

POLITICS AND ANTI-POVERTY.

The party now known as the united labor party polled at the late election nearly 75,000 votes in the state of New York. Though this is a large vote for a new party in its first campaign in behalf of a principle new in our politics, it is, nevertheless, true that it fell far below the party's expectations. The more than 68,000 votes cast for Mr. George in this city the year before had been confidently counted on as a nucleus of the new party's growth. Looking back, enlightened by our recent experience, it seems singular that we allowed ourselves to rely so implicitly on that vote as a basis for calculation. We have never known by whom it was cast. Though the number of enrolled members of the party was much larger this year than last, it never included an eighth part of the 68,000 votes of the previous year. For aught we know to the contrary, an actual majority of those voting for George in 1886 may have been members of the old party organizations. A republican or a democrat could then vote for our candidate and still account himself a good member of his own party, he having scratched but one name on its ticket in a local contest in which party lines were not closely drawn.

Furthermore, the new party entered the canvass this year with full knowledge of the fact that it had deliberately thrown away the five thousand or six thousand votes of the socialists, and with a suspicion, since verified by experience, that, while it was heartily supported by many of the leaders of organized labor and thousands of members of labor organizations, the sympathies of those wedded to old methods had been alienated.

These facts, now so apparent, were forgotten in the heat and enthusiasm of a contest that was all aglow with the hope inspired by a great principle. That principle, and the hope inspired by it, remain, and they sustain us in the disappointment that we have experienced of expectations founded on false premises. They also cause us to rejoice that we took the action that drove out the socialists and deprived us of all support based on mere class prejudice. We now have a party built upon a rock and its upbuilding henceforth must be sound and enduring.

The cardinal article in our creed is the declaration that the land of the country belongs to the people in common and that private possession is a privilege granted by society, for which the holder should pay a full and exact equivalent into the public treasury. The party therefore aims "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." Those of us who now constitute the new party see that the enforcement of this simple rule of equity will solve the labor problem and abolish involuntary poverty. It will enrich the community, giving it the enormous values that the community creates through the mere growth of population. It will put an end to the monopolization of land by speculators, and render it unprofitable for any man to hold land for any other purpose than use, thus throwing open to labor and capital all unused natural opportunities now held idle by speculators. It will relieve industry and enterprise of the fines and burdens now laid upon them by a system of taxation that discourages and punishes the creation of wealth; for the ground rents now taken by private individuals, in return for no service rendered to society, when once turned into the public treasury, will vastly exceed in amount the total sum now gathered by a vexatious and profligate mixed system of direct and indirect taxation.

As incidental to and a part of the new system, the platform declares against the further alienation or farming out of the people's governmental powers, and demands that the federal government shall issue all money without the intervention of banks, and take absolute control of the railway and telegraph systems, and that our municipalities shall supply their inhabitants with water, light and heat. In short, the platform demands for the community that which the community, as such, receives as a free gift from God, and the values that it creates, leaving to each person absolute freedom in possession of whatsoever is created by his individual skill or exertion. This is our remedy for social wrongs, and we see clearly that labor, unfettered by taxes and free to employ itself, will never work for wages lower than it can earn by self-employment, and that capital, shut out from the opportunity to bury itself in the ground or hide itself in land and mortgages, will be eager to co-operate with labor on just terms.

Seeing all this plainly, and clearly asserting the absolute control by the individual of the product of his own labor, the Syracuse convention deliberately denounced the un-American idea of state socialism, and at the same time declined to commit itself to the nostrums so long urged by ignorant though well meaning men. It announced the one and only sufficient remedy, and merely recommended as measures of relief, pending the application of the true remedy, legislation tending to reduce the hours of labor, to prevent the employment of children of tender years, and so on. It also—"since the ballot is the only means by which in our republic the redress of political or social grievances is

to be sought"—demanded the adoption of the Australian system of voting.

That a party standing on such a platform should have polled more than 70,000 votes in its first state campaign is a most remarkable and encouraging fact. That a platform looking to the ballot as the sole means by which redress of grievances is to be sought, and drawing the line with such positive clearness between public rights and functions and individual rights and liberties should not merely repel but enrage socialists and anarchists, was to be expected. That a platform which relates to a subordinate place the great mass of incongruous measures advanced for years in the name of the wage workers should at first fail to attract leaders of organized labor, is not to be wondered at. Hence, there is no just cause for surprise in the facts now apparent that the socialists made alliances with the capitalists to defeat our ticket, and that many of the labor organizations, as such, did nothing for it.

Yet all of this gives assurance of our party's solid growth in the future. It is purified as though by fire from all taint of socialism. It is relieved of the appearance of a class organization appealing to class prejudices rather than to the reason and conscience of all honest men. It is none the less truly a labor party, for it proposes a radical and final solution of the labor problem, but it does not propose to elevate one body of men by pulling others down. This fact has been made plain to thousands of wage workers who, while acknowledging the usefulness of trade organizations in resisting or palliating existing evils, see that they offer no other prospect than that of a perpetual contest between classes whose true interests are identical. Thousands of such men have not only voted with us, but they will henceforth be busy in propagating the new idea among their companions and shopmates. And with them have voted other thousands of business and professional men who have overcome some prejudice against a title that is a misnomer in order to vote for principles that assure the promotion of the general welfare.

The party is, then, in better position than ever before to appeal to the intelligence and moral sense of all fair minded men. It can afford to accept no accessions, it can make no alliances that are not such as to advance its main idea. To it the proposal to abolish all taxes on industry or its products and substitute in their stead a single tax on land values is not merely a cold economic proposition, but the enforcement of a great moral principle that will accomplish and guarantee that equality promised in the Declaration of Independence and the objects recited in the preamble to the constitution of United States.

On the other hand, our party cannot afford to fall into the pit that the prohibitionists and the greenbackers have fallen into. In order to propagate its principles it must not segregate itself from human kind and cease to be a factor in public affairs. It must lend active assistance to every effort to advance any of the principles to which it is committed. There now appears to be no doubt that the monstrous bribery and corruption of the late election will cause a serious effort to pass a bill establishing the Australian system of voting in this state. Perhaps, as a preliminary to that, a committee will be appointed to investigate the cost of holding elections under the existing system in this city. Our people should most cordially co-operate in such a movement.

Again an effort will doubtless be made in congress this winter to authorize the building of telegraph lines by the post office department. This is one of our measures, and we should not only assist the effort by petitions, but watch carefully the action of members of congress from this state on the question. We must, while holding fast to our principles, fight for each step forward and make our strength the sure dependence of every man who seeks to strike a blow at monopoly or vested wrong.

As to how that strength may best be utilized next year, my own mind is not yet clear, but my impression at present is that it would be folly to name a presidential ticket. For us there is little, if any, choice between the old parties, but in the din of this final conflict between them any appeal to reason, any advocacy of principle, would be lost. Our fight, it seems to me, should be concentrated on legislators and congressmen. In the present condition of politics half a dozen men may easily hold the balance of power in the house of representatives. They would there find plenty of men eager to fight some form of monopoly, though not ready to attack that parent of all others—the monopoly of land. At the polls, too, we should find allies not now with us. All sincere free traders begin to see that tariff tinkering is a picaresque business unworthy of the efforts of brainy men and incapable of exciting popular interest or enthusiasm. Such men are rapidly acquiring the courage of their convictions, and the moment that they do so and begin to advocate the abolition of custom houses, they will recognize their duty to propose an alternative for tariff taxation. Though some of them still fall back on an income tax, theoretically fair, but practically impossible to collect, the more advanced among them see, with Thomas G. Shearman, that the one alternative to tariff taxation is a land value tax. Thus, by a different path, guided by economic considerations only, they arrive at the same conclusion that we have reached,

and become, for a time at least, our natural allies.

Our party, while maintaining its own high purpose, must not hold itself so far aloof from all not yet educated to its idea that it will refuse their aid so long as we are both advancing toward the same end. We want first of all to transfer all taxation to land values and relieve industry and its products from existing burdens. He who aims at this is with us for the present, even though he frankly tells us that he will part company with us when we propose to increase the rate of taxation to the full rental value of land. Merely because of this prospective difference we have no right to reject assistance in the first step of our great reform. The new party must maintain itself in a position to take advantage of all opportunities to advance its principles. That is the only reason for its existence. Those of us who left old parties to join in this effort did not do so because we desired to form a new party as a thing desirable in itself. We have rather reluctantly taken up the burden, because we saw that the old party had neither the ability nor the disposition to grapple with the new and grave problems that have arisen since their habits of thought and prejudices were formed, and that there was, therefore, nothing else to do but to form a new party that would offer an adequate remedy for the evils that threaten the state and menace society. We have been accustomed to have our votes, our voices or our pens count for something in public affairs, and we wish to still hold a place in the arena ready to strike a blow at monopoly whenever it shows its head. This, I think, should be the attitude of our party as a whole.

The republican party was the outgrowth of the anti-slavery agitation, but for years it refused to acknowledge its parent. The most sensible of the abolitionists joined it, however, though it only proposed to restrict the growth of slavery, and rather went out of its way to declare that it would take no steps toward the extirpation of the system where it already existed. We all know the result. It became, in time, permeated with hatred of chattel slavery, and when opportunity came it overthrew the system at a single blow. In its earlier days any proposition to liberate the slaves without compensation to their masters would have been rejected with indignation by the great mass of republicans. It may be that we shall have for a time to listen with patience to the advocacy of the imposition of the single tax on mere economic grounds and number in our ranks men who would indignantly protest against taxation to the rental value as "confiscation," which, despite its innocent etymology, has come to be a word of evil omen. I hope this may not be so, but nevertheless we must face all possibilities in attempting to forecast the future.

Should such be the case, we shall not be without a great moral helper and an inspiration to high purposes, such as the true abolitionists in the republican ranks had in the anti-slavery society. Our Anti-poverty society has all the zeal, enthusiasm and directness of purpose that marked its predecessor in the work of emancipation. It will ever hold aloft the pure white banner of the new crusade, and looking neither to the right nor the left, march forward toward that final victory which alone will satisfy its high purpose and emancipate all men from the injustice that now enslaves them. It is the custodian and defender of the very heart of our creed. For it there can be neither hesitation, fear nor the shadow of turning. It has taken the cross of the new crusade and set its face toward the promised land. It is the chosen defender of the faith that all of God's children are the equal heirs to their Father's bounty, and that the sweeping away of the obstacles interposed by ignorance and greed will restore the disinherited to their own and open wide the doors for the coming of God's kingdom on earth, where His will shall yet be done as it is in heaven.

Whatever the mutations of politics, and however much of dross may even yet come to be mingled with the pure gold of our principles, the Anti-poverty society must remain the soul and conscience of our movement, ever spurring it to nobler endeavor and always checking its impulses to yield to the temptation of immediate success ignobly won. The society must spread and grow. It should permeate this great city, and branches should spring up in every city, town and hamlet in our land. It must be the missionary force of our movement, and the prospect before it is an alluring one, for it preaches anew the glad tidings received eagerly of old, and it finds that this gospel to-day bears the stamp that proved its genuineness in the beginning; that is, the common people hear it gladly. Never before was the need of the devotion and enthusiasm that has marked the Anti-poverty society from the beginning of its existence so great as now, and happily, never before was its zeal so unflagging and its hope so high. WM. T. CROSADEALE.

A Suggestion.

NEW YORK, Nov. 16.—Would it not be a good idea for Mr. Dana to issue in pamphlet form his "White Slaves of New York" for the benefit of Mr. Dewey and other "saviors of society" who make the statement that "never before in the history of the world has wages been so high and the purchasing power of money so great as in the United States to-day?" I admit that the purchasing power of money is greater than ever. We had conclusive proof of that in the late election.

THE PARTY IN MISSOURI.

An Attempt to Stifle the Land Doctrine Falls—A National Conference Proposed.

KANSAS CITY, Mo., Nov. 19.—The convention called to meet in this city for the purpose of perfecting a state organization of the united labor party in Missouri convened at Turner hall Wednesday, Nov. 16. Thirty-seven duly accredited delegates, representing nearly all the congressional districts in the state, were present. A permanent organization was effected by electing H. Martin Williams of St. Louis chairman, and J. V. Jackson (colored) of Ray county, F. G. Johnson of Kansas City vice presidents, and Pearl Michael of Kansas City and J. C. Williams of Richmond secretaries.

On taking the chair H. Martin Williams made a rousing speech on the movement for the suppression of poverty and was repeatedly cheered. He said it was not a class movement, intended to better the condition of only those who earned their bread by manual labor, but those who in any trade, calling, vocation or pursuit earned their bread by brain or hand were included in the anti-poverty movement.

A committee was appointed on platform and resolutions and the convention adjourned until ten o'clock Thursday morning, when the committee made the following report:

"In view of the fact that steps are being taken for the holding of a national conference of the united labor party in the near future, this convention does not deem it wise or expedient to formulate a new declaration of principles in advance of the meeting of such a national conference. Believing the platform of principles adopted by the united labor party of New York at Syracuse, September 23, 1887, to be a sufficiently comprehensive and clear statement of the fundamental principles upon which the new party movement is being organized, we hereby adopt it as the platform of the united labor party of Missouri, and extend an earnest invitation to all citizens of the state who believe that the governmental reforms which are of such pressing importance to all classes of workers and producers cannot possibly come through either the democratic or republican parties, to unite with us in extending and perfecting a thorough organization of our forces throughout the entire state, to the end that the hosts of labor may present a solid, unbroken front to their opponents in the great national contest of 1892. In presenting the Syracuse platform to the voters of this state, we ask for it the thoughtful, considerate attention of intelligent people of all classes, and ask them to study the reforms therein proposed before condemning them."

After a warm discussion on the report of the committee a motion to refer it back to the committee, with instructions to strike out the single tax plank, on the plea that it would not receive the support of the farmers, was lost.

H. Martin Williams then said, in support of the report, that "the earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, and the sons of men are entitled to the benefits of it. Do you propose to send out to the voters a hoarse, podgy, crazy-quilt platform? Rats! I have been following Jack of lanterns long enough. I have my eyes fixed on the grand polar star. I have entered the straight and narrow way. I want to go on until I stand in the broad sunshine and enjoy the life-giving warmth of the god-given promise. The earth is for all the children of God, not a few of them. I was at Cincinnati, and the convention was presided over by as great a land grabber and monopolist as ever lived, A. J. Streator of Illinois. I am here to oppose any change in the platform regarding the grand, central, all important land question. I will stick to this thing to a bitter end, and will use every parliamentary device, every crazy-quilt platform, every hoarse, podgy, crazy-quilt platform to defeat any change in the land tax clause. I wish to God we could have a million men converted as Saul was converted. I have seen the cut, and I wish every one else here could see it."

Mr. John S. Crosby of Kansas City offered the following as a substitute for the report of the committee, which was unanimously adopted:

"We, as delegates of the united labor party of Missouri, in convention assembled, respectfully submit to the candid consideration of the people of the state the following declaration of principles:

"That the legitimate function of government is to provide for each and all equal protection from the fraud or violence of any and equal security in the enjoyment of natural rights, and of those opportunities for the pursuit of happiness that nature has made common to all men.

"That whenever the power of government is used for any other than this legitimate purpose it must inevitably be to the advantage of some and to the corresponding disadvantage of others; that government has no right to interfere with and can not abrogate those natural laws which govern man's relation to the earth and his fellow men; that whenever government, with or without consideration, grants special privileges to any of the people, it is at the expense of the rest of the people; that such privileges are equally unjust whether recently granted or clothed with the respectability of age.

"That the free soil party of the United States were right when, in their platform of 1852, they declared that all men have a natural right to a portion of the soil; and that as the use of the soil is indispensable to life, the right of all men to the soil is as sacred as their right to life itself; and that a single tax on land values is admirably adapted to the securing to all men their right to the soil without injustice to any.

"That all such monopolies as have been built up by the assistance of the government through the grant of special privileges, and necessary enterprises exceeding the power of individual ability, should be owned and controlled by the government as the postal system now is.

"That the Australian system of voting should be adopted in order to secure some approximation to independence in and purity of elections."

Mr. F. G. Johnson offered the following resolutions, which were adopted:

"Resolved, That this conference considers the holding of a national conference of the united labor party at the earliest practicable day for the purpose of extending and perfecting its organization in every state and territory of the Union to be a matter of the first importance. To this end the state committee appointed by this convention is hereby instructed to immediately confer with the state executive committee of the united labor party of the state of New York, and such committees of our party as may be in existence in other states in respect to the matter of calling such national conference.

"Resolved further, That this convention favors the selection of the city of St. Louis as the location for the holding of such national conference, by reason of its central

location and ease of access from all sections of the Union."

The following plan of organization was also adopted:

1. The member of the state committee from each congressional district shall be the organizer of his district. As such it shall be his duty to call and attend meetings of the voters of the united labor party, and all who may be in sympathy with its principles and aims for the purpose of securing county organizations by townships.

2. Each member of the state committee shall be the chairman of the organization in his congressional district, and it shall be his duty to call a district convention for the purpose of nominating a candidate for congress or such other purposes as may be deemed expedient.

3. Land and labor clubs and anti-poverty societies shall be organized in every county and township as far as possible, and the work of disseminating land and labor literature shall be actively carried forward.

4. It shall be the duty of the state committee to arrange for as thorough a canvass of the state by united labor and anti-poverty speakers as the means at its command will enable it to do.

5. As our party has no other means of raising the necessary funds with which to carry forward the great work in which it is engaged than the voluntary contributions of its sympathizers, we call upon all who hold its principles above all other political considerations to give as generously as possible to defray the expenses that must necessarily be incurred in sending out tracts, literature and speakers.

The state central committee was then selected by congressional districts as follows:

First district—J. G. Edwards, Beaver.

Second district—George B. Snyder, Moberly.

Third district—J. C. Williams, Richmond.

Fourth district—W. H. Blake, St. Joe.

Fifth district—W. J. Reese, Kansas City.

Sixth district—E. T. Behrens, Sedalia.

