from their very nature are difficult to those who have not been accustomed to close thinking. It is a book to be read not once, but several times. "Social Problems" is, in my opinion, a better book for most people to begin with, and "The Land Question" and "Property in Land," being shorter, are even better adapted for the first reading of a large class. "Protection or Free Trade?" especially now that the tariff has come into political discussion, will be extremely useful not only in giving a thorough understanding of the tariff question but in leading men through the tariff question to the land question.

As for THE STANDARD: You can increase its circulation by getting up clubs among your acquaintances, taking subscriptions for one year, six months, three months or four weeks, and by getting newsdealers to keep it, where they do not already do so. One way of getting a newsdealer to do this is to get him to send for one, two or three copies each week, with the understanding that if he does not sell them you will take them off his hands at the end of the week.

In some of these various ways, or in others that may suggest themselves, every one who wishes to aid the cause can surely do so. And the man who tries to do what he can, be it ever so little, will surely find his power grow and his sphere of usefulness widen. Great meetings, stirring addresses, political campaigns, may be all in their way useful; but that which tells most is the quiet, hand to hand effort of earnest men and women. Do not be impatient to see results; do not be disheartened if you do not see them. No one can ever tell how much he may do. Thought set in motion goes on perpetuating its impulse in ever widening circles, and the humblest and the weakest may strike a spark that will in time kindle a great light.

HENRY GEORGE.

Interesting to Readers in Passaic, N. J.

Readers of THE STANDARD in Passaic, N. J., who wish to organize for the purpose of spreading the principles of the single tax reform are invited to communicate with

J. J. BARNARD,
Box 181, Post office, Passaic, N. J.

HOW TO BECOME WEALTHY.

1. Never work for any one else. In fact it is better not to work at all, in the literal sense. Let others produce wealth. Be it your mission to get it from them.

2. Engage in some occupation in which others have been successful. Do not become a laborer, a mechanic, a clerk or even a professional man and expect to make money as such. It is impossible to accumulate money by doing anything useful. Speculate. The men who are wealthy have been speculators. Beg, borrow or steal enough to begin on. Real estate and politics are choice fields. The landlord controls the tenant body and soul, and the politician who is poor has himself to blame.

3. Do not give credit unless you get good interest and good security.

4. Adopt a high moral tone; attend some church and take an active interest in the vineyard in connection with your particular business.

5. Be charitable. Every cent so given will bring a return in reputation, lull suspicion and give many opportunities to gather in more than your goodness prompted you to give. "Cast thy bread upon the waters and it will return in many days."

6. Be dignified. The majority will mistake this for wisdom and it will inspire confidence in your undertakings.

7. Do no manual labor under any circumstances, and carefully avoid any mental strain that does not pay. You can accumulate enough in one day of speculation to buy brains and muscle for a year.

8. Spread the impression that it is by your superior intellect you have made money. Tell the workmen and other producers of wealth that they are living off your labors, and if they complain abuse them as a worthless, idle set, and declare that any man who is economical, willing to work and temperate, can make $800 a year in any occupation.

9. If you have employes educate them in business habits. Make them as much like machines as possible—pay them their market value and no more, and teach them to feel they are making a living out of you. Compel them to observe any rules you may think it advisable to make in your own interest. If they cannot or will not do so, throw them out and get others. Labor is cheap.

10. If you think you deserve a rest after your great exertions employ a partner—on salary. Eight men out of every ten will be willing to do all your great brain work for about $1,500 a year, and you will then be able to take the profits of your business and confine your exertions to signing receipts, etc.

Adopt the above course and you will become rich, respected and happy. The proof you will find in the prosperity of the men who are following it.

R. A. W.

Toronto, Canada.

The Anti-Poverty Society's Good Work.

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—The sixth public meeting of the Anti-poverty society of St. Louis was held on Sunday evening, 18th inst., at Excelsior hall, with a large attendance. Wm. Harmon, president of the society, introduced Geo. M. Jackson as the chairman of the evening, who made a few introductory remarks. After singing by the choir, W. C. Bohannon recited a chapter from "Social Problems." John G. Hummell then occupied the platform for over an hour, explaining very clearly the beneficial effects of abolishing taxes on production, and placing all taxation on land values. At the conclusion of his address the speaker answered questions which were asked him from the audience. Wm. Harmon closed the meeting with a short address.

At a very well attended meeting of the society the following resolution was adopted and the secretary ordered to transmit it to THE STANDARD for publication:

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this society that a national conference of the friends of the single tax on land values should be held at an early day for the purpose of organizing for the coming presidential campaign, and also that we should put forward a candidate for the presidency, and a ticket for all offices in this state, without any entangling alliances with either of the old parties."

The society also resolved to join the league of anti-poverty societies under the plan decided upon by the executive committee of the New York society.

S. W. Williams, who did such good work in the New York campaign, will speak here on January 8, his subject being "The General Denial."

The society wishes to make an appeal to all friends in St. Louis and elsewhere to contribute financially as soon and often as they are able to its support. This is absolutely necessary for the success of the good work. Contributions will be acknowledged in the St. Louis *New Order*.

CHAS. M. WILSON, Sec.

Is Inclined to Favor a Nomination, but Wouldn't Like to See a Low Tariff Candidate Defeated.

HUTCHINSON, Kansas.—Messrs. Post and Croasdale seem to be in a minority, but united labor folks should have great respect for the views of people who are in the minority. We no doubt all want to take that course which would soonest bring about the result we all desire so ardently.

I must say I was surprised to find two of your leaders opposed to the nomination of a full national ticket. I had hoped that we should be allowed to vote for a presidential candidate holding our views. It seems to me that this would increase our strength. But we might all feel sorry if the running of a presidential candidate should be the means of defeating a low tariff president and electing a high tariff man.

In this way we might be the means of doing just what we don't want to do, viz., increasing taxes on the products of labor and diminishing them on land. The difference between the two old parties is unmistakably in our line. The republicans want to increase taxes on products of labor; the democrats want to diminish them, and we want to abolish them. I hope wise counsels will prevail and will try to be satisfied with whichever plan is adopted, and will do all I can for our principles while life lasts. But I think I am with the majority in favor of a full ticket.

J. G. MALCOLM.

A District Organization that Intends to Discuss Protection and Free Trade.

The members of the Twenty-first assembly district, united labor party, New York city, have settled down to earnest work. The party assciation in the district—that is, the effective workers who compose the club which meets weekly—now number some two hundred members, and each week brings new additions to the ranks. The meetings are held every Tuesday evening at 922 Sixth avenue, near Fifty-second street, and are well attended and enthusiastic. The district has decided to devote the greater portion of each evening to the discussion of topics of vital interest to the party, and to that end has appointed a committee to prepare for each meeting a programme, to consist of papers and addresses and readings from Henry George's "Progress and Poverty." The district will also discuss the propriety of nominating a presidential candidate for 1888, and will introduce, for the purpose of exchanging views and for mental advancement, the hitherto tabooed topic of protection and free trade. As this seems to be the most rational way to get at the truth or falsity of any doctrine or theory, these meetings are not without interest to thinkers and men who are beginning to think. An earnest invitation is extended to the public to attend these meetings each Tuesday evening.

Pro and Con.

COLUMBUS, O.—It is not best to forget the responsibilities of our present situation. We have reached a critical point in our existence; to go forward is the desire of all; how best to get forward is the subject of much doubt. Enthusiasm, however meritorious at other times, in the discussion of such a question, at such a conjuncture as this, is not useful.

There are several objections to entering the presidential race. We may lack an available candidate who will consent to run, or we may lack funds to carry on the campaign. It has been suggested as a third objection that if either of the old parties raises an issue involving our principles we should give them our support. This objection cannot be met by saying such an issue may only involve a portion of one of our principles, or that it may be raised from motives which we cannot approve. It certainly is our duty to support any attempt at legislation which has a tendency in the direction of true reform. We cannot expect to be victorious in a few years, and we should accept any help which is thrown in our way, if we can honorably do so.

On the other hand there is a widespread distrust of and dissatisfaction with the old parties. Men desire to affiliate with a new party of honor and principle, and we must shape our course to draw them to us.

EDW. L. HYNEMAN.

Boston's Anti-Poverty Society Joins in the League.

BOSTON, Mass., Dec. 26.—At the fourteenth regular weekly meeting of the Anti-poverty society at Horticultural hall last night, a brief address was delivered by Samuel Brazier, and Professor Hamlin Garland read and discussed selections from Victor Hugo's works. A business meeting followed the addresses, and the club formally accepted the invitation of the New York Anti-poverty society to unite with the league. A permanent organization was effected by the adoption of a constitution and by-laws. John R. Roche was re-elected president and E. M. White secretary, and the remaining offices will be filled next week. The constitution states that "the object of the society is to spread a knowledge of the truth that God has made ample provision for the needs of all men during their residence upon earth, and that involuntary poverty is the result of the human laws that allow individuals to claim as private property that which the Creator has provided for the use of all." It was announced that the Rev. O. P. Gifford of the Warren avenue (Boston) Baptist church would address the meeting next Sunday evening.

The Henry George Land Club of South Brooklyn.

A number of residents of South Brooklyn have united to organize the Henry George land club, with temporary headquarters at 358 Sackett street. The club will be absolutely non-political, and hopes to attract to its meetings that large class of citizens who, though yet unwilling to accept the doctrine of the single tax on land values, are willing to listen to the arguments in its favor.

The club will hold regular weekly meetings on Tuesday evenings. At each meeting a chapter of "Progress and Poverty" will be read, to be followed by discussion, in which visitors as well as members will be invited to take part. Whenever possible public meetings will be held, at which the great economic questions of the day will be debated pro and con.

The club rooms are open every evening and visitors will be welcome without special invitation. Among the organizers of the club are Messrs. John Muir, John Edelman, L. P. Smith, John Maclagan, Joseph Kehoe and C. T. Christianson.

One of the Men nominated by the Old Parties will be President, and Members of the United Labor Party Should be Free to Express their Choice Between Them.

HENDERSONVILLE, N. C.—I hope the united labor party will not make a presidential nomination next year. One of the two men nominated by the old parties will be the next president, and every voter should express his choice between the two. Our party should make nominations only where there is at least a fighting chance, working elsewhere simply to arouse intelligent interest, and secure intelligent consideration of the principles we advocate.

U. H. WHITNEY BROWN.

A Christmas Present for Dr. McGlynn.

The meeting of the McGlynn parishioners of St. Stephen's parish, held on Friday of last week, being a sort of Christmas celebration, was, if possible, more crowded than ever. Dr. Henry Carey announced that he had presented to the doctor $1,200, raised during the last few weeks by subscription. The speakers were John J. Bealin, who has not attended the meetings for several months on account of sickness, and whose return was warmly welcomed, Mrs. Margaret Moore, George Smith and Edward McDermott. Chairman Feeney presided.

Louis F. Post's Class in Political Economy.

The class in political economy now being conducted by Louis F. Post under the auspices of the Anti-poverty society, already bids fair to be a marked success. About sixty pupils are regular in their attendance, and all show intelligent interest in the study they have undertaken. The class are now engaged in the consideration of the laws of production. The sessions are held every Wednesday evening.

No Bargain With the Old Parties.

NEW YORK CITY.—I think we ought to make an independent nomination next year, even if we have to write our ballots out. Our principles are bound to spread. When we make a convert we hold him. It may take longer than we could wish, but let the progress be in the right direction and free from anything like a bargain with the old parties.

EDWARD HAYES.

The Wedge is Entered, and We Ought to Keep Hauling on It.

NORFOLK, Va.—I am in favor of a presidential candidate first, last and all the time. A candidate, a vote; no candidate, no vote; that's the proposition. We have a wedge entered into the old parties. With a candidate we can continue to maul; without a candidate the wedge will loosen.

R. B. ALLEN.

Will Have a Candidate Even if He Has to Call a Convention of One to Make the Nomination.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.—Hugh O. Pentecost, in THE STANDARD of December 17, expresses my views exactly. If our party does not put a presidential ticket in the field I shall hold a little nominating convention of my own.

J. H. LYNCH.

ANTI-POVERTY.

DR. M'GLYNN AND HENRY GEORGE AT THE THIRTY-FIFTH PUBLIC MEETING.

Testimonials From the Members of St. Stephen's Parish—Chairman Feeney Presides—Dr. McGlynn Shows that the Fundamental Principles of Christianity are the Same as Those Advocated by the Anti-Poverty Society—Henry George on the Social Situation.

The Academy of Music was decorated with evergreens last Sunday evening at the thirty-fifth public meeting of the Anti-poverty society, in honor of Christmas, and there was a holiday air about the bright toilets of the ladies and the cheerful faces of the men. Miss Munier swung her baton with more than usual vigor, and there were extra features of the music. The house was crowded in every part. Henry George announced that on the 15th inst. a benefit would be given to Miss Munier by the Concordia chorus and the Anti-poverty society. Among all, he said, who had taken part in the movement, no one had worked harder—he thought he could say no one had worked as hard—as Miss Munier. Leaving her position as leader of St. Stephen's choir, she had for the greater part of a year devoted the principal part of her time to the purpose of furnishing music to anti-poverty meetings. She had refused the pecuniary compensation tendered her, and a benefit ought to be given her that would fill every seat in the Academy. Mr. George then introduced, as chairman for the evening, Mr. John R. Feeny, chairman of the parishioners of St. Stephen's, who had remained so unswervingly loyal to Dr. McGlynn, and who only a few days before had tendered him a check for $1,200 as a Christmas present.

Mr. Feeney had only spoken for a moment when Dr. McGlynn entered. He was greeted with tumultuous applause, the vast audience rising, the ladies waving handkerchiefs and the men cheering. Two large floral ornaments were handed up to the stage. One was a large wreath of red and white flowers, the other a cross and anchor about four feet high with the inscription in purple and red letters, "From St. Stephen's parishioners to our beloved pastor, Dr. McGlynn." A little girl carried a bunch of white flowers to the doctor on the stage and the applause was renewed.

When the plaudits for Dr. McGlynn had quieted down Mr. Feeney said he congratulated St. Stephen's parishioners that the Anti-poverty society had granted them the opportunity of having a family gathering of its true friends to show that Dr. McGlynn was not a crushed out priest who could be starved into subjection. The true, representative Catholics of St. Stephen's felt that they were right in defending him, and they would continue to do so while they were alive. Mr. Feeney said he was devoting himself to the vindication and restoration to his functions of a pure, pious, holy priest. When St. Stephen's parishioners should be successful in that mission, when they saw Dr. McGlynn once more at the altar of St. Stephen's, their task would still be "the land for the people." The contributions at St. Stephen's hall for the past eleven months had all been voluntary, and the donations had poured in.

The Concordia chorus next sang the exultation hymn, after which Mr. Feeney introduced Dr. McGlynn. He began by reading Alfred Domett's hymn describing the birth of Christ "in the calm and silent night, in the solemn midnight centuries ago," and then read Tennyson's poem on New Year's eve, "Ring out the old, ring in the new; ring out the false, ring in the true." The reading was received with applause, after which Dr. McGlynn spoke as follows:

"In the solemn midnight centuries ago," when Christ was born, new hope was born to a world ready to perish by the weight of its doubt, its misery and its sin. But the Father who had made the world, in mercy and in love, could not forget his original work, and therefore would He give evidence of the great love with which He loved His own handiwork, no matter how strangely fallen from its first estate. And He who was born in that stable centuries ago, in the calm and silent midnight, tells us that God so loved the world—a world so steeped in sin, a word guilty of strangest apostacy, a world steeped in the love of the things of time and sense, and having but little thought or love for the things of the spirit—that He would give for it His only begotten son. But it were unworthy of the Maker to forget His work, to ignore His own image stamped indelibly upon this first flower of all His creation, this highest of all His visible works, this compendium and this mouthpiece of the visible universe.

It is no new truth for you, dear friends, whether you be of that flock to which it was my unspeakable happiness to minister for twenty-one years, or members or guests of this Anti-poverty society, to hear fr u this platform that God has made us in his own image and likeness and that that likeness is in our spiritual part, in the capacity to know the truth, to love the good, to enjoy the beautiful, and that therefore we were made in the image of God, that we might know and love and enjoy him, the infinite, the eternal, the ideal goodness, truth and beauty. It were unworthy of the Father not to honor at all times and everywhere His own sacred, indelible image. And since man, abusing his free will, forgetting the heavenly destiny to which he was raised, would sink again to the level of the brute, the Father, to bring man back to God, must send his well beloved son to take our image, that man, made in the image of God, having apostatized from God, should be brought back to God again by God coming in the image of man.

It was to bring man back to God, it was to teach all men to recognize, honor and revere in themselves the image of God that Christ was born in the solemn midnight, centuries ago. It was to make good the Father's love, and to forbid the lusts and passions of the flesh, the errors of the mind and, if you choose, the enmity of Satan, to mar the Father's work. It was in a manner worthy of the majesty of God out of the very poison to extract the antidote, from the very errors and wanderings to bring out a more perfect truth, after the jarring, the discordant notes of human history, to make human hearts feel the interests of others, to do to others as we would have others do to us, to seek rather the lowliest than the highest place, to anticipate others in honors and in benefits rather than to assert any imagined right of our own, to lose not our time in seeking revenge for evil done us, but to endeavor to heap benefits upon the one that has injured us that we may win him to the love of the Father. It was to teach us to revere in every human being, and, if you will, most in those individual members of the human family who are most degraded and debased, physically, mentally and morally, the image of God; and to sorrow the more, to grieve the more inconsolably because the image of the Father is so debased, so smirched and so distorted; and to find in the crimes, the miseries, the injustices of man but a new inducement to hunger and thirst after justice, to do battle for the right, to give ourselves no rest as long as we live, doing what we can to redress the wrong and to hasten the coming of the blessed day foretold by saints and sages and promised by Him who was born on this blessed night, to do what we can while hastening the coming of the kingdom of heaven on earth, to deserve the reward that He promised to those who shall seek to promote His blessed interests, to hunger and thirst for the coming of that day of perfect justice, that even here we may begin to taste the sweetness of that reward of which He promises us the fullness some time, somewhere, when he says, "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall have their fill." (Applause.)

There can be no member of this Anti-poverty society, no guest of this society here to-night, even though he never have called himself by the name of Christian, who must not feel his mind elevated and his heart purified and stirred to its deepest depths by the lessons taught in the simple gospel of Him who was born in the midnight centuries ago. The quarrel of the world with the Christian church, with Christian kingdoms, with the ministers of Christianity, has never been a quarrel with Christ. It has never been a quarrel with those beautiful, simple teachings and precepts of His blessed gospel. It was a wonderful thing told by a bishop in a recent gathering how he himself had learned that at a meeting of workingmen, while the name of the church was hissed, the name of Christ was received with rapturous and vehement applause. (Applause) There are men here to-night of every denomination of Christians, there are not a few here to-night who are children of that glorious race that gave to us the highest and most wondrous inspired literature of religion of all the ages, so that the Christian priest and monk can find no higher utterance for their most enraptured spiritual thoughts than in the magnificent poetry of the saints, the seers and the singers of Israel. (Applause.)

And I am reminded by this thought that on a not very remote occasion I had the pleasure of standing on the same platform with a distinguished member of that race; and he spoke in wondrously beautiful and touching and eloquent language of the mission and the character of the work of Him who was born in the solemn midnight centuries ago. And he rebuked the thought of those who say that masses of men are discontented to-day with religion, with Christianity, have lost faith in its teachings, hope in its promises, confidence in its ministrations, because the intellectual skepticism and agnosticism of the cultivated classes has percolated down to the masses. "Away with such rubbish," said he. "If the masses to-day are alienated from the Christian churches it is because the Christian churches and the Christian people so often fail to appreciate the spirit, to obey the precepts and to follow the example of Him from whom they take their name." (Great applause.) "Let Christians," he went on to say, "let Christians but believe the doctrines, obey the precepts and imitate the example of Jesus of Nazareth and there shall be but few agnostics in the world." (Applause.)

Dr. McGlynn here referred to the fact that, though it was not the purpose of the Anti-poverty society to set up a new religion, its cardinal principal was the essence of all true religion. He continued:

The world is out of joint. The times are waxing ill. There is unrest that bodes no good for the future of society and our civilization. Men feel that they stand, as it were, upon the brink of a horrid chasm, and they shrink back affrighted. And in this peril of society, in this want and misery, we see many perishing of hunger, we see many stalwart arms that seek employment in vain, we see vast multitudes—millions and tens of millions of men—whose weary, ceaseless toil brings so little requital. The world is hungering for something better; is hungering for rest, for repose, for love, for culture, for virtue. And so the world cries out: "If there be a God will He not have mercy upon his creatures? Can He have forgotten His original work?"

Let us vindicate Christ in the world. Let us be doers as well as preachers of these His heavenly doctrines. Let us do what we can, friends of the Anti-poverty society, you men and women that sit upon this platform and in this hall to make practical the teachings of Christ. Let us do what we can, not by violence, but by persuasion, by example, by earnest effort and by fervent prayer, to raise up the lowly and to beat down the proud, to break down the barriers, and to bring the whole human family into a more perfect knowledge of the Father and a more blessed union with His spirit. It is for this that we are to strive. It is this that gives unspeakable comfort to our hearts. It is this that gives so clear a light to our minds in the midst of the weariness and the crosses and the disappointments and the darkness of life.

Civilization is almost synonymous with and coincident with Christendom. It has been largely the work of Him who was born so long ago, that woman to-day enjoys that deference, that esteem, that reverence, that she enjoys only in Christian lands. It is largely, chiefly, to Him that the slave everywhere has owed his emancipation. It is to Him that the world owes those gentle charities, that it cannot forget, even in the midst of the ignoble pursuit of interest, of pleasure, of pelf and power.

While on other occasions we have said severe things against that so-called charity that will make charity consist too largely in merely alleviating, palliating, some of our social evils while actually fostering the root of these evils, yet should it be our kindly office this evening to sing hymns of praise to Him who has taught the world the inestimable preciousness of the waifs, the strays, the outcasts of human society, the blind, the lame, the feeble, the insane, the useless aged ones, the helpless little ones. While it were a great mistake, a mistake that it is a large part of the office of this society to combat, to make charity consist chiefly in that, while it should consist in the magnificent love of justice for God's sake and for man's sake, yet we find in these precepts and in this teaching a wondrous practical object lesson to teach to all men the infinite preciousness and sanctity of every human life, of every human soul. The test of the strength of a chain is its weakest link. And so, by teaching us the preciousness of these despised ones He teaches us with singular potency the preciousness of all human life, the ineffable dignity of every human soul, the sanctity of the image of God in each human being, utterly regardless of the accidents of its condition. It is the teaching of this Christian society that makes possible, that makes universal, the hope of so large a portion of the human family of the coming of a better day, that has changed the human attitude from one of retrospection to one of expectancy of a better time to come.

The world is looking on for the coming of a better day. It is looking for the millennium, whether actual or figurative, for the golden age to come that shall be the reward of the sorrows, and the cares, and the burdens, and the battles of life, borne and suffered and fought by His people, by the men and the women and the children who throughout the Christian ages have believed His word, and, even as they died, never relinquished their hope of the coming of a better day.

It is because this Anti-poverty society has caught, as if with new freshness, this spirit of the Master, has by a special and a loving providence of God been called to feel with new potency the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man; it is therefore that this vast hall is crowded Sunday after Sunday, that the name of Christ and His teachings and the blessed prayer that He taught us to utter, are received with such tender, loving, and rapturous applause. It is a new thing at which men wonder, and yet it is but the old thing, it is but the perception of the spirit that conquered the world.

Great applause followed the conclusion of Dr. McGlynn's address, and it was some moments before Mr. Feeney could introduce Signor Ducenzi, who sung the tenor solo "Noel," by Adam. The singing was of a high order of excellence and the singer was called out again with vehement applause and constrained to repeat the solo. Mr. Feeney then announced that on New Year's night Dr. McGlynn and Henry George would address the Anti-poverty society and their guests at the Academy of Music.