Seventh district—Peter Rothermel, Wells-ville, Montgomery county.

Eighth district—C. W. Bovard, 520 Pine street, St. Louis.

Ninth district—E. Clifton, Hotel Rozier, St. Louis.

Tenth district—H. J. Todd, Ironton, Mo.

Eleventh district—Charles Opel, Jefferson City.

Twelfth district—John Bates, Lamar.

Thirteenth district—Fred Lipscomb, South Greenfield, Dade county.

Fourteenth district—Ewell G. Munn, Poplar Bluff, Butler county.

Ed Clifton, of St. Louis, was selected chairman, with power to appoint his own secretary.

The convention then adjourned sine die.

On Wednesday evening an enthusiastic public meeting was held, which was addressed by W. J. Reese, John S. Crosby and H. Martin Williams.

A Touching Letter from an Earnest Man.

READING, Pa.—Allow me to tender you my congratulations upon what I would regard as a great victory won for an important principle in the recent election held in the Empire state. When, several years ago, I had read the last page of your great book, "Progress and Poverty," I felt that many years of persistent agitation would be required, and a great deal of the "hammer, hammer, hammer" would have to be resorted to before such a result could be made possible. I looked forward to about the year A. D. 1850, or perhaps A. D. 2000, as the time when the people might be persuaded to incorporate those principles with the laws of our land. I now feel, however, that within the next twenty or twenty-five years industrial slavery in this country shall have had its doom. I am sick-sick of pulmonary consumption—and therefore unable to do much in the way of propaganda, but I feel that I have done something in behalf of the cause. I have made a favorable impression on some of my friends and acquaintances by direct talk, and by sending out the copy of THE STANDARD that I have received weekly at one of our news stands. I think I have sown some seed that will come to fruition. I shall die all the more peaceably and contentedly with the assurance that I have done some good toward that "consummation so devoutly to be wished." Good cheer! Forward, march! On to victory!

FRIEND.

No Discouragement in Binghamton.

Mr. H. H. Freeman, writing from Binghamton, in this state, says: "We are all growing happier and happier over the result, in view of the circumstances. You can almost pick out a united labor party man on the street by the springiness of his step and the clearness of his countenance. Ours is the true winning party."

Mr. Freeman also sends us a programme of an "Anti-poverty dime social" held in Binghamton on Friday evening, Nov. 18, which may prove useful as a suggestion to anti-poverty societies elsewhere. The programme included a ten minutes' reading, anti-poverty songs, a ten minutes' reading, a short address, music and a question box. The following are "Anti-poverty lunch," and the exercises closed with singing "Hard Times Come Again No More." Anti-poverty societies in other places much smaller than Binghamton might readily thus combine social entertainment with instruction, and thus spread the light.

A Challenge to Pro-Poverty Debaters.

Mr. Robert Cumming of Braceville, Ill., challenges any socialist or pro-poverty advocate to meet him in Braceville or Gardner, Ill., in oral debate, or to discuss in the columns of any local or other newspaper, the remedy proposed in "Progress and Poverty," namely, the taking of the "uneared increment" of land values by a single tax in lieu of all other taxes, and the control by the government of such things only as are in their nature monopolies. Mr. Cumming will maintain that this remedy is just, and that it will, without prejudice to existing institutions, give equal success to all the bounties of nature and abolish poverty. He offers to take the affirmative, and, in case of oral debate, pay half the cost of the hall.

What the Feeling is in Maine.

AUBURN, Me.—Land and labor club No. 2 has passed resolutions indicative of the spirit of its members in view of the New York election. The resolutions declare that the vote is a gratifying verdict from 75,000 enlightened and courageous men; that the members reassert their unwavering fidelity to the principle of striking at land speculation through a tax on land values; that active and increased work shall be done henceforth in circulating in Maine tracts and books relating to the cause, and that an invitation is extended to all believers in Henry George's philosophy to join the club.

F. W. BEALS, Secretary.

ANTI-POVERTY.

THREE NOTABLE ADDRESSES AT THE THIRTIETH MEETING OF THE SOCIETY.

Rev. Edward McGlynn Speaks of the Methods of Politicians and the Puritan Press—Rev. J. O. M. Huntington Appeals to the Religious Sentiment of the Audience—Mr. W. McGarver on the Miners' Strike and the Single Land Value Tax.

The thirtieth meeting of the Anti-poverty society was held on last Sunday evening in Steepleway hall, as previously announced. The meeting was as crowded as usual, many of the audience being unable to find seats.

On the platform were several of the leaders in the movement. Prof. David B. Scott, of the College of the city of New York, presided.

Dr. McGlynn, accompanied by James Redpath, Prof. Scott, John McMackin and James P. Archibald, entered the hall at eight o'clock. Their appearance was the signal for an outburst of applause.

The meeting was opened with a hymn by Miss Munier's chorus.

Dr. McGlynn was the first speaker. After the prolonged cheering had ceased he said:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen—Thank God we are not here without a divine purpose, a divine inspiration, a call from heaven which has induced us to band ourselves together in this anti-poverty society and write at the very head of our declaration of principles a profound belief in the Almighty Creator and Father; and in a slightly different form we repeat not merely the faith of all the Christian ages, but the prayer that has gone up from the human heart in every land, in every age, "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth." Our society is therefore necessarily a religious society, and so far from deprecating the sanctity of the day consecrated to hearing the word of God and speaking and singing His praises, we feel that we are protesting our faith in Him, that we are speaking His praises, and we are doing that which the poet says is the best evidence of love for God, in showing our love for man. (Applause.)

Therefore could we smile, were we not too sad and too full of pity at the croakings and crows of those who, because of mere trifling incidents in a recent election, seem to speak of this society as if it were already on the decline, as if it were nearly time for it to disband and to sell out its effects. Little do they know the faith that has been kindled in the hearts of the thousands who have banded themselves together in this holy brotherhood; little do they know of the magnificent enthusiasm for humanity that has seized upon their minds and hearts. They count all loss as gain; they count suffering, martyrdom, battle and even defeat as only triumphs, because of the perfect faith in the omnipotence, the omniscience and the infinite mercy and benevolence of Him who is the soul of the universe; of Him who is overruling the history of men for His own divine purposes, the one simple rule and measure of which is the brotherhood of men, the rule of justice.

These great and consoling truths, dear friends, are opportune; the time calls for the rehearsal of them, and it is well that we should here tonight pledge ourselves anew, more forcibly if possible, to a still more enthusiastic love of justice, to a sterner pursuit of its holy ends, that we shall not permit our hearts to be embittered at the revivings of those brethren, who by their revivings give evidence of the great work that is yet before us to do; and so far from giving us occasion to desist from the work, the indignation and disgust should stimulate us to go on to the end to undo the injustice that is so powerful, so prevalent, so widespread, that not merely the debased and degraded poor for whom we have always expressed so much sympathy, are selling themselves to perpetuate it, but the cultivated, the learned, the intelligent, too often men who sit upon the judicial bench, men who are called ornaments of the bar, men who preach from Christian pulpits and ministers at Christian altars, and those magazine mentors and monitors, and instructors of the press are actually in league with injustice, are actually on the side of Satan and all his hosts, practically if not avowedly, in reality if not consciously, denying the fatherhood of God as they so strangely and persistently in practice deny the brotherhood of man. (Applause.) One of these, a little more frank than the rest, whose name was charitably suppressed by the journals, but a week or so ago said that the recent election had practically done away with all this nonsense of the brotherhood of man. They talk of "vested" rights. Rights that are not God-vested can never be vested, because they are against that eternal right, that essential equality of men laid down in the magnificent Declaration of Independence, that men are made by their Creator equal, and endowed by Him with rights which, for the simple reason that they come from Him, are unalienable, so that no power can ever deprive men of them. (Applause.) They have too long been cruelly disappointed in the future of their expectations; and it was intensely pathetic a year or so ago for me to hear a man of much learning, in a discussion at the Nineteenth Century club in which I took amiable part, tell of the bitter disappointment of the world in the failure of what he called the magnificent promise of Christianity. He said that Christian nations had been too often misled in the name of Him over whose manger had been pronounced the benediction of peace on earth, and that that message seemed almost to be a literal declaration of war, as Christians had so long, in the very name of the Prince of Peace, betrayed, burned, exterminated one another. (Applause.) And to-day, in all the Christian nations we may safely say, without exception, justice is actually defeated and injury rules supreme. There is not equal law for the rich and the poor, and even in the gilded and marble temples dedicated to the worship of Him, injustice is extolled and justice pure and simple is denounced and accursed (applause); and so vast multitudes of men are compelled by their bitter disappointment to come to the conclusion that the best church is out of doors. (Applause.) They are forced back upon that rock that never shall fail any child of God; they are forced back into the arms of the everlasting Father, and in spite of the false religion of churchmen, in spite of banded might and wealth and influence and learning, in spite of injustice, they can look up and say, "Our Father who art in heaven," and believe and feel and know that the teaching of the immortal Declaration of Independence is the very truth of God, that it is in perfect conformity with the teachings of the Christ. Therefore the man who works for some great cause need

never fear defeat, even if the cause of justice to which he has sworn allegiance shall at times appear to be irretrievably trampled under the feet of the conquering hosts of iniquity.

And, therefore, dear friends, I think it well that we who have so magnificent a banner, may without irreverence be permitted to emblazon upon it the very sign of the Son of Man; we who have this perfect assurance that God is on our side, can surely omit to notice the snags and misrepresentations of those who have enlisted in the service of Satan, and who must necessarily in their opposition to our cause give evidence of the spirit that inspires them. You can always judge of the tree by its fruit; and the peculiar malignancy and the villainous inconsistency of the attacks upon this cause have stamped them with the sign manual of the father of lies. It seems to me, therefore, that it is only in our weaker moments that our blood boils and we are filled with indignation at the calumny, the perversion of the truth, with which our movement is constantly met; yet in our calmer moments all bitterness goes out of our hearts; then we have only pity for our misguided brethren.

Therefore, I say we should feel but the more pity for those brethren who have sold themselves for wretched gain for momentary political success, or for the sake of reclaiming a rapidly declining circulation for their newspapers. These very papers that are so serviceable to the cause of evil, call some of us slanderers because we have said what every body knows and what they themselves know better than most people, that the late election, the so-called "vindication of principle," was simply a matter of purchase and sale.

We are told, on what seems very respectable authority, that nearly a million of dollars was expended for the election in this city, and I think you need no assurance from me that very little of that million dollars was spent by our party. (Applause.) This is a poor but virtuous party. This party did, it is true, have to spend a small amount for halls, electioneering and other such expenses. We know that the actual legal expenses which were paid by public authority at the election amounted to at least \$12,000. It will thus be seen that nearly three-quarters of a million of dollars in round numbers was said to have been expended by the two other parties in the late election here in New York city, and it is notorious that by far the greater part of that was spent by the democratic party to achieve the magnificent "vindication of its principles." (Applause.)

Some journals say that instead of making these vain assertions of corruption in Albany about the purchasing of legislators we would give the names of those engaged in such work that they would then be enabled to some weight, when, as a matter of fact, we have only to turn to previous numbers of these very journals to find the most complete evidence of the truth of our assertions, and even the names of the lobbyists whose profession it is to procure legislation. These same journals are the ones that are now asking for the names of the wrong doers and are sneering at statements because they come from this platform. They now stand avowed defenders of the immaculate purity and virtue of our legislators, ignoring their editorial denunciations and ignoring the fact that the columns have within the past few weeks been teeming with new revelations of the rascalities committed.

While we are called slanderers when we talk about the joke of purchasing elections, the papers have teemed with similar jokes; the joke, for instance, about the "vindication of the principles" of the grand old party by the carrying of the state of Indiana. A banquet was actually given at which the great lights of the party were compelled to be chained to the car of triumphant villainy. At that banquet, that good natured, estimable gentleman, Chester A. Arthur, congratulated the gentleman who had been chief manager of the successful campaign; he was in very good humor; it was during "the feast of reason and the flow of soul." He said, when in that happy mood, that his party had captured Indiana by an admirable supply of food and then in parenthesis, as it appeared in some of the papers, "long protracted laughter." But it was not a plentiful supply of "long protracted laughter" that carried the campaign in Indiana. Some of the reporters, with more acute imaginations, caught from the vice-president's lips, or invented, the word "soap." It has gone into some versions of history as "a plentiful supply of long protracted laughter," and into other, and I think more correct, versions of history it has gone "a plentiful supply of soap." Certain revelations afterward told us what was the nature of the "soap." To change the nature of the metaphor, it was not soap at all, but it was "principles" (laughter), and by this "diffusion of principles" in the shape of new, crisp two-dollar bills, the republicans were completely vindicated. (Laughter and applause.) And it was a matter of notoriety at the same time here in New York that certain well known leaders, or "doctors," in the immediate neighborhood in which I used to live were giving five dollars for a vote for Mr. Garfield in order to vindicate the principles of the grand old party. (Applause.) It is equally notorious that the same thing was done on Tuesday before last, and it is a huge joke to see the solemn faces with which these editors talk about the "slanderous imputation" that the election was carried by money. (Laughter and applause.) It would be very funny, if it were not so serious, to see how many people there are who think the greatest thing to be done on the winning side, or to believe that there is nothing so successful as success, and who, no matter how the victory has been gained, are only too ready to throw their caps in the air and shout for the party for which they voted. How long will our so-called liberties endure under the mere forms of republicanism if our elections are to be controlled by such means? Where, then, would be your party? Declining in the same proportion, next time it might be expected that we would poll only eight thousand votes, and the year after that we would be twenty-two thousand votes worse off than nothing.

Where was the Christian religion the day after Christ was crucified? Do you remember the story told in the gospel of the evening of the first Easter day, when two of the disciples of Christ were on their journey to a village near Jerusalem, and their hearts were heavy? They had hoped to see the literal fulfillment of the prophecies of the seers, when the yoke of Rome should be broken, and all the nations should bring their tributes to the holy city, and it should rule the world; they had interpreted literally the spiritual teachings of Christ, of the future world wide brotherhood, when they were still striving and dying for, in the hope that it shall some day bless the world. Therefore, they had lost all hope; and the Master, already arisen, is said to have joined them by the way and explained to them the meaning of the prophecy. Their hearts became warm with new love; their minds were gladdened with a new light, and they began to take on a clear vision of the glories of the spiritual kingdom, when Christ would be the redeemer of Israel. But afterward, becoming disheartened, they said now he is dead and buried; he is almost forgotten; his followers are in witing and accepting invitations to dinner;

they are engaging in their usual petty squabbles for office, for place, for self.

Where was the church of Christ when Peter was put into prison and James was killed and Paul was condemned? Do you remember the inscription that has been discovered in Spain, reciting that "the divine Nero" had reserved the honors awarded to him by Romans, when they were living under the forms of republicanism, still endorsing their laws with "the senate and people of Rome," and saying that they had actually in their adulation of the monster erected a monument to him in Spain, to glorify him for having finally extinguished Christianity? So according to that monument, which like all other monuments, "can't tell a lie," Christianity was actually extinguished all over the Roman world by Nero in the year 60 or 65; but it is still a pretty lively institution, after having been "extinguished" some eighteen hundred years ago.

Now, it may be asked, where is the united labor party? It is just as lively as the Christian church was after it had been extinguished by Nero. (Great applause.) It would be a capital thing for somebody to put in a heretically selected glass case several copies of some of these journals that are glowing over the extinction of the united labor party, in order that some future antiquary might be able to amuse his audience in some hall that will be built in a couple of thousand years from now by telling them there was an editor in this city, which was then called by the compound name of New York, who actually flattered himself, on the 9th of November 1887, that the united labor party and all its principles had actually been totally extinguished. Would not the editor of that journal, if he could hear that lecture, be somewhat overwhelmed to find that these principles were prevalent and had been for the last fifteen hundred or eighteen hundred years? (Applause.)

One of these sheets there is a demand that "the surplus" shall be spent on fortifications to protect us from somebody. What would the future antiquary think of that? What savagery there must have been in those days! Against whom did they have to protect themselves? Against their brethren and sisters! If that editor could but view things as they were, would he not be a little more sane when he saw that iron clad and fortifications and such warlike things were practically as extinct from human society as the ichthyosaurus, which is now only found in the museums?

When we come together to condole over our recent disaster it is in order for us to say, if it be a disaster, it is fraught with all sorts of compensation, and we can very speedily re-enforce our lines, and we have already begun to do so. There is no doubt as to our sons, still less is there any doubt as to our officers.

One fellow, who was practically a traitor during the late election, tried to find an excuse for it, and so he said that now he thought he was going to devote himself more to the question of "labor proper," as if heretofore he had been devoting himself to labor improper. (Laughter and applause.) We are going to do it, in reality what this fellow is thinking of doing; we are going to devote ourselves to the question of labor proper, and that means this: That labor is the law of life and therefore is a duty, that properly understood it is one of the chief tenets and boldest examples of Christ our Master, and because, whether we labor by brain or by hand, it is the means by which we are fulfilling the word of God, by which we are doing what we are to learn His lessons and to fulfill His tasks, and we are thus working out the magnificent plan of the best of fathers by making the kingdom of God here on earth so that it shall be the nursery of plants that He shall in His good time transfer to His heaven beyond. (Applause.)

Therefore we have nothing to retract, nothing to regret, except it be the misery, the degradation of not a few of those who were with us in the election of a year ago and were not with us in the election of a few days ago, for the reason that so many of them yielded to the offers of their tempters and wholly forgot for the moment the magnificent promise of a glorious future and miserable sold their birthright for but little more than a mess of pottage. (Applause.)

We shall go on preaching this "nonsense" of the brotherhood of man, and we shall go on asserting the same obsolete, antiquated and not a few dangerous doctrine of the Declaration of Independence.