Then there were calls of "George!" "George!" from all parts of the house. Henry George arose and was welcomed with a shout of "Merry Christmas!" from the gallery, at which there was renewed applause. When quiet had been restored Mr. George said:

It is now almost nineteen centuries since over the stable of Bethlehem in Judea the angels sang that message of peace on earth and good will to men. Almost nineteen centuries, and yet to-day the standing armies of the world are greater than ever before, the money expended on military preparations is larger than ever before, the tariffs that aim at preventing the intercourse of nation with nation are higher than ever before. (Applause.) As we celebrate the festival, as we think of what it means, as we ponder on the truths that our good priest has so eloquently told us, let us also resolve that we will pray with that prayer that St. Augustine has said is in work; to tear down every thing that stands in the way of peace and good will over all the earth (great applause); that the time may come when men may beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; that the time may come when every human being shall be regarded as an equal child of God; that the time may come when there shall be in the world no undeserved poverty, when every child shall enter upon his heritage and when for every human being there shall be opportunity to develop his higher nature. (Great applause.)

The "Adeste Fideles" was then sung by Madame Di Carlo, the Concordia choir singing the chorus, in which the audience also joined. This was encored and the exercises concluded with the singing of "The Cross of Our Crusade," all the audience standing and joining in the hymn.

After the close of the meeting members of St. Stephen's parish and many others in the audience clambered over the footlights on the stage and surrounded Dr. McGlynn to shake hands and wish a merry Christmas. Others turned their attention to the flowers and made short work of the tributes to Dr. McGlynn, nearly every one carrying off some floral memento of the Anti-poverty society's first Christmas.

Through some unfortunate misunderstanding what would have been an interesting and appropriate feature of the occasion was omitted. Miss A. M. Brown, one of the most zealous members of the society, had at great personal trouble and expense prepared a beautiful set of Christmas decorations for the stage which, had her design been carried out, would have presented the appearance of an evergreen bower sprinkled with snow, and fronted with the text, "Peace on earth to men of good will." But by some blunder Miss Brown was at the last moment refused permission to erect the decorations; and before the mistake could be rectified so much time had elapsed that the erection was impossible. Miss Brown, who had worked all night hastening her preparations, was naturally much disappointed, but bore her ill luck patiently.

Changing His Field of Action, but Firm of Mind and Purpose.

The Fourth ward association of the united labor party of Brooklyn met on Friday evening last, and received with regret the following letter of resignation from its president:

To the members of the Fourth ward association of the U. L. P.—Gentlemen: Forced by exigencies of business to resign a position whose duties have been an honor and whose labor a pleasure, permit me to thank you for your uniform courtesy and consideration. Though as far removed from you as one can be and yet remain in this country, believe me, I shall ever take a warm personal interest in your affairs and deliberations. Permit me to express the hope that in the future, as in the past, the watchword and war cry of the association will ever be: "The land for the people!" Until we have this all else is vanity. Sincerely yours, H. T. WHITE.

Mr. White has been an earnest worker in the cause, and will be an acquisition to the party in San Francisco, where he goes to make his home.

The Nineteenth Ward Association of Brooklyn Discuss the Tariff and the Land Tax.

On last Friday, the 23d, the united labor party organization of the Nineteenth ward of Brooklyn met at 145 Walton street and discussed the question whether the advocacy of free trade should be the present policy of land and labor reformers. A. G. Sullivan argued for free trade and Messrs. Murphy and Sayre took the protectionist side. The majority of those present seemed to favor free trade, and of late several stanch protectionists have been converted to the free trade idea. The feeling is that a tariff protects monopoly only and that the abolition of duties would force us to tax and so destroy monopoly of all kinds.

The association is trying to arrange for a new and better meeting hall, and contributions to that end are requested from members who live in the ward.

Put Up a Candidate and Give the Rank and File of the Party a Chance to Show Their Pluck.

NEPONSET, Mass.—I hope it will finally be decided to make a nomination. There has not been a movement since the uprising against slavery that has drawn men to its ranks as this is doing, for principle alone and why should a party made of such material be afraid of showing its strength?

I do not believe the democrats, as a party, have arrived at that point where they have the courage to advocate free trade. So let us have a presidential candidate; put up any good and able man, and I think we will show that the rank and file have got more pluck than some of their leaders give them credit for. Q. A. LOTHROP.

Wants a National Convention Called to Settle the Question as Soon as Possible.

PORTLAND, Me.—Thos. A. McCann's letter in THE STANDARD expresses my sentiments. We should run a presidential candidate next year.

Of course a national convention is the time and place to settle this matter, and I hope and trust that one will be called as early as is consistent with the best interests of the cause. P. H. GORDON.

LANDLORDISM IN ENGLAND.

BOSTON, England, Dec. 9.—Certain instances of social conditions here may serve to show what landlordism means when population becomes dense and society hardened. After that carnival of sycophancy and snobbery last June, the queen's jubilee, a relative of mine, the wife of a large tenant farmer, told me how it was that the jubilee was celebrated in their village. It had been decided not to celebrate, as some thought it all humbug and others very lukewarm; but shortly after the landlord of the place sent over a sum of money and an intimation of his desire to see a celebration; and, said my informer, "What could we do," so the necessary loyalty was manufactured

Among the villagers and farmers one may frequently hear the expression "I live under Sir John or Lord So-and-so," meaning they are his tenants; but I often think that the literal meaning is the true meaning, and in more senses than one. The known influence of every landlord is enormous, but the unseen power is greater still. Once it was a matter of course for every tenant to vote as the landlord directed, and even now, with the utmost secrecy in voting, the power over the tenant is but little diminished. So long, so persistently and successfully have the landlords used their power that great numbers of the tenants have come to really believe in every social injustice or legal iniquity that the landlords uphold, and fight for the maintenance or establishment of them with more zeal than even the landlords themselves.

Through the farmers the landlord can bring great pressure to bear on those poor downtrodden creatures, the agricultural laborers. And this influence is used without stint. The farmers threaten them with dismissal from employment if he suspects they are likely to vote for liberal or radical candidates, and so well known is this intimidation that liberal candidates often feel it necessary to debate upon the ample and complete secrecy which the ballot affords. How helpless the tenents are whenever landlords exert the power that the mere ownership of land gives them is well illustrated by the failure of two acts of parliament passed for the special protection of the tenants. These two acts were the agricultural holdings act and a bill to permit tenants to trap or shoot ground game. The first of these measures was for the purpose of compensating the tenants for unexhausted improvements and the second established the right to destroy game without consent of the landlord. Where the tenants have leases this legislation has been of some small benefit, but as the great majority of tenants are subject to six months' notice to quit, they dare not assert the rights the law gives them. The country is now suffering very keenly from industrial depression, and this, and the keen competition of American produce has resulted in a decrease in the money value of the rent of agricultural land. As a consequence of this we have the most dire predictions of ruin from the landlords and very pathetic appeals to our patriotism and self interest, urging us no longer to be ruined by a deluge of cheap foreign produce.

To hear some of the melancholy speeches from the landlord party one might almost think that the landlords were the most ill-used class in the nation. But, nevertheless, in spite of hard times the rent, measured by the true standard (the proportion of produce), is almost as great as ever, and in the large towns is steadily augmenting, while at the same time a vigorous strike against a reduction in rent is maintained by the landlord farming some of the land at a loss. During the past few years thousands of farmers have been ruined by the attempt to pay impossible rents, and the capital of those who have survived the ordeal has undergone a fearful diminution, but the only remedy that the landlords propose is a tax on foreign corn and release of land from every species of taxation. The truth is that the landlords are ready to confiscate every interest but their own. A tax on food or clothing they call protection, but a tax on land would be confiscation.

On the whole, however, the aspect of affairs here is encouraging. The Irish question is having a great educational effect on the British democracy, and, whether the Irish get home rule soon or late, they are certain to keep up an agitation which is likely to bear good fruit in the future. There is also, here and there, evidence of the growth of correct ideas on the land question among the radical element, which is steadily increasing its ascendancy over the liberal party. Only the other day I saw in the *Times* some translations from the Welsh vernacular press of articles that plainly advocated the doctrine of equal rights to the land. And many utterances of members of parliament show that there are some who long to be free from party pressure on this great question.

ROWLAND HILL.

Believes that the United Labor Party Must Go Right on and Finish Monopoly.

PLAINFIELD, N. J.—At the risk of darkening counsel let me add a word concerning the much discussed nomination for the presidency. Those who would make no nomination argue, it seems to me, from the standpoint of the few, the intelligent few, however—the salt of every movement for reform—who having once perceived the justice of a measure work for it persistently though victory should not be even within sight. Their purpose, as I understand it, is by steady, healthy accretions to build up around the nucleus of the 72,000 already segregated a solid, homogeneous party which, once in power, would stay. To this end they would try to tide over the next presidential campaign, holding the party together if possible by concentrating effort on congressmen, hoping by this course to bring the party into such a condition in regard to members and discipline that it would enter the campaign of '92 with some hope of success. In any normal condition of affairs this would probably be the wiser course. But it seems to me that the posture of affairs is not normal. There are contingencies in the near future which may, probably will, make it necessary for large numbers of persons who now look upon the united labor party as merely a gang of communists to cast in their lot with us for very self-preservation. There is every indication that the big fish will shortly begin to eat up the little ones. The enormous aggregations of capital now going on under the name of pools, trusts, etc.—a movement which has only just begun to gather rapid headway—can have but one object, an object which will soon become apparent to the class above mentioned—to individuals in business, unassociated firms, retailers, and small producers of every sort. When the latter find that the monopolists have them by the throat they will flock to the standard of the only party that offers relief. For all such he must keep open house. We must not leave them to cast about at that critical moment, uncertain where to go. Nor must we permit either of the old parties to steal our thunder by slipping one of our sound planks into its rickety platform, as it will surely attempt to do if it finds us as a party partially disbanded. We must stand ready, with platform perfected and thoroughly advertised and candidates named, to take advantage of the stampede when it comes. The intelligent few who were with us at the start will be with us then also, for they are always to be counted on, being of the fiber that fights right on, though nothing but a corporal's guard is left. In other words, if we wish the co-operation of men who will be driven into our ranks by their necessities and afterward held there by their slowly educated convictions, we must furnish them with just such a mechanism for the expression of their political faith as they have been accustomed to, so that the transfer from the old to the new may be most easily made.

We may take a lesson right here from one of the shrewdest political managers our country has known—Abraham Lincoln. I say shrewdest, because when a moral question is brought into the arena of politics he is always the shrewdest politician who takes the most direct and candid way of solving it. He saw early that slavery was doomed if any struggle should be provoked. He simply announced this as his individual conviction and as inevitable from the constitution of things, but took no step to urge it on, even after he was elected president. All through the first year of the war, however, he kept strict watch of the popular feeling. As the national purpose concerning the institution began to gather head he quietly provided means for its destruction, but took no overt action. When the popular will became unmistakable he issued his provisional proclamation. Then followed the proclamation proper, with a united north behind it and a million men under arms to enforce its provisions, and slavery was swiftly swept into the limbo of departed tyrannies.

The conditions are much the same now. The united labor party desires the abolition of private property in land, and serves its notice through its platform. The monopolies that thrive upon the evil only grow more insolent. The party answers by issuing its ultimatum and marshaling its forces. When the nation, roused to the assumption of its sovereign function, turns to give the hydra of monopoly its finishing blow, it must find ready to its hand, not a rusty weapon, not even a capable weapon only, but a familiar weapon, serviceable entirely and keen with recent use. To my way of thinking, the united labor party should not even sleep on its arms. It should issue at once three days' cooked rations and forty rounds, order all its forces into line and throw out skirmishers. S. H. R.

Hold No Parley With the Forces of Evil.

TORONTO, Can.—Writing, as I do, from the most conservative city in a conservative country I feel that in judging by my surroundings I am not likely to err on the sanguine side. We have watched your campaign from start to finish, and although some expected a larger vote, yet those best qualified to judge were surprised by the manner in which you held your ground in New York city and advanced the banner through the state. We know also that not one member who was really a George man has turned his back.

We know many who have joined since. We know that if funds were wanting for another election to-morrow we could send dollar for dollar from the self same sources and more besides. We have heard nothing, but let us get at them again, and next year we will make the running livelier.

Now, why is there any doubt about nominating a presidential ticket? The idea of us being a laughing stock is absurd. The enemy are too keenly alive to the real strength of our position to indulge in much laughter. The prohibitionists, far from being a laughing stock, are a model for us to take pattern by. They deserve the credit and praise of all honest men for the manly way they have fought losing battles often to victory, even if we do not altogether agree with their platform. If we do not nominate a presidential ticket we are to a certain extent lost sight of and swallowed. If we do stand out bold and clear before the world and our ideas with us can we advance our fight better than in the turmoil of a presidential election? When men are being persuaded from one idea to another let us hold no parley with the forces of evil. Let us neither give nor take quarter. Let our watch word be for "Home and Freedom," as in the olden time "For St. George and Merrie England." R. CARTWRIGHT,
Vice President Toronto A. P. S. L.

The Pioneer United Labor Club of Oswego.

OSWEGO, N. Y.—The Pioneer united labor club of this city is in a flourishing condition. Our membership is steadily increasing, and we intend to place a full city ticket in the field next spring, and I think we will succeed in electing a majority of city officials pledged to land and labor reform.

Last fall we polled 671 votes for Henry George. We were not thoroughly organized at the time, and the doctrine of land for the people was not so well understood as it is at present. Earnest, thoughtful men are joining our ranks, and all our members are working hard for recruits. Tracts are distributed freely, and converts to the land and labor party are made daily. Our meetings heretofore have been held in the Seamen's union hall, but hereafter will be held in a suite of rooms kindly placed at our disposal by our president, Mr. James Ryan, which we intend to fit out as reading rooms. Members of the club will contribute books of all kinds, and everything will be done to increase our membership. Our meetings are held every Tuesday evening, and we hope soon to have some eminent speakers from headquarters to assist us in carrying on the good work.

ALEX SKILLIN,
Treasurer Pioneer Land and Labor Club.

What the Treasury Surplus Represents.

BALTIMORE, Md.—In a recent sermon one of our most prominent preachers, after enumerating many causes for thankfulness to God, struck one that, to me, was rather amusing. He thanked God for the $105,000,000 surplus in the treasury.

I could not help thinking how much pauperism has been caused by the taxation which that surplus represents.

The average earnings of workingmen are but little more than $300 a year. This surplus, therefore, represents a year's labor of 350,000 men; and supposing each wage earner to support a wife and three children, the year's support of no less than 1,750,000 human beings swallowed up by my friend the clergyman's is "cause for thanksgiving." Of course the same view can be taken of the whole system of tariff and internal revenue taxes.

WM. U. HILL, M. D.

Stand Up and Be Counted.

SUMMIT, R. I.—I say let the voters for the principle stand up and be counted in the coming presidential election. I sometimes think that the members of our party do not even yet fully comprehend the magnitude of the work involved in the effort to establish the principle on which our platform is based.

L. INGRAHAM.

All in Favor of a Nomination.

JACKSONVILLE, Ill.—The new crusade has many friends here, though as yet they are unorganized, and as far as I can learn they all favor a presidential nomination.

DANIEL E. PIERSON.

SEEKING FOR ADVICE.

A Methodist Layman Appeals to the Editor of the "Christian Advocate" to Say Wherein He is Wrong in Advocating the Single Tax on Land Values.

Rev. O. P. Fitzgerald, D. D., Editor *Christian Advocate*, Nashville, Tenn.—Dear Editor and Brother: From my boyhood I have been taught to esteem you as a wise counselor as well as a faithful and consistent minister of the gospel. I am glad to say that I still regard you as I have done "from my youth up." For that reason I come, respectfully, reverently, as to an elder brother and friend, for counsel and light on what I am persuaded is a most vital subject—vital, not only to the cause which is dear to you and to me, in which you are a prominent worker, but to the world at large, the people of every ecclesiastical faith and of no ecclesiastical faith.

Did I think you capable of dismissing me and the subject in the superficial, not to say flippant, manner which I regret to see so many of our ministers are doing, I would save the time and effort required to write this letter. But I am persuaded better things of you, Dr. Fitzgerald, and believe that you will readily respond in this, our time of need, and help us, for thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, join me in asking your aid to reach safe, wise and Christian conclusions with reference to the subject under consideration.

Recently you delivered an address of welcome to a convention of prominent educators assembled in the city of Nashville. Among many good things which you said I note the following:

You will not be satisfied until something is done to insure a more equal distribution of the benefits of common school education. If the state is the educational unit in a state school system, then all the children of the state should be treated as nearly alike as possible. She should not make children of some and only step-children of others. She should not give universal education to a few and deny the rudiments of English to the many. Let all the children have their bread and milk before you give pound cake and plum pudding to any.

My information is that the utterance of the words quoted elicited hearty applause, as it was proper they should have done, for they are wise and brave words and contain the essence of the gospel truth upon which all Christian faith is founded, viz: "God is no respecter of persons;" that is, as we understand it, He has no favorites among His children to whom He would "give university education" while "denying rudiments of English to the many." Now, doctor, there are, as I have already indicated, a large number of our brethren who claim that our social machinery is so adjusted that a comparatively small number, by monopolizing the earth, from which all must draw the means of subsistence, are enabled to enjoy the "pound cake and plum pudding" of life while the many are denied the "bread and milk," or, if they get the bread and milk, it is stale bread and skimmed milk.

These brethren are honest and reasonable. They do not demand that the superior advantages be transferred to them, as some thoughtless persons claim they do; they simply demand, as the children of a common Father, with reference to the things essential to life, what you justly say is due to the children of Tennessee with reference to educational privileges. To bring about such equality they simply propose to employ the reasonable and peaceful method of taxing land values and relieving everything else. They subscribe fully to the scriptural doctrine that "if a man will not work neither should he eat," so it cannot be claimed that they desire any advantage.

Are these brethren right or wrong, doctor? If right, aid them in their effort to secure to all the children (of God) their bread and milk before giving pound cake and plum pudding to any. If they are wrong tell them wherein they are wrong.

I urge you as a Christian, as a citizen, as a brother, turn not a deaf ear to your brethren.

I have addressed you through THE STANDARD for the reason that many of those who are thinking on this subject look to its columns for information. I am sure the publishers will give you the space necessary for your reply. Necessity forces me to use for the present a nom de plume. Give the aid asked and I'll thank you in a personal letter. Fraternally yours, A METHODIST LAYMAN.

What Could Any Man Do for Us More Than the Democratic President Is Already Pledged to Do?

I think we have found a presidential candidate already at our hands. That is Mr. Cleveland. He is president already, and as chief magistrate of our country proposes an entrance into the strongholds of monopoly itself. Why need we go further at this time for a president? What more could a man do for us now than to commence reducing the burdens laid upon the existence and industry of the people of the country?

Let us as a political party do our best to elect representatives in congress to support the proposition of Mr. Cleveland, and to support further propositions. Let us also show ourselves in the state and local elections of the coming year, and whatever we do, do it on our own tickets. Thus doing, there is no danger but we can keep our lamps trimmed and burning till another presidential election.

We don't want to wear out Henry George by running him as a candidate all the time. Rather let us wear out Mr. Cleveland.

When Cleveland stops short our movement will simply go on past him and without him. But meantime let us not be cramped by the idea that no man can do us any good unless he belongs to our own family circle.

It is quite true that by running a candidate of our own we might reduce the vote for Cleveland enough to elect Blaine, and thus aggravate the evils that afflict our country, and in this way we might force people to a realizing sense of the value of our principles as the only salvation for the country. But if we obey our higher and less material promptings we will not take this course. We will not do evil that good may come.

J. B. PACKARD.

The North Side Land and Labor Club of Chicago.

CHICAGO, Ill.—We have started a land and labor club on the north side and had our first public lecture last Wednesday evening at No. 26 and 28 Clybourn avenue, at which we had a large and attentive audience. The speakers were Messrs. J. Z. White, president anti-poverty society, Clarence Moeller, Mr. Cowdery and T. W. Whittler. The latter announced the object of the club, saying that it was for the purpose of bringing about a more thorough understanding of the land question as expounded by Henry George, to awaken interest among the masses on this great and momentous question, and, in fact, to do anything and everything possible in a peaceable and lawful manner to get this great question before the people in its proper light. To accomplish this object it is the intention of the club to give free lectures as often as possible and also to distribute tracts and THE STANDARD among the audience attending the lectures. T. W. WHITTLER.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
32 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, $2.50; six months, $1.25; 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 at every postoffice 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, DECEMBER 31, 1887.

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 co-operation of citizens of other states, the following declaration of principles adopted on September 23, 1886, 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 corruptions of government and the impoverishment of labor result from neglect of the self-evident truths proclaimed by the founders of this republic that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, we aim at the abolition of a system which compels men to pay their fellow creatures for the use of God's gifts to all, and permits monopolizers to deprive labor of natural opportunities for employment, thus filling the land with tramps and paupers and bringing about an unnatural competition which tends to reduce wages to starvation rates and to make the wealth producer the industrial slave of those who grow rich by his toil.

"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 benefcent inventions as the railroad and telegraph a means for the oppression of the people and the aggrandizement of an aristocracy of wealth and power. We declare the true purpose of government to be the maintenance of that sacred right of property which gives to every one opportunity to employ his labor, and security that he shall enjoy its fruits; 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 be better done by organized society than by individuals; and we aim at the abolition of all laws which give to any class of citizens advantages, either judicial, financial, industrial or political, that are not equally shared by 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 organizing a great national party on this broad platform of natural rights and equal justice. We do not aim at securing any forced equality in the distributon 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 or capital 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 his holding or title, but by abolishing all taxes on industry or 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 its area, but according to its value, must, while relieving the working farmer and small homestead owner of the undue burdens 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 horde of officials required by the present system of taxation and with its incentives to fraud and corruption, we would further promote the common weal and further secure the equal rights of all, by placing under public control such agencies as are in their nature monopolies: We would have our municipalities supply their inhabitants with water, light and heat; we would have the general government issue all money, without the intervention of banks; we would add a postal telegraph system and postal savings banks to the postal service, and would assume public control and ownership of those iron 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, and while 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 evil effects of ignoring those rights, 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.

And since the ballot is the only means by which in our republic the redress of political and social grievances is to be sought, we especially and emphatically declare for the adoption of what is known as the "Australian system of voting," in order that the effectual secrecy of the ballot and the relief of candidates for public office from the heavy expenses now imposed upon them, 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 solicit the co-operation of all patriotic citizens who, sick of the degradation of politics, desire by constitutional methods to establish justice, to preserve liberty, to extend the spirit of fraternity, and to elevate humanity.

BISHOP HUNTINGTON'S LETTER.

In another column of THE STANDARD appears the open letter of Bishop Huntington in defense of the church association for the advancement of the interests of labor. It is a document which deserves the widest circulation. Manly, timely, and in the true sense conservative, it recognizes that grave social problems are pressing for solution; that in some way or another gross injustice is being done to a large class of human beings; and that the principles involved are so essentially religious as to make it the solemn duty of Christian pastors to examine into the matter, that they may guide their flocks aright, and apply their efforts to the end "that the class of workingmen shall be righteously put into such righteous conditions that they can be made righteous men." Bishop Huntington has approved himself a stalwart champion of the association over which he presides. He has defended its existence, its purpose and its methods, and he has done all this so clearly, so logically and so exhaustively as completely to refute the criticisms of his correspondent.

Yet, clear as has been Bishop Huntington's utterance, admirable as are the principles and methods of his society, it seems to me that there is still something to be said to which the members of the association may properly be asked to listen.

Here are the principles and methods of the association, as stated under the signatures of the president and secretary:

PRINCIPLES.

1. It is of the essence of the teachings of Jesus Christ that God is the father of all men and that all men are brothers.
2. God is the sole possessor of the earth and its fullness: man is but the steward of God's bounties.
3. Labor, being the exercise of body, mind and spirit in the broadening and elevating of human life, it is the duty of every man to labor diligently.
4. Labor as thus defined should be the standard of social worth.
5. When the divinely intended opportunity to labor is given to all men, one great cause of the present widespread suffering and destitution will be removed.

METHODS.

1. Prayer.
2. Sermons setting forth the teachings of the gospel as the guide to the solution of every question involved in the interests of labor.
3. The proper use of the press and the circulation of tracts as occasion may require.
4. Lectures and addresses on occasions when the interests of labor may be advanced.
5. The encouragement, by precept and example, of a conscientious use of the ballot.

Sermons setting forth the teachings of the gospel!

What are the teachings of the gospel which can be applied to "the solution of every question involved in the interests of labor?" It is not hard to find them. In the Sermon on the Mount Christ explicitly defined the laws by which His followers should be governed in their intercourse with their fellow men, and emphasized them by the concluding warning that—

Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock. . . . And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand.