Do not such avowals of corrupt politicians on the one hand, and this contempt for God's truth on the part of these journalists, all go to show that it is high time that the Word of God shall be professed and preached from the stages of theaters, from the tails of cars, especially since it is professed so half heartedly at Christian altars and Christian pulpits? Is it not high time that a party shall arise in this country—and, thank God, one has arisen—that should begin to give new significance to the practical interpretation of the Declaration of Independence? We shall go on to preach, if possible, with still more vigor and zeal and hopefulness the dogmatic religion that God is, that He is all-wise, all-good, all-merciful, all-powerful, and the correlative of that is that perfect goodness and duty are but one and the self-same thing. None can surpass me in reverence to all the tenets of the Christian religion and in reverence for the sacraments of the Christian church, yet I am called to go out and teach to the whole world, what I have been taught in the schools of the Christian church, that all the dogmas must have their purpose in the building up of the great eternal truth; that while sacraments have a most excellent purpose, yet at the same time the very essence and the core of all religion to which these things are but means, consist in knowing God, in knowing something of His purposes and in loving Him with all our hearts, and loving, in spite of their too frequent unlovableness, because of His image stamped upon them, all our brethren. And, therefore, must we rise to that exalted stature of not merely natural religion, but to be able with outspread arms to say, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do;" and count it an unspeakable gain to be permitted to lose reputation and happiness and life itself, by making every sacrifice we save our brethren. (Applause.)

But a moment ago there entered upon this platform a man whose presence here to-night is full of the truth that I have been trying to preach; whose presence here to-night is evidence that this is something more than a mere political platform. I myself have said time and again that I stand upon this platform because it is not merely a political platform, but because it is so largely a moral and a religious one. But at the same time some of you might say, "Well it is a good deal of a political platform, but small blame to him for standing on it just now, for the reason that he does not happen to have any pressing ecclesiastical engagements, and if he should begin to have them probably then he would not be seen quite so often upon that platform; perhaps there would not be so much occasion for it." But to answer that doubt here comes a man (turning to Father Huntington) who, by his very garb, shows that he is not an unfrocked priest. (Applause.) He is here, I believe, after finishing a church service in some part of the city, and I mention it as a very happy illustration of what I am trying to teach.

Now, then, let us take heart of hope, sing-

ing the praises of the Most High, thanking him for the moral victory of the late election while declaring the immoral victory of those who won it. (Great applause.)

Father Huntington's appearance was the signal for an outburst of applause. When it ceased he said:

Since I last spoke to you from this platform the movement to which we have given heart and soul has been through an ordeal, has been put to a test, and I think it has come out unscathed. So far from having to score a defeat, we consider that we have in the most emphatic way vindicated the principles for which we work. We have shown what the method is that we intend to pursue, and have proved by the action of all on our side that we mean what we say.

It would be natural for many people to think that the religious element in this movement was an adventitious thing, that it had for a basis a certain sentimentality, that it was introduced to please a few individuals, and that through these individuals might be humored by allowing it place for a time, that yet it was not a real factor in the movement, and did not rest on the platform. It has been shown that that is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (Applause.)

We have said, and I think we have said with increasing earnestness, seeing more and more clearly what the words mean, that this is the cause of God. That is a tremendous statement, but it is not the case; that if religion has formed a part of this movement, it is because it is an essential part, because it could not be got rid of, because it belonged there, and had come to stay, and that if religion were out of it the movement itself would be at an end. (

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

What to Do with the Tax.

CHICAGO.—Will you please explain (1) what you would do with the taxes that would be raised under the laws proposed by the Anti-poverty society, and (2) how a person would know what a fair tax would be?

R. O'NEILL.

(1) Pay the ordinary expenses of government and for public institutions.

(2) By the market value of the land that was taxed.

Income and Ground Rent.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., Sept. 22.—I have been a laborer ever since I was eight years old. I worked in the "tobacco patch" when I was so small the leaves of the plant would reach my hair and "gum" it so that nothing but mother's application of hot water and soap would enable me to comb it. I have swung a hammer in the mines of the Rocky mountains day after day alongside of the best miners. I have a right to consider myself a working man. Six months ago I began reading your writings, believing you a dreamer whose theories could not be put into practice. Today I endorse nearly all your published opinions. I wish you to answer me two questions:

(1) Is there any reason why incomes should not be taxed?

(2) I have seen it stated that a reasonable ground rent on the land of the United States will only produce four hundred millions of dollars annually; whereas the present rate of United States, state and county taxation produces eight hundred millions every year. I think the trouble with this statement is that the first part of it is false, but have no means at hand to disprove it. J. S. DE JARRETTE.

(1) Is there any reason why an income honestly earned should be taxed. When the rental value of land is taken in taxation an unearned income would be impossible, and until it is taken a tax on incomes would not prevent the acquisition of wealth unearned by the possessor.

(2) The land values of New York city alone are now worth more than \$100,000,000 annually, while the present tax levy is \$32,000,000. Moreover, if land values alone were taxed, some of the most expensive machinery of government would be abolished.

A Tax Upon a Tax.

AUGUSTA, Ga.—Is it not true that land is worthless until man by his labor has utilized it, and that the market value of unoccupied land is due to its possibilities of production when utilized by the labor of man? That is what the Constitution says, and I would like to know wherein it is wrong.

YANKEE.

It is evident that a temperance reform is needed in Augusta. If the market value of unoccupied land is due to its possibilities of production, how can it be said by a sober man that land is worthless until utilized by labor?

Some land is worthless until labor has utilized it, but when the value attaching to it is wholly due to labor the land itself is worthless after labor has utilized it as well as before. The value in that case is a labor or improvement value, which should be exempt from taxation.

Other land has a value, though not utilized—a value that is due to its possibilities of production. It may be an unopened mine or a vacant city lot. That value is not a labor or improvement value, but a price for the privilege of using the land. Whoever gets that price from labor gets something for nothing, for the "owner" of the land did not make it nor did he give to it its possibilities of production. It would be there all the same, and offer the same possibilities of production if it had never been owned. This value which attaches to land on account of its possibilities of production is a fit subject of taxation. It takes nothing from any one that he has produced, but only takes from him in taxation for public use what he has taken from some one else in taxation for private use. It is a public tax upon a private tax, and the nearer the public tax comes to absorbing the entire private tax the juster it will be.

Selling Value and Rental Value.

BOSTON, Mass.—Here is a question for THE STANDARD. As I understand it, the basis of estimating the rental value of land would be by taking a percentage of its selling value, but as more and more of the taxes were laid on land values, the selling value would decrease; but would the rental value decrease in the same proportion? For illustration, we will suppose a piece of land with a selling value of \$10,000 and the rental four per cent, or \$400; suppose the taxes absorb \$300 of this, causing the selling value to fall to \$2,500; would four per cent of that be the rental value on which to levy the tax? If so, the rental value would soon fall to nothing with the selling value. E. LUCAS.

As the selling value decreased the rate would rise, and the occupant would pay the higher rate so long as it did not exceed the rental value of his land. Ultimately there would be no selling value, and then taxes, instead of being levied on selling value, would be levied directly on rental value. Rental value would not decrease with selling value, although it would be subject to some, perhaps to considerable temporary decrease, due to the releasing of vacant land now monopolized for speculative purposes.

Referring to your illustration, when the selling value had declined to \$2,500 the tax could be raised to twelve per cent on that value without making any difference to the occupant. He would still get a rental of \$150 more than the tax.

Would He Be Better Off?

NEW YORK.—Say I am a man advanced in years. Having saved enough, I invest the little I have in a house and lot, and rent it out to a storekeeper and a family in each of the two floors above, drawing therefrom a revenue of one thousand dollars per annum. I myself live in cheaper apartments.

I am too old to betake myself to any productive pursuit or enterprise. I have only the revenue derived from my real estate to live upon. Now, in what condition would I find myself were your plan carried out? Would I be as well off as I am now? Would I be more helpless in my old age than I am now? Or would my condition be improved as compared to what it is now?

TRUTH SEEKER.

Your condition would be improved; and what would be even better, the condition of many other old people, men and women, who through no fault of their own are much worse off than you, would be improved, too.

So much of your thousand dollars as is the rent of the ground you own, you would lose; but you would retain all of

your income from the building, and as you would not have to add improvement taxes to your rent, you could find tenants more readily and certainly than now, because you could make the same profit on a lower rent. Besides, you would have an interest as a citizen in all the land values of your community.

Your condition would not be so much improved as if you were a worker, for you could not get the benefit of higher wages, but it would be better than it is now, and you would be spared the misery of others, which, unless you are a singularly selfish man, must detract from the comfort of your present condition.

Raising the Rent.

NEW YORK.—A owns a lot upon which he pays, according to our theory, \$100 tax; he puts a house on it worth, with the land, \$1,000 a year. B rents the building. What is to prevent A from putting the land tax on B, making the rent on B \$1,100?

ANTI-LANDLORD.

According to your figures the house is worth \$900 a year, and on account of the location B is willing to pay \$100 more, or \$1,000 in all. But he will pay no more, because if he did he would be paying a higher price for the location than it was worth. Read tract No. 57, Land and labor library.

Natural Rights and Colonizing.

NEW YORK, Nov. 7.—Kindly answer the following questions in the columns of your paper:

(1) Does the unearned increment belong to the township, the county, the state, the country, the race or mankind?

(2) Have not all things an interest in land as well as man?

(3) If the unearned increment is confined to the state, why should the immigrant of yesterday have the benefits of the native?

(4) What is the objection against setting apart a part of the public domain to experiment on and see how it will work, as socialistic colonies have done, and let the enthusiastic spirits of the "new crusade" work and show how it is feasible, and then the community may take up their ideas in politics?

G. R. RUTHERFORD.

(1) The "unearned increment" belongs to the community whose presence creates it.

(2) Man's right to land may be expressed in a syllogism as follows: Man is entitled to life; but life is impossible without land; therefore man is entitled to land. If we concede the major premise in favor of all animate things, then all animate things have a right to land.

(3) When the single tax is enforced, the immigrant of yesterday is, other things being equal, as much a taxpayer as the native, for like the native he must use land, and if the land is of the same value he pays the same tax. He has the same right to the benefits of the tax fund as any other contributor. You make the mistake of supposing that the "unearned increment" is an increment. It is not; it is only a capitalization of current rental value, which is caused as much by the immigrant of yesterday as by the native of a generation, as you will realize if you consider what would be the effect upon land values in a long settled village of a large immigration.

(4) It would require almost as much agitation to try the experiment as to amend our tax laws, and when accomplished the colony would have none of the advantages of free exchange, one of the most important features of production, and would be like a naked prisoner surrounded by cannibals.

An Unphilosophical Ph.D.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Some time ago I was talking to a Ph.D. who has much respect for your position as a reformer and philanthropist, but who said that he could not endorse your land tax theory because it is so "abominably unjust" to the farmer. He said that the wealthy men of the cities have only about one-fifth of their wealth in land, whereas the farmers have three-fourths of theirs in their land. Consequently the single tax on land would let the rich off with very little taxation, and make the poor pay a comparatively large part of it. Again, the enormously valuable railroads of the country are built for the most part on land of little value and not much of it. They would escape taxation under the land tax scheme. He would tax wealth, not land, and in order to keep the wealth from evading taxation he would have the general government impose a progressive tax on stocks, bonds and mortgages sold in amounts over a given sum. The general government could make the people who have these things show up, and a tax of this sort would compel the billionaires and bondholders to show up and shell out, and relieve the workers of taxation.

Your Ph.D. does not understand our "land tax" theory, or else he knows nothing about the value of farm land. We propose to tax land values, not land, and as the value of ordinary farm land is from thirty per cent down to no per cent of the value of the farm, the farmer's tax on his farm would be in most cases less than now; besides, the great burden of indirect taxes he now pays when he goes to the store would be lifted from his shoulders. Whether the wealthy men of cities have only about one-fifth of their wealth in land we do not know, nor does your Ph.D.; but this we do know, that in cities thousands of acres, any one of which is worth more than whole farms, are not improved at all, while thousands more are only slightly improved. We also know that much of the wealth of wealthy men in cities which is called personal property is in reality an interest in land, such, for example, as mining stock. We know, too, that if labor were liberated, so that men could make free contracts for the sale of their labor, those incomes of wealthy men which consist of profits on labor, would rapidly tend toward the dimensions of a geometric point. Ask your Ph.D. why it is, if the single tax would make the poor pay most taxes and let the rich off with very little taxation, that the rich are so bitterly opposed to it. Is it because the rich are greedy even unto anger at a proposition to shift their burdens upon the poor?

The land value tax would not wholly remedy the railroad monopoly, because that monopoly has a double root—land and government franchise. We therefore propose as to railroads that the government should no longer farm out its functions to corporations, but should resume its sovereign power over highways as a public institution.

To your friend's proposition to tax wealth there are several objections. It easily evades taxation; the tax payer

shifts the tax to the consumer, it is expensive and inquisitorial, it tempts to perjury and consequently tends to give the dishonest man an advantage over the honest one, and, above all, if the wealth is honestly acquired, it is confiscation. Of course, your friend has not in mind honestly acquired wealth. He thinks only of the vast fortunes that grow out of bad social adjustments. But it is not our purpose to allow fortunes to grow in that way and then to tax them; we would kill them at the root by removing what at once causes poverty on the one hand and great fortunes on the other.

The philosophy of your Ph.D. needs a little doctoring.

Three Practical Questions.

EASTPORT, Me.—(1) In conversation with a gentleman not long ago he raised the following point, which I did not consider myself far enough advanced in George's scheme of taxation to answer satisfactorily. He had been a resident of Deer Island, N. B., and after marriage found himself unable to rent a house to live in or even to buy a piece of land on which he could build. Understand, he had money enough to do either, but could get no chance. At last, after a two years' residence, he came across a man who was willing to sell him land enough whereon to build a house, which he did for the sum of \$40. Now, this was absolutely the only piece of land he could get there. The island is a small one, and as he was well known there, every one knew of his desire to build, but nobody would sell him a piece of land. The land was worthless for any other purpose, so worthless, indeed, that had he desired it he might have had twice as much for no extra charge, but he did not want it. The point he raised was how to determine the value of anything. Here this man had him. He knew that my friend must have this land, as he could not go on living the way he was. Had he charged him \$200 or even \$500 for it, he would have paid it. "But," he said, "either of these sums would have been far in excess of the real value, and if the man who sold had charged either of these sums, according to George's theory I would have been taxed on that amount." This he claims, is not just, because it makes it possible for a man who gets another in a tight place to have imposed upon him a tax heavier than he ought to pay.

(2) Another objection he had was this: That there would be a great many people who would not buy a piece of land, and consequently would escape taxation under the single tax. They could hoard up their money or invest it in such a way as to reap all the profit, while the land owners paid all the public bills.

(3) Still another objection to the single tax, put to me the other night, and which I could not answer clearly. One of my brother knights owns a piece of land and the house and all improvements. "Now," said he, "the whole business is not worth \$500, but ten times that amount would not induce me to sell it. I was born there, and my father and mother worked hard to procure it as a home for themselves in their old age. Now, the single tax would make it easy for some man, either from spite or self-interest, to raise my tax from the present value of the bare land to any value he had a notion to raise it to. Thus, if George's theory were in operation to-day, I should, instead of paying a tax on an assessed valuation of \$450, merely pay a tax on about \$30, the value of the bare land. That would be very nice, but to morrow you might come out, either from a motive of spite or because you really wanted the place, raise the basis of my tax from \$30 to \$500. Now, I don't want to sell, not because the place is intrinsically worth more, but because I place what might be called a "sentimental" value upon it. But under the George idea I must either sell under the circumstances or be willing to pay a tax far in excess of what I pay under the present system."

SAMUEL R. SHAW.

(1) Your friend of Deer Island could not have been got into the tight place of which he complained if land values had been subject to full taxation. The land of that island was monopolized. It would not have been monopolized if every one had been compelled to pay a full value tax on what he held. If he had been compelled to pay \$500 for his lot, as he says he was willing to rather than go without it, it would have been because he could not get any suitable land for less than that, and would have shown that land equally well situated was worth \$500 a lot. Consequently, not only your friend, but the man he bought of, and every other owner of similar land on the island would have been taxed on that basis. But if the land was not really worth so much, a good many owners would soon be anxious to sell rather than pay the high tax, and in trying to sell would bring the speculative value down, and with it the tax, until your friend would pay taxes on only the real value of the land, instead of on the blackmail price he would have paid. He would then have nothing to complain of but the big price he paid, but if the land value tax had been in force before he bought, land values would have been at a normal level, and he could have got his lot for what it was worth. So long as there is so much good vacant land as there is, no man could get another into the tight place which your friend fears if the land value tax were in force. It can be done under the present system of low land value tax, but not under the proposed system.

(2) Although a great many people would not buy land, every one would use land, and in the ground rents they paid would contribute to the public revenues. If any one hoarded his money he would get no profit, for money in a stocking does not increase. If he devoted it to productive purposes he would be contributing to the general prosperity and ought not to be taxed.

(3) No one could from spite or self-interest raise your friend's tax on his home. It is not proposed to tax "sentimental" values, but market values, and your friend's tax would not be increased unless the market value of the land increased. However anxious that mythical man of spite and greed might be to increase your friend's taxes by bidding solid cash against sentiment, he could not succeed unless the market came to his aid, and the market, you know, is very business like and is seldom affected by sentiment or spite, even if it does respond to greed. If the bare land on which your friend's house stands is worth \$50 other lots similarly situated are worth the same, and though the spiteful man offered your friend \$5,000 his taxes would not be on that basis unless that was the market value of the land, in which case the market value of the other places would be as much and the tax on them would increase too. If your friend

found a rich deposit of gold ore in his lot its value would be greater than that of the other lots and he would have to pay a higher tax, but in that case he would be willing to.

Notes.

HYMAN STAROSIELSKY, New York.—You say that a man has "a right to plant a tree and have that tree grow by the aid of natural forces." I infer, therefore, that you concede the right of ownership of the grown tree. If you do, by what process of reasoning do you conclude that, though the man owns the tree and is exclusively entitled to all its benefits, yet if he sell it he must not take the value of the grown tree, but only the value of the labor he has expended on it—that he must surrender the difference in value to the buyer without consideration? That difference in value is interest. Some one will get the benefit of it. Whom should it be, the man whose labor has given direction to natural forces resulting in a grown tree, or the man who has done nothing toward giving that direction to these forces?