Let any clergyman of the Church association for the advancement of the interests of labor declare these laws from the pulpit, and instruct his congregation that they are no easy going platitudes, meaning nothing in particular, but rules of life, to break the absolute letter of which is a sin, while to deny the duty to obey them literally is to reject Christianity; and see what sort of effect he will produce upon his hearers. Let him sit down to write a sermon on the subject, and as he writes it consider what would happen if his congregation should pay heed to it. How would the laboring man fare in "the part of the year when there is no supply of work" if he did as Christ distinctly orders him to do and took no thought for the morrow, but left the morrow to take thought for the things of itself? How long would the well-to-do citizen's wealth abide with him if when any one would sue him at the law and take away his coat he should follow Christ's plain instructions and abandon to the plaintiff his cloak also? What would become of society if every Christian gave to him who asked and turned not away from him who would borrow?

The members of the Church association for the advancement of the interests of labor will not dispute that the Christ whose precepts they are constantly urging their fellow men to obey really did lay down clear, unmistakable laws for the guidance of men in their temporal affairs. They cannot deny that, as society is at present constituted, a literal compliance with Christ's teachings is so absolutely impossible that any preacher proposing it would be thought insane. They must admit either that Christ's words were but idle breath, or that there is something radically wrong in our social organization, which must be remedied before men can even begin to be Christians.

Bishop Huntington ridicules the idea "that King David wrote 'platitudes,' and that St. Paul meant 'nothing in particular.'" But on every Sunday of the year the Christian clergy proclaim, either by their words or by their silence, that Christ himself uttered "platitudes" and meant "nothing in particular." They preach to their congregations a Christ so loving of humanity that he gave His life for it, yet so careless of humanity that he mocked the suffering He saw around Him on earth with senseless remedies and words which had no meaning.

In a certain sense the criticism of Bishop Huntington's correspondent is justified. There is no call for a church association for the advancement of the interests of labor. For the advancement of the interests of labor is a social question; and while the church, by implication or avowal, admits that the teachings of her founder have no application to society as a whole, it must be worse than useless to seek to apply those teachings to a single section of society. Christ says to men, Do certain things,—follow certain rules of action,—and I promise that you shall not want. And after well nigh nineteen centuries the church of Christ surveys mankind, sees that the majority of them *do* want, sees that they *don't* obey Christ's rules of action, and—organizes an association to find out what's the matter. The problem that in truth confronts the church is wider, deeper far than that which the association for the advancement of the interests of labor are endeavoring to solve. It is the question of the truth or falsehood of the whole scheme of Christianity. If the express promise of temporal blessings to mankind is a mockery and a delusion, on what foundation can men build a hope that the promise of eternal bliss will not prove equally fallacious? If the direct commands of the Master must perforce be disregarded, how can it be expected that the exegetical commands shall be obeyed? Men ask, Of what use is this gospel you declare to us? And the church answers, Die and see.

The church association declare in their statement of principles that "God is the sole possessor of the earth and its fullness; man is but the steward of God's bounties." Let them look around them and observe how the stewardship is administered. They declare that the opportunity to labor is divinely intended for all men. Let them imagine this declaration converted from a platitude to a living truth, and they will discover that a state of society is possible in which every precept of the Sermon on the Mount shall be joyfully obeyed to the letter. Mankind as a whole have violated a fundamental law of God. As a necessary consequence they find themselves, as individuals, compelled to the daily violation of other laws of God under penalty of destitution or death. When once the social crime is undone individual righteousness of life will become possible.

T. L. McCREADY.

HAVE DEMOCRATS THE PLUCK TO DO IT?

The democratic party has of late been so little accustomed to conducting campaigns in behalf of any vital principles that a few words of friendly advice from those who believe that political parties representing no principles are obstructive public nuisances may not be amiss. In the first place, the party may as well dismiss the notion that it can run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. Tariff reduction will surely benefit the many, but it is, for the time being, menacing to powerful interests that have long been accustomed to use governmental powers for their private advantage. These men are going to fight, and they know how to fight. They understand what the republican party has done for them and they will freely supply it with the munitions of war in order that it may continue the system that has built up their fortunes while impoverishing the country. The democratic trimmers need not think that they can fool the protected monopolies by any false pretenses. The men at the head of the industries fostered by government at the public cost are about the shrewdest set of men in this country, and the democrats in and out of congress cannot give them any points in lying or trickery.

Neither can they fool the workingmen by any half hearted declarations of their desire to continue the protection of American labor. The workingman who still believes that the tariff is maintained for his benefit is going to vote for the republican candidate. He may not have much sense, but he would simply be an idiot, if wanting that kind of goods, he should pass by the shop which makes them its sole stock in trade to buy of the opposition shop where protective tariffs are decried. If the democratic party is going into this campaign declaring that any tax on commodities protects labor, and that it is in favor of only a little less protection than the republican party offers, then it is going to be beaten, and it will richly deserve defeat. If protection is a good thing workingmen cannot have too much of it, and they would be very silly not to vote the republican ticket.

But the democratic party need not lose the votes of workingmen because of the attitude into which it is likely to be forced by the president's message. If it has any pluck or sense at all, it can win more votes than it will lose on that issue. It can not proclaim itself for free trade, because it has not yet learned how to raise a federal revenue without a tariff; but it can and, if it hopes to win it, must deny that a tariff protects labor. The programme is a very simple one. The republican party proclaims that a high tariff protects labor and that that is the reason, and the only reason, why it favors a high tariff. This involves a stupid untruth, and all that the democrats need do is to show that it is an untruth. There is no real difficulty in showing this to a workingman as well as to any other kind of a man. The ability to comprehend a truth, clearly presented, does not depend on a man's vocation, but on his honesty and intelligence.

The workingmen already know that one-half of the republican declaration is false,—the pretense, namely, that the protected monopolists who have perpetuated the tariff have done so from a desire to maintain high prices for American labor. The numerous strikes and lockouts in the protected industries have opened their eyes concerning that matter. But many of them still believe that but for the system by which their bosses profit so enormously they themselves would be thrown out of work, and that there would be less money to divide among them; while now and then they do, for a time, secure an advance in wages. So long as they believe this they will vote for the high tariff party, and when they cease to believe it they will desert that party in a body. The democratic party must show them that the tariff hurts instead of helping the great mass of working people. Every time the party does this it makes a vote, and every time it admits that the tariff, "up to a certain point," really protects labor it loses a vote itself, or makes one doubly sure to the republican candidate.

Whatever may be the plan of campaign with which the democratic party enters this fight, its speakers, when they once begin to face audiences, will find that they must denounce and expose, and not attempt to defend, the protective theory. This the party must do or die.

MANUAL TRAINING IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

After the 1st of February next the children in a limited number of grammar schools in this city are to receive a course of "manual training," the girls being instructed in the arts of cooking and sewing and the boys in carpentry. The instruction is intended to be singularly thorough. The cooking course will include instruction in physiology, the chemical constituents and nutritive values of different foods and the best methods of preparing them, practical marketing, tests of quality, economy in the use of fuel and other matters which go to make up the ideally economical housekeeper. In the higher grades practical lessons will be given in ornamental needlework and dressmaking. The boys are to receive equally thorough training. They will learn designing, modeling, the use of tools and the elements of mechanics and physics. It is estimated that from 3,000 to 5,000 children will receive the benefits of the course during the coming year; and should the system prove as successful as is anticipated it will be extended to all the schools in the city. The beginning of this rational system of fitting boys and girls for the work of men and women marks a new era in our educational system, and we owe for it great thanks to such men as the late Peter Cooper, Felix Adler, Courtland Palmer and the other men and women who have been pioneers in the work. Once introduced into our public schools, manual training is sure to be exceeding popular and to steadily make its way. From time to time new branches of instruction will probably be added. The girls will be taught stenography and type writing, designing and engraving, bookkeeping, correspondence, etc.; the boys will be fitted for mechanical and civil engineering, printing, book binding, lithographing and other skilled occupations. Instructed by carefully selected teachers, at a period of life when their minds are peculiarly receptive and their muscles easy to be trained, these boys and girls will acquire a degree of proficiency unattainable by any present methods. Moreover, each child will be developed along the line of his or her special aptitude, and will run no risk, as at present, of being forced into some uncongenial occupation. The boy with an aptitude for carpentering will become a carpenter; the girl of artistic instincts will graduate as an engraver or designer, while she of domestic tastes will develop into a model cook and housekeeper. Each will learn just that sort of work for which he or she is best adapted; and the result will be not only a constantly increasing body of skilled workers, but a steady advance of the standard of excellence in every department of human industry.

The benefits to accrue from such a scheme are patent. If carried out in its entirety the boys and girls of New York who, a few years hence, enter upon the actual business of life, will do so with advantages to which their parents have been strangers. Instead of having to serve tedious apprenticeships at occupations chosen haphazard, or sinking into common unskilled laborers, or degenerating into criminals and vagabonds, they will be ready to accept employment as artisans or in positions of responsibility at once. And their school training will have affected them as consumers as well as producers. They will scornfully decline to use the adulterated or innutritious foods, the scamped work on poor material, the tawdry imitations of artistic products, which their parents contentedly accept and even admire. They will insist on having good things or none. The squalor of the tenement house will revolt them. The groggery will offer fewer temptations. The attractiveness of pure enjoyment will grow with the capacity to enjoy. This is the bright side of the picture. Unfortunately the canvas is painted on both sides.

Consider the condition of the artisan class to-day. If it is better than that of the unskilled laborer, is it not because of and in proportion to the difficulty of acquiring the required skill? It is one in which preparation for industrial war is varied by actual hostilities. In every trade there seem to be already more competitors for work than there is work to be done, and the effort of the artisan is to restrict this competition. To this end trades unions are organized, whose bottom principle is that when there is not work enough to go round, members of the union shall submit to go without work rather than compete with their fellows. To this end the teaching of apprentices is checked, and an agitation is beginning against the importation of foreign labor. When the quantity of work to be done diminishes, or the number of men to do it increases, wages fall; when the work increases, and the men diminish, wages rise. A great fire in which immense quantities of manufactured products are destroyed is a blessing to the trades that produce them; an invention which simplifies the process of production makes life more difficult in the trade which it affects; and the teaching of useful trades to the inmates of our prisons is acknowledged by our law makers to be a legitimate cause of complaint on the part of honest men who work for their living. All this is absurd, of course; but the most strenuous advocate of things as they are will hardly dispute that it is strictly true.

Now, what will happen when into a society existing under such conditions there shall be injected every year thousands of young men and women specially trained to various vocations, sober, industrious, eager for employment, and with all the advantage of having lived since early childhood in the city where they are seeking work? What will the carpenters do when every grammar school in the city shall be vomiting yearly a graduating class of certificated carpenters? What will the printers, and the stenographers, and the wood engravers, and the engineers, and all the rest of them do when this flood of skilled labor shall be let loose upon society?

These are questions as easy to answer as they are to ask. Economic conditions remaining as they are, the resultant evil to all classes of honest skilled workers would be more terrible than if all the criminals and prostitutes in the country should be converted into honest, hard-working people; and could only be equaled by the frightful results which would follow the sudden transformation of the whole army of tramps into sober, healthy, work-seeking citizens.

What will the man who earns twenty dollars a week do when half a dozen equally competent men are offering to do his work for fifteen dollars? He must do one of three things. If fitted to take the place of some other man receiving higher pay, he can try to secure that man's place at twenty dollars or less; or he can consent to a reduction of his own wages to fifteen dollars; or he can abandon his job, and let the other man take it. Whichever course he may adopt, the result must be to diminish the net earnings of himself and others; and when his case is that of increasing thousands of his fellow workers, the aggregate reduction will be increasingly large. Reduced earnings involve reduced expenditure—a smaller demand for the products of industry—which in turn diminishes the amount of work to be apportioned among wage earners, thus still further increasing the competition for what work there is. Such will be the tendency when the feeble barriers of trades unionism, already strained to the limit of their strength, shall be swept away by the rush of a generation qualified by education for skilled occupations and with sufficient self respect to make them unwilling to sink into criminals or alms takers. When skilled labor becomes as common as unskilled it will be as poorly paid.

And is there no menace to society in all this? Hearken to the words of wisdom of the *Evening Post*, delivered *ex cathedra* in the very issue whose news columns contain an account of the proposed advance in school methods:

As we have heretofore pointed out, there is no possible way of detecting an anarchist or labor agitator when he lands from the steamer. The worst cut-throats or bomb throwers are very apt to wear the mildest and most studious expression of countenance, and are very often the best educated in a whole shipload.

Remember that to the intelligence of the *Evening Post*, the words "cut throat" and "bomb thrower" are synonymous with "anarchist" and "labor agitator;" and then observe that in the *Post's* experience men of these classes are apt to be distinguished by "studious expression" *and superior education.* Is there no warning here of danger in educating children to be discontented with their condition without at the same time rendering it possible for them to emerge from that condition? The reverse side of the picture is as appalling as its obverse is alluring.

The fact is that so long as society consents to ignore the fundamental truth that every human being has an equal right of access to the storehouse of nature during his stay upon this earth and no longer, so long will it be confronted with just such paradoxes as this. Restore to the children of our slums and tenements their birthright in the bounties of providence; and the more thorough the industrial education given them the greater will be their production of wealth; but to develop in them the faculties for producing and the qualities for enjoying, while denying them the right to produce or enjoy save by permission of specially favored men and women, who are given by our laws the exclusive ownership of the earth, is but to awake in them a fierce spirit of unrest and discontent which in some way or another will surely find vent. The world will be fortunate indeed if the line of least resistance shall prove to be in the direction of justice and equal rights.

WORK TO BE DONE.

There is some danger that the general expression of favor toward the Australian system of voting made immediately after the late election may fail to influence the legislature unless some organized effort is made to push the reform. THE STANDARD is circulating petitions which will doubtless be numerously signed; but petitions, though useful, will not alone force a reluctant legislature to pass a bill that confessedly aims to curtail the power of money in politics and to make bribery difficult or impossible.

The united labor party has thus far been foremost in pressing this reform on public attention, but its interest in the matter is no greater than that of other parties, and no party can have any interest other than that born of a desire for clean and honest elections. If the subject were once fully comprehended by our people, no party would dare to refuse to pass some bill that would assure the printing of ballots by the state and absolute secrecy in voting.

The principal question is, how shall public opinion be educated and aroused? To do this effectively there must be some co-operation among all interested. The Anti-poverty society has received the promise of a prominent democratic advocate of the system to deliver an address before it on this subject, and it has received a valuable paper on the question from a prominent republican, to be read on the same evening. Everything is arranged but the date.

This is very well, but it is not enough. Republicans, democrats and prohibitionists who desire decent elections and clean politics should co-operate in the effort to secure a reform in our system of balloting at this session of the legislature, and the more perfect the co-operation between members of all parties the greater will be the chance that such a bill can pass a republican legislature and receive the signature of a democratic governor. If our daily papers are really sincere in their advocacy of the Australian system of voting they ought to stir up their readers to action. At least one reform measure should mark this winter's session of the legislature.

The New York *Times* prints an epitome of a recent report of the commissioner of the Michigan labor bureau which is decidedly interesting reading, especially to those who persist in refusing to believe that the American farmer is fast exchanging the condition of an independent land owner for that of a dependent tenant. The commissioner presents statistics of 90,803 Michigan farms. Of these 43,079 are mortgaged for fifty-five to sixty per cent of their assessed valuation, the average rate of interest being 7.2 per cent, "which means that they are paying the mortgagee his entire loan every fourteen years in addition to being held for the principal." This, the *Times* goes on to say,

is a lamentable condition of affairs and one under which no agricultural community can maintain even the appearance of prosperity for any length of time. The Michigan farmers are seemingly engaged in a struggle to enrich the money lenders of the state, instead of to render themselves independent, and the records show that their history is not peculiar among agriculturists. The farmer will never wrest a good inheritance from the ground until he is content to live within his means and ceases to discount the future by borrowing on the security of his homestead.

Apparently the *Times* imagines that the Michigan farmer mortgages his homestead for the fun of the thing, and that he may have a season of wild enjoyment in the present at the cost of a little extra work in the future. Men of more practical minds will appreciate the fact that in Michigan, as everywhere else in the civilized parts of our country, the man who wants to till the land must first pay somebody else who doesn't till the land for the privilege of doing so. A Michigan farmer's mortgage generally means that the original "owner" of the soil, besides taking all the cash the farmer could scrape together, has exacted in addition the promise of a heavy yearly payment, which the farmer is bound to make under penalty of having his license to till the soil revoked, and very often his house, barn, live stock, etc., confiscated into the bargain. As for discounting the future, the farmer, as a rule, hasn't much future to discount.

The New York *Commercial Bulletin* of a recent date devotes a large portion of its editorial space to the discussion of the social question. That "the rich are growing richer, and the poor are growing poorer," it asserts,

has been the refrain of pretty much all the public addresses of which Mr. George and Mr. George's labor movement has lately been provocative, as well as the text of about all of the Sunday evening discourses that are delivered before the workingmen's Anti-poverty society at the Academy of Music and echoed throughout the country. The net result of such impressions, which are permitted to pass unchallenged, it is unnecessary to say, is to foment discontent and to create a feeling of hostility between different classes in a country where classes have no official recognition.

And lest the discontent should become too much fomented, the *Commercial Bulletin* hastily gets out its blue books, and proves from official statistics that in Great Britain at least "the rich, if anything, are growing poorer, and the poor richer." As regards the United States, it declines to commit itself to any positive statement until the census of 1890 shall have been taken, but meantime it believes "that the demagogic dogma . . . would be found not less fallacious in its application to the United States than to Great Britain."

It is a pity that the *Commercial Bulletin* should have wasted so much space in the discussion of a question which is, after all, of comparatively trifling importance. What the "workingmen's Anti-poverty society" claims is not that the poor are poorer than they ever were before, but that by the theft of their birthright they are kept in poverty now. And the *Commercial Bulletin* will do well to consider whether, by telling the poor they really are as well off as they have any right to expect, it may not be doing more to "foment discontent" than those who recognize the grievous affliction of humanity and propose a peaceful and efficient remedy for it.

Miss Munier's Concert.

Frequent rehearsals for the concert to be tendered Miss Munier by the Anti-poverty society in the Academy of Music on Sunday evening, January 15, are now being held and a fine entertainment is promised. Tickets can be obtained at the room of the Anti-poverty society, 30 Cooper union, at THE STANDARD office, and from any of the members of the chorus. Admission tickets cost fifty cents, reserved seat tickets $1.

Make New York the Battlefield Once More.

ELLENVILLE, N. Y.—Why not fight it out on the New York line? Run a candidate for governor next fall and test the question of an advanced vote for the principle of the single tax?

JAMES L. PURCELL.

IN ENGLAND'S JUBILEE YEAR.

Close following the glorious jubilee festivities of her majesty the queen come discordant sounds of distress from the east end. Though, as Lord Salisbury says, "the rich can take care of themselves," the poor are each year becoming more miserable, and this very summer poverty, driven to desperation, made bold to thrust forward its gaunt face and rags as royalty passed in imperial magnificence from palace gate to sacred abbey. Since that summer day poverty has waxed apace, and as winter sets in the bitter cry of outcast London brings forebodings of unrest to the minds of the comfortable and well to do. The chill air and the police are making alleys, river embankments and bridges less endurable sleeping places, and the weary ones "move on" with sighs and moans.

What, though appeals are made for cast off boots, and sisters of Nazareth distribute quantities of soup, and board schools breakfast a quarter of a million children, and other public and private institutions keep 100,000 paupers alive; still do the needy beat against the doors for relief and waifs and strays at nightfall creep under arches or lie down on doorsteps with famine gnawing at their vitals.

Her majesty's government says that one-third of the working classes in the east end are out of work, and that the wages of artisans lucky enough to have employment do not exceed £1 ($4.88) a week, while the average wages of the common laborer are twelve shillings a week, out of which he pays four shillings a week in rent for a single room and another shilling in rates and taxes. Whether he has work or not rent day comes around with dreadful certainty, and down he must pay or out he must go into the street, though the other day a landlord contented himself with merely taking the windows out "and the children slept with the fog coming in." The worst of it is that distress seems to be getting chronic. "The poor are poorer," says an authority in the *Congregational Review*, "from the fact that their resources—that is, things to pawn or sell—are less than they were a year since."

Of course there is the workhouse, but the masses somehow have a horror of the place, and just the other day an old couple, past seventy, flew into the face of providence and obstinately died of starvation rather than suffer separation and monotonous toil there.

Nevertheless, though the east end writhed with pain and misery, the west end might have continued to revel and fare sumptuously had not attention been drawn to the wretched beings sleeping in Trafalgar square on summer nights. Charitable people at once gave aid, which attracted many men out of employment. They came in numbers and began to linger about the place during the day time as well as at night, and talked among themselves of their grievances. Next speakers began explaining that involuntary poverty sprung from man's violation of the clear intentions of the creator. Says the *Church Reformer*: "A black flag and a red flag were brought to them and small processions were organized so that the poor marching through the streets might impress the fact of their existence more plainly on the comfortable classes." The police interfered with the processions and often broke the meetings up on the ground that they were "disorderly" and were not composed of "genuine unemployed," and arrests became frequent. In October a deputation from the guild of St. Matthew, a society representing sixty clergymen and numerous lay members of the church of England, and of which Rev. Stewart D. Headlam is warden, addressed a meeting, at which these resolutions were passed:

That whereas, the present contrast between the condition of the great body of the workers who produce much and consume little, and of those classes who produce little and consume much, is contrary to the Christian doctrines of brotherhood and justice. This meeting urges on all the duty of supporting such measures as will tend—(*a*) To restore to the people the value which they give to the land; (*b*) To bring about a better distribution of the wealth created by labor; (*c*) To give the whole body of the people a voice in their own government; and (*d*) To abolish false standards of worth and dignity.

That this meeting calls the attention of her majesty's government to the recent public statement of Professor Leone Levi that while population has been increasing at the rate of one per cent per annum, production has been increasing at the rate of from ten to twenty per cent per annum, and to the obvious inference that the extreme destitution of many thousands of honest London workmen is solely due to social mal-adjustment, and urges as a temporary measure of relief that her majesty's ministers enforce on local authorities the opening of public works.

Matters went along in this way for some time. Men out of work swelled the meetings and the newspapers began to attach importance to the gatherings. The comfortable classes began to get very uncomfortable until mere rumors of "riots" and "risings" filled them with alarm, and finally Sir Charles Warren, chief commissioner of police, issued a proclamation prohibiting public meetings in Trafalgar square on the pretext that they tended to break the peace and were terrorizing the neighborhood. Thus were the "unemployed" between the devil and the deep sea—the police on one side and starvation on the other.

Previous to the issuance of the proclamation the Land restoration league had advertised a meeting for Nov. 11, and to make a test case Mr. William Saunders, Rev. Mr. Headlam and others determined to carry out their plan. On the day appointed they went to Trafalgar square, and Mr. Saunders had hardly commenced to speak when he was arrested. But his case was subsequently dismissed for the reason that, as there was no statutory warrant for the proclamation, he had committed no breach of the law in quietly addressing a peaceable meeting. When he was taken from the meeting Mr. Headlam stepped into his place and moved these resolutions:

That a principal cause of the poverty of the workers—in England as well as in Scotland and Ireland, in the great manufacturing centers as well as in the agricultural districts—is the monopoly by the few of the land, which is the common property of all. This meeting therefore urges the workers to unite in sending to parliament delegates who will demand that those who enjoy the use of land shall pay for the privilege to its rightful owners, the people.

Then came the memorable 13th of November, known as "Bloody Sunday." The radical clubs had called a meeting to protest against the unjust imprisonment of William O'Brien and came in orderly procession toward Trafalgar square. They were set upon by the police and most brutally clubbed. A contingent of horse guards, called to assist in quelling the disorder, pranced around the square, now and again charging a too venturesome crowd of spectators. Men and boys with no thought of violence were mercilessly beaten and hundreds were arrested, and in default of bail were flung into a dark and filthy den to await trial. A number of them were, upon testimony of the very policemen who had clubbed them and without being permitted to call witnesses in their own defense, convicted and sentenced to several months' imprisonment with hard labor. Mr. Cunninghame Graham, M. P., without any intention of committing violence, but wishing simply to make a test case, was so badly beaten about the head that a surgeon had to dress his wounds. He was arrested on the charge of assaulting a police officer, though he really only raised his arms to ward off blows.