E. T. HUBSON, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Your suggestions are kindly received, but you have evidently not prepared yourself, by a clear understanding of what you criticize and the reasoning on which it is founded, to make them. Read "Progress and Poverty" and write again. Because landholders have been allowed to tax you in the past, and to buy and sell the privilege of taxing you in the future, is no reason why you should feel that justice requires you to submit to the operation. If dealers in the privilege of taxing you have miscalculated your endurance, they may lose in the speculation; but they will have the satisfaction of knowing that opportunities for labor have been made so plentiful that they can recover their losses by work.

JOHN REA, N. Y.—The inspectors who qualified and offered to serve on the first day of registration, and did serve on the day of election, are entitled to full pay if they are entitled to any.

J. W. BROWN, Grand Rapids, Mich.—Your idea is good. You can get a complete list of tariff duties at the land book stores or of a custom house broker, or at the treasury department at Washington.

LOUIS F. POST.

"TAX THE AREA."

Under this title the John W. Lovell company publishes a new solution of the land problem, by Kemper Bocock. Mr. Bocock has made the somewhat remarkable discovery that a tax on land values "is a tax on the improvement and a hindrance to the productive capacity of the land itself," and he proposes "that specific taxation be substituted for the ad valorem taxation of land by applying to each unit of measurement (an acre or a square foot) a tax of a definite sum of money." It does not require a very profound intellect to understand that such a system would allow the occupant of the best land to pay as low a tax acre for acre or foot for foot as the occupant of much poorer land, and Mr. Bocock hastens to explain that he "does not mean to impose the same tax rate on one acre as on another acre differently situated."

He proposes to classify land for taxation by defining boundaries as voting or police precincts are now defined. Fixing one rate per foot or acre for land lying within certain boundaries and another rate for land lying within other boundaries. In other words, Mr. Bocock does not intend to tax area after all, but in a bungling manner to tax values. He would classify Broadway and Wall street for a high rate and the suburbs of Juncleton for a low rate. Why? Because the former is a desirable location of high value and the latter is not. But the market value of the land in those two places determines relative desirability with much greater accuracy than any tax assessor could. Indeed, if the classifications were made with any regard for fairness at all, the man who made them would first have to ascertain the values of the separate lots before he could make any average of the value by areas. Thus it would be much simpler to impose a uniform rate on the varying values than to district the land according to value and impose a varying rate on the area.

Mr. Bocock would himself see this readily enough if he knew what land value is. He concedes that "an acre of land which is favorably located for purposes of improvement ought to bear a much higher tax than an acre the location of which suggests no improvement at all," and he would no doubt agree that taxes paid by a higher or lower tax extremes ought to pay a higher or lower tax according to its location. But, ignorant of the nature of land values, he fails to see that they distinguish not only the most favorably from the least favorably located lands, but every grade between. That Mr. Bocock is ignorant of the nature of land values is no mere inference from his reasoning. He confesses it almost expressly when he says, speaking of the land value tax, "that the farmer who takes up some wild land, clears it, fertilizes it, makes it worth something, is taxed or fined for so doing." Mr. Bocock confuses improvement values with land values. In the case he supposes the farmer might make a valuable farm, but he would add nothing to the value of the land. Wild land similarly located would still be worth nothing if any of it was appropriated.

The truth is that any system of taxation by area, unless it was in effect a tax according to value, would encourage land monopoly, and if the system were in effect a tax according to value, to make it so in fact would be as much better as the natural is better than the artificial. Mr. Bocock's book is simply an addition to crank literature—the book of a man too conceited to realize his own ignorance and who rushes into print before taking time to think.

A Bit of Telegraph History.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The fact is not generally known that the first line of electric telegraph established in this country was built and supported by the United States government. This was a single wire from Washington to Baltimore. The appropriation was \$50,000, and \$5,000 was afterward voted to keep it in repair and pay expenses. The act passed congress in December, 1843, and the wires were put up and got into working order in time to send as the first dispatch the announcement of the nomination of James K. Polk for the presidency by the democratic party in session at Baltimore. This was at the end of May, 1844.

In 1845, February 23, the general appropriation bill being under consideration in the senate, Mr. Barrow of Louisiana moved to insert the following instead of the appropriation of \$5,000 per annum for keeping up the telegraph between Washington and Baltimore:

"That the postmaster general be and hereby is authorized and directed, in concurrence with the proprietors of Morse's electro-magnetic telegraph, to contract for the construction of such telegraph from the city of Baltimore to such point or points as the city of New York as may be found most practicable, for the exclusive use and direction of the United States; provided, the same shall consist of a line of six wires and

shall not exceed the cost of \$50 per mile, inclusive of all necessary instruments for establishing telegraphic communications to and from the city of Washington and Baltimore, in Maryland; Wilmington, in Delaware; Philadelphia, in Pennsylvania; Trenton, in New Jersey; and the city of New York respectively, to be paid out of any moneys in the treasury not otherwise appropriated; and the same, when constructed, shall be assigned and made appurtenant to the postoffice department, under the superintendence of Samuel F. B. Morse, and under such regulations and tariff of charges for communications made thereby for private or governmental purposes—as the postmaster general shall institute and until congress shall otherwise order. And the sum of eight thousand dollars is hereby appropriated out of any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated to be expended together with the unexpended balance of the former appropriation, under the direction of the postmaster general, for the care, repairs and superintendence of said telegraph, with power to adjust and pay all outstanding demands thereon."

Mr. McDuffie, Mr. Benton and others objected, threw cold water on the proposition, on the ground that it was not called for by petition or otherwise by the business public. And so the gallant and far-seeing Mr. Barrow was forced to give it over for the time. There was no braver or truer man in congress in 1845 than Alexander Barrow. Representing a slave holding state on the border of Texas, he voted against the joint resolution for the admission of that republic into the Union; and, unlike other southern things who did so, he declared that he would not vote for annexation in any form, whether by treaty or otherwise. His liberality was strikingly shown by this proposition, which was to begin the system of a national telegraph by its extension to the great commercial cities north of Washington.

DANIEL R. GOODLOE.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO FUTURE WORK.

MAHLEBOROUGH, N. Y.—Let THE STANDARD readers give their earnest consideration to agitating against vote buying and send in their suggestions. I suggest the following: A public agitation against corruption at the polls and in favor of the Australian system of voting. The means: The publication in form of a land and labor tract, of a complete and plain description of the Australian system; the necessity for its adoption; what it will accomplish and how it can be effected through the legislature. Then let petitions to the legislature asking for the adoption by the state of this system be distributed for signatures. I have no doubt hundreds of thousands of names could be obtained, and a pressure great enough to compel its adoption by this state be brought to bear upon our law makers. Honest men of all parties, disgusted with machine politics, are ready to do anything for us to accomplish this first and necessary reform.

C. H. BALDWIN.

120 HERKIMER STREET, BROOKLYN.—It has struck me that it would be a good idea to form at once in this city, New York and perhaps at other points, lyceums for the study and discussion of the live economic questions suggested in the Syracuse platform. We should aim to have a membership of bright young men who will undergo a course of careful study, and who, by frequent speeches and replying to questions in the meetings, will qualify themselves for the stump or rostrum. If this idea is carried out, by next fall we can have scores of intelligent speakers and no doubt some first-rate orators. What do you think of this suggestion? It will be like drilling men before taking them into battle.

ALFRED R. CALHOUN.

ASHTABULA, O.—Why not organize a lecture bureau? Let all lectures be free. Take up a collection at each for the general fund. We can put 1,000 men into the field within six months. Some can go for expenses and some cannot.

A. D. STRONG.

KANSAS CITY, Kas.—We have arranged with a member of our club to establish a labor news agency in connection with his other business, where all of Henry George's publications will be kept for sale. All the copies of THE STANDARD that remain on his hands each week the club agrees to purchase and distribute where they will do the most good. We are receiving letters from all parts of the cause in every portion of the state calling for a state convention as soon as possible, and organizing on the Syracuse platform.

We will be glad to hear from all other sympathizers in this state who have not corresponded.

F. M. P. DONNELLY.

Secretary land and labor club.

HOUSTON, Tex., Nov. 13.—We have perfected a plan for organizing the state and have drawn up the by-laws of a tax reform association, by which we propose to carry on the agitation all over the state in a quiet but effective manner. Our organization is based on clubs of from three to five members each. The clubs are to hold meetings weekly and report monthly to county executive committees. The reports are to be made on blanks prepared for the purpose, showing number of meetings held by the club during month; number of persons approached on the subject of tax reform; number of set interviews had for the purpose of thoroughly explaining the doctrine, with name, post-office address and voting precinct of those to whom the doctrine has been thoroughly explained, name, postoffice address and voting precinct of every man ascertained since last report to be a tax reformer; number of personal letters written on the subject and number of subscriptions to tax reform papers obtained since last report, etc., including number of tracts distributed. The county executive committee are to send, on blanks prepared for the purpose, a monthly summary of the work accomplished in the counties to the state executive committee, who will, monthly, prepare a report showing the aggregate amount of work accomplished in the entire state since the last report was issued, a copy of which will be mailed direct to every club in the state. As soon as three temporary members are added to a full club five members a new club will be organized. The expenses of the state executive committee in compiling and publishing the monthly report issued by them will be met by assessments for amount needed from time to time on the clubs. In this way we can only believe that a thorough and systematic organization of the entire state can be speedily accomplished, but that every true believer will be encouraged to put forth his best personal efforts by the knowledge of what others are doing and of the steady progress made as he will see by these monthly reports. The by-laws have been drawn so that the organization may become a national one should no better plan, in the opinion of our friends in New York city, be suggested.

H. F. KING.

PORTLAND, Me., Nov. 26.—I am fully satisfied with the result in New York and elsewhere at the recent election. I should, of course, have rejoiced to know that a greater number had seen the light, but we had no right to expect so many in so short a time. One thing we need, and that is, the organization. Let all who have seen the light be organized into a house to house canvass, or in any other way that will insure the best result. We have much to encourage us. Let the wise ones take council together and see if there is not some common ground on which all workers can stand.

S. T. TAYLOR.

IN NEW SOUTH WALES.

What the Newspapers Say of the Land Question and What the Church Does Not Say.

SYDNEY, Oct. 19.—The present attitude of New South Wales with regard to the land question is in many respects a peculiar one. So far as the press is concerned, the great majority of writers appear woefully ignorant of the rudiments of the subject, though it is now admittedly of such importance that at least an occasional reference to the existence of Mr. George is necessary for every journal that desires to be abreast of the times. Hence, we have articles written by men who regard the matter in all kinds of erroneous lights, and their errors invariably assume forms which prove that the writers have never comprehended the principles they attempt to criticize, nor even read the books in which those principles are set forth.

We have, of course, our own press, of which the Sydney Morning Herald, the oldest and wealthiest daily in the colonies, may be taken as a type. This paper meets every demand for reform with the remark that "it is too much," and comments on every concession made, with the observation that "it is enough." If ever a journal adopted as its motto the doctrine that "whatever is is right," calmly oblivious of the principles which Charles Dickens pointed out was involved therein, viz, that "nothing that ever was was wrong"—that journal is the Sydney Morning Herald. When the news of the McGlynn demonstration in New York reached Sydney, the only mention THE HERALD made of the affair occupied about two inches in their American letter. The notice may be condensed as follows: "This question will no doubt be fought out in America. Let us in the colonies wait and see how it eventuates there. The American issue of the struggle will be a safe guide for the colonies to follow." The idea of judging the movement by the standard of truth and morality, and of supporting it if it were right, and opposing it if it were wrong, never seems to have entered the editorial head.

The Sydney Daily Telegraph, the other morning paper, is inclined to be somewhat prebend in its principles. Those who are "in the know" affirm that the editorial department is under the control of two men holding antagonistic views, and that these men edit the paper alternately. The only difficulty in the way of accepting this explanation of the curious mixture of advanced and fossilized ideas which find their way into the Telegraph's columns is the perplexing fact that sometimes the contradictions appear in the same issue, and occasionally in the same article—a thing which occurred several times recently during the period when the papers were intoxicated with royal jubileism. To put the matter in religious form, the creed of the Telegraph seems to be "God is good, but the devil's not a bad sort after all."

The Evening News—poor thing!—has not yet ventured an opinion, and unkind people say that it hasn't got one to venture.

Of the weekly papers, the most popular and powerful without doubt, is the Bulletin. But the attitude of the Bulletin, to a true student of the works of Henry George, is excessively perplexing. It did a tremendous educational work when "Progress and Poverty" first came out and supported the principles of land nationalization to the utmost. Week after week leading articles appeared in favor of Mr. George and in defence of his theories against the attacks of the ignoramus and scoundrel. But when "Protection or Free Trade?" appeared this sweet music ceased, and in the last electioneering campaign, when the issue put before the electors was "Free Trade or Protection," all its great influence was exerted, though without avail, on the side of the protectionists. If the Bulletin could be converted to the cause of true free trade the victory for the land question in New South Wales would not be far off.

The churches have as yet maintained a solemn silence on the subject. Bishop Barry, the head of the Anglican body, has had his intellect employed too fully in the discussion of the advisableness of removing a Reredos from over the altar of St. Andrew's cathedral to spare time for so trivial a subject as the land question. While the chief metropolitan Congregationalist, Dr. Jefferis—a successful land speculator, by the by—airily disposes of the whole question in five minutes' insolent and patronizing twaddle, and straightway proceeds to lecture to his flock on "How to be merry and wise."

But, leaving the scribes and pharisees, there is a strong and growing party who are fired with an intense enthusiasm for the new cause. There is an element of inquiry and discontent with things as they are, and a growing murmur which could all too soon be collected together, would soon swell into a roar. A visit from Mr. George, Dr. McGlynn or the Rev. Hugh Pentecost, would collect and cement all these scattered sympathizers, and make them a great power in the land. Like the man from Macedonia, we cry to the apostles of the new crusade, "Come over and help us."

JUNEX.

"The Land Question in America" in the Westminster Review.

Edward J. Shriver, the new treasurer of the Anti-poverty society, contributes to the November number of the Westminster Review an admirable article on "The Land Question in America." The growth of sentiment in favor of the single tax theory is sketched, and due importance is given to the effect of last year's vote for Mr. George on a land tax platform in this city. Mr. Shriver truly says that success in that election could have had no direct effect in advancing the doctrine, and that "the whole campaign, in fact, was designed as a magnificent demonstration, like a mass meeting or a procession; and it was for this purpose an unequalled success." Of course Mr. Shriver wrote before the recent election, but despite the disappointment of our friends and the election of our enemies, there was nothing in the result of Nov. 3 to impeach the accuracy of his statement. But for the "magnificent demonstration" of 1886 it would have been impossible to poll nearly 50,000 votes in 1887 for the principles enunciated in the Syracuse platform. We

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
33 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One Year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.50; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class
matter.Communications and contributions are invited, and
will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found
suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient
stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be
taken of anonymous communications.Contributions and letters on editorial matters should
be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD,
and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER
OF THE STANDARD.THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscrib-
ers at every postoffice in the United States, to whom
liberal terms will be given.THE STANDARD is for sale by newsmen through-
out the United States. Persons who may be unable to
obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notify-
ing him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 26, 1887.

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

THE LAND QUESTION ABROAD.

The existing alliance between the Irish
nationalists and the English liberals is
having on the latter an educational influ-
ence that must in time broaden and clarify
the views of the Irish people. The Novem-
ber number of the *Westminster Review*
has a leading article on Lord Hartington
that abounds in forcible expressions, show-
ing the tendency of the liberal party toward
radicalism. While denying to Lord Hart-
ington any just claim to the name of
statesman, it freely accords that title to
Mr. Morely, the radical leader. It rejoices
in the defection of the whigs, because it
gives greater weight to the radicals in the
councils of the liberal party. It intimates
that a continuous policy of obstruction by
the house of lords may lead to the destruc-
tion of the political power of that body.

All of this is significant, and none the
less so because it has become so common
that it no longer excites surprise. But the
remarkable thing about this article is its
clear recognition of the fact that the present
struggle is one between the people and the
landlords. Speaking of Lord Hartington,
the writer says:

The history of the family of the Caven-
dishes is not great in our national life; they
have always had a great affinity to the
church, to the land, and great mansions. A
family that owns 136,322 acres in fourteen
counties and has the patronage of forty-two
livings and seven manorial seats, and the
chief landlord of two great towns, can hardly
be expected to take much interest in the
people. It would be acting contrary to human
nature were it to do so. He is, in fact, a great
trades union leader of landlords, and this is
the sole burden of the journal of which he is
the patron.

Here is a clear recognition of the fact
that the privilege claimed by landlords, as
such, is in direct antagonism to the rights
and interests of the people. The assertion
of the supreme importance of the land
question is even more clear and em-
phatic when the author treats of the
effects expected from home rule in Ireland.
He says:

We are trying more or less to deal with the
Irish land question; that is a matter for the
Irish people, and should be dealt with in their
own parliament, because our parliament
of landlords cannot appreciate its crucial im-
portance and legislate upon it. Lord Hartington
ought to have seen, as Mr. Gladstone did,
that it is a great agrarian social revolution,
brought about by causes which the nation did
not produce, and which, as in other countries,
must be faced by the west men.

Here is a clear statement of Ireland's
rights and of the one great Irish problem.
The *Westminster Review* demands that its
settlement shall be the first work of the
liberal party after its restoration to power.
It insists that it is the duty of the radical
party "to become more radical than ever,"
and that "English and Irish democracy
must join to the common end." No one
can read such expressions in a magazine of
such character and standing and fail to see
that at last the true solution of the Irish
question is at hand, and that it will be so
accomplished as to set at rest forever all
reasonable fear of disunion, but rather in
such fashion that a union will be cemented
between the common people of the two
islands that will cause the Tories to regret
that they did not promote the secession of
Ireland, and thus prevent the further par-
ticipation of its representatives in British
legislation.