The Sunday following had been fixed by the Democratic federation for its annual out-of-door demonstration. Former meetings had been held in Trafalgar square, but a peaceful gathering there being out of the question, Hyde park was selected and permission obtained for a procession through the streets. Notwithstanding this the police set upon a part of the procession as it passed along Holborn, and, seizing banners and smashing drums, put it to rout with blows. One man, Alfred Linnell, was thrown to the ground with such violence that he died a few days afterward from his injuries.

Thus the chief commissioner of police has but to pronounce a gathering disorderly to have it scattered to the four winds. True born Englishmen are feeling the weight of that coercive power which the tory government is using against the Irish across the channel, and common persecution is bringing the masses of the two countries closer together.

But more important in its immediate results is it that "the condition of the able-bodied poor has been brought home to the people in London by the meetings in Trafalgar square," as Lord Stalbridge stated at a meeting of the Charity organization society—and thereupon came more talk of charity. All sorts of shin plaster schemes have been offered to cure the social cancer. Even his royal highness, the prince of Wales, in a fit of generosity, has sent forty pheasants to St. George's hospital, and her majesty the queen has granted leave to display her jubilee presents before the forlorn and lowly in the east end early next year. It is to be hoped that much good will accrue to outcast London from these acts of royal condescension; but in the meantime a registration is being made of the unemployed. Through the activity of Mr. W. T. Stead, who in the *Pall Mall Gazette* daily defended the rights of the masses in the Trafalgar square troubles, a law and liberty league was organized to concern itself in all assaults upon the rights of procession, free speech, free press and personal liberty. The league embraces men of every political creed. At the first meeting Jacob Bright, M. P., presided and among the speakers and those on the platform were William Saunders, Rev. S. D. Headlam, J. Tims, secretary of the Metropolitan radical federation; H. M. Hyndman of the Democratic federation, William Morris, Professor Hunter, M. P., Rev. B. Waugh, Dr. Parkhurst, Rev. John Morgan, Rev. J. P. Gladstone and John Burns. This society quickly raised a fund of over $1,500 and at once bailed out a number of the unfortunate men imprisoned since "Bloody Sunday." But a greater work was that of registering the name, address and occupation of every man and woman out of employment. Such an operation in such a city was no easy task. The members of parliament were induced to help in their districts, trades and labor organizations were interested, and even the police department was forced to prepare for the work. Just in the nick of time a large commercial firm offered to defray the whole expense of opening an office in each one of the sixty London parliamentary districts and of hiring the necessary clerical aid. As a result of the first three days' registration, before the plan had become well known, 4,000 persons were registered.

It is probable that to meet present distress relief works will be opened and charity will be doled out. But such measures, while at best only temporary in their benefits, are demoralizing both to those who give and those who receive; and as long as dissatisfaction is allayed men are kept from looking for the source of the evil. The hope of the future lies with such men as William Saunders, Rev. Mr. Headlam, Frederick Verinder, James C. Durant and a host of others in the Land restoration league who hold that England was made for all Englishmen, and who ask what better natural right the duke of Westminster has to the most valuable land in London than has the puniest child of the most miserable pauper. These men years ago set their faces against the iniquitous system which makes land on which and from which all men must live the private property of but a few of their number, and they have by public speeches, by the distribution of tracts and through the columns of newspapers and periodicals proclaimed their faith far and wide. The *Democrat*, a small but bright monthly magazine, edited by William Saunders, and the *Church Reformer*, edited by Rev. Mr. Headlam, have scattered the seed broadcast, and there is likely before long to be a plenteous harvest. Converts are springing out of unexpected places, and concerted action seems to be all that is necessary for a very successful propaganda campaign.

As for the reasons for all this—why, it is that men willing and anxious to work are compelled to degrading poverty amid abounding wealth. They are shown by the report of a royal commission appointed in 1885 to inquire into the condition of the working classes and to suggest means for the housing of the poor. A brief extract will suffice:

At present land available for building in the neighborhood of our populous centers, though its capital value is very great, is probably producing a small yearly return until it is let for building. The owners of this land are rated, not in relation to the real value, but to the actual annual income. They can thus afford to keep their land out of the market and to part with only small quantities so as to raise the price beyond the natural monopoly price which the land would command by its advantages of position. Meantime the general expenditure of the town on improvements is increasing the value of their property. If this land were rated at, say four per cent on its selling value, the owners would have a more direct incentive to part with it to those who are desirous of building, and a twofold advantage would result to the community. First, all the valuable property would contribute to the rates, and thus the burden on the occupiers would be diminished by the increase in the ratable property. Secondly, the owners of the building land would be forced to offer their land for sale, and thus competition with one another would bring down the price of building land, and so diminish the tax in the shape of ground rent, or prices paid for land which is now levied on urban enterprise by the adjacent landowners, a tax, be it remembered, which is no recompense for any industry or expenditure on their part, but is the natural result of the industry and activity of the townspeople themselves. Your majesty's commissioners would recommend that these matters should be included in legislation when the law of rating comes to be dealt with by parliament

This is signed by the prince of Wales, Professor Caird, Cardinal Manning, Lord Salisbury, George J. Goschen, Lord Cross, E. Dwyer Gray, Henry Broadhurst, Jesse Collins, Samuel Morley, Charles W. Dilke and others.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

Votes for a Full Ticket.

DETROIT, Mich.—I am in favor of a full ticket, from coroner to president.

S. G. HOWE.

FROM THE BISHOP OF CENTRAL NEW YORK.

Bishop Huntington's Outspoken Apology for the Association to Advance the Interests of Labor—The Shadow that Overhangs Society—How the "Working Class" Live—A Warning to the Episcopal Church not to Repeat the Blunder of the Roman Catholic.

Living Church.

Dear Friend—You disparage an association lately formed by clergymen of the church to "advance the interests of labor." Belonging to that association and knowing what its principles and objects are, I am led to examine your objections to it.

1. You think such a society is not called for. Hitherto, when the shifting conditions of social life have disclosed some increasing and alarming moral danger, or have demanded some special and united effort to overcome wrong with righteousness, it has been thought wise and quite consistent with church principles to create combinations and measures for such a purpose, subject always to the general control of church authority. We have a considerable number of such movements and measures constantly pressed upon our attention. Each has its advocates and supporters. The question, then, is whether the present industrial, social and proprietary conditions in this country justify one of these combinations on the part of Christian preachers and leaders. Unless your range of observation differs entirely from mine you are aware that problems involved in the conditions just mentioned, and growing out of them, are agitating the minds of the people of the United States, of every class and in almost every community, with unprecedented force. Statesmen, legislators, scholars, bankers, merchants, masters of enterprise, householders, women, are anxiously concerned about them. The more confidential and reserved is their speech the weightier is its import. With no disposition to raise a public alarm they regard their own future and that of their children and of the nation with apprehensions amounting to fear Thousands of them rise up and lie down and shape their plans in a concealed disquietude. Financial and domestic arrangements are silently made with reference to possible upheavals. Forms of threatened evil, colored by blood and flame, are in some places not unfamiliar to the imagination. An unmentioned shadow rests on many festivals. Our daily press has its admonitions. It may be said without dispute that these menaces of trouble to the order, safety and peace of human homes and human lives arise from the plain fact that the "classes" of mankind, the members of the social body, are not in a state of reconciliation and harmony with one another, are not living as a brotherhood. Notice then that the problems are as much moral as they are financial or economical. Do you believe that Christianity, in its organized and didactic and sympathetic operation, has nothing to do with them? Do you think that this Christianity in its pulpits and other publications, in its demonstrations of feeling and action, is now dealing with them as far as it can, or as far as it ought to? Do you hold that all the existing societies in the church contemplate more important ends or deserve more encouragement than one which seeks directly to avert catastrophes of riot and anarchy by practically proclaiming that under the fatherhood of God all men of all classes are brothers? If the present alienation with all its manifest and manifold mischiefs has grown up under Christianity administered as it is, is it not permissible to seek out a way of mending our mistake? You propose *Laissez faire*. But *Laissez faire* looks like destruction.

2. You are opposed to treating or recognizing "laboring men" as a "class." What this society proposes to do is to recognize facts as they are whether we like them or not, and, so far as they are pernicious, to try to get rid of them or to remedy them. We admit all that you can say of the difficulty of drawing a visible line between working men and idle men, between rich and poor, between a class of employers and a class of the employed. That does not in the least alter the tremendous fact that these distinctions are actual, and that because of them, or in close connection with them, there are enormous injustices and frightful sufferings for which somebody is accountable. Here is a man, my neighbor, who works with his hands in a shop, field or factory, from ten to thirteen hours of every week day, and not far away are several of his "class" who must work more or less on Sundays. He leaves his house at early daylight with his dinner of the plainest food in a tin pail, or else his wife or little daughter brings him this at noon, no matter what the weather may be. His wife and children, as soon as they are old enough, work nearly as many hours as he does. Between working and trudging hours they are too tired for much but sleep. They have little knowledge, few ideas, few books, nothing that can be called intellectual exercise or delight, and social pleasures of only an inferior sort. Their life is mostly animal, a struggle for bodily subsistence or comfort, for the indulgence of physical wants or pleasures. They are poor; they are always in a precarious state; a sense of abundance is never felt; nothing is accumulated. A part of the year there is no supply of work, and then it is all outgo, with a scanty table, little fuel, discouragement, and much temptation to the tavern or saloon. If the man or one of the children is sick, a physician, or a cordial, or medicine, or needed nourishment can be had only by running in debt. If wages are not paid to man or woman redress at law is hopelessly costly. If a gross wrong of any sort is inflicted justice is out of reach. If the factory shuts down, or the employer changes his business or his mind, or the "employment society" closes, there is nothing to fall back upon. Pew rent is out of the question. Now, without going further, a hundred thousand men and families of this description make up a "class." It is frivolous or worse to quibble about names. Not a few of these men are as much dictated to as to what ticket they shall vote as if they were slaves. There is scarcely a place or a turn in their lives where they do not know that they are subject to some sort of exclusion or disadvantage or disability, not by reason of what they are in character or moral worth, but because they are "common laborers." With the girls and women the case is unspeakably worse; because for these the alternative to self support by ill paid toil is shame, debauchery, ruin. Thousands upon thousands of them are polluted every year in body and soul because they belong to this "class," and by the husbands and sons of women who belong to another "class." Do not flinch, my friend, but face the fact. Now turn to the "class" to which you belong. Take up, if you have not graciously done it already, each one of the particulars in the workingman's lot which I have just named and compare it, item by item, with the circumstances and conditions and resources and enjoyments in the daily lives of those all about you who do not live by the labor of their hands alone and on the wages of capital. Will you venture to say that between the two there is not another inequality than that of property, and yet one which property has done a great deal to produce? Will you pretend that this wide and deep gulf of difference is agreeable to the heart and law of Christ or the will of God? That it is caused by any of those qualities in men which Christ has declared to be the only strength and glory of manhood and womanhood? That the privileged or fortunate or well to do or wealthy are dearer to the Savior than the unprivileged? that nothing can be done to fill the gulf up, or to bring the classes nearer together? or that the kingdom of God is not on the earth to do that very thing, and that church ministers and worshipers ought not to be about their Master's business?

3. You accuse this association of making labor itself and the profits of it a moral merit, of exalting it into a virtue: and you say, in the language of another, "The simple truth is that a good and unselfish and noble workingman is just as worthy as a good and unselfish and noble man who does not work, and he is no better." Taking this sentence as you probably mean it to be taken, it is, to be sure, "simple" enough, so simple indeed as to come very near to what you elsewhere call a "platitude." But you overlook some needful discriminations. I have not myself happened to meet in real life or history many persons who did not work and yet were "good and noble and unselfish" persons, unless they were invalids. Work that is honest and lawful, if not excessive and distorted, does tend to make men better, and so far it has a moral value. The barren, selfish laziness of uncounted men who happen to have much unearned money is an immorality of the same kind with the laziness of men who have little or none; it is a sin. But this society does not at all fall into the error you point out; it uses the term "labor" as signifying shortly a certain social condition, but with no purpose at all of separating the work that the workingman does from the man and his character. Quite the contrary; it insists that the class of workingmen shall be righteously put into such righteous conditions that they can be made righteous men. It intends to do whatever it is enabled to do in accordance with the laws of God in His spiritual kingdom and in the personal spirit and will. It means to discredit and abate all sorts of factitious claims to position, dignity or honor. As it would desire to stand in an attitude of mediation between the strong and the weak, rich and poor, capital and labor, having a message from God of warning and hope to the one just as much as to the other, so it would lift up its voice against the perils and sins that lie on either hand So far as it does this it will deserve the confidence and the thanks of both property and poverty, of political economy and religion. It scrupulously shuns every political entanglement or alliance. We know nothing of any "Gospel of Labor" or any other gospel than that of Him who preached His gospel in the synagogue of Nazareth, who fed the multitude on the mountain side because they were hungry, and whom the common people heard gladly. We shall not be surprised or disconcerted if influential brothers stand aloof, some from conviction, some from indifference, some from policy. If it should happen that in the proclamation of the faith of the cross the rich should be made more uneasy in their riches than the poor in their poverty, whose fault is that? If the conscience of some clergymen should be pricked by a secret accusation that their lives are not the lives of workingmen, or that they give a larger portion of their time, their favor, their deference, their company, to their comfortable and affluent parishioners than to the ill-clad, ill-fed and ill-lodged, we must leave the issue between them and their judge. Do what we will about it, make what we may of it, we are not able to hide from ourselves what stands out beyond question or mistake on the pages of Holy Scripture in Old Testament and New—that in the divine economy we do find far more express care, sympathy and provision for the unprivileged than for the privileged class. No exegesis can rub that out of the text. The parable of Dives and Lazarus was not an accident. St. James wrote about rich men and poor men what the Holy Ghost bade him write. Look into the arrangements of our congregations, the pew system and its practical results, the parochial system and its secular abuses, the composition of vestries, the influence on a spiritual economy of a million of dollars, the proportion of space given to "workingmen" of unblemished repute and acknowledged devotion in our church conventions, and consider whether all that we apostolic Christians have to do is to leave things as they are, hiding our inconsistency under some sophistical generalities, and sneering at those stewards, watchmen and messengers, who believe that having our "conversation in heaven" means conforming human society and its institutions to the heavenly pattern, and believe that the church has not gone beyond the need of being reformed back to its original charter and catholic commission.

4. You are so misinformed or so rash as to charge this association with discrediting the right of property and the accumulation of earnings. On inquiry you will learn that every member of the society holds that right of property unquestioned and unquestionable. I am afraid you are of that "class," numerous and popular, who, in their nervous solicitude to keep things pretty much as they are, neglect to look below the surface of things both as they are and as they have been. It is a pity the writers and speakers who fling phrases right and left about socialism and communism do not take time to make a study of these quite distinct social and economical theories, their several varieties, and at least their modern history on the continent, in Great Britain and in America. It is too late to use catch words on this grave subject *in terrorem*. To say that these toiling and self-denying and humble minded pastors and evangelists, these "good men who have undertaken to form this association" are endeavoring to "conciliate the social and political prejudices of the workingmen," is just as far from truth and charity, just as absurd, as to say that the Trinity church corporation is a land speculating concern which intends to buy up Wall street. The "dangers of preaching to the poor alone" do not appear to have been formidable to the preacher of Galilee and Decapolis. I have lately read this comment on our infant organization; perhaps you agree with it: "The declaration of principles simply says that 'God is the sole possessor of the earth and its fullness; man is but the steward of God's bounties.' If that means anything more than a mere platitude, it would reduce civilized society immediately to a state of savagery. The worst errors of the wildest socialists could hardly require a more sweeping abrogation of all property rights than this, if it means anything in particular." Now as the first of the two parts of that cited declaration is written explicitly in the twenty-fourth psalm by King David and is quoted by St. Paul to the Corinthians, and as the second, which conditions the stewardship of man on the sole ownership of God, follows necessarily and logically upon it, expresses the uniform doctrine of the whole church Catholic from the beginning, and is the theme of some of its grandest sermons, we have then the original literary opinion—as the Bible has not reduced civilization to savagery or abrogated all property rights—that King David wrote "platitudes," and that St. Paul meant "nothing in particular." This leaves the society's principles in tolerably good company, at least at the outset. Whether it accomplishes much or little or nothing I think you will live to say that it is likely to do no harm.

Next to the fearless proclamation of God's truth, and the faithful doing of Christ's service, man by man, clergyman by clergyman, is the careful commending of our church, in its power and glory, to the people of this land. Before all the striving Christian denominations about us, that church, by its entire system of discipline and worship, its correspondence and analogy with the legislative methods of the republic, its scriptural letter and spirit, and the impartial offices of its manly and godly prayer book, holds a singular vantage ground for gaining the interest, affection and confidence of workingmen. Of the two great bodies which might naturally be expected to share with us this magnificent privilege, the Roman Catholic and the Methodist, the first has blundered, and the second is made up too exclusively of one of the sections of society needing to be brought together to occupy effectively the position of a mediator. Both by apostolic derivation and intrinsic catholicity the opportunity belongs fairly to us. We have not too well guarded that trust. Shall we forfeit it by apathy, by timidity, by petty jealousies, by "untimely projects"—from which the Moravian litany supplicates deliverance—by that let alone policy which dwarfs aspiration, stops advancement and deadens zeal? Lying on the table before me are two fresh letters just received from two men of gentle breeding who fairly represent the strong class of educated, vigorous, masculine young minds of the country, one of them actively engaged in a great publishing house in New York, and the other the master of an ample estate. Both of them tell me they were, until lately, unbelievers in revealed and historical Christianity. They were of that multitude which must be a puzzle to you—ready to greet with applause the name of Jesus Christ as a reformer, but thoroughly distrusting and so forsaking the church because of its supposed indifference to humanity and its apostasy from its head. Both of them declare that within a few months past they have come to see where they are, that there is a church where upright labor and not wealth is made the ground of honorable standing, and where they can worship "without wrath and doubting," side by side with their brothers who come in coarse raiment, and with gladness of heart. Faithfully yours,

F. D. HUNTINGTON.

Syracuse, Nov. 24, 1887.

Homes for the Homeless.

A. J. H. Duganne.

Homes for the homeless!
Our prayers still rise:
Justice is faithful—
And Truth never dies.
Roses for nettles,
And plenty for dearth;
Homes for the homeless,
On God's free earth.

Homes for the orphan—
The widow forlorn;
Homes for the exile—
Where'er he was born.
Give us, O country!
Our right to the soil—
Earth shall be gladsome
With generous toil.

Homes for the homeless—
Who famish for bread—
Earth for the living,
And earth for the dead.
Give us our birthright,
O tyrannous gold!
The Land is our charter—
It shall not be sold!

Has no Money to Spare, but is Doing His Share of Work.

SENECA FALLS, N. Y.—If there is no candidate for president in the united labor party what are men like myself going to do who have made a solemn vow to never vote for or with either of the old political parties. I say by all means have a national convention and put a full ticket in the field.

I am a cigar maker by trade, working at the table. I have no money, but I am willing to work for the cause, as I am doing every day of my life. I am librarian of our club, and I see that all of our books are in circulation all the time.

A farmer acquaintance whom I was urging to read "Progress and Poverty" asked me the other day if we still kept our club going and what we expected to do, anyhow. I said:

"We intend to make the land values of this country pay the expenses of it (the country) and I want to say right here you farmers have got a mistaken idea when you suppose you will have to pay the bulk of the tax. The centers of population will have to bear the biggest part of it."

"Why," said he, "how is that? What is a small lot in the village or city compared to the acres in the country?"

I said: "A single village lot will, in many cases, pay more than your whole farm. There is more land in Seneca county by far than in New York city, yet in the city the land values amount to more than $100,000,000 a year, which is a good deal more than all the land improvements in Seneca county are worth in fee simple."

My friend was called away at this stage of the argument; but he has promised to read "Progress and Poverty" and I am sure will do some thinking

WM. H. ADKINSON.

Has Taken a Contract and Means to Carry it Out.

LINN CREEK, Mo.—For four months I have been teaching a country school near Barnumton, Mo., which closed last Friday. While at that place I distributed many tracts and delivered several addresses on the single tax theory, which I am confident will result in much good.

I find that men—men who would make an honest living—are always anxious to listen to a discussion of the labor subject, and experience has taught me when a man gets a taste of anti-poverty doctrine his appetite is never satisfied, nor can be, so long as poverty exists. I have been taught from childhood up to "look before leaping," and when I made a contract or took a job not to cease laboring till it was completed. That is what I am going to do in the anti-poverty cause, not to quit work until every child of God has a chance to go to the material of nature and abolish his poverty. THOS. S. HART.

State Politics is our True Field.

CHICAGO, Ill.—While I do not think that running a full ticket next year would be good policy, refraining from such a contest because of the possible development of free trade tendencies on the part of one of the old parties would be, in my opinion, very bad policy.

It seems to me that state politics is our true field, for the reason that we can win in one state before we can in a majority, which we must do to be effective in congress, and, having been successful in one state, we can levy the single tax to the full rental value if we choose, thereby stopping land speculation and giving labor and capital so decided an advantage as to compel other states, because of business competition, to adopt the single tax in self-defense. Following this, short work will be made of the tariff.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

AN "ACTUAL SETTLER" TO THE PRESIDENT.

ARCHER, Wyoming Ter.—To Grover Cleveland, President of the United States—Dear Sir: Being prevented from going to Cheyenne to-night I thought I would write you a few lines. As I helped to elect you in Nebraska, you will naturally be glad to hear from me.

In your last letter to me, which you also sent to congress, you showed a lively interest in the the actual settler and his land, and as the New York *World* and other religious papers are giving you advice on the subject I know you will be glad to hear from a man like me, who is an actual settler himself. I therefore proceed to give you a few points.

The most successful actual settler is the man who makes a trip from some town in Nebraska or Iowa, takes up 160 acres timber claim and 160 acres homestead, and then goes back where he came from to boom the country. He will tell fairy tales about what good land there is "out there"—that you can raise 47½ bushels of corn to the acre, and that it is ridiculous for Henry George to be howling about land while he can get lots of it out there for nothing. A good deal of actual settling is done in the real estate offices of Lincoln and Omaha. Some actual settlers work with demijohns in Kansas towns; others put in their time selling calicoes and groceries, and not a few put in their work of settling on farms three or four hundred miles east of the land on which they are "actually settling." All these improve the country by letting other people do the work and watching their land rise in value from a distance.

Then there is the actual actual settler—the man who is fool enough to think that being an actual settler on the public domain means living there. There are about five or six of this kind to a township. The actual actual settler wears big ears, which stand at a pronounced angle with his head. He wears a hat in winter and a heavy woolen cap in summer; but he never wears a thinking cap at any time. He travels with a spavined horse and a balky mule hitched to a covered wagon; and as he goes west he winds his way in and out among the settlers' houses, sometimes passing as many as one in a mile or two. After driving past one or two hundred miles of "took up" land, occupied by barking prairie dogs and yelping coyotes, he gets down to actual settling. Having picked out a piece of the public domain "reserved for actual settlers" the first thing he will do, if he is a man of foresight, will be to stake out a burying ground for himself and family. After he gets sod enough piled up or a hole dug in the ground to live in he is ready to turn over a few acres of prairie with a railroad breaking plow. He will then turn his children loose and wait for the increase of rainfall, which at present is about ten inches, or less than half what is required to make a crop. This increase, judging by the experience of eastern Nebraska, will come in about twenty-five years. After that, if he can dodge protracted droughts, hail storms and grasshoppers, he will be able to make fair crops.

As for the actual actual settler from the far east, his method of getting here is a little different, though his prospects are equally brillian after he arrives. His best plan, after settling with his landlord, is to tie his furniture, kitchen stove, etc., into a bundle and take the Erie railway for Chicago. The walking is said to be easier by that route than by any other. From Chicago to Omaha he can follow the line of the C. B. & Q. or R. I. P.; at Omaha change tracks for the Union Pacific and travel west till he sees something white. That white is the snow on the Rocky mountains, and I would advise him not to take up land up there, though statistics show that there is lots of it.

In this way, if he can walk twenty-five miles a day, it will take the actual actual settler only a matter of three months to get to that part of the public domain reserved for actual settlers. Then, if he has been accustomed to farming in the city he comes from, he will need only about twenty-five years' experience. As population and improvements increase, his land (and that of the speculator's, too) will rise in value. This will make turnips, squashes and cabbage grow better, and will also give the man who holds the mortgage on his farm a chance to realize.