Nor can the rapid advance of opinion on
the land question among their English
allies fail to exert a powerful influence on
the Irish people, in causing them to throw
aside the petting and transitory
scheme of peasant proprietary in order to
establish a system of land tenure in accord
with their ancient history and traditions.
They need not go from home for teachers
and leaders. Bishop Nulty and other Irish
ecclesiastics have laid down the only true
principle of land tenure, and Michael
Davitt has, from time to time, when free
from political pressure, urged the only
permanent solution of the great problem
that the first Irish parliament must grapple
with.

The soil of Ireland belongs to the whole
people of Ireland. The curse of the coun-
try for centuries has been that its soil has
been held by a few men empowered to tax
others for living on it. Justice to all can-
not be done by taking it away from the
few who now hold it and giving it to others
who will still be a minority of the people,
leaving the majority disinherited. Let the
new division come, if need be, but main-
tain the common rights of all by taxing
the possessors the rental value of their
holdings for the general benefit. If Ireland
is this example the English radicals are

rapidly becoming prepared to extend the
system to their own country.

THE COST OF ELECTIONS.

The World undertook last week to make
an approximate estimate of the cost of
conducting the recent election in this city.
It credits the united labor party with re-
ceiving some \$20,000, \$10,000 in contribu-
tions and \$10,000 from the Anti-poverty
fair, which is substantially correct, but
says that "adding carriage hire and car
fares of Henry George and Dr. McGlynn,
which they paid out of their own pockets,
the expenses of the campaign and election
cost the united labor party at least \$31,-
000." This is a curious calculation. Dr.
McGlynn and Henry George did pay their
carriage hire and car fares out of their
own pockets, but they certainly did not
spend \$11,000 in this way. Neither did
the local candidates spend \$29,000 out of
their own pockets, thus warranting the
World's estimate of \$60,000 as the total
expenditure. The local candidates were
generally men who work for a living,
and they had no such sum to spend. We
doubt if all expenditures, including those
of the local candidates, amounted to \$30,-
000 in the city and state.

When it comes to figure up the ex-
penses of the old parties the World has
precedent to guide it, and its figures are
probably more nearly accurate. For in-
stance, it estimates the assessments on
judicial and other candidates at \$728,000,
the official payments by the city at \$216,-
200, and concludes that personal expendi-
tures by candidates would bring the
amount nearly to a million. It apparently
leaves out of account the enormous contri-
bution that the liquor dealers were forced
to make to the democratic campaign fund,
and the very large private contributions
made to both of the old parties. Had it
included these, its estimate of a million
dollars as the total cost would seem low.

In fact, it is a common opinion that the
democrats alone spent very much more
than half a million dollars on election day.
Be the sum more or less, such expendi-
tures are not merely disgraceful—they are
in the highest degree demoralizing and
dangerous. It is impossible that results
accomplished in this way can have any
moral force. It is impossible that laws
made by legislators chosen in this fashion
shall command any respect other than that
inspired by force in the minds of the mis-
erable wretches whose bought votes have
given the law makers their seats. All the
anarchists in the world could not, by their
united action, do so much to bring law and
government into contempt as was done by
the corrupt politicians of this city on the
8th of November by their wholesale and
shameless bribery of voters.

The World need not confine itself to
guessing at the cost of the job. It has
ample facilities for getting at the facts if it
will consent to use them. Some of its con-
temporaries are so bound up with the idea
of re-electing President Cleveland that
they are ready to condone anything that
contributes to that result. The World
claims to be a fearless and untrammelled
newspaper. Why does it not print the
news about that election? Anything like
a complete exposure of the sickening vil-
lainy of that day's work would force an
almost unanimous demand for the passage
of a law establishing the Australian sys-
tem of voting before another election is
held.

A CRYING EVIL.

Some six weeks ago or more a certain
incorporated society of this city bargained
with a long established dealer in coal for
the winner's supply. Soon after the coal
began to be delivered the janitor had
reason to suspect that the carts brought
short weight. He at once mentioned his
suspicions to one of the trustees and was
told to weigh one of the tons by barrel
weight as well as he could. He did so and
found a shortage of nearly 300 pounds.
The further delivery of coal was then pos-
tponed, twenty-seven tons, according to the
dealer's tickets, having been put in the
cellar. A licensed weigher was employed
and all the coal in the cellar weighed.
The weigher's figures on the completion of
his work were twenty-two and three-
quarters tons. The difference between the
dealer's tickets and the weigher's was,
therefore, four and one-quarter tons.
Call it only four tons and we have a differ-
ence of fifteen per cent, equal to a loss of
seventy-five cents per ton, reckoning coal
at \$5.

Thereupon the trustee went to the coal
dealer and quietly handed him the weigh-
er's statement. The coal dealer at once
thankfully paid the weigher's bill, amount-
ing to \$24, and then deducting the differ-
ence of weight from the amount stated on
his own tickets, humbly receipted for the
balance. His only defense was that the
weight was all right when the coal left the
yard. Comment on such a transaction is
unnecessary.

There are few housekeepers who have
not had more than a latent consciousness
that in this matter of coal they are con-
stantly and grossly cheated in weight.
But they are helpless. The re-weighing of
coal is a costly operation, is well nigh if
not altogether impossible after it is once
put in, and with limited quantities is not
to be thought of; and so they go on from
year to year, grumbling, perhaps chang-
ing the dealer, only to find that their cause
for grumbling does not seem to cease.

As with nearly every iniquity in trade,
the false weight presses most heavily on
the poor. Next to food and clothing, coal
is a prime necessity. For four or five
months of the year the want of it means
more than thousands in our city the most
heartrending misery. Families in comfort-
able circumstances may, indeed, grumble
at light weight, but it deprives them of no

other necessity, cramps them in no enjoy-
ment or luxury. To the poor the robbery
of seventy-five cents or even more a ton is
so much drawn from the common daily
capital, often painfully little.

Is there no way by which the community,
poor as well as rich, can be protected from
such barefaced stealing? The candle is
burned at both ends—the coal monopolist
in Pennsylvania sets fire to one, the coal
dealer in New York to the other. Mean-
while a great outcry is made against the
danger of paternal government. "We
must not be governed too much. This de-
stroys individual activity and enterprise."
Well! but suppose there are enterprising
thefts against whose robberies individuals
are powerless, what then? The very thing
for which society exists is mutual support
and protection, and the great object of all
government is to govern well, whether it
be much or little. A municipal govern-
ment exists especially and particularly
for the protection of the individual—
in the street, in the market and in
his home. In protecting the individual
it should guard alike his pocket and his
person; on no other has any reason
for existence. It is grossly negligent of its
great trust when it permits dealers of any
kind with false weights and measures to
pile up their ill-gotten gains under the
very eyes of its officials. Mayor Hewitt's
ear is heavy with complaints. He picks
many sores. Here is one that will stand a
good deal of pricking. In such a surgical
operation the mayor will have God on his
side, equal at any time to both county
democracy and Tammany united, and,
moreover, he will have the prayers of
every honest citizen. Let him hear what
the old Hebrew book saith: "A false bal-
ance is abomination to the Lord; but a just
weight is His delight."

DAVID B. SCOTT.

The proprietor of a famous road house of
upper New York, who was buried last
week, once said to a clergyman who sug-
gested the questionable character of his
calling—that of selling alcoholic liquor—
that he would be glad to quit it if there
was anything else he could get to do.
There is a lesson in this for our prohibition
friends. It is usually not a preference for
the business that makes liquor sellers, but
the opportunities it offers to make a living.
It is an easier business to get into than
any other, and more certain to be success-
ful. This is so because of the demand for
liquor and because manufacturers find it so
profitable to set men up in the retail busi-
ness that they are willing not only to
supply stock, but also to provide a loca-
tion. Consequently, almost any one with
a reputation for honesty, however small
his capital, can find an opportunity for
business in the retail rum trade when he
might starve before he could find an op-
portunity in any other trade. Manufactur-
ers of hats might be as willing as
brewers to give him credit for stock, but
not so willing to secure his rent. When
opportunities for employment are freely
open to all, the greatest attraction that the
liquor business now holds out will be gone.

The *Tribune*, in advocating the estab-
lishment of the Australian system of vot-
ing, makes the excellent point that the
state now requires that printed ballots
with a certain style of type shall be used,
and yet it neglects to provide any such
ballots. If it were not for private ex-
penditures, we could have no such thing
as a legal election. Thus the state fails
to provide for the enforcement of one of
its own laws.

The difficulties suggested by some papers
as likely to be encountered by voting for a
long list of officers on a single ticket are
not inevitable, nor are they such as oc-
casion difficulty elsewhere. In many states
the voter casts but one ballot, which con-
tains all the names of candidates, from a
list of presidential electors down to the
alderman of a ward or county constable.
Neither can we see any objection to
having the tickets so printed as to de-
signate the party to which the various candi-
dates belong. That, too, is customary
elsewhere, and in some states it is made
a misdemeanor to print any names but
those of the regular candidate under a
party name. If mixed tickets are printed,
they must be so headed, and any one
wanting to scratch must do it with pen or
pencil.

The truth is that little effort will be re-
quired on the part of our people to adapt
themselves to the new system, and any
anticipated difficulties can readily be pro-
vided for in a law the framers of which de-
sire shall succeed. The main points to be
kept in view are, first, that all ballots shall
be furnished by the state, and, being once
furnished, that the voter shall be permitted
to make his choice in secret and put his
ballot in the box before he again communi-
cates with any one outside the polling
room. This will put an end to "workers"
and their boxes, reduce expenses, stop
frauds in bunching and put an end to
bribery and intimidation. The man who is
low enough to sell his vote is too low to be
trusted, and no one will pay such a fellow
for his vote if he cannot watch him carry
his ballot to the polls and there see him
cast it. There is no difficulty in passing a
law to accomplish these objects; that
every voter will easily understand.

Last week a man attempted to commit
suicide by jumping off the East river
bridge. He was not seeking notoriety,
but escape from starvation. An investi-
gation proved that his wife and children
were in absolute want, and that from lack
of work he had been unable to provide for
them. Think of it! In a great city, a

center of civilization, where powers of pro-
duction are at the highest point of perfec-
tion, a man anxious to produce and capa-
ble of producing is forbidden to satisfy his
wants by exercising his powers until, in
desperation, he seeks relief in death. Alms
he might have had, but it was not alms he
wanted. He asked the right to make a
living, not the degrading privilege of
begging one. Of that right, conferred
upon him by nature in power to work
and boundless opportunities for work,
he had been divested by an institu-
tion that makes natural opportunities
for work private property, to be bought and
sold and speculated in. Master of one fac-
tor of producing wealth, labor, he was
made dependent on the self interest of fel-
low men for the other factor, land; and as
helpless as if manacled he stared starva-
tion in the face until death by drowning
seemed a boon. His case is one of thou-
sands which escape general attention be-
cause they lack the sensational feature in
which his culminated; and in the same
community are other thousands of men
who neither work nor have occasion to
work, because they live upon the price of
the very opportunities for work of which
this man was deprived.

The World recently did a work similar
to that of the *Sun* in exposing the misery
of the Pennsylvania miners; but like the
Sun, it, too, overlooked the fundamental
cause of their misery. In charging inhu-
manity upon employers, it shut its eyes
to the simple truth that it is private owner-
ship of mines which, by restricting oppor-
tunities to work, enables it if it does not
compel employers to oppress the men who do
their work.

The *Sun* is doing well in bringing to
public attention the awful condition of the
"white slaves" of New York—the sewing
women who work early and late for a pit-
tance that cannot possibly afford any ap-
proach to a decent living. But in blaming
employers for this, the *Sun* does not shine
in the right place. Employers must sell
cheap or stop selling, and if the cost of
production can be reduced at any point,
that is the point they must attack or a
competitor will attack it and undersell
them. The weakest point of attack is no-
toriously the price of labor, because there
is so much labor constantly seeking em-
ployment. Consequently, in the fierce
struggle for business existence, the price of
labor is forced down. The employer's
benefit from this is temporary at best.
Such benefit as there is is ultimately ap-
propriated by the owners of land. It is
not inhuman employers that grind down
the sewing women, but unemployed labor,
and unemployed labor is due to the arti-
ficial scarcity and high prices of land. To
blame employers is, to resort to a simile
adapted to the plane of the *Sun's* orbit,
like attributing a rat slaughter to the ter-
rier rather than to the confinement of the
rats.

The Cincinnati *Christian Advocate*
notes the case of a man who died of starva-
tion in Cincinnati a few days ago and
offers no other comment than that the
case "had only to be stated to bring swift
relief, and the relief would have been
given before if the facts had been com-
municated to those in charge of our
charities." What times are these when
starving people, able and willing to work
to supply their wants, must appeal for
food to a charity or die?

The religious press should understand
that righteousness is a more important
factor in the social problem than charity,
and begin to inquire why it is that from
the class which makes food comes those
who, though able and willing to make
either food or things that exchange for
food, suffer for want of food; and why it
is that people who make neither food nor
anything else have no occasion to appeal
for charity. There is something unright-
eous about a condition in which, in a com-
munity with ample opportunities for work,
men are forced, for want of work to do, to
die or beg.

If it were not for the price of Cincinnati
lots, which repels enterprise, there would
be such a demand for workers in Cincin-
nati that charitable institutions would be
useless except to the aged and infirm; but
so long as some of Cincinnati's citizens are
permitted to grab that part of the planet
on which Cincinnati stands, others of her
citizens will have to die of starvation for
lack of work to do, or surrender their
manhood by throwing themselves upon
public charity.

The World has discovered a mare's
nest. Weighed of the monopoly of the re-
ports of misery that come up from the ten-
ement districts, it has commissioned a re-
porter to investigate the pitiable condition
of Fifth avenue vacant lot owners. Its
philanthropic enterprise has been rewarded
with the discovery of many instances of
people who are regularly contributing large
sums of money to the city treasury with-
out reward or hope of reward, except an
approving conscience for good
deeds done. There is one Mrs. Ha-
mersley, for example, who has actu-
ally paid toward the maintenance
of our city government in the past ten
years the comfortable sum of \$11,201
without any return. She has possession
of a trifling area of vacant land on the
northwest corner of Fifty-fifth street and
Fifth avenue, which she might sell for
\$110,000, but actuated by that public spirit
which characterizes owners of vacant
land, she foregoes interest on that large
sum, besides paying an average of over
\$1,000 a year in taxes, just to prevent the
building trades from erecting a nuisance
in the shape of a dwelling house on the
ground. And yet those wicked anti-pov-

erty people would deal so unkindly and
ungratefully with this estimable lady as
to put so high a tax on that lot that she
would be compelled either to build upon it
or let somebody else build upon it.

But Mrs. Hamersley's grievous case is not
the only one the World has unearthed.
There is one Mary G. Pinckney, who serves
the community not only by keeping 138 lots
in the Twelfth ward out of use, but by
actually paying every year a tax of some-
thing like a tenth of one per cent on their
market value by way of gratuity to the
people of the city! Several similar cases
are found; but why itemize them? Every-
one knows that our impoverished vacant
lot owners contribute annually to the cost
of government large sums of money, and
everyone knows, without being told by the
World, that these contributions are
wholly philanthropic in character, for
vacant lots yield no income. But after
all would not the people of the city be
better off if the vacant lots were thrown
open to industry, even if the annual good-
will offerings of their present owners were
thereby cut off? Would not more work
and more house room with a lean public
treasury be better than scarcity of work and
business stagnation with a fat treasury?

The truth is that owners of vacant lots
pay these trifling taxes and forego inter-
est because they expect the growth of
the city to so increase the value of their
lots that in the end they will make a profit
over all. In so securing the privilege
to withhold the lots from use they
limit industrial opportunities and impose
oppressive burdens on their fellow citi-
zens. If they were required to pay the
annual value of the lots, as in honesty they
ought to be, and assured of freedom from
taxation on any improvements they might
make, as also in honesty they ought to be,
these lots would not long be vacant and
industry would not be so cramped.

In Chicago there is a paper called the
Western Rural, to which is due the start-
ling discovery that "any one can make
land." When called to account by a cor-
respondent, it explains that "in Chicago it
is done with garbage and old boots and tin
cans and bottles and broken dishes and
ashes and street sweepings," forgetting that
unless these various components of "land"
have a foundation to rest upon, they will
fall through. Making land with garbage
is like making a lake with water; neither
can be done unless nature furnishes a
bottom. The bottom is land.

A. C. Sullivan has issued, through Mc-
Hale, Rohde & Co. of 9 Courtland street,
New York, a pamphlet of twenty pages
bearing the title, "The Primary Elements
of the New Political Economy; or, the
Henry George System of Taxing Land
Values in a Nutshell." Mr. Sullivan makes
a succinct statement of the leading prin-
ciples enunciated in "Progress and Poverty,"
and presents them with a clearness and
brevity that cannot fail to be gratifying to
those wish an answer to the common
query, "What is it all about?" without tak-
ing time to give any close study to the
subject. His pamphlet, we think, will do
excellent service in clearing away misap-
prehension and in leading many to make
a more careful study of the whole problem.

"Let there be no barren tables on
Thanksgiving day" says the World. Mul-
tiply that prayer by 365 and give Heaven
a chance to grant it, and the Anti-poverty
society will no longer worry the unregen-
erate.

We have received a specimen "credit
check" from a miner who asks us not to
publish his name. It reads as follows:
"Braceville coal mines. Credit check.
No. (here a high serial number is written).
\$10.00. Date, Jan. 3, 1887. W. C. Shep-
pard & Co. The uncanceled amount of
this credit is payable on demand in mer-
chandise to (here appears the name of our
correspondent). Not transferable. Signed,
W. C. S. & Co. 'Preserve this for
reference.'"

Of these credit checks our correspondent
writes that while the miners are only re-
quested to buy them, it is a significant fact
that a miner who does not buy loses his job.
It is by such methods that the slim wages
of the miner are depleted through the
helplessness to which mine ownership re-
duces mine workers.

HORACE GREELY ON THE FOURTH COMMAND-
MENT.

From Greeley's "Hints Toward Reform."
"But God expressly commands men to labor
six days of every seven, and has made
obedience to this command a vital condition
of healthful and comfortable existence. (Alas,
that one man should obey and another enjoy
the reward of his obedience!) Here, in a state or
county, are 50,000 persons able and willing to
labor, with an abundance of arable land to
employ them all constantly and reward them
generously. But the land mainly belongs to a
few dozen or hundreds of this population (or,
still worse, absentee), who virtually say to
the 30,000 or 40,000 would-be laborers who
own no land, 'You can only be allowed to
work here on condition that you will allow us
(in the shape of rents, price of land or de-
pressed wages) one-half to three-fourths of
the entire product of your toil.' Is not here a
heavy tax levied by man upon obedience to
the laws of nature and of God? Who does
not see that labor is discouraged and idleness
immensely increased by this exaction, and the
power vested in the few to impose it? Yet
the most appalling feature of our present
system of landholding is the manifest tendency
of its evils to become more and more aggra-
vated and intolerable—nay, the inevitable
necessity that they should become so, if the
system itself be endured."

THE TRUTH GOES MARCHING ON.

VINCENNES, Ind., Nov. 8.—We have been
repeated, but the great truth goes marching
on. One day of the truth is more put off. I
am not discouraged. I have made two con-
verts to-day that will stick, and now we must
open the campaign for '88. W. W. BAILY.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

Cities, as things stand to-day, are the battle
ground of partisan politics—the arena of the
hot-beds of fraud.—[Kansas City Journal.]
Whether Henry George is right or wrong,
he deserves an honest hearing, and the man
who would sneer down his arguments only
shows up his own weakness of character.—
[Milwaukee Journal.]

The subject of the government owning and
controlling the telegraph system is engaging
public attention, as it ought to have done
long ago.—[Brackett, Tex., News.]

An episode like that of the Haymarket goes
a great way toward restriction of the liberties
of the people, for it prepares the public mind
to accept restrictive legislation that other-
wise no lawmakers would dare to suggest.
[Pittsburgh Labor Tribune.]

The fact that there are no tramps where
men can get work to do is sufficient evidence
of the cause of the tramp nuisance, and the
idea that tramping and starving and freezing
is a pleasurable thing is too ridiculous to think
of.—[Chicago Labor Enquirer.]

We are not stating the case too strongly
when we say that in the direction of personal
protection of society these two things—the
club of the policeman and the spy office of the
detective—are the evolutionary results of the
civilization of the nineteenth century.—[Kan-
sas City Journal.]

A land boom struck Victoria in 1862. It
would have been better for the place if a
western cyclone had swept over it. The
losses would have been less severe, the misery
less acute than that which resulted from the
feverish speculation of that period.—[Victo-
ria, B. C., Colonist.]

English lords are turning English, Irish and
Scotch tenants from the soil that London may
have more paupers, and filling the land with
game parks. Thousands of acres have gone
this way in Scotland, and it has driven
thousands of brave Scotch and Irish men
to starvation and perdition. It would
seem that the land question is very close to
the surface in English politics.—[Brooklyn
Tribune, Pa., Record.]

It would be a blessed thing if we could have
elections which would not need any inspectors
on the part of any party, and we could if we
had a really secret ballot. As it is, the claim
is made that the "two great political parties
have the thing all in their hands, and no third
party has the least 'chance of securing a
fair show.' If this is so the sooner the
legislature provides for what is called the
Australian ballot the better.—[Albany Press
and Knickerbocker.]

Under the land value system of taxation
the tax on an average farm of 100 acres
would be about three dollars a year, while
the farmer would escape entirely the
\$125 per year of tariff and other indirect
taxation which he now pays. The very central
idea of the George system is to throw tax-
ation on the things which now make million-
aires, and take it off of business and industry.
Are farmers ignorant and stupid? We doubt
it.—[Enterprise, Kansas, Anti-Monopolist.]

The principle which is at the foundation of
all Mr. George's arguments is unexceptionable.
We accept it as unqualifiedly as he
does. The principle, stating it in our own
terms, is simply this: Social wealth—the
wealth created by society as such rather than
by direct application of labor and capital—
should be made to benefit society as far
as possible, and should be appropriated for
the common good to such extent as the times
and customs of the country or community
make convenient and suitable.—[Minneapolis
Tribune.]

There are several very important reforms
that should take place in matters of taxation.
All money, bonds, mortgages, notes and
other forms of indebtedness—in fact, all per-
sonal property, should be free from taxation.
It is a fallacious idea to suppose that this
would in the end make the burden any heavier
upon the real estate owner. It would merely
equalize the burden, the mortgaged real es-
tate paying a double burden. To free money
from taxation would result in making it
cheaper to all classes of people.—[Greenpoint,
L. I., Star.]

The farmers of America are not ignorant,
but, as a class, intelligent and well read,
and always ready to improve their condition.
I had the pleasure of speaking to one of this
class who owns over four thousand acres of
land not very far from Kansas City, and he
complained of the unjust taxation that is im-
posed upon him. Not for his land values, but
for his improvements. The more he improves
his land and buildings, the more he is taxed,
and, using his own words, "If I only add
another shed, I am taxed for it."—[Corre-
spondence Kansas City Journal.]

The single tax on land values would not
give rise to an enormous army of tax gather-
ers, but the reverse. With only one tax to be
collected, that on land values, we should
largely reduce the number of these generally
unwelcome visitors. In most towns we have
a town collector and a school collector, and
in villages a third or corporation collector is
added to the list, as well as a corresponding
quota of assessors. All these would be wiped
out, save a single set. We should have no
custom houses with their myriads of office
holders, all fattening on the public and pro-
ducing nothing.—[Middletown, N. Y., Ad-
vocate.]

BUT THE QUESTION YOU WILL NOT STOP TO DIS-
CUSS IS THE VERY THING THAT LIES AT THE
ROOT OF THE WHOLE MATTER.

Exchange.
Pennsylvania is not behind any other state
in providing for the rights of the working
classes in so far as it is possible to meet those
wants through legislative enactment. A list
of the mere titles of the laws intended to pro-
tect the interests, guard the rights, and secure
the personal safety of those who toil and fill
several columns of space, while the details
would make a large-sized volume.

During the last session of the legislature
nearly a dozen different laws were added to
the already long list of the laws referred to.
Among these are the following: To prohibit
the employment of any child under the age of
twelve years, by any person or firm, to work
in any mill, manufactory or mine, or any
work pertaining thereto; to require any part-
nership or corporation, retaining from their
persons in their employ, under penalty
of forfeiture of a part of wages due, a
notice of intention to leave such employ, to
give notice of intention to discharge, under
penalty of a sum equal to the amount of said
forfeiture, except for incapacity or miscon-
duct; to limit the hours of labor of conductors,
drivers and employees of cable or horse car
companies to twelve hours a day; to require
wages to be paid semi-monthly; to require
secure laborers within the Commonwealth the
benefit of the exemption laws, and to prevent
assignment of claims for the purposes of
securing their collection against non-resident
laborers; giving mechanics and laborers a lien
for labor done on buildings where the claim is
not less than \$10, and to encourage and au-
thorize the formation of co-operative associations.

Whether these several acts will meet the
purposes intended, or only add more pages
to the statute book, we shall not stop
to discuss. The fact ought to be apparent to
all who labor that any reasonable demand
they choose to make upon the state legislature
is sure to be granted.

A GOOD DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIES.

Toronto Labor Reformer.
The London *Advertiser*

STATE OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS.

Steady Progress Toward Government Control on the Continent of Europe—The Belgian Example in Belgium.

The inter-state law is destined to advance the principle of the acquisition of railways by government more than volumes of print and years of discussion. The workings of the law have already produced a demand that the government should purchase all our railways. There is every indication that we have entered upon an industrial struggle in this country in which we shall need to use all our advantages if we mean to hold our own. Is it not therefore high time that we should take stock of our position? The worst course which can be followed in the interests of all parties is that of drifting. Delay is dangerous to the shareholders and prejudicial to the whole community. But before state purchase can either be accepted or neglected, fuller information than is ordinarily possessed by the public is wanted.

Government activity in the acquisition of railways has very much advanced in recent years on the continent of Europe, and it is well for our people to know it.

In 1875 there were on the continent 60,246 miles of railway, of which 14,268 miles, or about 20 per cent, belonged to government. Seven years later the mileage had risen to 88,782, of which 32,563 miles, or about thirty-six per cent, were in the hands of government.

Further acquisitions since 1882 have placed about fifty per cent of the continental lines under the management of the state. In Germany the transfer of the entire railway system to the government is nearly complete, and in Belgium it is only a question of time.

This statement, however, does not explain the full extent to which foreign governments have provided facilities for transport or the grasp they have upon the railways. Private companies have everywhere been assisted by government guarantees and subventions. The great engineering works under the Alps, the vast lines which connect the Black sea and the Baltic, and open up the far east to commerce, have been constructed with government aid. In every country except our own the revision has been secured by the state, and the people will succeed to a valuable inheritance by effluxion of time. Their position becomes more favorable every day in case it is found desirable to take the railways under their own administration. The money which the companies spend the better in the long run will it be for the people. Here our position is exactly the reverse. The larger the capital charge piled up by the companies, the more will the people be taxed in the form of rates to meet the swollen interest thereon.

Among the states which own and manage their own railways, Belgium has had the longest experience, and has obtained the best results, and we are able to form an opinion how they affect industry over a series of years under fluctuations of commerce. As joint stock railways have also been in operation there for many years, and have been allowed such freedom by the state, we are also able to determine which system is suitable to a nation of traders—a mixed manufacturing and agricultural country—as Belgium confessedly is.

The experiment has another value. It has been carried out gradually, tested thoroughly and adapted by degrees to the demands of industry. Both systems have had a fair trial. The state has not forced the hands of the companies, or set up an arbitrary standard of management, or driven them out of the field by excessive competition. If eventually the government obtain entire control of the system—as it seems certain it will do—it will be because the community is convinced that state management is more advantageous in the long run.

The balance of ownership between the state and the companies has varied from time to time. In 1850 the state possessed 288 miles of line, against 166 miles belonging to the companies. In 1855 the proportion was reversed, the companies having 560 miles, against 409 miles belonging to the government. In 1864 another change had occurred. The state owned 1,431 miles, compared with 780 miles belonging to the companies. The conclusion is inevitable that, notwithstanding the advantages conceded to industry, the state always must have been a fair financial success, as otherwise the companies would not have been able to compete for half a century against an antagonist which had the state purse to pull upon.

In 1864 the government first used its power to do exactly what our merchants and the railway companies do without success—they leveled the rates down all along the line. The minister stated that the results surpassed all expectation. The increase of traffic in half a year was equivalent to the average increase for three years. The increase of tonnage in the eighth year of the experiment was 106.32 per cent. This addition was practically on the same mileage, the government having acquired only fifty miles extra line.

The minister then sums up the general result of eight years' working: (1) The charges on goods have been lowered on an average by twenty-eight per cent. (2) The public have dispatched 2,706,000 tons more, while they have economized more than \$4,000,000 on the cost of carriage. (3) The public treasury has realized \$1,516,200 more, after having paid the cost of working and interest of capital.

The prosperity of which this experiment was the foundation is exhibited in the development of succeeding periods. In the next seven years (1864 to 1871) the goods traffic rose from 5,251,000 tons to 11,204,000 tons—that is to say, it more than doubled. In the following twelve years, down to 1885, it reached 22,033,347 tons—that is to say, it doubled again.

The reduction in rates was so successful that the public opinion demanded the extension of the principle of passenger fares. The legislature therefore delegated to the executive the power to make limited concessions. No alterations were made for short distances—less than six miles. Provisional decrees were made in the intermediate stage, between twenty-two and forty-nine miles, and large and definite reductions were made for longer distances. In the last stage the first class fare was reduced from 1.24d to 0.44d per mile, or on a distance of 155 miles from 16s. to 6s.—that is, from \$5.54 to \$1.44. The second class was reduced in like proportion.

In the year for the reduction in Belgium the increase of passengers in the zone where no change was made was 2 per cent, the increase where the provisional reduction was made was 20 per cent, and where the larger and definite reduction was made it was 92 per cent. Subsequent alterations had the effect of reducing the average fares, of increasing the number of passengers and increasing the profits. The passengers on the state railways rose from 45,032,882 in 1880 to 50,465,943 in 1884.

The advocates of state railways are entitled also to take credit for the fact that, side by side with state administration and the successive reduction of fares as well as rates, the country has developed a degree of material prosperity unequalled by any other nation of similar area, population and resources in the world.

In the face of these facts, we are confident

that, when the best application of national means to national ends is clearly apprehended by the masses, railways will be regarded as the beasts of burden of the nation, and they will no more think of using them for direct profits than the head of a family now thinks of debiting each member with the hire of his conveyance every time it is used.

Our strength in America is as yet unimpaired; our superiority in productive power is unquestioned and unequalled, but it is not on that account wise or prudent that we should neglect to look ahead and gather what useful lessons we may from the experience of other nations.

ALFRED L. ROYCE, U. S. N.

They Will Misrepresent Anhow, as Long as They Can.

NEW YORK.—I have been many years heartily in favor of the principle you advocate, holding it the first measure needed to rescue the people from the grasp of sharper plunderers; and I shall do all in my power to sustain the party that works for this. I believe that misunderstanding of the matter by the masses is the chief obstacle in the way of its rapid success. I want to suggest what seems to me an imperfection in your naming of the idea, and which leaves the monopolists' papers power to misrepresent and keep up the mistaken view that they have given the farmers. The principle you advocate is really the taxing of land-location values—the values which our industrial system gives to places in or near our business centers; this is to be taken and used for the public benefit. Very poor land is of great value in such places, while farms of the best land, which cannot become city or town lots and are not accessible as city or village suburban residence, near the markets, railroads or other conveyances to market, will rarely sell for what improvements cost—what would make of wild lands such a farm—or rent for more than a small per cent on the price of improvement. I know of many such farms within fifty miles of New York city. I believe that three-fourths, if not nine-tenths, of the farms of our country, if the improvements were exempt, would have no tax, or far less than the land and improvements now have. This should be kept constantly before the farmers, and though your explanations show all the way to those who carefully study them, yet too few do this, and it seems to me that if you constantly used the term "land-location values" it would forestall the misrepresentations with which capitalistic papers deceive farmers.

CALVIN S. WEEKS.

They'll "Fight It Out on that Line."

LOS ANGELES, Cal., Nov. 8.—Acting on the suggestion of Dr. McGlynn in a late issue of THE STANDARD, that associate anti-poverty societies be formed wherever possible, the following sympathizers in this place, R. W. Ready, Major Isaac Kinley, M. Street, Mr. Brown, master workman of K. of L. local; Rev. Ely Fay, Rev. Mr. Cantine, Rev. Dr. Cox, Mr. Bailey, myself and others, have been working for two weeks past to organize a society. We have interested many other ladies and gentlemen, have secured the promise of a large meeting hall, and of a number of voices for a choir. The executive committee of the party here is organizing for an active fight during the coming year on the lines laid down in the Syracuse platform.

Three weeks ago I asked the booksellers here who sell THE STANDARD to get twenty copies more than they were getting, guaranteeing sale for them. I paid for what was unsold, and distributed them in the labor organizations; and the next week asked each of the three newsdealers to add twenty more copies, guaranteeing sale for them, as before, and last week, seeing an increasing demand for THE STANDARD, I asked these newsdealers to get 100 copies each on my account. Two of them say they have ordered 100 STANDARDS each more than they had been getting, with one dozen display cards.

W. H. DODGE.

Addressed to Men who Shrink from Discussion.

"The Right of Free Speech." Section 3 of Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics."

For there are invariably some—and not a small number, either—who regard the discussion of every question that comes uppermost with dread, and predict all kinds of disasters from its continuance.

Old women of both sexes working themselves into a state of great tribulation over the terrible vaticinations of a *Standard* or the melancholy wailings of a *Herald* would fain have put down the free trade propagandist and if their "sense of security" had been duly consulted, they should have had their way. Religious disabilities, too, ought, for the same reason, to have been still maintained, for the proposal to repeal them was productive of extreme consternation to multitudes of weak-minded people.

Well, here was a useful loss of the "sense of security," and therefore the authorities ought to have stopped the movement for Catholic emancipation by gagging all its advocates, fettering its press, and preventing its meetings.

An Honest Adversary Convinced.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.—I am a German by birth, and a member of the Methodist Episcopal church. We have here what we call a Young people's society, the object of which is literary and musical advancement. The pastor of our church is our president, and he shares your views on the land taxation question. Recently he asked one of the young men to give us your views on the land question, which the young man did. I did not then share your views, and, therefore, asked the chairman if it would not be a good plan to have some one state to us why your ideas would not work to day; whereupon I was told to prepare for and answer that question. For three weeks I read your book in my spare moments, and wrote page after page, which, I at first thought, knocked your views in the shade. But when I read on and on, it gradually dawned upon my mind that I was wrong and you were right. Instead of ridiculing your ideas, as I intended to do, I yielded them to the great surprise of everybody. I am putting in a word for this great cause wherever I can.

W. LICHTWART.

What Her Bible Tells a Young Girl.

NEW YORK, Nov. 15.—I have heard the pro-poverty people say a great many times that to attempt to abolish poverty would be wicked and contrary to the will of Providence. Christ's words are quoted: "The poor ye have always with you, even unto the end of the earth." It was a great pleasure to me when, the other day, I came upon a Bible verse, which I think is a good argument on our side of the question, and I should like all anti-poverty people to know it, so I decided to write and ask you to publish it in THE STANDARD. Psalm, chapter ix, verse 18: "The needy shall not always be forgotten; the expectation of the poor shall not perish forever." Any one having a reference Bible will find several more to the same effect.