I have strung these few bits of information together, thinking they might be useful to you in your future correspondence with myself and the rest of the American people. I will only add that the most comfortable way to be an actual settler and grow up with the country is to sit in a newspaper office and do your settling with pen, ink and paper. Very respectfully,

A. G. GROH, Actual Settler.

Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost at Bayonne, N. J.

BAYONNE, N. J.—The land and labor club of this city held a meeting at Schuyler hall, Bergen Point, on the evening of December 16, to listen to an address from Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost on the question "Can poverty be abolished?" The audience was a representative one, consisting of workingmen, clerks and small storekeepers. A few ladies were present. The local clergy, who had been specially invited to attend, were conspicuous by their absence. Mr. Wm. B. DuBois, the president of the club, occupied the chair, and introduced Mr. Pentecost in a brief speech.

Mr. Pentecost, after pointing out some of the most apparent evils of poverty, as seen in city tenement houses and elsewhere where men are compelled to herd together, showed the absolute inefficiency of eleemosynary charity as a remedy. The whole tendency of the yearly pouring of millions of dollars into the lap of charity is simply to lower wages and pauperize the recipients. The speaker pointed out that labor organizations, though they might succeed for a time in averting the poverty of their own members, could effect nothing for the great mass of working people, and must themselves be ultimately defeated by the forces arrayed against them. He next showed the impracticability of the remedies proposed by the advocates of socialism and anarchy, and concluded with an apt presentation of the arguments in favor of the single tax on land values.

The audience were evidently impressed with the discourse and evinced their appreciation by frequent applause. A series of meetings of a similar character will be held during the winter. BAYONNE.

Nominate a Full Ticket and Advocate the Australian System.

VICTOR, Ia.—Here in southeastern Iowa I think we are all in favor of holding a convention at an early date and nominating a full ticket. The question of the Australian voting system ought also to be considered in convention. This last is a matter of prime importance, and though it will be opposed by the corruptionists of the old parties, we can count on its being supported by the prohibitionists to a man.

THE STANDARD of December 17 is, I think, one of the best numbers yet issued. Your dignified, calm and temperate remarks as to the advisability of our nominating a presidential ticket for the next election were doubtless read with satisfaction and approved by all the friends of the cause.

GEO. F. LEWIS.

AT AN ANTI-POVERTY MEETING.

A Sunday Evening at the Academy of Music—Bits of Intelligence Concerning the Minor Phases of the Society's Weekly Assemblage.

In a Dakota town lives a family every member of which cherishes a belief in the doctrines of the New York Anti-poverty society. The head of the house subscribes for THE STANDARD, and once a week its account of the proceedings at the society's meeting in the Academy of Music is read aloud in the family circle, the applause that at times seems fairly to shake the academy then finding an echo in the sitting room of those brethren in that distant Dakota town. Every member of that household knows by heart the society's brief declaration of principles, whose acceptance by our countrymen, they firmly believe, is only a matter of time. Not only do these earnest supporters of the cause of equal rights devour with absorbing interest the entire contents of THE STANDARD, but they also read every item relating to the movement that can be found in any publication falling into their hands. Sometimes a rumor detrimental to the society is awarded the fleetness of the telegraph, and they are disturbed; or the petty sting of an unfriendly paragrapher is reprinted by one newspaper from another until their local journal takes it up, and, being human, they are irritated. A few weeks ago they read that the anti-poverty addleheads had retired to the semi-obscurity of a music hall, obliged to forego the luxury of the academy. In good time, however, the truth came along, which was no more than that an enterprising manager of Sunday sacred concerts had succeeded in engaging the academy for two evenings from its superintendent before the proprietor stepped forward and insisted that proper courtesies should be extended to his regular customer, the Anti-poverty society. The flippant writers of the gossipy New York letters to the press of the interior, finding the Anti-poverty society's work a never failing object of criticism for their employers, the newspaper organs of the old parties, in speaking of the society sound every note in the gamut of ridicule, employing alike the lie of malignancy and the patronizing and affectedly good natured tolerance adopted by the self-satisfied when constrained to notice badly advised people attempting tasks wherein the sages fail.

These uncomplimentary things are read by neighbors of our Dakota friends—neighbors who pride themselves in the knowledge that they have never taken up with fallacious "isms." Then it is that those distant brethren feel just a little the burden of the cross they have taken up. They are isolated in the nobility of their thought. None the less upholders of the truth, and with no abatement in the fervency of their faith, they are nowadays in a receptive mood for comforting tidings. They would like to be as well prepared to meet the disparagements of the careless and unscrupulous as they are to reason with all men in defense of their cause. They feel that they would like, just once, to attend a meeting of the Anti-poverty society at the New York Academy of Music. The evidence gathered in such a visit would enable them to estimate the probabilities of the truth in the unfavorable rumors concerning the society's meetings that are spread about the country with such frequency. They would see for themselves if the audience was composed mainly of weazen—hysterical women, defamers have said; if the house were crowded or half empty; if the foreigners in the audience outnumbered the Americans; if the applause was indiscriminate, or rendered inopportunely; if the riff raff were there in great force, to roar and bawl when tickled; if it was a choice gathering of the "long haired and wild eyed," betraying in their very persons ill-regulated nerves and obliquity of judgment—for many disagreeable and inconsistent things such as these have they read of the membership in anti-poverty.

A sympathetic out of town visitor attending the thirty-third public meeting of the Anti-poverty society would have been enabled to gain a fair impression of an average gathering at one of its academy meetings in bad weather during a period of no excitement—a good season withal for note taking, the enormous crowds that in feverish times pack the streets near the academy not contributing to the convenience of the observer.

The Academy of Music, a massive building of brick, painted red, standing midway between Third and Fourth avenues, faces on Fourteenth street to the south and Irving place to the west. A door leading to the upper gallery from Fourteenth street is opened for the Anti-poverty society's meetings, but the grand entrance to the main floor on the same street is kept closed, the great crowds passing into the building from Irving place. In this thoroughfare a broad platform half the breadth of the building in length, reached by a few steps from the sidewalk, leads to half a dozen massive doors opening in upon the main lobby. At each side of the lobby is a ticket-seller's window. To the left is a stairway leading to the upper gallery. Those going into the lower part of the house pass through a second lobby, at the gate of which door tenders collect the tickets, returning the check ends to those who have bought reserved seats. The wide corridors that compass the main floor of the auditorium are then entered. Here ushers direct incoming people to the part of the house where they are entitled to be seated. Other ushers stand in the aisles, seating the people in the order of arrival if they have charge of unreserved seats or receiving the checks and directing the holders to their purchased places if the seats are reserved. All this precisely as if it were a theater night.

The Academy of Music has been for many years the home of Italian opera in New York, but as a place of resort for ultra-fashionable amusement seekers it has lately given way to the Metropolitan opera house. It is still highly popular, however, its situation being one of the best in the city, and it commands a high rental. The Anti-poverty society holds a lease upon it for Sunday evenings during the next six months.

A regular attendant at the meetings of the society might have been able to form the opinion that the prevailing bad weather had told against the attendance at that thirty-third public meeting, but the visitor for the first time, on the contrary, would be impressed with the presence of an immense audience. On walking through the corridors, down stairs and up, and looking in upon the house from various doorways, that impression would have gained with him. As a matter of fact, two thousand five hundred persons were present.

A very interesting thing it was, looking over that seated assemblage, just after the beginning of the proceedings of the evening. The stage, its back ground an indoor scene, had its seats, with the exception of the front row, taken up with the Concordia chorus, now composed of forty young ladies and twenty-five young men. The leader of the chorus is Miss Agatha Munier, who organized it at the origination of the society, eight months ago, and has drilled it with such talent and patience that its constant improvement has been noticeable to all who love and understand music. A young man at a piano is the only instrumental accompanist. On the front row of stage chairs are usually seated the chairman of the evening, members of the society's executive committee and persons invited by it to be present, these as a rule being prominent out of town workers for anti-poverty. Occupants of seats on the stage on the evening in question were John McMackin, chairman of the county committee united labor party; J. P. Archibald, of the executive board district assembly 49, Knights of Labor; Professor David B. Scott, of the College of the City of New York; Rev. S. B. Hershey, of Ashtabula, Ohio; Mr. Wm. Miller and his son, of Glasgow, Scotland, and Louis F. Post presiding.

Nearest the stage among those in the audience are the occupants of the eighteen proscenium boxes, which are arranged in three tiers to the right and left of the stage, in part lapping along it. The seats in the two lower tiers are sold for the anti-poverty meetings at fifty cents each and those in the upper tiers at twenty-five cents. Directly in front of the stage, within the musicians' railing, are seats for the ushers' families and tables for a party of gentlemen to whom the society is much indebted—the reporters for the press. Of those newspaper men regularly assigned to these meetings it can be truthfully said that they have befriended the society. They are not themselves impervious to the good things said by the speakers, however deaf their editors may mean to be. When it is remembered that many of the readers of the papers they represent have an appetite for what is strong they may be pardoned if occasionally they give their reports a dash of "ginger" or it may be of "vinegar." But none of them wield a malicious pen, and the more space their journals give to their notices of the society the better are they pleased!

The main floor of the auditorium is divided into what are technically termed the orchestra and the orchestra circle, the two being divided by a partition the height of an ordinary hand railing, and the circle running back to the walls at a somewhat steeper angle than that given the orchestra seats with relation to the stage. The orchestra seats are sold at twenty-five cents for Anti-poverty meetings. About two hundred of those nearest the stage are taken every Sunday by members of Rev. Dr. McGlynn's old parish, St. Stephen's. A majority of these two hundred persons are women. They are not, it is to be confidently asserted, the least enthusiastic people in the audience. It may be that the story that the members of the Anti-poverty society were nine-tenths over excitable women came from some near sighted reporter, who seeing from his table these faithful women in the van of the house, and taking no more than the testimony of his circumscribed vision, penciled a mem. to that effect in his note book and chronicled it for truth. While Dr. McGlynn's parishioners are also scattered all over the house, there they are, every Sunday evening, this solid contingent from St. Stephen's parish, not the same people every time, but always to the number of several hundred, a body of staunch friends that intend to cleave to their well loved pastor to the death—aye, even beyond what has more terrors than death to some of them. He it was in bygone days who consoled them in misfortune, married them, baptized their children, and perhaps married these children in later years. They know well of his ministrations to the poor and the distressed. They have enjoyed the happiness of holding him as their friend of friends.

At the thirty-third public meeting a little patch of empty seats in the last three rows of the orchestra, conspicuous because of their red plush covers, could be attributed to the bad weather. The orchestra circle, seats free, was fully occupied, and a line of young men stood along the walls. Had the weather been fine their gentler friends would have come with them. Then they would have bought seats.

Two galleries compose the rest of the auditorium. The lower has a double row of boxes next the walls and thence rows of seats extending to the rails, the boxes formerly adjoining it having recently been removed. This part of the house is sold for the anti-poverty meetings at twenty-five cents a seat. About 250 persons were in this gallery. Above is the upper gallery.

A very difficult task it is to describe anti-poverty's audience. It cannot be compared with the average gathering of any theater or any church. It has little of the style of a Madison square theater audience, for example; in hardly any particular, on the other hand, does it resemble a variety theater crowd. Select your New York church as to location, very often as to denomination, and you know the stamp of people you will see on going to it. The Anti-poverty society's assemblage cannot be characterized in a word or a phrase, because it does not easily fall within the lines of comparison. Anyone, on looking over it, will declare it to be entirely respectable, but more is needed to name what it is.

Let us look over the house again. Behind St. Stephen's representatives, in the orchestra, are a dozen rows of occupied seats. In three rows are sixty-two persons, eighteen of whom are women. All are comfortably, some quite fashionably, attired. In the orchestra circle the people appear in general to be clerks or shopkeepers or of the more highly skilled artisan class. A few bronzed complexions indicate outdoor work. Some, a good per centage, are evidently in occupations that afford them leisure for more than ordinary self culture; earnest and intelligent people, they appear to be. Here and there are members of the assembly district organizations and delegates to the county committee of the united labor party, and leaders in the trades unions and the Knights of Labor. Occasionally the visitor will hear one person mention to another a name that he will recognize as that of an active man in the new politics.

Going up one flight and observing the people seated in the lower gallery or circle, one detects a slight dissimilarity from those elsewhere in the house—a little difference in dress perhaps, a trifle less of warmth toward the speaker, a barely noticeable air of not wholly belonging here. This circle seems to be the favorite place for strangers in the city and for people in the city who have half feared they might feel strange among the anti-povertyites. These two sets of strangers buy the inconspicuous seats of this part of the house, uncertain whether, in coming here, they are not giving countenance to something that borders on the absurd or sensational. They have a curiosity to learn what anti-poverty really means to do. It is instructive to watch these people. He who does so is enabled to record that the better elements in human nature often unexpectedly sway men and women. These strangers are prepared for the applause that greets the appearance of the speakers. They had heard all about that rapturous, unbounded hand clapping and hurrahing. But the tone of the speaker's address, his mildness when mentioning opponents, his warmth of feeling toward all humanity, his eloquence and the beauty of his diction, his forcible presentation of anti-poverty's faith, his intermingling of the old and new in religion, his utter abstention from denunciations of the horrid capitalist—all this was not precisely what was expected. This circle of people commonly begins the evening with a frigidity self-embarrassing among so many enthusiasts, and ends it with the warmest approval of the speaker's sentiments, and not infrequently with avowed conversion to the cause.

To the great upper gallery, a flight farther up, go many from the habit of regarding it as a cheap place free from restraints. Yet on looking over it closely, no one is seen whose poverty speaks in rags or patches. Of its occupants to-night, five are men to every woman. There are hardly any foreign physiognomies along those lines, save Irish—and are they foreign? The majority are New Yorkers, in looks and appearance. Here a few people drop in late and a few go away early. Yet, with hardly an exception, these rows upon rows of faces are set intently toward the speaker, who is so far away, down there on the stage, that he is diminished in size. But he can be heard better up here than down stairs under the first gallery.

Of the two thousand members of the Anti-poverty society, it is doubtful if more than one-half are ever present at any one meeting. There are many regular attendants at meetings who are not members of the society. Very few children are to be seen. Young men are numerous; not so young girls. Some colored people are always present. A few gray heads stand out in the mass, but the body is middle-aged or on the sunny side of life. The society is not a Sunday social club of neighbors. People come miles to its meetings. Comparatively few seem acquainted with one another. The eye may wander over the whole house without perceiving a single self-confessed, revealed-by-oddness, crank. But then the whole society is made up of people who applaud, sometimes with startling noise and heartiness, on Sunday.

The academy's house help, four or five employes such as the gas man, gate attendants and stage door guard, are paid by the owner. The society has a corps of fifty volunteer ushers. Each wears as a badge a dark blue ribbon six inches long by one and a half wide, having printed on it the figure of the cross of the new crusade, the name "Anti-poverty society" and the word "collector." Many of the ushers have done their work regularly from the first meeting at the academy. So far as is possible each retains in his care the same section of boxes or seats at all meetings. The ushers have acquired the art of managing throngs of people pushing for places and they appreciate the extent to which the reputation of the society depends upon their self-control and politeness. They supply blanks to those wishing to join the society, distribute tracts and programmes, and before the main address is delivered they perform what has been termed the one undeniably religious ceremony of the evening—they take up a collection. The collecting baskets are delivered at once to the chairman of the house committee, the money—usually between one hundred and two hundred dollars—is put in a safe and the next day is counted by the treasurer and placed in bank to the credit of the society.

It may be well to add that nothing is free to members of the society that is not equally free to the public. The members of the society bear the brunt of its expenses. None of the officers receive any compensation save the secretary, whose entire time is devoted to his duties. The members of the executive committee, twenty-five in number, give their services free, and bills for incidental expenses from them are unknown. If they want reserved seats they buy tickets for them.

Running a Full Ticket Will Be the Means of Making Men Think.

PITTSFIELD, Ill.—I am quite confident that as a whole we would poll a much stronger vote for a ticket with a head than for a headless ticket.

One thing certain as regards this section of the country, by putting out a full ticket from president down, even if we do not elect a single man, it would be the means of making men think, and the sooner men get to thinking just that much sooner will we be able to carry out our principles. If the united labor party fails to nominate a presidential ticket for '88, I am afraid that there will be a sad mistake made somewhere, although I shall not "give up the ship" if the wise men of the party should see fit to omit that portion of the programme.

AL. PIERSON.

We Should be in the Field Early.

CINCINNATI, O.—Two things we ought not to do. We ought not to aid in electing men who stand for some reforms while they ignore or compromise the principle for which we stand. Such men once placed will never forget that they owe their advancement not to advocating our reform, but to ignoring it. And we ought not to rely upon the democratic party as a sincere advocate of free trade.

We should be in the field early. The progress of a long national campaign will be, during its whole continuance, an incentive to organization among ourselves, while our local clubs will be in position to profit by the discussions of the old parties, whose every jar will shake down pippins for our cause.

C. H. FITCH

Another Anti-Poverty Branch Society.

SHARON, Conn.—It gives me great pleasure to report the organization here of a branch anti-poverty society with a membership of ten earnest men and women. We have held two regular meetings, and on the 15th of this month had our first public meeting in the Town hall, with Dr. McGlynn for our speaker. The night was very stormy, but an audience which filled the hall listened attentively to the lecture, and we shall soon be able to report accessions to our society membership as a consequence of Dr. McGlynn's eloquent words. We can't sufficiently express our gratitude to him for consenting to come to so small a town to inaugurate the public meetings of so small a society. We hope to hold these public meetings once every month during the winter, and to be in good fighting trim for the election next fall.

GEORGE ST. J. LEAVENS,
Secretary.

The Free Land Club of Dayton, O., Urges the Calling of a National Conference.

DAYTON, O.—The wish is almost universal here to go into the campaign next year with candidates for president and vice-president. The subject was brought up at the meeting of the Free land club yesterday and the following resolution passed almost unanimously:

It is the opinion of the Free land club of Dayton that the interests of land reform will be best promoted by the early calling of a national conference to make the necessary arrangements for organizing in all the states, and the nomination next year of candidates for president and vice-president of the United States.

W. W. KILE, Secretary.

Believes in Keeping the Flag Flying Whether We Win or Lose.

CANON CITY, Col.—We are beginning to do some work out here.—One of our county papers is already pledged to open its columns to the discussion of economic questions. Our cause has many supporters in this county, though yet unorganized, and we propose to make an effort to concentrate our forces, and do some work. I am in favor of keeping our flag flying, whether we win or no, and hope to see a national organization next year.

FRANK P. BLAKE, M. D.

IN RURAL ENGLAND.

Changes Wrought in the Present Generation—The Homes of the Agricultural Laborers—"Men" no Longer, but "Hands."

In 1879 an English clergyman, who had a quarter of a century before resigned the curacy of a country parish and gone to live in London, was presented with a benefice in the agricultural county of Norfolk. In that twenty-five years farm life in England had undergone a revolution. It was a period that witnessed greater industrial changes than had ever been seen in the same time in the history of the world. It was just about during that quarter of a century that, as Mr. Mulhall tells us, improvement in the arts advanced so rapidly that five men were enabled to perform the labor at its close that eight men were required to perform at its beginning. During that period in England money steadily cheapened, newspapers and low priced publications multiplied, the schools quadrupled their attendance, the railroads added a half to their mileage, the telegraph became a part of the postal service, distributive co-operation grew until 900,000 families held an interest in the stores, improved facilities of exchange with the world enriched England—the workshop of the world; above all, the cities grew and a sad change came over the the agricultural districts. This English clergyman, the Rev. Augustus Jessopp, D. D., struck with the altered state of things in Norfolk, wrote some account of it which was published in the *Nineteenth Century* in August, 1881. Other articles followed at intervals, each of about a year, to the same subject by the same author, have just been published in book form by G. P. Putnam's Sons, under the title "Arcady: for better for worse." The author's purposes seem, first, a portrayal of sundry phases of the life of the small farmers and agricultural laborers of Norfolk, a task to which he brings fair literary abilities of the *diettante* order; and, second, to enforce the lesson of Christian charity, in which alone he sees any remedy for the conditions he describes—charity that would dole out some thousand pounds in a parish in erecting improved dwellings for the poor or that would forego a fraction of a per cent in the exactions of rent.

The reverend gentleman twitters, in a gently mournful way, about the old men who remember the roadsides, the wastes and village greens, and patches of no man's land which have gone from them forever, and about the donkey munching thistles or rolling in the dust, the cow picking up a livelihood under the hedge or on the waste, the geese that brought in a few shillings at Michaelmas time for their owner—but none of which the laborer of to-day can enjoy. The agricultural laborer's life has become dull and sodden. There are scores—perhaps hundreds—of villages where the inhabitants have absolutely no amusement of any kind outside the public house, where cricket, or bowls, or even skittles are as unknown as bear-baiting; where the children play at marbles in the gutter in bodily fear lest the road surveyor should come down upon them.

Dr. Jessopp has very strong convictions concerning what he terms the new doctrines of the rights of man. They are heretical and preposterous and ought to be argued down. Unconsciously, however, he gives testimony against his old political economy in nearly every page of his book. It has a value, coming from the source that it does, and the following extracts from his work are employed here for a purpose far different from that for which he wrote them:

The change in the face of the country generally is so patent as to require only a few words. The small fields that used to be so picturesque and so wasteful—where one could botanize with so much interest and pick up all sorts of odd pieces of information—have gone or are rapidly going; the tall hedges, the high banks, the scrub or the bottoms where a fox or a weasel might hope to find a night's lodging, the bye lanes where the gypsies' tents used to pitch. . . . All those things have vanished—"been done away with, sir."

All this has been brought about by a huge expenditure of capital, such as the farmers whom I knew in my earlier Arcadian days, certainly had not at their command. The money has been brought in by men who were not simple sons of the soil—retired publicans and commercial travellers, town shopkeepers and those intelligent and pushing gentlemen yclept salesmen, or young men whose fathers have left them a few thousands and a defective education. . . .

The rural districts have benefited largely by this outpouring of money, but they have lost something, too. The shop keepers in the market towns have been enormous gainers and have grown rich, their enterprise has met with its reward; the country lawyers have increased and multiplied and thriven exceedingly; the bankers have had a good time of it; *the landlords' rents have risen largely;* the laborer's wages have gone up, and his luxuries have multiplied surprisingly. But the small farmers have grown fewer and fewer, their homesteads have fallen into decay or been pulled down, they and their families have been thrust out, driven off to America or New Zealand or Australia, and their place knows them no more, the *village* shopkeepers have almost been improved off the face of the earth, and last, not least, the country clergy are relatively to their neighbors much poorer than they were, and are in process of becoming seriously impoverished. . . .

And yet these are the men whom economists and agents and capitalists are combining to oust from their holdings. Nevertheless, they are the very salt of the earth, and among them are to be found not only the best, but almost the only remaining specimens of the slow, silent, stolid, sturdy English yeoman whom you may knock about all day and all night, but who will never suspect that he is getting beaten till you squeeze the life out of him by lifting him from his mother earth. . . .

Under those thatched roofs . . . two or three generations of frugal peasants have brought up their families and yet paid their way, and *could do it now* if you wrung from them only as much rent as their fathers paid in the best times, or asked only as many shillings an acre as the big man on the other side of the hedge pays for his larger holding. . . .

I am inclined to think that the laborer's material gains have been appraised a little too highly. The increase in money wages has been considerable, but I am satisfied that directly and indirectly he has gained less than has been supposed. Thirty years ago in harvest time a man's wife earned at least half as much as her husband, every child gained a little, every house was shut up. . . . As for the gleaning, I have known instances where a family has been kept in bread over Christmas day, the flour ground exclusively from the corn picked up in gleaning time. In those days farmers kept few accounts, and these not very trustworthy ones, but they roughly guessed that the harvest cost them ten or twelve shillings an acre against sixteen or seventeen, which it costs them now. There is good reason to think the old estimate too low, whatever may be thought of the new reckoning. . . .

But if the agricultural laborer has been a gainer to the extent indicated he is not a bit more—nay, he is much less contented with his lot than he was. How should he be? The old men remember the roadsides, the wastes and commons and village greens and patches of no man's land which have gone from them for ever. . . .