H. G. R.

IN WESTCHESTER COUNTY.

How the Cause Takes Hold of the People—The New Pushing the Movement.

PEEKSKILL, Nov. 10.—During the last five days I have been traveling through Westchester county doing missionary work and learning the condition of organization. In all the places I visited the land and labor clubs were active; meetings have been held since election day, the machinery of the organizations has been strengthened, and fresh plans for the propagation of the faith have been adopted. Our men hereabouts are up and doing, and talk of the future with enthusiasm.

At Yonkers, which was the first point visited, there is a club of over forty members. A meeting was held a few days after election and four new names were added to the roll. It was decided that the work of education should not be confined to Yonkers, but that measures be taken to scour the country around and supply the farmers with tracts.

Alexander Sutherland, who represented the county in the state committee, and who was very active in organizing during the recent campaign, was in the best humor possible. He contended that although Westchester county had polled only 1,001 votes for the state ticket, Yonkers giving 348, such were the powerful influences arrayed against the new party that none but men strong of purpose and thoroughly imbued with the principle of the single tax dared stand up and vote our ticket. Every one of these 1,001 men, he believed, could be relied on for missionary labors, not to mention the work which would certainly be done by men who had embraced the faith, but who, for fear of losing their situations, or of being ostracized, or from unwillingness to "throw away their votes," had failed to show the courage of their convictions. So far from being downcast at the apparently small vote, he said that all reformers who would have been cast at Yonkers' point had there been more time to think about the doctrines which the majority had on that occasion heard stated for the first time.

A few miles north of Sing Sing is Croton, a rather small place, chiefly concerned in brick burning. Several large estates have brick making establishments, which combine can turn out more than 200,000 bricks a day. Lately a new concern, the Croton company, has discovered an economy of transportation in digging the clay from the river bottom when the water is shallow. Thus is the privilege of private property extended to the very bottom of the river.

A year ago William H. Daly moved from New York into Croton. He was the only man in the town who knew anything about the theory of putting all taxes on land values, and he began at once to teach it to others. He soon gathered a few earnest men around him, and though they had not succeeded in drawing out many votes for the united labor party, they remained undaunted and were working as zealously as ever. Sanford Dorn, Chester A. Weller, A. Herzog, Abe Anderson, Brookland Anderson, Michael Walsh, Abe Anderson, Jr., John Anderson, John Ryan, James Lynch and Mr. Manchester are all fast enlisted in the anti-poverty crusade. Mr. Daly reports that though a New York resident for many years, he never saw such flagrant violation of the election laws as he witnessed in Croton on the 8th inst. Money was openly passed in the polling place after the ballots had been deposited, and men were marched from the brick yards to the polls like so many prisoners, voting a bunch of tickets which had been put in their hands while the foreman stood on watch at the door.

Similar reports of shameful corruption at the polls I heard on arriving at Peekskill yesterday afternoon. Money influenced the deciding ballots in the contest, and men who might otherwise have remained in the ranks of the old parties turned away in disgust at the violation of the rights and duties of the franchise. The adoption of the Australian system of voting is advocated by the members of the land and labor club with increased fervor, and the measure is finding stalwart adherents among well intentioned men, irrespective of party affiliations. And the other reforms which this club has at heart have come into wider and more general discussion. The club is more defiant and aggressive than ever, and intends to put a straight ticket in the field in the spring local election in order to bring its principles into fuller discussion. No opportunity to plant seed is ever permitted to pass unimproved. Mr. Sylvester keeps an assortment of tracts in his little shoe shop close to his hand, and John Buttery points out "the cat" to anybody who comes for a load of door frames or window sashes to the planing mill where he is employed.

Peekskill, like nearly every other town, furnishes plentiful illustrations of the way in which the present method of taxation encourages land speculation. For instance, an acre of land situated in the very heart of the village is appraised and assessed as farming land, save a small portion consisting of three lots, which have been measured off, and upon which buildings have been or are being erected. Upon the land comprising these three lots, irrespective of the tax upon the improvements themselves, the burden of taxation is greatly increased. Mr. Chauncey M. Depew, I am informed, holds a similar but much larger piece of unused land in the southern part of the village, and though it is notoriously very valuable, and would sell, as building lots, for a small fortune, it bears the light assessment of "unimproved farming land." This unjust discrimination between improved and unimproved land, though side by side and presenting the same natural advantages, is readily perceived, and it is only a step further to see how, if all taxes were shifted from improvements to the value of land, Mr. Depew would find less inducement to keep his land vacant, and would either put it to use, thus giving employment to labor and capital, or would throw it into the market, to be taken by somebody who would use it. And thus it would be with all land now held for speculation, and the result would be that rents would depreciate as this land was forced into use, and wages would rise as competition for employment.

Cases of this kind are everywhere prevalent, and are being pointed to with telling effect.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

A Christian Without Knowing It.

ATCHISON, Kan.—The result of the campaign in New York is to me very encouraging. Seventy-three thousand votes cast in a single state in support of a great principle, it seems to me, a grand showing and an assurance of ultimate success.

I shall commence aggressive movements at once, and expect to see a well organized united labor club in Atchison at an early day. My heart is in this movement. Though not a Christian, I can still see in this crusade a grand reform movement along the line of liberty and justice toward a grander, purer and more intelligent humanity than this world has heretofore dreamed of.

C. H. ALLEN.

THE SPINGLER FARM.

The Splendid Income Derived by a Family That Has Done Nothing for the City's Prosperity.

The New York World recently printed a gossip article about three old houses still occupied by eccentric old people in this city, and situated in the midst of business buildings. The fact that these people, because of their neglect to put the ground they occupy to the best use, and that they are because of this permitted to escape the measure of taxation falling on their more enterprising neighbors, has probably never occurred to the World. It is, nevertheless, a situation that would not be likely to exist if all taxes were laid on land values.

In the course of its article the World gives an interesting description of the Spingler estate that even more directly bears on the land question. After describing the double brown stone mansion at No. 23 West Fourteenth street, occupied by Mrs. Vanburen, it says that the old lady is the oldest living representative of the great Spingler estate, which it thus describes:

"The Spingler estate is the remains of what once was the Spingler farm, whose acres spread westward from what is now Union square. As the city grew to the northward the land, of course, became more valuable, and taxes and assessments upon it became frequent. To meet these disbursements lots were occasionally sold out of the farm land, and the integrity of the farm as it first stood has been therefore impaired to a certain extent; but the Spingler estate now covers practically the four blocks bounded by Thirteenth and Fifteenth streets, Sixth avenue on the west, and University place and Union square on the east. It comprises such houses as Tiffany's, Brentano's, the Manhattan Club, and two or three of the large dry goods houses on the west side of Fourteenth street. It does not include Macy's establishment nor the property immediately opposite, and on the north side of Fourteenth street it does not extend further west than the Presbyterian church. All this property is leasehold property—that is to say, the Spingler estate have no present interest in the buildings which are erected on the land. They have simply leased the land itself to people intending to build on leases running twenty-one years, with the understanding that if the lease is not renewed the building shall be bought by the estate on a proper appraisal of its value. It is noted by all real estate agents as a fact worthy to be noted that in no case has advantage ever been taken of the people who put up buildings or made other improvements on the land. In the case of one large \$100,000 building on West Fourteenth street, it was built about three years before the termination of the lease. How large the Vanburen family income from these land rentals is can be approximately estimated. As already mentioned, the more valuable fronts on Fourteenth street, Fifth avenue and Union square are rated at \$3,000 to \$5,000 a lot, and on Thirteenth street \$1,000 a lot would be about the figure. At this rate it is obvious that the income of Mrs. Vanburen and her immediate family runs up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars, and must necessarily be increasing all the time. The estate is regarded among real estate men as one of the finest and most desirable in the city because of the fact that the land lies all together and is not distributed in a dozen different directions."

There is a story that the original owner of the Spingler estate mysteriously disappeared and that Spingler, his gardener, came into possession of it merely as its custodian. The owner never appeared and the old gardener passed on the custody to his heirs, who have become its legal possessors through mere continuance of tenure. Be this as it may, it is clear, even from the World's narrative, that they have done nothing but hold on to it and have contributed nothing whatever toward that wonderful growth that made Union square for years the very heart of New York until the continuous movement of population and business northward made Madison square the new center of the city. But though they have contributed nothing to this movement, the heirs of the Spingler farm have profited by it enormously. Under a just system of taxing land values this annual increase would have gone into the public treasury instead of into the pocket of this estimable old lady, who persists in occupying space for a mansion in one of the most crowded thoroughfares of our city.

The facts as stated by the World also answer a question frequently raised by those who object to the single land tax theory, and that is: Who would erect costly buildings on such a tenure? Here it is stated that within four years of the expiration of a lease on this Spingler property a tenant erected a \$100,000 building on it, trusting to the traditional fairness of the owners of the estate in dealing with their tenants. Is this a tenure to be compared in permanency with a freehold subject to a tax equal to the rental value of the property to be levied by public officers elected by the people, who would have a personal interest in keeping taxes from going so high that property would be forced out of use?

The little sketch in the World is an object lesson in the single tax theory. What would have happened had a just system of taxation prevailed in this city from the beginning? Simply this: The people who occupy the property between Union square and Sixth avenue would have paid their ground rents into the city treasury instead of into the pockets of the Spingler heirs. This would not have been so pleasant for these heirs, but it would have been vastly better for the people of New York.

ANTI-POVERTY OUT OF TOWN.

Following are extracts from letters received during the week at the Anti-poverty society's office, 30 Cooper union, and at THE STANDARD office:

WILL WALK ALL THE HARDER.

BROOKLYN.—I have no doubt we shall ultimately succeed. I know the seed has been well sown, and that in due time the harvest shall come. Feeling confident of our ultimate success, I am not much cast down by the result of the election. Inclosed find my semi-monthly subscription.

FELLOW CHRISTIANS ARMYED AGAINST A COMMON ENEMY.

CINCINNATI, O.—A lady to whom I read your letter made me explain our whole movement to her, and I know she will be a reliable co-operator in future. Our pastor, I expect, will oppose us, but if he says anything in the pulpit against us, I'll challenge him to a debate on the matter. You ought to hear me lecture to my Bible class on "Consider the lilies of the field" or "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth," or strengthening their faith by "According to your faith be it unto you," or showing that mammon is persecuting true Christians as much to-day as was done by the rack or flames in the early days of persecution, and introducing the name of Dr. McGlynn (God bless him) on cross bearing. I presume of your name (referring to the secretary of the Anti-poverty society) that you are a Catholic, and it is a constant

source of joy to me that I can now look on Catholics, not with suspicion and dread, as formerly, but as fellow Christians fighting a common enemy for the glory of God and the love of man. Before coming into this movement I learned broad things and good concerning Catholicism, but now I can triumphantly point to Dr. McGlynn as the greatest preacher of the purest gospel that I have ever heard of read.

R. W. HARRISON.

THREE-FOURTHS OF HIS NEIGHBORS CONVERTED.

WACO, Tex.—I certainly shall distribute the tracts where they will do most good. I keep a supply on hand always. We have held Henry George meetings here and there was enthusiastic interest in the work. Three-fourths of my neighbors are now all right. Made an address in Waco to the Workingmen's aid society. It was well received. Please send me necessary papers and instructions and we will organize an anti-poverty society.

I. L. CALDWELL.

HELPING THEM TO SEE.

HIGHBRIDGE, N. Y.—Your tracts received. God helping me I will do my best to help others to see what I see. Hoping to see more, J. H. DRUMMOND.

THEY WILL WORK RIGHT ALONG.

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 12.—When we think of the impending financial crisis we feel like rejoicing that we were not immediately successful, for, as was said in THE STANDARD, we would have been pointed at as the cause. And the only victory any intelligent man can see in it is a victory for corruption, and how dare respectable people rejoice in such a victory? We have begun a systematic ward organization of the city preparatory to the campaign of 1888, and propose to work right straight along with might and main through to the end. We propose at once to send a speaker or two throughout the state to arouse the people and organize clubs. We want to be much more aggressive than we have been in the past and will be only too glad to get a few hints now and then from our veteran fellow soldiers of the cross of the new crusade in New York.

JOHN F. HALBACH,

Treasurer Philadelphia A. P. S.

A GREAT MEETING IN ST. LOUIS.

Enterprise hall in St. Louis was packed on the occasion of Judge Maguire's visit Sunday evening, Nov. 13. The judge's address was received with great applause, and is spoken of by the St. Louis press as an eloquent one. He said that from an analysis of the vote of Nov. 8 he believed that 35,000 adherents had been gained since the election of last year to the grand principles of the new party. The vote for Mr. George in the mayoralty contest was a protest not based upon a well defined cause, and standing for no clear cut conviction or well established principle. This fall the situation was changed. A new party had been born; a principle had been set forth, and those who were not for that principle were arrayed against it. He regarded it as an encouraging sign that the new movement was represented by nearly 40,000 in New York city and 35,000 elsewhere in the state. He remembered ten years ago when George could only summon three men who had examined his theories and accepted them.

At the conclusion of Judge Maguire's address, H. Martin Williams made a speech that well reflected the hopeful and determined attitude of the audience.

THE NINTH REGULAR MEETING IN BOSTON.

BOSTON, Nov. 21.—The Boston Anti-poverty society held its ninth regular weekly public meeting at Horticultural hall last evening. The president, Mr. J. R. Roche, occupied the chair, and addresses were made by Mr. Andrew Garbutt, president of land and labor club No. 2 of Boston and Mr. Samuel Brazin of Birmingham, Eng. There was a fair attendance. A collection of \$18.30 was taken up. After the regular addresses a sort of "experience" meeting was held, at which an able expounder of the doctrine of the land for the people was discovered in the person of Professor Hamlin Garland of Boston. Professor Garland will address the tenth meeting, to be held at the same hall next Sunday evening.

"The Standard" in the National Park.

G. L. Henderson, writing under the date of Oct. 30, from Yellowstone park, says that THE STANDARD is finding appreciative readers in the heart of the Rocky mountains. William C. Douglass, a subscriber, has passed his copy around until it is read by twenty people beside himself. Mr. Henderson says: "Dr. McGlynn has now become the ideal American priest, and his sermons are read around the campfires of soldiers, miners and hunters. The proposition to abolish poverty from the earth at first seems so startling that a vague fear arises that there is a tinge of insanity in the minds of those who instigate the hope. Dr. John P. Newman, while on his way through wonderland, was interdicted concerning the new crusade. He contended that Dr. McGlynn had an excellent record. He had been loyal to the government when its enemies sought to destroy the Union; he had been loyal to humanity in favoring the abolition of slavery, and he had been loyal to universal education in his defense of the common schools. Dr. McGlynn had done well, and he deserved the good will and gratitude of all good men, but in attempting to abolish poverty he was seeking an impossible utopia." Dr. Newman was asked if he had any faith in the possibility of realizing that portion of the Lord's prayer, asking that God's will shall be done on earth as it is in Heaven. He declared that this would be accomplished, but not in the way that man anticipated.

A Clergyman who Nails His Colors to the Mast.

FREDONIA, Kas.—I wish to express my delight at the spirit in which the united labor party accept their first reverse.

The great parties say they have slain and buried our principle once and forever; but we know that no great truth can be thus destroyed. Let us continue to study and to spread our doctrines. If they are false, we want to find it out; if true, then they will advance and overcome all opposition, for truth is omnipotent.

My plan for the future is to induce people to give the subject study and thought. To this end I shall spread anti-poverty literature and discuss the question in private and public. I do not think that any line of thought has ever advanced more than this. How many difficulties it takes away from the mind of the Christian, and what an inspiration it is to his hopes! Yours truly,

(Rev.) T. SHERK.

What's Preached in New South Wales.

LAGDON, New South Wales, Eastern.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are certain that we know the true method of dealing with the land question to the greatest good of the world, and we are certain that we can prove what we assert. But to do this we shall give the fullest scope to the opinions of those who differ from us, and the more they differ, the more willingly will we give them ample room to say their say. Our position is this: "That no more land will be absolutely sold; that a progressive tax be put upon all land already sold, which shall gradually divert the whole value of it from the pockets of private owners into the coffers of the state; and that no taxation shall be on anything whatsoever except land." In the observance of these conditions lies hidden the solution of the problem of human poverty and suffering.

LETTERS TO A WAYNE COUNTY FARMER.

My Dear Cousin: Your letter received. It calls to mind the following lines, which I once read in an old book. They were printed beneath the pictures of a king, a soldier, a priest and a farmer:

The king proclaims, "I govern all!"
The priest declares, "I pray for all!"
The farmer exclaims, "I pay for all!"—
which he is represented as doing with a very free face.

You state that you are determined to sell the old homestead and engage in some other business, giving as a reason that "farming doesn't pay."

Don't pay! Do not seed time and harvest follow each other as in the years gone by! Do not your orchards blossom and bear fruit, your fields change with the seasons their brown to green, and later on to golden waves of grain under the kindly influence of the summer sun, and rain! Are not your granaries filled to overflowing after the threshers have come and gone!

Why is it, then, that farming doesn't pay? It is not because your wages—the wealth that you have drawn from nature's bosom—are siphoned from you by those who profit and grow fat upon the proceeds of the toil of others! The farmer rises with the first faint glimmer of the dawn in the east; he labors on with aching back and blistered hands till the shadows fall and the stars come out in the evening sky, struggling even the sacred day of rest from the busy season.

As I write, the vision rises before me of the old farm, with its broad fields, the orchards laden with fruit, the wood lot crimson in its October glory, the quaint old farm house, built with honest work and lasting materials, were more thought of than the gaudy veneer of modern country house architecture; the great barns and cattle sheds with their high mow, where once we had rare sport practicing gymnastics on the soft hay. And it seems to me that on such a spot good luck should empty out her horn of plenty at the feet of industry, and that the farmer's sons would never care to leave the old home and its comforts to take their chances in the struggle for existence among the crowds that gather in the vanity fair.