I remember the time when among the most enterprising and intelligent of the peasantry there were always two careers open. The one was the hiring of "a bit of land" large enough to keep a horse and a cow or two; the other was the setting up a shop where even in old age an honest, frugal couple might make a livelihood and never be forced to go on the parish. I seldom hear of anyone looking forward to the former of these possible careers. I never find anyone inclined to venture upon the latter.

What have the peasantry of England done and what is their crime, that they alone have been left as they were? "As they were?" No! Not as they were—ten times worse than they were! Let a man of fifty ride five miles in any direction from his own door in some of the most carefully tilled counties of England, and he must be fortunate in his surroundings if he can find ten laborers' cottages *with three sleeping rooms* that have been built since he arrived at manhood. Let him at the same time take a note of the "houses" of agricultural laborers in which large families have been brought up—God knows how—and on which £50 have been spent during the same time. Let him end by counting the number of dwellings that have been allowed to fall down and from which the last occupant has escaped only just soon enough. Let him do all this, I say, and I think that man will be startled and shocked if he has any heart or pity in him. . . .

Men pretend to wonder that the population of our villages goes on decreasing. It would be wonderful if it were otherwise. The peasantry have acquired migratory habits and gone into the towns from sheer necessity. . . .

Taking the rural population in the mass and comparing their income man by man with that of the mass of the townsmen, I have a strong suspicion that the countrymen would be found by no means the poorer of the two. . . . The truth is you have increased the laborer's daily wages, but that is absolutely all that you have done for him. He asks for a decent home, for a chance of *bettering* himself, for the *possibility* of a future which may raise him to the rank of a small proprietor, for *some* prospect of trying his luck with a cow or a horse and cart, for *some* innocent recreation and amusement when his day's work is done, for *some* tiny playground for his children in the summer evenings, for *some* object of ambition. I have seen children crying because it was holiday time at the school, and they had *nothing* to do at home and *no* place to play in. . . .

Men do not run away in shoals from homes where their childhood was happy and their youth blessed with joyous memories, and in which they may look forward in their turn to pass their best years in some decency, comfort and self respect. They do run away from the odious thought of living and dying in a squalid hovel with a clay floor and two dark cabins under the rafters, reached by a ricketty ladder, in the one of which sleep father and mother as best they can, while in the fetid air of the other their offspring of both sexes huddle, sometimes eight or nine of them, among them young men and young women out of whom you are stamping all sense of shame. Yes! People do run away from a life like this, leaving it behind them as a dreadful past which they remember only with indignation, or rebelling against the prospect of it as a future too hideous to be entertained except with scorn. I, for one, do not blame them. . . .

Houses! Why, you may see whole rows of hovels in no one of which would any farmer in the parish put his nag for a single night without indignant protest—rows of hovels where there are only two rooms, one above and one below. I could point to three of these disgraceful tenements immediately contiguous to one another, in each of which by a strange coincidence there were lately a father, mother and seven children, all sleeping in a single room. In one case the mother produced an eighth child in the night, her only helper being her daughter, a girl of fourteen, who did her best while the father ran to fetch the midwife. . . .

I have myself had to visit and do my best for a family housed in a wooden hut seventeen feet three inches long, fifteen feet nine inches wide and nine feet high, outside measurement, in which a man and woman with three children were living—the children suffering from modified, the mother dying of confluent, smallpox, the father safe by the accident of his having been inoculated in his childhood. When I say that I had more than once to hunt the fowls from the room in which that dreadful object was lying, I am only lifting a corner of the curtain which my shuddering recollection of that frightful experience will not permit me to raise. In a hamlet of my parish, where a dozen families are—I am at a loss for the word—in a rookery which grew up on the edge of a piece of waste in days when squatting was not unusual, I do not hesitate to say that, during the outbreak of smallpox to which I refer, if it had not been for vaccination, there would not have been a house in which there would not have been one dead. . . .

You may tell me that things are worse in the towns. What if they are? Two wrongs do not make one right. I do not stop to dwell upon the fact that the wretched beings who crowd the horrible garrets in London or Liverpool are the lowest and worst of their class, and these poor villagers are often among the best. But this I do say emphatically that there may be some excuse for this hideous crowding of human beings in the towns, but there is no excuse for it in the country, where land is sold by the acre, not by the square inch. . . .

If in the last thirty years the agricultural laborers in East Anglia have not deteriorated, then the commonly received belief in the connection between cause and effect must be a delusion. From the parish in which I write thirty-one sons of the soil have been enrolled as London policemen in thirty years. What does that mean? It means that these young men, who were the very pick of the parish, men not only of splendid physique, but of approved character, men above the average in intelligence and education, have been taken from us never to return. Why should they return? They will be fathers elsewhere, and their sturdy sons will push their way, but not in the country village at the plow's tail. During these same thirty years the men who have emigrated across the seas have in all cases been the men of enterprise, intelligence and sobriety. America does not want and will not have paupers and raga muffins. We retain the sediment; the vicious, the immoral, the men whose character is not above suspicion, the sickly, the depraved, the dissipated and profligate, the roughs. . . . The rising generation are in a far more dangerous and inflammable condition than the world outside has any suspicion of. . . .

Granted that the house accommodation for the working classes in London or Liverpool were as bad as the most sensational writers have declared it to be, this does not keep the countrymen away; the cry is. Still they come. But where do they come from? Not from the pretty cottages within pleasant gardens; not from the model houses on the rich man's estate who will not permit overcrowding, and whose pride and delight is to see the woodbine clambering over the porch, and the chubby children patting the pig in the sty. They come from the tumble-down hovels run up on no man's land—heaven knows when or by whom—the hamlets, as we call them, for want of any better name, which belong to the firm of Grasper, Grind & Sponge, and which the young fellows whom we are *beginning* to educate find simply uninhabitable. In the towns the bad houses do not drive the best men away—in the country they do. To the towns the stream of immigration flows on, unchecked by any deterrent force which the slums may exercise. In the country the laborer is not deterred from going, he is only deterred from staying. It is to him a hideous prospect to begin where his father left off, and to leave off in the hole where you ask him to begin. . . . You are enlarging his range of ideas, stimulating his ambition, appealing to his imagination, tempting him to read books and newspapers, and in so far as you succeed in your laudable endeavors to raise him he is pretty sure to ask himself and others some very searching questions, to look ahead, and to look around him, and to feel—

The lift
Of a great instinct shouting, Forward!

Begin where his father left off! Nay; he is already miles in advance of any point to which his father ever dreamt of attaining. "Stay here to grovel with the swine, and not half as well cared for? Not I." . . . Can it admit even of question whether or not it is clear madness to let the exhaustion of all enterprise and all personal worth from the villages go uncheeked till only helots are left to scratch the fields and feed like hogs? . . .

"You've some very handsome farm buildings, Mr. *Dix*."

"So I ought to have. I farm over 2,000 acres, and I've six landlords. Why, I've ninety-seven horses—all told."

"How many men do you employ?"

"How many hands do you mean? That's as it happens. In such weather as this we turn 'em off of course."

Of course! They're hands already—coming and going. Hands, and very cold hands in the frost and snow.

AN OPEN LETTER.

Louis F. Post—My Dear Sir: I find myself in perfect accord with the ideas expressed in your open letter in THE STANDARD of Dec. 3.

The machinery of a national party must result from a slow process of manufacture if it is to be stable. And it seems to me that so certain is the final question of making its way now that an unsuccessful national undertaking can add nothing either to this surety or to the speediness of its accomplishment.

I favor the formation of a national reform movement, based upon some single proposition, so simple and so generally understood that all factions that are honest can enthusiastically and harmoniously support it.

Meanwhile let the land and labor clubs proclaim the doctrine of the single tax in season and out of season, in public and in private; agitate, educate and co-operate.

In each state the organization of these clubs should be effected so as to place congressional candidates, when it is possible to do so on the free land and free trade issue.

The rank and file of workingmen are perfectly honest, and a long and disappointing period of endeavor has made them suspicious and easily seared. The labor politician has managed to manipulate them so many times that they view with alarm and uneasiness the advent of new forces and new features in their ranks. Depose the demagogues and assemble a genuine conference of men whose souls are in the advance movement and this bickering and backbiting will cease; but those who thus assemble must be willing to give and take, then upon mature deliberation evolve the simplest and at the same time the most effective proposition, one that all departments of industry appreciate and understand, and from such a beginning them must be evolved in proper time that organization grounded in the truth that will demand the single tax. I know that many of us feel that this is a serious period in the history of our nation. The common people of this land are being crucified between two thieves, the democratic and republican parties, and it is only a question of time when the grip of the octopi (monopolies) will effectually strangle our industries. Every month makes their grasp more and more oppressive and permanent, and it seems to me that we must arrest it in some way if we desire to see our institutions preserved in such shape that we can accomplish any reform.

You know something of my unswerving fidelity to the doctrine of the "land for the people," but it is "for the people" that we want the land and we must have the people with us in our crusade.

It seems to me that the best way to reach the people is to go with them, so long as they are traveling toward the right goal and not away from it; and as we journey let us unfold to them the picture and the parable of "the cat."

ALFRED L. HOUGHTON.

Cincinnati, Dec. 5.

Doesn't Believe in Democratic Promises, and Wants a Candidate in the Field.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—Our club held its regular meeting Sunday evening, Dec. 10, and had a good attendance of members and others. The morning papers here give considerable space to the reports of our meetings. We are steadily growing in numbers. Our membership includes the better class of workmen, and small merchants as well as some large ones; among them Mr. Clemens Vorrigut, the proprietor of one of our largest hardware stores, and Colonel Johnson, the owner of the Citizens' street railway.

I want to record my vote against giving up the fight by not nominating a national ticket next year. My greatest objection is this: The majority of our members in this section are drawn from the ranks of the republican party, and you can't persuade them to vote for anything tainted with so-called democracy, it doesn't matter what.

GILBERT SEIBERT.

Doesn't Want to be Deprived of the Privilege of Voting for a Principle.

ATHENS, Pa.—I did not vote at our last election, as there was nothing to vote for save the putting of one man or the other into office; but I consoled myself with the thought that in '88 I should not only have the privilege of voting for a principle myself, but would secure a large vote for our party by showing my friends something to vote for. I hope that I and thousands similarly situated are not to be deprived of the privilege of voting for a presidential candidate who represents our views. In my opinion we should nominate a candidate as soon as possible.

A. L. PIERCE.

THE DEVIL TO PAY.

The king was puzzled, for his treasury was empty, and he knew not how to fill it. While he pondered this mighty question of state, the devil came to him, not in a dream, but in sober earnest. And the devil, as is his habit, went at once to business.

"You are in trouble, sir," said he to the king; "shall I help you out of it?"

"No, thank you," replied the king, "you charge too much for your help. I do not forget that my father is still working out a debt to you which was beyond all proportion to your service."

"Yes," said the devil. "I did charge the old man about all the traffic would bear; but I have tried to be considerate, and although he is still working out the debt, let me assure you that his position is the most comfortable, in winter, in all my dominions. But that is beside the question. Your treasury is empty, and I can fill it. I will make no conditions. You may command me freely. What say you?"

"And has the devil turned saint?" the king inquired.

"Not by a long shot. I shall get my pay; though not from you, from your subjects."

"My subjects be ——."

"Stop!" interrupted the devil, "that sentiment is not original with you. It is the motto of my kingdom, and I won't permit it to be appropriated with impunity. Come, what do you say; shall I tell you how to fill your treasury?"

"Yes," the king whispered.

"Then, listen. All your subjects have plenty, have they not?"

"They have. There is not a poor man in my kingdom, except myself."

"How do they get it?"

"They work for it."

"Why do you allow them to work?"

"It is the command of God"——

"Silence!" the devil screamed, his face purple with rage and his tail lashing the floor of the palace till the air was laden with sparks.

"Well, then," gasped the frightened king, "they would starve if I stopped them, and what good would that do me?"

"It would do you no good if they starved," the devil answered, as he gathered his tail under his left arm and opened the window to let out the stifling fumes. "But it would do you some good to charge them for working, wouldn't it? They would pay rather than starve, eh?

"Good idea!" exclaimed the king.

"I thought so," said the devil. "Now, suppose you issue a proclamation that no one may work without a royal charter."

"Yes," the king interrupted, impatiently.

"And then suppose you sell charters to one man to work in a certain territory and to another man to work in another territory, and so on."

"Yes."

"And suppose you allow the owners of these charters to farm out the privileges under them."

"Yes."

"And suppose you issue no charters at all for some of the best territory; don't you see that you will get a lot of ready money from the sale of charters and have a permanent income from the territory reserved, and be favored with a wealthy leisure class in whose society you may enjoy yourself?

"Capital!" exclaimed the king, and before the word was out of his mouth the devil had vanished.

The king lost no time. Having issued his proclamation forbidding his beloved subjects to weary themselves with work, he sent for his attorney-general and ordered that functionary, on the basis of a contingent fee, to draft a form of charter. It read in substance like this: Be it known that his pious and gracious majesty, Impecunious X, having from love of his faithful subjects forbidden them to work without his command, does now, by these presents, confer upon his well-beloved Bylighote, lord of Towmaytokahn hill, his heirs and assigns forever, full power and authority to permit the good people of all that territory known as Quad, and bounded, etc., etc., etc., to work or not to work, as to him may seem best, and on such terms as to him may seem just. Signed, sealed, etc., etc., etc.

The proclamation caused an uproar among the people, for the seeding season was just opening; but when Lord Bylighote appeared with his charter in Quad, quiet was restored and terms were made. "I will give so much a year to be allowed to work," said one, and "I will give so much," said another. And in this way it went, until Lord Bylighote had arranged with all the people in his territory. And while Lord Bylighote was adjusting things in Quad, Lord This and Lord That and Lord Tother were doing the same in Quam and Quim and Qurl. And so it was that the king's treasury was full from the sale of charters, and the lords, instead of working as they used to do, lived on what the people paid them for the privilege of being allowed to work, while the attorney general's contingent fee was big enough to make a shyster respectable. And between them the king, the lords and the attorney general enjoyed their leisure amazingly.

But as the king's subjects increased a great many could not buy the right to work and had to hire themselves to those who could, and many of these could not find men to hire them, and many more found it easier to follow the example of the kings and the lords and live on plunder than either to buy the right to work or to hire themselves out. And it came about that there were paupers in the kingdom, which was something novel, since the king had theretofore been the only pauper; and there were criminals there, which was also novel, for when nobody had to pay to be allowed to work, and everybody got rich by working, no one ever thought of being a criminal.

And so things went on for many and many a year. The king was lazy and happy, for he had nothing to do and plenty to eat. The lords were lazy and happy for the same reason. The people, though, were far from being lazy and happy; the beggars were lazy but they went hungry; the criminals were neither lazy nor happy, and the people who worked had no time to be lazy, and after paying the lords for the right to work had little left on which to be happy.

In the course of time the king died and the lords died but the charters lived and new kings and new lords profited by them.

At last the people got so restless and made such grim threats that the lords were frightened, and when a rebellion was imminent the lords were on the point of burning up their charters. But this did not meet the views of the devil, and he put it into the heads of the people who were paying for the right to work to buy the right of their lords for a lump sum. Of course the lords were glad to compromise in this way, and it came about that each man who worked in a certain place bought the right of his lord to work there forever, him and his children after him, and to sell the right to others. It took a good many years to complete this change but when it was done the devil rubbed his hands and switched his tail gently, now this way and now that, saying: "Surely the devil will be to pay!"

And it was so.

Some of the purchasers from the lords found that where they had the right to work they could make a good deal with only a little effort, and others found that where they had the right to work they could only make a little with great effort; and thus it happened that the first and those who bought of them grew rich and the others remained poor. And those that grew rich did just what the lords had done before them; they sold permission to work to the poor who had no charters, and this proved so profitable that they were able themselves to obey the old proclamation against working and yet to live in great comfort. Like the lords from whom they had bought, they were lazy and happy.

But the people were constantly begging to be allowed to work, and the more they begged the less attention was paid to them. And when they did get a chance to work they were not allowed to receive, no matter where they worked or how much they made, any more than the people who had charters to work in the very poorest places in the kingdom. And that was little enough, as everybody knew.

With al the people increased and multiplied, and to help them out of their trouble they invented great machines, which did marvelous work; but neither the people nor the machines could work without permission of a charter owner, and the more the people worked and the more marvelous their machines the more the charter owners charged them for the right to work, until even the machines fell into the hands of a few, and the people could not make new ones, because charters to work had become so valuable that except in the very poorest places only the few were able to buy the right to work, and the poor were trying to hire themselves out. And so it appeared that, happen what might to make work easier and more fruitful, the charter owners got all the benefit.

In these days a prophet arose who told the people that the charter owners had no right to forbid them to work nor any right to make them pay for working. But the charter owners railed at the prophet as a devil (the devil having put it into their heads to do so), saying, "Have we not bought and paid for these charters?"

And then arose a priest who, seeing how the people were oppressed and robbed by the charters, denounced the charters and demanded that they be abolished; but the devil ordered the priest to be put down, and he was put down.

And yet every one marveled that there were so many poor and that the poor increased. But the priests taught that it was not marvelous, for God willed it, whereat the devil again rubbed his hands together and gently switched his tail, now this way, now that, saying to himself, "It won't be long now until the devil is to pay!" And he was right.

Pretty soon everything was in readiness, and from advising king, and lord and charter owner the devil turned to advising the poor.

"See how the rich revel in the wealth you have created!" he said to them. "Why do you not burn and murder and pillage? Is there no manhood in you? Are you slaves?"

But at first the people protested that they were opposed to murder and pillage, and asked why they should not abolish the charters, as the prophet and priest advised, which would need neither murder nor pillage.

"Away with your prophet and your priest!" shouted the devil. "They are in league with the rich. Make no half way measures! Let there be no compromise! Lay waste! Lay waste! See, I will set you an example," and with that the devil touched the tip of his tail to the palace of a charter owner and instantly it was ablaze; and then the devil's scheme, so patiently planned, culminated. Like rats from their holes rushed a million debased and desperate men. Half famished and all in rags, aiming at nothing and caring for nothing, spurred on by revenge, hitting right and left, burning, killing, plundering, they laid waste the land.

The devil was indeed to pay!

LEWIS FREELAND.

The Economical Heresy of a Savage.

Exchange.

Once a European was conversing with a savage chief in the Malay archipelago. He complimented the savage on the healthy condition of his tribe and remarked the absence of poverty, and then proceeded to tell him of the starving millions in civilized countries. "But," said the savage, "how can that be? I have always heard of the immense wealth of the white man, and if it is so, how can he starve, when I, who have almost nothing, can live well—have you no food in Europe, nothing to build houses of?"

"You don't understand me," replied the European; "we have immense quantities of food, and any number of houses, but there is not enough work, and so there are very many who can get nothing, and wages are very low for those who do work, because of competition."

The savage was thunderstruck and thought, are the white men mad? so he said: "What you say is absurd; in this country food is meant to eat and houses to live in, and while there is enough of both nobody lacks them. As for work, we build our huts and kill our game, but it is only in time of plenty that there is no work, and too much work is a hardship and no blessing."

UP THE HUDSON.

"Lots of money is made out of landed property in this section," said a young man behind me in a train traveling along the Hudson river a few days ago.

"Yes," answered his companion. "But more is made out west where a town springs up in a night like a mushroom and a poor man to-day is a rich man to-morrow. A friend of mine bought a lot cheap in Minneapolis a few years ago and built a little house on it. The city grew up and the other day he was offered $200,000 for it by an insurance company that wanted to put up a big office building. He refused, and will wait until it is worth $300,000. Then he intends to sell and take things easy for the rest of his days."

"Your friend must be a bright man to make so much money," said the young man.

"Oh, he didn't make the lot worth that much," was the reply. "He's a railroad conductor and his home is there. But he could live just as comfortably in another part of the city. What gives his lot enhanced value is that increasing population makes it more and more important as a business center, and so he has only to hold on and let its value rise."

"I see," the young man said. "It is population which is making the fortune of your friend."

"Well, yes," answered the other; "if you wish to put it in that way."

"But I don't see why your friend deserves a fortune," said the young man. "He is making poor use of his opportunity. He might better live elsewhere and throw that land open for business purposes. There are Jones and Smith and Brown working in cramped quarters because he won't permit the insurance company or anyone else to put up a building with more offices."

"He can do what he likes with his own, can't he?" asked the elder man.

"Certainly," was the response. "But you said the increased value of his lot was due to population. That means that it is a public value. Then why should he get it? Why should it not go to the city?

"But the law permits him to take it."

"Then the law can withdraw its permission."

"It's impracticable, any way," snapped the elder man.

"What is simpler," asked his companion, "than taxing the value of the land?"

"But in adding to taxes you cause a surplus revenue," was objected.

"Then why not abolish the taxes that burden industry?" asked the young man. "Have only one tax, and that resting on the value of land, which is made by and should meet the expenses of the community."

"Well, that's a very pretty scheme, but it won't come in our day. The world may see it a hundred years hence"—and just then the conductor shouted "Nyack," and I had to get off without hearing the end of the conversation; but I had heard enough. Plainly the yeast was at work; and I found it working everywhere I went.

In Nyack there are many enlisted in the movement. They have a compact organization and hold regular public meetings for "spreading the light." Aug. J. Gross, Robert Holliday, John B. Ross, Mr. Beebe and Thomas J. Devine are among the most active men.

The chief industry of Nyack is the making of shoes. Two big factories employ hundreds of hands, and when in full operation they turn out thousands of shoes daily. These factories are full of wonderful machinery. Steel fingers stitch the upper, sew on the sole, fasten the buttons, work button holes, nail on and shape the heel and do the smoothing and polishing, all that is required of human intelligence being to guide them. In the heeling department three men and three boys do the work that formerly required twenty-five men. And so it is all through the factory, save the lasting department, where peculiar skill, acquired by long experience, is needed. Thus far no machinery has been invented which would do this work, and the lasters are therefore comparatively independent and get the highest pay. I asked a young man in the movement, who took me through one of these factories, if the introduction of this labor saving machinery had increased wages. He said that it had not; that on the contrary wages had fallen, for upon the introduction of a new machine men or women were discharged, only to return and compete for the places of those who remained. Besides, the more machinery used the less skill and experience required, and after a few days' or a few weeks' practice anybody could do as much work as one long years at the trade. Every year witnesses new inventions which are turning the independent workman into a mere feeder of machinery. The future, he said, seemed hopeless until he saw that the way to lessen competition and raise wages was to open new channels of industry, and that this could be done by taxing land values and forcing monopolizers to open to labor vast quantities of valuable land now withheld from use for speculative purposes.

By this way of reasoning the doctrine of the single tax has made many converts among the operatives.

In Newburg the Henry George club is working steadily to spread these principles. A meeting is held every Saturday evening at the headquarters on Water street. The members keep well supplied with tracts. Michael F. Mullen is president, Alex. Laird is secretary; James McGarvey, treasurer, and John J. Mullen, state committeeman.

Mr. C. Rich has done much effective work in a quiet way. Although past seventy he is as enthusiastic as a young man and improves every opportunity to scatter seed. It is told how, walking along a street in Newburg one day, he stopped where a house was being built and asked the builder what he gave for the lot.

"One thousand dollars," was the answer.

"What would the lot be worth if there were no people here?" asked Mr. Rich.

"Nothing," replied the builder.

"Then it is clear that the value of that lot is due to the presence of people."

"Yes, that is so," said the builder. "I never thought about the matter."

"Then," asked Mr. Rich, "don't you see how, in buying that lot, you paid an individual for a value which the whole community created? Suppose you had paid that money into the public treasury for the support of government, your house need not have been taxed."

"Oh, that sounds well enough as a theory, but it won't work," the builder replied.

"Let me see if it won't," was the rejoinder. "What would be the effect of taking taxes off houses?"

"More houses would be built."

"What would be the effect of taxing vacant lots?"

"Owners would improve them or drop them. But what are you driving at?" asked the builder.

"Just this," answered Mr. Rich. "A man would not be taxed for having a house; speculators would have to improve land or give it up; the building of houses would be stimulated, and the community would get a value which it had created by simply shifting taxes from improvements to the value of land?"

When Mr. Rich asked if he understood, the builder said he thought he did.

In Poughkeepsie William C. Albro, Henry Bartlett, William Sweeny, Prof. F. L. Gardner, Fred Arnold and a host of other good men are keeping up an active propaganda. There was a reorganization soon after election and a canvass for the spring local elections was commenced. The land and labor club holds a public meeting every Sunday afternoon. An effort will be made to get up some debates on the land question, and it will not take a great deal to get public interest enlisted, for this town, too, furnishes plentiful illustrations of the absurdity and injustice of private property in land. I was told, for instance, how a gentleman had bought one of three vacant lots for $1,000 and had erected a fine house upon it. The next year he wished to purchase another lot but was told that the price would be $1,100. When he remonstrated he was informed that the fine house which he had built upon his lot had made the other two lots more desirable, hence the increase in price.

One of the chief supporters of the cause in Poughkeepsie is Rev. James Nilan, pastor of St. Peter's R. C. church, and a warm friend of Dr. McGlynn. He has both publicly and privately declared his convictions in unmistakable terms.

On visiting Kingston, a few miles north of Poughkeepsie, on the west side of the Hudson, I found our men well pleased with their 388 votes on November 8, for at the commencement of the fight only a handful of them understood the principles of the party. Herman Shader, a young and enthusiastic worker, said that a strong organization was to be formed shortly, and that at least 200 men would sign the roll. Correspondence will furthermore be opened with men in other parts of the county. During the winter months the work of education will be energetically pushed. Michael Lawless and Hubert Hawley are among those most earnest in their devotion to the cause.

In Columbia county, where Samuel J. Tilden received his political education, our men are working against great odds. The whole county is politically rotten. Votes are bought and sold like merchandise. It is notorious that half the votes in the village of Hudson are purchasable—an election going to the party spending the most money. "The republicans carried the day," said a democratic worker, "because they spent $6,000 more than we did." It is alleged that even shop keepers sell their votes, and I heard of a man worth $7,000 who regularly puts his vote up at auction, and who has taken fifty cents when he could get no more. Corruption reaches its highest point in the First ward, where, out of 359 votes, 227 have been bought and paid for. Young men relate with pride how such and such a candidate was beaten by votes which they had purchased. But even in this hot bed of corruption there are earnest and determined men leavening the lump with ideas that call for a thorough purification of politics and the righting of social wrongs. Such men as Frank and Charles Wilcox, William Tough and James McNeill of Hudson are untiring in their labors and are ably supported by George Kivlin at Valatia, Isaac and M. J. Smith of Stockport, P. H. Miller at Germantown, H. B. Meech at Chatham, E. J. Clark, C. Smith, C. E. Halstead and R. D. Barnes at Chatham village, and, in short, by trustworthy men in all the villages of any importance in the county. They will push the agitation of electoral reform and advocate the adoption of the Australian system of voting.

In Albany I heard a similar tale of corruption. Both of the old parties spent more money at the recent contest than ever before. In the eastern district of the Seventeenth ward one of the democratic workers carried a canvass bag filled with silver dollars. In the western district men moving in highly respectable circles were guilty of violating the franchise. Two church deacons stood at the polling booths and are alleged to have used money for the republican ticket.

J. J. McCabe, chairman of the county executive committee, is hopeful of rapid progress. Proselytes throughout the county are spreading the fire lighted in the late struggle. Robert A. Wood, associate editor on the *Daily Press and Knickerbocker*, and brother of Dr. Wood of Gloversville, is a steady worker. C. H. Barrett and Joseph C. Roshirt are doing good work, too. An anti-poverty society was recently formed and is rapidly increasing its membership. In its ranks are a hundred enthusiastic men and women who will spread the gospel far and wide.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

REV. EDWARD McGLYNN, D. D., PRESIDENT.

The thirty-sixth public meeting of the society will be held at

THE ACADEMY OF MUSIC

SUNDAY EVENING, JAN. 1.

ADDRESS

by

REV. DR. M'GLYNN.

Musical service by

CONCORDIA CHORUS.

Admission free to Family Circle. Balcony and Circle Boxes 10 cents. Orchestra and Orchestra Circle 25 cents. Proscenium Boxes 50 cents.

Tickets on sale at the Anti-Poverty Society office, 30 Cooper Union.

Box office at Academy open at 6:30 p. m. Sunday.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY

In Philadelphia will hold meetings every Sunday evening during December at Knights of Labor hall, 806 Gerard avenue. Commencing Jan. 1, 1888, at Lincoln hall, Broad street and Fairmont avenue. The monthly business meeting will be held Thursday, Jan. 5, 1888, at Odd Fellows' hall, corner Broad and Spring Garden streets. Everybody invited to attend.

By order Executive committee.

WM. J. ATKINSON, President,
J. H. McINTYRE, Secretary.

ANTI-POVERTY DOCTRINES IN A NUTSHELL.

Thirty pamphlets on various phases of the social problem. The question of the hour. All should understand it. Will be sent post paid on receipt of fifteen cents in stamps, or will be sent free to any one sending twenty-five cents for six months' subscription to the *Tax Reformer*, a sixteen page journal. Address, ANTI-POVERTY PRESS, 184 William st., New York.

CHARLES B. SCHAIDNER,

PHOTOGRAPHER,

2280 Third avenue, cor. 124th street, New York.

Children's Photographs by instantaneous process a specialty

JAMES BOGAN, PRINCIPAL AGENT for James Means' $3 and $4 shoes. 226 BOWERY, near Prince street.

HOLLAND'S

COFFEE AND DINING ROOMS,
175 Fourth avenue,
Bet. 13th and 14th sts.

PRINTING.

CONCORD CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY (Ld.)

47 and 49 Center st., N. Y.

BOOK, JOB AND NEWSPAPER PRINTING.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

POPULAR EDITION.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TARIFF QUESTION WITH ESPECIAL REGARD TO THE INTERESTS OF LABOR.

By HENRY GEORGE.

One Volume, Paper Covers.
PRICE, THIRTY-FIVE CENTS.

Now in press and ready for delivery September 12.

When this book was originally published, in May, 1886, it seemed to me that the tariff would be the first of the economic questions to come into political issue in the United States, and I looked to it as a means by which the underlying land question would be brought into general discussion.

But events then unforeseen are bringing the land question into the discussions of "practical politics" with greater rapidity than I expected, and it now seems likely that it will be an awakening as to the larger question that will lead the masses of our people to consider the smaller.

This gratifying change, however, instead of lessening the interest and usefulness of this book, gives to the matters of which it treats so much more immediate and practical importance as to call for the publication of a popular edition. It has already done much, and is I trust destined to do more, not only to place the tariff question in its true light, but to clear away confusions of thought that obscure the full scope and beauty of the simple measure, which securing equality with regard to natural opportunities, will emancipate labor and give free play to productive forces.

HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George's Works.

Progress and Poverty, paper		$ 35
" "	cloth	1 00
" "	half calf or half morocco	2 50
Social Problems, paper		20
" "	cloth	1 00
" "	half calf or half morocco	2 50
Protection or Free Trade? paper		35
" "	cloth	1 50
" "	half calf or half morocco	3 00
Property in Land, paper		15
The Land Question, paper		10

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price.

HENRY GEORGE & CO., 23 Ann street, New York.

Henry George's Buch

Fortschritt und Armuth

Eine billige deutsche Ausgabe von

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Preis 35 Cents,

ist soeben erschienen und durch alle Buchhändler und Colporteure zu beziehen. Wird nach Empfang des Preises portofrei versandt vom Verleger

HENRY GEORGE,

25 Ann Street, New York.

GERMAN TRACTS.

ISSUED IN THE LAND AND LABOR LIBRARY.

NOW READY.

No. 41. The Syracuse Platform. 2 pages.
No. 42. "First Principles." Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 43. "Socialism—Its Truth and Its Error." Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 46. "Taxing Land Values." Henry George. 8 pages.
No. 47. "It is the Law of Christ." Rev. S. H. Spencer of Henry, Ill. 4 pages.
No. 48. "The Case Plainly Stated." H. F. Ring. 8 pages.
No. 50. "Progress and Poverty." Henry George.
No. 52. "The Case Plainly Stated." (Swedish.) H. F. Ring. 8 pages.
No. 53. "Sailors' Snug Harbor." Wm. T. Croasdale. 12 pages.

Prices, free by mail: 2-page tracts—50 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 15 cents; 1,000 copies, $1; 5,000 copies, $4.25.
Four-page tracts—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 1,000 copies, $2; 5,000 copies, $8.50.
Eight-page tracts—25 copies, 20 cents; 100 copies, 50 cents; 1,000 copies, $4; 5,000 copies, $17.
Other numbers in preparation. Address

HENRY GEORGE,
25 Ann street, New York.

HEAVEN AND HELL,

From things heard and seen by Emanuel Swedenborg. Cheap edition, paper, fifteen cents, postpaid. This work unfolds the laws of the spiritual world and describes the condition of both good and evil men after death. It treats, among other things, of the sun of heaven and the light and heat thence proceeding, of the garments and habitations of the angels, their government, worship, occupations, conjugal relations, etc., of the state of the heathen and young children, of the rich and poor, and of the wise and simple in heaven. A work in harmony with right reason and the teachings of sacred scripture and one that confirms the principles of "Progress and Poverty."

Intercourse Between the Soul and the Body, paper, five cents; and all other writing of Swedenborg and of New Church authors. Catalogue free. Address New Church Board of Publication, Room 20, Cooper Union, New York.

J. C. JACKSON,
Business Manager.

NOW OUT.

THE GERMAN EDITION

OF

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

PRICE, IN PAPER COVERS,

Thirty-five Cents.

Address HENRY GEORGE,

25 Ann Street, New York.

$5.00 LABOR LIBRARY.—30 STANDARD works by 24 authors—Marx, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Kropotkin, Reclus, Hyndman, Gronlund, Bebel, Annie Besant, Lassalle, Bradlaugh, George. Speeches of anarchists and trial, etc., bound in 3 vols.; cloth, $5; postpaid, $5.50. Complete list mailed free. MODERN PRESS,
250 1-2 Bowery, New York.

THE DEMOCRAT.

A RADICAL REVIEW MONTHLY.

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 18 months to any address in the United States or Canada.

Address 5 New Bridge street, London, E. C.

TAX REFORMER.

The first paper published in America devoted to the advocacy of the principles of "Progress and Poverty."

Subscription, one year, with a copy of "Progress and Poverty," given free, 50 cents; with "Progress and Poverty" and "Social Problems," 75 cents.

M. BATTLE, 9 Spruce street,
New York.

JUST OUT.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GEORGE-HEWITT CAMPAIGN.

By Louis F. Post and Fred. C. Leubuscher.

1 vol., paper covers. Price, 20 cents.

Address HENRY GEORGE & CO.,
25 Ann street, New York.

THE SINGLE TAX.

Special editions of ready-printed newspapers containing current Single Tax reading matter. All sizes; low prices. UNION PRINTING CO., 15 Vandewater street, New York.

HENRY GEORGE, PENDENNIS, DR. McGLYNN. Three Cartoons, 25 cents. McGILL, 304 Henry street, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE LAND AND LABOR LIBRARY.

We are now publishing under the title of "The Land and Labor Library" a series of short tracts on various phases of the social problem. These pamphlets contain facts, figures and arguments expressed in concise, vigorous language easily understood. As a means of propaganda we recommend them to all who desire to help on the movement for social reform. Those who wish to have these tracts placed where they will do good but who are unable personally to attend to their distribution, can remit the price to us, as we have every facility for sending them where they are needed and will be read.

The following have already appeared:

No. 1. "First Principles." By Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 2. "Land and Taxation." A conversation between David Dudley Field and Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 3. "The Right to the Use of the Earth." By Herbert Spencer. 4 pages.
No. 4. "A Christian Minister on the Remedy for Poverty." A sermon by the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost of Newark, N. J. 2 pages.
No. 5. "A Sum in Proportion." By T. L. McCready. 2 pages.
No. 6. "The Settler's Nightmare." By Louis F. Post. 4 pages.
No. 7. "New York's Docks: The True Mode of Raising Revenue." By J. W. Sullivan. 4 pages.
No. 8. "Unemployed Labor." By Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 9. "Voices for Reform." 2 pages.
No. 10. "A Mysterious Disappearance." By Lewis Freeland. 6 pages.
No. 11. "How to Increase Profits." By A. J. Steers. 2 pages.
No. 12. "The American Farmer." By Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 13. "Sailors' Snug Harbor and the Randall Farm." By W. T. Croasdale. 12 pages.
No. 14. "The Collegiate Church and the Shoemaker's Field." By W. T. Croasdale. 12 pages.
No. 15. "Only a Dream." By Abner C. Thomas. 4 pages.
No. 16. "The Anti-Poverty Society." Dr. McGlynn's address at the first meeting. 5 pages.
No. 17. "The Cross of the New Crusade." A poem. By David Rorty. 2 pages.
No. 18. "It is the Law of Christ." By Rev. S. H. Spencer of Henry, Ill. 4 pages.
No. 19. "My Landlord. By John Jones. 4 pages.
No. 20. "Thou Shalt Not Steal." An address by Henry George before the Anti-Poverty Society. 8 pages.
No. 21. "Christianity and Poverty." An address by Father Huntington before the Anti-poverty society. 4 pages.
No. 22. "Poverty and Christianity." An address by Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost before the Anti-poverty society. 8 pages.
No. 23. "The Single Tax." By Thomas G. Shearman. 8 pages.
No. 24. "Hymns of the New Crusade"—No. 1. 4 pages.
No. 25. "Hymns of the New Crusade"—No. 2. 4 pages.
No. 26. "Religion vs. Robbery." Address by Rev. Dr McGlynn before the New York Anti-poverty society June 12, 1887. 8 pages.
No. 27. "Back to the Land." Bishop Nulty's letter to the clergy and laity of his diocese. 16 pages. Price, 5 cents.
No. 28. "Anti-Slavery and Anti-Poverty." An address by the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost before the New York Anti-Poverty Society, June 19. 8 pages.
No. 29. "Tenement House Morality." Rev. J. O. S. Huntington in the Forum. 4 pages.
No. 30. "The Case Plainly Stated." A speech by H. F. Ring before the Knights of Labor at Houston, Texas. 8 pages.
No. 31. "Questions and Answers." Questions by Rev. Howard Henderson of the Sixty-first street M. E. church of New York; with answers by Henry George. 2 pages.
No. 32. "Objections to the Land Tax." By Thomas G. Shearman. 4 pages.
No. 33. "Socialism—Its Truth and Its Error." Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 34. "Horse Sense." W. C. Woods. 2 pages.
No. 35. The Syracuse Platform. 2 pages.
No. 36. "Citycus and Rusticus." Tudor S. Jenks. 4 pages.
No. 37. "Taxing Land Values." Henry George. 8 pp.
No. 38. "God Wills It." Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 39. "What We Want." Everett Glackin, president Typographical Union No. 6. 2 pages.
No. 40. "Protection or Free Trade." Henry George. Price, 35 cents.
No. 41. The Syracuse Platform. (German.) 2 pages.
No. 42. "First Principles." (German.) Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 43. "Socialism—Its Truth and Its Error. (German.) Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 44. "How John's Father Saw the Light." W. C. Woods, M. D. 2 pages.
45. Platform of the United Labor Party. 2 pages.
No. 46. "Taxing Land Values." (German.) Henry George. 8 pages.
No. 47. "It is the Law of Christ." (German.) Rev. S. H. Spencer. 4 pages.
No. 48. "The Case Plainly Stated." (German). H. F. Ring. 8 pages.
No. 49. "The Distribution of Wealth." Thomas G. Shearman. 16 pages.
No. 50. "Progress and Poverty." (German.) Henry George.
No. 51. "Ten Thoughts for Christian Thinkers." Rev John W. Kramer. 4 pages.
No. 52. "The Case Plainly Stated." (Swedish). H. F. Ring. 8 pages.
No. 53. "Sailors' Snug Harbor." (German.) Wm. T. Croasdale. 12 pages.
No. 54. "What the United Labor Party Want." Henry George. 2 pages.
No. 55. "Stories for Farmers." 4 pages.
No. 56. "Electoral Reform." A. T. Rice. 4 pages.
No. 57. "Protection as a Universal Need." Henr George. 4 pages.
No. 58. "To a College Professor." Bartholomew Appleby. 4 pages.
No. 59. "Before a Royal Commission." W. A. Douglass 2 pages.
No. 60. "The Tariff Question." Henry George. 4 pages.
No. 61. "A Practical Illustration." Hugh B. Brown. 2 pages.
No. 62. "Progress and Poverty." Henry George Price, 35 cents.

Prices, free by mail: 2-page tracts—50 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 15 cents; 1,000 copies, $1; 5,000 copies, $4.25.
Four-page tracts—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 1,000 copies, $2; 5,000 copies, $8.50.
Six-page tracts—25 copies, 15 cents; 100 copies, 37 cents; 1,000 copies, $3; 5,000 copies, $12.75.
Eight-page tracts—25 copies, 20 cents; 100 copies 50 cents; 1,000 copies, $4; 5,000 copies, $17.
Twelve-page tracts—25 copies, 30 cents; 100 copies, 75 cents; 1,000 copies, $6; 5,000 copies, $22.50.
Sixteen-page tracts—25 copies, 40 cents; 100 copies, $1; 1,000 copies, $8; 5,000 copies, $34.

Other numbers in preparation.

Address HENRY GEORGE,
25 Ann st., New York City.

HENRY GEORGE'S SOLUTION

OF THE LABOR PROBLEM.

WHY I PREACHED ON IT.

by

HUGH O. PENTECOST,

Minister to the Belleville Avenue Congregational Church in Newark, N. J.

A sixteen-page pamphlet. Price 5 cents.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. Address as above.

UNITED LABOR PARTY—Citizens of the following named states who indorse the principles of the United Labor Party and desire to lend active aid in the movement, are requested to communicate with the State Organizers of their respective states, as follows:

California—Judge James G. Maguire, San Francisco.
Connecticut—Robert Pyne, 284 Asylum st., Hartford.
Eastern Pennsylvania—Henry George club, box 190, Philadelphia.
Indiana—Warren Worth Bailey, Vincennes.
Kentucky—Land and Labor Club No. 1, box 406, Cincinnati.
Louisiana—Jere. J. Sullivan, 705 Fulton street, New Orleans.
Massachusetts (Berkshire county)—F. Harvey Lincoln, box 115, Zylonite.
Maryland—T. H. Garside, 1507 West Lexington street, Baltimore.
Minnesota—Central Committee, United Labor Party, 42 Third st. south, Minneapolis.
New York—John McMackin, 28 Cooper Union, New York city.
Ohio—Land and Labor Club No. 1, box 99, Cincinnati.
South Carolina—Benjamin Adams, Charleston.
West Tennessee, Eastern Arkansas and Northern Mississippi—Land and Labor Club No. 2. Rooms, 9 and 10, Cotton Exchange, Memphis, Tenn.

ILLINOIS—Readers of the "Standard" in the state of Illinois, and all others interested in the great principles it advocates, are requested to send names and addresses to W. H. Van Ornum, president of land and labor club No. 1, Room 63, 170 Madison street, Chicago, with a view to effecting some plan of organization for the state. Persons in Chicago not already members of land and labor clubs, as well as secretaries of such organizations, are especially requested to write.

ALL READERS OF THE STANDARD IN favor of a united labor party in the First assembly district, composing the First, Second, Third, Fourth and Fifteenth wards, also the counties and towns included in the district will please send their names and addresses to the undersigned, for the purpose of organizing the district thoroughly. JOS. H. ROSHIRT, President First assembly district, united labor party, 22 Third avenue, Albany, N. Y.

23RD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT MEETS every Monday evening. German speaking members every Tuesday evening at Vincent hall, 1597 Third avenue, corner 105th street. Open every evening for enrollment of members. Thursday and Saturday evenings free debates of the Progress and Poverty club.

VOTERS OF MARYLAND WHO ARE desirous to aid in propagating the principles of the united labor party, as set forth in the New York platform, adopted at Syracuse, Aug. 19 are requested to send their names and addresses to JOHN SALMON,
415 N. Eutaw st., Baltimore, Md.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Questions from an Enthusiastic Believer.

VICTOR, Iowa.—(1.) Referring to your answer to an inquirer in THE STANDARD of December 10, is it not a fact that the law of supply and demand fixes the price of labor, so long as nature's opportunities are monopolized, in spite of any standard of living set up by the laborer?

(2.) In the same answer and also in another you use the term "the margin of cultivation," the meaning and application of which I would like to be able to explain.

(3.) What, under the single tax, will be the rate per cent on the assessed valuation of our farm lands and town lots?

GEORGE F. LEWIS.

(1) Land being monopolized, the law of supply and demand does fix the price of labor; but the standard of living (not that set up by the laborer, but that which is common in the community) has a disturbing effect upon the operation of the law of supply and demand powerful enough to check the downward tendency of wages. But as the supply of labor increases, land being still monopolized, the pressure upon the standard of living continues until the standard falls. Ultimately, therefor[e] standard of living will be driven to the point of bare subsistence, below which wages cannot fall, their tende[ncy] so being counteracted by the te[n]dency of the supply of labor to dimini[sh]. In the last analysis there is no st[an]dard of living which fixes the minimum wages save that which is itself [the] human endurance; and as [the] power of this limit is due [to] the check it puts upon the supply of labor, you are substantially right in [say]ing that while land is monopolized [wages] are fixed by the supply of and demand [for] labor.

(2.) "The margin of cultivation" is a technical term of political economy relating to the law of rent and the law of wages. It is called the margin of *cultivation*, because when the true law of rent was first discovered prominence was given to the rent of agricultural land; it is more accurately "the margin of *production*," and may be more readily understood perhaps if described as "the margin of *desirableness*." Land that is so desirable that any one who is able to will pay for the privilege of occupying it rather than go to less desirable land, is above the margin of cultivation or production; it bears rent. But land which can be had for nothing is below the margin of cultivation or production and bears no rent. Manhattan island when it was bought for the nominal sum of $26 was practically below the margin of cultivation; whoever worked upon it could enjoy as wages for his work all that he produced. But to-day there is not a foot of land on Manhattan island which is not far above the margin of cultivation or production; whoever works upon it must pay a large part of his earnings for the privilege. Read chapter 2 of book 4 of "Progress and Poverty."

(3) By ascertaining the value of farm lands and town lots and the necessary taxes of any given locality, you can approximate to the tax rate. It is impossible to work out a sum in arithmetic unless a sum is stated. You might as well ask me to tell you the length of a clothes line.

Land Without Value.

HAMILTON, Ohio.—On pages 304-5 of "Protection and Free Trade?" Mr. George says: "So long as any unused land remains those who wish to use it could obtain it not only without the payment of any purchase price, but without the payment of any tax or rent." I cannot comprehend this. It appears to me that the moment any one began to till or make use of any land the land would have some value. G. W. FULKERSON.

You do not mean that using land gives value to it, as land. What you are thinking of is the value that labor produces; such as buildings, fences, clearing, and so on. But this value is not land value. To determine what the value of any particular land is, ascertain the value of the land of the adjoining highway.

No land has any value as land so long as there is any land equally desirable which any man can take possession of and use if he wants to. The most valuable gold mine would be worth nothing (although gold taken from it would be valuable) if there were a free gold mine equally good alongside of it. But under our system of private ownership a great deal of land is kept out of use. People want to use it, but they are not allowed to without paying a price. And so it happens that, though there is plenty of unused land in every community, there is none which is not owned, and those who wish to use it must pay a purchase price or rent or a tax. But if taxes were imposed only on land values, it would not pay to keep land out of use, and unused land would be unappropriated; and since unappropriated land has no value, any one wishing to use it could go upon it without price either for purchase or in rent, and there would be nothing to pay for it until all land equally desirable was put to use. Therefore it is that Mr. George said that so long as any unused land remained, those who wished to use it could obtain it without paying any purchase price, any tax or any rent.

A Few Illustrations.

DANBURY, Conn.—(1) Our town and borough raises $75,000 a year by taxes; as the tax will be more year by year, will taxing the land alone raise $75,000 or more a year easier than by taxing houses and land as now? (2) Will a vacant lot that rents for $10 a year be taxed as much as the lot adjoining with a $2,000 house thereon? (3) A florist earns $1,000 a year on one-fourth of an acre; will he pay more tax on his lot than the owner of the adjoining lot, who does not get over $2 a year therefrom? (4) Potatoes are worth double this year over last, the crop being that much short; will taxing land values alone reduce the price of potatoes?

A. T. PECK.

(1) Whether a land value tax will raise $75,000 and upward in your town and borough, I cannot say; but I am sure that it will raise all that is needed for purely local expenses, and that the land value tax in the whole state will be sufficient to pay all expenses which the state at large ought to bear, such as the cost of schools, highways, and so on. And it will be better for your locality and your state than taxing land and houses as now. Land values being taxed heavily, speculation in land will nearly or wholly cease, and you will have plenty of cheap land; and since houses and other improvements will be exempt from taxation everybody will want a home. Your town and borough will build up with a population of industrious people, and only your land speculators will emigrate.

(2) Yes; and it ought to be. The man who keeps a lot of land worth $10 a year out of use does an injury to your community. By preventing builders from working he helps to keep down wages and the builders cannot buy so much as they would; from this your storekeepers and farmers suffer, and the seeds of industrial disease are sown among you. But the man who has erected a $2,000 house is a public benefactor. You should encourage him to improve his house, and others to build houses where there are none, by withdrawing your menace of taxation. Besides this there is a moral side to the question. The ten dollar lot is a part of the earth which was made for the common benefit of all, while the $2,000 house is a product of human labor. You ignore the eighth commandment if you tax the house owner for his house, and you observe it if you tax both him and his neighbor on the value of the land they occupy.

(3) Yes. What the florist gets (less $2 as rent for land) he earns by his labor and you have no right to rob him of any of it by taxation. What the other man gets he does not earn at all.

(4) Taxing land values alone will reduce the labor cost of potatoes; anyone who works, whether he makes hats or shoes or sells goods or raises potatoes will be able to get more potatoes with less work than he can now. If that is what you mean by a reduction of the price of potatoes, the answer to your question is, yes.

A Stony Farm.

PITTSBURG, Pa.—Suppose, for instance, I bought a piece of ground and it was full of stones and grown over with weeds and bushes, and I with much labor cleared it and made a nice place of it. Now, when I am done, along come your laws. How can I, after having gone to so much expense, pay taxes as high as those on other and (naturally) better pieces of land? JOSEF HIRSCHNER.

You will not pay taxes as high as those imposed on naturally better land.

If the single tax had been in force when you bought your stony ground you would not have bought it; you would not have taken it for a gift, because there would have been much better land to be had for the taking, upon which there would have been no tax. The reason you had to pay for your stony land was because speculation in land takes so much land out of use that even the poorest commands a price. But speculation could not thrive under the single tax; and if that were in force, wherever you could find unused land you would find land without an owner. All such land would have no value and pay no tax.

Judging from your statement of the kind of farm you occupy, instead of paying high taxes you would pay no taxes at all if the single tax were in force.

Is It an Exception?

BOSTON.—Here is a case in which it seems to me that the tax on land values would be shifted.

It is when the tenant leases the land for a term of years, agreeing to pay a stipulated sum and the taxes as rent. I know of land in the business portion of this city that is so leased and for as long a period as ninety-nine years. If the land value tax is put in force before the lease expires, will not the lessee have to pay it, since he has agreed to pay the taxes? E. LUCAS.

So long as the tax, plus the stipulated rent, did not exceed the annual value, the tenant would pay the tax. But that is no exception to the rule, the essence of which is that tenants cannot be made to pay more than the land is worth.

If the tax were increased so as to exceed the value, the tenant would not pay it.

For example: Suppose the annual value to be 100 and the stipulated rent 50; now so long as the tax is not in excess of 50, the tenant will pay; but if the tax were 90, the tenant would be called upon to pay 140, or 40 more than the land was worth, which he would not do. True, debts being collectable at law, the landlord might sue the tenant, and if the tenant were rich, force him to pay 40 more than the land was worth; but that extra amount would not be rent, nor would its payment be an exception to the law of rent. Rent is what people will pay for any particular land rather than do without it; what the tenant in this case would pay in excess of the value of the land would be the penalty of a bad bargain, enforceable at law.

The kind of tenant to whom you refer is in part, and often in very large part, a landlord instead of a tenant. Instead of buying land in fee simple, he buys a term of years, and if the land increases in value during the term the difference between what he pays as rent and the annual value of the land is an increase which he enjoys in his character of landlord. Whatever loss he might suffer therefor would be the same in kind as that of a land owner.

Three Terms.

NEW YORK.—Please oblige me, and no doubt many more of your readers, by briefly defining socialism, anarchism and communism.

ANTI-POVERTYITE No. 395.

Socialism is a scheme of governmental co-operation, whereby the production and distribution of wealth are to be carried on by rule under the management of appropriate officials.

Anarchy, the antipodes of socialism, involves the abolition of government and laws. It is the extreme of the democratic doctrine that that government is best which governs least.

Communism involves the independence of communities and the enjoyment of property in common in each community.

LOUIS F. POST.

Votes to Nominate a Candidate, But Won't Give His Name for Fear of "Civil Service Rules."

NEW YORK CITY.—As an ex-republican who was led to the light by reading "Progress and Poverty" and thoroughly confirmed through "Protection or Free Trade?" I feel as though I would be practically disfranchised if our party should fail to put a presidential candidate in the field. I agree with the Rev. Mr. Pentecost that principle and not expediency should prompt us in our action. As I am under civil service rules, which work both ways, please omit my name. ——.

AMERICAN PROTECTION AND BRITISH FREE TRADE.

Chapter 2 of "Protection or Free Trade?"

The protective theory has certainly the weight of most general acceptance. Forty years ago all civilized countries based their policy upon it; and though Great Britain has since discarded it, she remains the only considerable nation that has done so, while not only have her own colonies, as soon as they have obtained the power, shown a disposition to revert to it, but such a disposition has of late years been growing in Great Britain herself.

It should be remembered, however, that the presumption in favor of any belief generally entertained has existed in favor of many beliefs now known to be entirely erroneous, and is especially weak in the case of a theory which, like that of protection, enlists the support of powerful special interests. The history of mankind everywhere shows the power that special interests, capable of organization and action, may exert in securing the acceptance of the most monstrous doctrines. We have, indeed, only to look around us to see how easily a small special interest may exert greater influence in forming opinion and making laws than a large general interest. As what is everybody's business is nobody's business, so what is everybody's interest is nobody's interest. Two or three citizens of a seaside town see that the building of a custom house or the dredging of a creek will put money in their pockets; a few silver miners conclude that it will be a good thing for them to have the government stow away some millions of silver every month; a navy contractor wants the profit of repairing useless iron clads or building needless cruisers, and again and again such petty interests have their way against the larger interests of the whole people. What can be clearer than that a note directly issued by the government is at least as good as a note based on a government bond? Yet special interests have sufficed with us to institute and maintain a hybrid currency for which no other valid reason can be assigned than private profit.

Those who are specially interested in protective tariffs find it easy to believe that protection is of general benefit. The directness of their interest makes them active in spreading their views and having control of large means—for the protected industries are those in which large capitals are engaged—and being ready on occasion, as a matter of business, to spend money in propagating their doctrines, they exert great influence upon the organs of public opinion. Free trade, on the contrary, offers no special advantage to any particular interest, and in the present state of social morality benefits or injuries which men share in common with their fellows are not felt so intensely as those which affect them specially.

I do not mean to say that the pecuniary interests which protection enlists suffice to explain the widespread acceptance of its theories and the tenacity with which they are held. But it is plain that these interests do constitute a power of the kind most potent in forming opinion and influencing legislation, and that this fact weakens the presumption the wide acceptance of protection might otherwise afford, and is a reason why those who believe in protection merely because they have constantly heard it praised should examine the question for themselves.

Protection, moreover, has always found an effective ally in those national prejudices and hatreds which are in part the cause and in part the result of the wars that have made the annals of mankind a record of bloodshed and devastation—prejudices and hatreds which have everywhere been the means by which the masses have been induced to use their own power for their own enslavement.

For the first half century of our national existence American protectionists pointed to the protective tariff of Great Britain as an example to be followed; but since that country, in 1846, discarded protection, its American advocates have endeavored to utilize national prejudice by constantly speaking of protection as an American system and of free trade as a British invention. Just now they are endeavoring to utilize in the same way the enmity against everything British which long oppressions and insults have engendered in the Irish heart, and, in the words of a recent political platform, Irish-Americans are called upon "to resist the introduction into America of the English theory of free trade, which has been so successfully used as a means to destroy the industries and oppress the people of Ireland."

Even if free trade had originated in Great Britain we should be as foolish in rejecting it on that account as we should be in refusing to speak our mother tongue because it is of British origin, or in going back to hand and water power because steam engines were first introduced in Great Britain. But, in truth, free trade no more originated in Great Britain than did the habit of walking on the feet. Free trade is the natural trade—the trade that goes on in the absence of artificial restrictions. It is protection that had to be invented. But instead of being invented in the United States, it was in full force in Great Britain long before the United States were thought of. It would be nearer the truth to say that protection originated in Great Britain, for, if the system did not originate there, it was fully developed there, and it is from that country that it has been derived by us. Nor yet did the reaction against it originate in Great Britain, but in France, among a school of eminent men headed by Quesnay, who were Adam Smith's predecessors and in many things his teachers. These French economists were what neither Smith nor any subsequent British economist or statesman has been—true free traders. They wished to sweep away not merely protective duties but all taxes, direct and indirect, save a single tax upon land values. This logical conclusion of free trade principles the so-called British free traders have shirked, and it meets to-day as bitter opposition from the Cobden club as from American protectionists. The only sense in which we can properly speak of "British free trade" is the same sense in which we speak of a certain imitation metal as "German silver." "British free trade" is spurious free trade. Great Britain does not really enjoy free trade. To say nothing of internal taxes, inconsistent with true free trade, she still maintains a cordon of custom house officers, coast guards and baggage searchers, and still collects over a hundred million dollars of her revenue from import duties. To be sure, her tariff is "for revenue only," but a tariff for revenue only is not free trade. The ruling classes of Great Britain have adopted only so much free trade as suits their class interests, and the battle for free trade in that country has yet to be fought.

On the other hand, it is absurd to talk of protection as an American system. It had been fully developed in Europe before the American colonies were planted, and during our colonial period England maintained a more thorough system of protection than now anywhere exists—a system which aimed at building up English industries not merely by protective duties, but by the repression of like industries in Ireland and the colonies, and wherever else throughout the world English power could be exerted. What we got of protection was the wrong side of it, in regulations intended to prevent American industries from competing with those of the mother country and to give her a monopoly of the American trade.

The irritation produced in the growing colonies by these restrictions was the main cause of the revolution which made of them an independent nation. Protectionist ideas were doubtless at that time latent among our people, for they permeated the mental atmosphere of the civilized world; but so little disposition was there to embody those ideas in a national policy that the American representatives in negotiating the treaty of peace endeavored to secure complete freedom of trade between the United States and Great Britain. This was refused by England, then and for a long time afterward completely dominated by protective ideas. But during the period following the revolution in which the American Union existed during the articles of confederation, no tariff hampered importations into the American states.

The adoption of the constitution made a federal tariff possible, and to give the federal government an independent revenue a tariff was soon imposed; but although protection had then begun to find advocates in the United States, this first American tariff was almost nominal as compared with what the British tariff was then or our tariff is now. And in the federal constitution state tariffs were prohibited—a step which has resulted in giving to the principle of free trade the greatest extension it has had in modern times. Nothing could more clearly show how far the American people then were from accepting the theories of protection since popularized among them, for the national idea had not then acquired the force it has since gained, and if protection had then been looked upon as necessary the different states would not without a struggle have given up the power of imposing tariffs of their own.

Nor could protection have reached its present height in the United States but for the civil war. While attention was concentrated on the struggle and mothers were sending their sons to the battlefield, the interests that sought protection took advantage of the patriotism that was ready for any sacrifice to secure protective taxes such as had never before been dreamed of—taxes which they have ever since managed to keep in force, and even in many cases to increase.

The truth is that protection is no more American than is the distinction made in our regular army and navy between commissioned officers and enlisted men—a distinction not of degree, but of kind, so that there is between the highest non-commissioned officer and the lowest commissioned officer a deep gulf fixed, a gulf which can only be likened to that which exists between white and black where the color line is drawn sharpest. This distinction is historically a survival of that made in the armies of aristocratic Europe, when they were officered by nobles and recruited from peasants, and has been copied by us in the same spirit of imitation that has led us to copy other undemocratic customs and institutions. Though we preserve this aristocratic distinction after it has been abandoned in some European countries, it is in no sense American. It neither originated with us nor does it consort with our distinctive ideas and institutions. So it is with protection. Whatever be its economic merits there can be no doubt that it conflicts with those ideas of natural right and personal freedom which received national expression in the establishment of the American republic, and which we have been accustomed to regard as distinctively American. What more incongruous than the administering of custom house oaths and the searching of trunks and hand bags under the shadow of "Liberty Enlightening the World?"

As for the assertion that "the English theory of free trade" has been used "to destroy the industries and oppress the people of Ireland," the truth is that it was "the English theory of protection" that was so used. The restrictions which British protection imposed upon the American colonies were trivial as compared with those imposed upon Ireland. The successful resistance of the colonies aroused in Ireland the same spirit, and led to the great movement of "Irish volunteers," who, with cannon bearing the inscription "Free trade or ——!" forced the repeal of those restrictions and won for a time Irish legislative independence.

Whether Irish industries that were unquestionably hampered and throttled by British protection could now be benefited by Irish protection, like the question whether protection benefits the United States, is only to be settled by a determination of the effects of protection upon the country that imposes it. But without going into that, it is evident that the free trade between Great Britain and Ireland which has existed since the union in 1801, has not been the cause of the backwardness of Irish industry. There is one part of Ireland which has enjoyed comparative prosperity and in which important industries have grown up—some of them, such as the building of iron ships, for which natural advantages cannot be claimed. How can this be explained on the theory that Irish industries cannot be re-established without protection?

If the very men who are now trying to persuade Irish-American voters that Ireland has been impoverished by "British free trade" were privately asked the cause of the greater prosperity of Ulster over other parts of Ireland, they would probably give the answer made familiar by religious bigotry—that Ulster is enterprising and prosperous because it is Protestant, while the rest of Ireland is sluggish and poor because it is Catholic. But the true reason is plain. It is, that the land tenure in Ulster has been such that a larger portion of the wealth produced has been left there than in other parts of Ireland, and that the mass of the people have not been so remorselessly hunted and oppressed. In Presbyterian Skye the same general poverty, the same primitive conditions of industry exist as in Catholic Connemara, and its cause is to be seen in the same rapacious system of landlordism which has carried off the fruits of industry and prevented the accumulation of capital. To attribute the backwardness of industry among a people who are steadily stripped of all they can produce above a bare living, to the want of a protective tariff or to religious opinions is like attributing the sinking of a scuttled ship to the loss of her figurehead or the color of her paint.

What, however, in the United States at least, has tended more than any appeals to national feeling to dispose the masses in favor of protection, has been the difference of attitude toward the working classes assumed by the contending policies. In its beginnings in this country protection was strongest in those sections where labor had the largest opportunities and was held in the highest esteem, while the strength of free trade has been the greatest in the section in which up to the civil war slavery prevailed. The political party which successfully challenged the aggressions of the slave power also declared for a protective tariff, while the men who tried to rend the Union in order to establish a nation based upon the right of capital to own labor, prohibited protection in the constitution they formed. The explanation of these facts is, that in one section of the country there were many industries that could be protected, while in the other section there were few. While American cotton culture was in its earlier stages, southern cotton planters were willing enough to avail themselves of a heavy duty on India cottons, and Louisiana sugar growers have always been persistent sticklers for protection. But when cotton raised for export became the great staple of the south, protection, in the absence of manufactures, was not only clearly opposed to dominant southern interests, but assumed the character of a sectional imposition by which the south was taxed for the benefit of the north. This sectional division of the tariff question had no reference whatever to the conditions of labor, but in many minds its effect has been to associate protection with respect for labor and free trade with its enslavement.

Irrespective of this there has been much in the presentation of the two theories to dispose the working classes toward protection and against free trade. Workingmen generally feel that they do not get a fair reward for their labor. They know that what prevents them from successfully demanding higher wages is the competition of others anxious for work, and they are naturally disposed to favor the doctrine or party that proposes to shield them from competition. This, its advocates urge, is the aim of protection. And whatever protection accomplishes, protectionists at least profess regard for the working classes and proclaim their desire to use the powers of government to raise and maintain wages. Protection, they declare, means the protection of labor. So constantly is this reiterated that many suppose that this is the real derivation of the term, and that "protection" is short for "protection of labor."

On the other hand, the opponents of protection have, for the most part, not only professed no special interest in the well being of the working classes and no desire to raise wages, but have denied the justice of attempting to use the powers of government for this purpose. The doctrines of free trade have been intertwined with teachings that throw upon the laws of nature responsibility for the poverty of the laboring class, and foster a callous indifference to their sufferings. On the same grounds on which they have condemned legislative interference with commerce, free trade economists have condemned interference with hours of labor, with the rate of wages, and even with the employment of women and children, and have united protectionism and trades unionism in the same denunciation, proclaiming supply and demand to be the only true and rightful regulator of the price of labor as of the price of pig iron. While protesting against restrictions upon the production of wealth they have ignored the monstrous injustice of its distribution, and have treated as fair and normal that competition in which human beings, deprived of their natural opportunities of employing themselves, are compelled by biting want to bid against one another.

All this is true. But it is also true that the needs of labor require more than kind words, and are not to be satisfied by such soft phrases as we address to a horse when we want to catch him that we may put a bit in his mouth and a saddle on his back. Let me ask those who are disposed to regard protection as favorable to the aspirations of labor, to consider whether it can be true that what labor needs is to be protected.

To admit that labor needs protection is to acknowledge its inferiority; it is to acquiesce in an assumption that degrades the workman to the position of a dependent, and leads logically to the claim that the employe is bound to vote in the interests of the employer who provides him with work. There is some thing in the very word "protection" that ought to make workingmen cautious of accepting anything presented to them under it. The protection of the masses has in all times been the pretense of tyranny—the plea of monarchy, of aristocracy, of special privilege of every kind. The slave owners justified slavery as protecting the slaves. British misrule in Ireland is upheld on the ground that it is for the protection of the Irish. But, whether under a monarchy or under a republic, is there an instance in the history of the world in which the "protection" of the laboring masses has not meant their oppression? The protection that those who have got the law-making power into their hands have given to labor, has at best always been the protection that man gives to cattle—he protects them that he may use and eat them.

There runs through protectionist professions of concern for labor a tone of condescending patronage more insulting to men who feel the true dignity of labor than frankly expressed contempt could be—an assumption that pauperism is the natural condition of labor, to which it must everywhere fall unless benevolently protected. It is never intimated that the land owner or the capitalist needs protection. They, it is always assumed, can take care of themselves. It is only the poor workingman who must be protected.

What is labor that it should so need protection? Is not labor the creator of capital, the producer of all wealth? Is it not the men who labor that feed and clothe all others? Is it not true, as has been said, that the three great orders of society are 'workingmen, beggarmen and thieves?' How, then, does it come that workingmen alone need protection? When the first man came upon the earth who was there to protect him or to provide him with employment? Yet whenever or however he came, he must have managed to get a living and raise a family!

When we consider that labor is the producer of all wealth, is it not evident that the impoverishment and dependence of labor are abnormal conditions resulting from restrictions and usurpations, and that instead of accepting protection, what labor should demand is freedom? That those who advocate any extension of freedom choose to go no further than suits their own special purpose is no reason why freedom itself should be distrusted. For years it was held that the assertion of our Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, applied only to white men. But this in nowise vitiated the principle. Nor does it vitiate the principle that it is still held to apply only to political rights.

And so, that freedom of trade has been advocated by those who have no sympathy with labor should not prejudice us against it. Can the road to the industrial emancipation of the masses be any other than that of freedom?

CURE FOR THE DEAF

PECK'S PATENT IMPROVED CUSHIONED EAR DRUMS **Perfectly Restore the Hearing**, and perform the work of the natural drum. Invisible, comfortable and always in position. All conversation and even whispers heard distinctly. Send for illustrated book with testimonials, FREE. Address F. HISCOX, 853 Broadway, N. Y.

Please mention paper.

MEMBERS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS and others wishing to canvass for subscribers to this paper on a liberal commission are invited to send their names and addresses to the publishers of THE STANDARD, 25 Ann street, New York.

EXCELLENT BLACK COPIES of *original writing* or *drawing* with *any* Pen (or Type Writer) by the Patent **AUTOCOPYIST**. Only equalled by Lithography. Specimens Free. AUTOCOPYIST Co., 166 William St., New York.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

An Examination of the Tariff Question with Especial Regard to the Interests of Labor

BY HENRY GEORGE.

CONTENTS:

I. Introductory.
II. Clearing ground.
III. Of method.
IV. Protection as a universal need.
V. The protective unit.
VI. Trade.
VII. Production and producers.
VIII. Tariffs for revenue.
IX. Tariffs for protection.
X. The encouragement of industry.
XI. The home market and home trade.
XII. Exports and imports.
XIII. Confusions arising from the use of money.
XIV. Do high wages necessitate protection?
XV. Of advantages and disadvantages as reasons for protection.
XVI. The Development of manufactures.
XVII. Protection and producers.
XVIII. Effect of protection on American industries.
XIX. Protection and wages.
XX. The abolition of protection.
XXI. Inadequacy of the free trade argument.
XXII. The Real Weakness of Free Trade.
XXIII. The Real Strength of Protection.
XXIV. The Paradox.
XXV. The Robber that Takes All that is Left.
XXVI. True Free Trade.
XXVII. The Lion in the Way.
XXVIII. Free Trade and Socialism.
XXIX. Practical Politics.
XXX. Conclusion.

One Volume. Price, Cloth, $1.50; in Paper, 35 Cents.

Address HENRY GEORGE & CO., 25 Ann Street, New York.

WHO WOULDN'T BE DRESSED WELL

PRINCE ALBERT COAT AND VEST, SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE..... $18.
TROUSERS TO MEASURE, FROM..... 4.
BUSINESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 16.
DRESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM.. 20.
BLUE, BLACK OR BROWN CORKSCREW CUTAWAY COAT & VEST TO MEASURE, FROM..... 12.
OVERCOATS, QUILTED SILK OR SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, FROM..... 20.

GRAHAM'S 212 BOWERY N.Y.

OPPOSITE BIVINGTON ST.

Samples and Self-Measurement Cards Mailed on Application.

THOUSANDS OF THE BEST

$38 GOLD WATCH

EVER MADE ARE SELLING IN OUR

CO-OPERATIVE CLUB

This is the Best, Cheapest, Most Convenient.

And *only* co-operative System of selling watches. The watches are American Lever Stem Winders, containing every essential to accuracy and durability, and have, in addition, numerous patented improvements found in no other watch. They are solately the only *Dust and Dampproof Movements* made in the World, and are jeweled throughout with *GENUINE RUBIES*. The *Patent Stem Wind and Set* is the strongest and simplest made. *They are fully equal for appearance, accuracy, durability and service to any $75 Watch.*

Our Co-operative Club System brings them within the reach of every one.

We want an active, responsible representative in EVERY CITY AND TOWN.

Heavy profits guaranteed on limited investment. Write for full particulars.

The Keystone Watch Club Co.
P. O. Box 923, Philadelphia, Pa.

REFERENCES:—Keystone National Bank, or any Commercial Agency.

AGENCIES:

New York, N.Y. Harrisburg
Chicago, Ill. Denver, Col.
Pittsburgh, Pa. Baltimore,
Boston, Mass. St. Louis,
Philadelphia, Pa. Wilmington
Detroit, Mich. Etc., etc.

Piso's Remedy for Catarrh is the Best, Easiest to Use, and Cheapest.

CATARRH

Sold by druggists or sent by mail. 50c. E. T. Hazeltine, Warren, Pa.

HAND MADE CIGARS

Canned Goods WITH THIS STAMP THE BOTTOM CANS ARE Free from Poison AND ARE MADE ORGANIZED LABOR

Trade-Mark.—Registered.

THE GREAT AMERICAN TEA COMPANY

GOOD NEWS TO LADIES

Greatest offer. Now is your time to get orders for our celebrated Teas, Coffees and Baking Powder, and secure a beautiful Gold Band or Moss Rose Tea Set, Dinner Set, Gold Moss Rose Toilet Set, Watch, Brass Lamp, Castor, Webster's Dictionary. For particulars address THE GREAT AMERICAN TEA CO., P. O. Box 289. 31 and 33 Vesey St., New York.



COOGAN BROS., CARPET AND FURNITURE DEALERS COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.