The truth is you do not get all that your labor produces nor a fair return for the capital you are obliged to invest in purchasing a spot on God's earth on which to employ your labor.

I propose in this and other letters to show you how you are robbed, by whom and what can best be done to prevent it in the future.

There is a robber who ever lies in wait at your door, and as your labor and industry creates wealth, rises up to demand a portion, leaving blackmail upon your enterprise, putting a fine upon your production and punishing you for thrift as though it were an offense against public morals.

Tax is the name of the robber. Sometimes he openly demands a part of what the farmer produces, but frequently he takes by indirect means, exacting a far greater portion than the farmer would yield upon a direct command to "stand and deliver." The drain on the farmer's resources from direct taxation, and the still greater drain from the pocket-picking style of the indirect form, make what is left so pitifully small that the purchase of labor-saving machinery must be deferred. The boys must stay at home from school, and wife and daughter must work harder and dress poorer than do factory girls in town and city.

Let us look into this matter of taxation, observe the manner in which taxes are levied on the farmer and compare it with the method of the assessment upon the property of others. The farmer is assessed at from sixty to eighty per cent of the selling value of his farm and improvements. On this he must pay in direct taxation state taxes, county taxes, town taxes, road taxes, school taxes, and from time to time some special tax. His property is all out of doors, in plain sight of the assessor, who couldn't miss it if he tried; so down it goes on the assessment roll for every penny it is worth. If the barn is painted or a few rods of fence built, if the old house is remodeled to make it more comfortable, if a stump lot be cleared or a swamp drained, up goes the assessment and down must he pay the increased taxes. The tax is levied upon him by the town, county and state for his enterprise and industry.

He thinks it hard that he should be thus taxed on the evidences of his labor and thrift, and he asks himself whether his fellow citizens in general pay the same proportion of taxes that he does. If all pay alike, he thinks it fair. But do any escape their share of the burden? Do assessors assess value uniformly? No, with small possessions, pays a large percentage in taxes, while enormous sums must be gathered from wealthy men and corporations!

Here is a farmer who has scraped money enough together to pay his taxes. Let us see what is likely to occur on his trip to town in visiting the tax gatherer. He hitches up the old horse and sets out from home. On the way his mind naturally turns toward the subject of taxation, and he wonders what his neighbors pay. As he draws near the village he comes to the farm of an acquaintance who, though an unsuccessful farmer and a far from industrious man, seems to have been born with the traditional silver spoon in his mouth. His friend steps out from a knot of workmen, and, laying down a surveyor's chain, climbs the fence, proffers a cigar, and enters into conversation. The farmer finds his friend can only talk on one subject—real estate—and is not at all conversant with the figures that drop so easily from the speculator's tongue.

"This farm cost me a hundred dollars per acre five years ago," says the speculator, "and I had a pretty hard time getting along with interest, taxes and so on to pay. But one day they decided to run a railroad along here, and they built the depot over there on one corner of my farm. Then things began to boom. I bought for a hundred and sold for a thousand dollars per acre. Pretty good profit that," he continues, puffing away at his cigar, and glancing complacently from the farmer's faded clothes back to his own fashionable suit. "I gave away a lot of two just to start things, sold some more, and lent the fellows that bought them the money they paid for the lots to build with, taking a mortgage on the whole for security. Pretty good that!"

And he laughingly says good-by, and goes to meet a prospective customer he spies coming toward him.

The farmer drives on with, I am afraid, a little envy ranking in his heart as he thinks with a sigh of the days and months of toil, the economy and self denial he must practice before he can save as much as the land speculator will make in that afternoon's sale. He thinks how his boys long for a college education, and why he didn't have the luck to have a railroad run through his farm, dropping a depot and a growing town near by.

"Well, he must have a pretty penny of taxes to pay," thinks the farmer, as he pulls up in front of the tax collector's office. He walks in, pays his taxes, and as he folds up the receipt inquires in a casual way how much his friend of the building lots pays. Imagine

his astonishment when he learns that he pays little if any more than he himself, that they are both assessed as owning farming land of about the same value. While in reality the farmer is assessed at about seventy-five per cent of what he would gladly sell his farm for, the speculator is assessed at only from ten to twenty per cent of what he will get for his land. He inquires of the collector, who says:

"We have to draw the line somewhere and so we stop at five acres. All over that we assess as farming land, and all less as building or village lots."

"Then you assess that ten acres over there as farming land, and if it is divided into lots and sold, each purchaser must pay taxes on building lots?"

The collector is forced to admit that to be the truth. The farmer pursues his inquiry and finds that the vacant lots are assessed at a much lower percentage of their real value than is improved property; that the vacant lot worth two or three hundred dollars is assessed at from a hundred and fifty to two hundred dollars; that the vacant lots that lie near the center of the town and could not be bought for thousands are assessed still lower, at less than two or three hundred dollars, while the brick block adjoining is taxed for from two-thirds to three-fourths of what it is worth. He inquires the reason and is told that as the vacant lots don't produce any income to the owner, it isn't fair to tax them too much; that the land speculator's land is taxed at what it would be worth if used only for agricultural purposes, and so made to yield an income; that as he don't get any income from it now, it ought not to be taxed any higher.

This is a puzzle to the farmer, who bought for a hundred and in five years sells for a thousand dollars per acre doesn't get a rather larger income than he could if he had stuck to farming. He puts up again at the store where he "does his trading," unloads a jar of butter, and while making his barter with the storekeeper enters into conversation upon the subject of taxation with him.

The farmer has already found out, first, that he pays on about double the assessment in proportion to value that the land speculator does; second, that the owner of a cheap building lot pays on a higher proportionate assessment than the owner of a valuable lot; thirdly, that the owners of improved property pay on a higher proportionate assessment than the owners of unimproved land.

It begins to look to the farmer as though there couldn't be a better plan devised to punish industry, enterprise and thrift, or to benefit the rich at the expense of the poor. But he goes on to the store, and before he comes out will learn that this is only one way in which the farmer is robbed.

Wm. C. Wood, M. D.
Gloversville, Nov. 13, 1887.

AMONG THE FARMERS.

There is no field of labor which promises better results for recruiting the ranks of the United Labor party than the rural districts. Our American farmers as a class are honest and conscientious, and when once convinced of the truth of a great principle, they will stand by it, work for it and vote it. Many of them improve their leisure during the long winter in reading and study, but unfortunately their papers and periodicals come mostly from the opposition press. They have been misled and prejudiced against the land theories of Henry George, and made to think that the burden of taxation would fall upon their already overburdened shoulders; but I find that a plain statement of our principles soon disabuses their minds of this error and wins them over to our side.

I have been holding public meetings in rural villages in Indiana the past week, and my audiences were composed largely of farmers. They listen eagerly, ask questions, and almost to a man acknowledge that they had been misinformed on the subject. Many come out at once and declare their conversion and adhesion to the single tax on land values. They say that they are taxed on everything directly and indirectly; taxed almost out of farm and home. A brief explanation enables them to understand the distinction between taxing land and taxing land values. They see that the latter tax, the only one proposed by us, would fall chiefly upon city and village lots and mining districts, and that farmers would have comparatively but a light tax to pay when all improvements, which in the majority of cases constitute three-fourths of the worth of farms, are exempt from taxation.

I am making my home with an old acquaintance, Mr. William B. Mohler, while speaking of this country, and he has been so much interested that he goes with me from meeting to meeting. He is a farmer and an active greenbacker. I found him very suspicious of the "Henry George theory." At the close of my first meeting he said to me, "You are right. Give us the single tax and we'll be better off. We farmers are taxed, taxed—taxed on everything! till there is nothing left to show for our hard work." He went on to say that he had a good farm, worth at least \$100 per acre. Forty-five dollars of the sixty dollars of value is due, he said, to improvements—to clearing off the timber, grubbing out the stumps, ditching and tilling, and to buildings and fences and orchards. He says he is now taxed, not only on the whole value, but on everything he produces. Once a year the assessor comes around and questions him as to every item of produce he possesses, and he is taxed on them all. "How many acres of corn?" "How many cattle?" "How many hogs?" "How many chickens and geese and ducks?" "How much wheat and corn and rye and hay and potatoes?" "How many wagons and harnesses and plows and cultivators and reapers and mowers?" are among the many questions asked and items taxed. He is fined for keeping a sewing machine, an organ, a lawnmower, a watch dog and an old broken-down horse. The subject is properly presented. Greater effort should be made to spread the light through the rural districts.

Leo Miller.
Rushville, Ind., Nov. 18, 1887.

The People Give the Elevated Road Its Franchise, and the Landlords Reap the Benefit.

No one will dispute the fact that property in the upper wards almost doubles in value with each succeeding year. In many localities of the Eighteenth ward, the value of lots has increased so rapidly that property which sold twenty years ago for from \$500 to \$1,000 per lot, now sells from \$1,200 to \$2,000. In 1855 the *Blade* predicted this advance in real estate prices, at the same time stating that lots in the Twenty-first and Twenty-fifth wards would increase at the same ratio, which is now proven by the sales reported in the *Free Press* and other journals.

Again the *Blade* intends to prophesy that "present real estate values will double before 1888." Thus it will be plainly seen that the sooner an investment is made, the better for the investor. This is the case with the new elevated road, now that the new elevated road is almost completed, and should be taken advantage of.

THE "GOOD OLD TIMES" IN TRADE.

Last week, happening to be in an inland town, I met a friend of mine, a commercial traveler, who is also an anti-poverty man. We were to go out on the same train in half an hour or so, and he proposed we should walk to the station, as he wished to have a final word with a customer on the way.

We found the merchant serving a woman who had laid out two dollars in necessities as carefully as if she were buying a farm. Next, a small boy, who wanted a dollar's worth of gray cotton "for Uncle Ed's Mary, and book it," was identified. Then my friend finished his business, and the conversation turned on the hard times, the dull trade and ruinous competition, as compared with the good old times.

"Well, yes," said the merchant, "when I first started on my own account times were good. Why, I used to take in \$250 and \$300 cash day after day right along. Everybody had money or money's worth, and if you trusted any, you were sure of your pay. Too much competition now—ruinous competition. We'll never see the good old times again."

"What do you think," asked my friend, "is the cause of the change in the times, and of the ruinous competition in trade?"

"Well," admitted the merchant, "I don't really know. People rush into trade without sufficient capital or experience, and then the competition among your wholesalers is so great that it seems as if any one can get goods on credit. Then the slaughtering begins. Of course we have to keep in the market and hold our customers, hoping it won't last long, and it doesn't generally with any particular one; but there is always a fresh man ready to step in, and sometimes two of them, and it goes on. We have to handle more goods, credit more goods, and at greater risk and with much smaller profits, if any at all. The bulk of the trade is in the staples or necessities, and most of them are sold, as you know, without any paying margin. I tell you, it's all one can do to hold his own these times."

"At the time you speak of," ventured the traveler, "when the times were good, were your wages also good, and was not work plentiful?"

"Yes, that's so," replied the merchant. "Any man could get work. Of course this place was then comparatively newly settled. It's true work was plenty and wages good, and men were scarce, too. Why, if you had a good man working for you then you couldn't be sure of him. He'd sooner have a few months' savings abroad than he'd be off and take up land in the Big flat."

"That's just where you lay open the secret of the change in the times," said my friend. "While you could readily employ their labor on land there was an established minimum wage; but to-day, when this opportunity is lost to them, the minimum wage sinks almost to the starvation line. Now," continued he, "do you not think that if to-day we could make the opportunities for men to work plentiful again times would improve. That is, if by any means we could have two jobs looking for one man, in place of two men looking for one job, would not competition be relieved and wages raised? Competition where every man would, by being able to become a producer, be able to be a more liberal consumer, too, and if—"

"Yes, yes," broke in the merchant; "that's all correct. No doubt if—"

"Well, hold on; I'm coming to that," said my friend, confidently, "and there is real y if about it. Let me see, we have agreed that if we can make plentiful the opportunities for men to apply their labor profitably that it would relieve competition, and that's the important point reached. Competition comes up from below, begins with the struggle of laboring men impelled by fear of want and suffering to themselves and to their families to underbid each other for wages, and as there are not enough of these opportunities to work for all, some must be at the starvation line all the time. This makes the cleverer laborers crowd up and compete with mechanics, and they again, without experience, rush into trade. Now you do not have competition in trade from mechanics, doctors and the other professions, do you? I see the professions are complaining that merchants and farmers' sons are run through college in great numbers, and that they are crowded."

"Well, well; no doubt that's about the way it is," said the merchant, "but how on earth do you propose to mend it? How are you going to make work plentiful and wages good again—two jobs looking for one man, as you say. There's the rub!"

"Just coming to that," continued the drummer, "I think I can show you, and plainly, too, that this much to be desired result can be brought about simply by a readjustment of our assessment for taxation. Simply stated: Make site value of land the sole basis of taxation, relieving all other values from taxation entirely. For instance, this store, if I remember rightly, cost you about \$100 to build, and its building was a great improvement to the street, to the town, in fact, and every man would become more valuable on account of your improvement. But under the present system of assessment you have for several years, and will as long as the building stands, have to pay to the community an interest of one and a half to two per cent per annum on this capital, because you have been enterprising and public spirited enough to erect a building that is a credit to the town. That vacant lot next you have not assessed for one-quarter of what you have to pay on, I'll warrant you."

"No, no, it isn't," said the merchant. "It's only assessed for \$500, and he has been offered twice that, but won't sell, as the lot is getting more valuable all the time, and he can afford to hold it."

"And who, pray, is making it more valuable?" asked my friend.

"What? Why—why—not he, any way. Why, it's the general growth of the place, but he never improves anything—won't even repair the old, tumble-down places he rents to the poorest people."

"Indeed! And is that why the town pays him a bonus in the shape of low taxation, while it fines you for making improvements—really compels you to pay the town an interest annually on capital invested in improvements that are of a perishable nature compared with town lots, and frequently in need of expensive repairs—your investment depreciating, his appreciating, in value every day."

be employed. And just so it would be with the idle land he holds in the country. The land he sits in the flat just in the heart of the station, I'll venture, does not pay as much taxes as the twenty-five acres of orchard and market garden just beyond. Now assess the orchard, less the value of improvements, and the hundred acres at the same tax per acre, how long do you suppose that fine piece of land would lie idle? The first tax bill would start him out to look for labor to begin improvements. And just so it would be with the other used and unused land in the country. Land users would pay—and justly pay—less taxes than they do now, and land speculators would pay more, and enough more to very soon have two jobs looking for one man, as it was in the good old times, but with this very important difference, mark you, that the better new times would have come to stay.

"Well," said the merchant after a pause, "I believe they would, but I never thought of it that way before. I believe your plan would be only fair play, too, and I would like to see it tried. By the way, though, Banter Brownson told me the other day that you were a Henry George socialist. I wouldn't go that far with you."

"It's very easy to call names," my friend replied, "and nothing can be farther from socialism, as commonly understood, or be simpler than the Henry George proposition. Only just this, make the site value of land the sole basis of taxation. This, of course, involves the perfect freedom from taxation not only of improvements, but of all other values—perfect free trade in everything, whether it be man's labor, whether of his hand or brain, for to tax the product of labor is to discourage the employment of labor. Why, they clap on more taxes if a man only paints his house!"

"That's a fact," said the merchant quickly. "They jumped the assessment upon my house when I painted four years ago, and the taxes have cost me more than the painting did. The worst is, the paint has worn off, but the taxes have stuck."

"Last longer than paint, eh?" "Well, indeed, they do," continued the merchant, "and my wife wants the house painted again, and I'd almost bargained with the painter before I thought about it. Poor fellow, I was sorry to refuse him, too. He's a chap that takes jobs of painting on his own account, has a large family, and is a customer right along, too, and always pays up when he can get work. He told me that he would have lots of houses to paint only people were afraid to improve."

"Yes," said my friend, "that's just the way the present clumsy, stupid and unjust system of assessment works. Why, I know a farmer who had borrowed money at five and a half per cent to build a needed barn and make other improvements, and who found his loan really costing him eight per cent when he reckoned his extra taxes, and another farmer who has very stony land and has made himself an old man at fifty by hard work trying to clear his fields till his stone fences are four to six feet broad. Well, he tells me that for every acre he clears he has to pay an increasing penalty of ten per cent annual fine. They both vote for the better new times the first chance they get, they will."

The rumble of the omnibus could now be heard coming along the street, so we bade the merchant farewell and made our way to the station.

A STRATEGIC POINT.

For immediate results, the weakest point in the enemy's line is just now the moribund protective tariff. Little as it pleases them, our invertebrate representatives at Washington stand in a few weeks deal with the problem of how customs duties shall be modified. Intent chiefly on smothering any real issues that may exist political combinations, there is hardly a man among them that has any real conception of more than a mere question of expediency. The republican party is willing, even anxious, to maintain and intensify a system of taxation that has protected thousands of workmen into poverty and hundreds of manufacturers into bankruptcy. The democratic party can see no moral principle involved in anything higher than a mere question of expediency. The republican party is willing, even anxious, to maintain and intensify a system of taxation that has protected thousands of workmen into poverty and hundreds of manufacturers into bankruptcy. The democratic party can see no moral principle involved in anything higher than a mere question of expediency. The republican party is willing, even anxious, to maintain and intensify a system of taxation that has protected thousands of workmen into poverty and hundreds of manufacturers into bankruptcy. The democratic party can see no moral principle involved in anything higher than a mere question of expediency.

A NATIONAL RELIGION.

Among the many true words spoken by Father Huntington there are none truer than these in his late letter to the *London Church Reformer*. He says: "As a nation we present a strange spectacle to the student of history. We are a people without a religion. . . . One feels that a change must come. . . . That the change has come no one will doubt; that is, no one will doubt it who is imbued with any serious desire to discern truth; no one will doubt it who cherishes any hope for mankind; no one will doubt it who in his heart believes that Christ came on earth for some nobler end than to receive a tawdry homage or the mere lip promise of carrying out His will. If Christianity means anything, it means fellowship. If human society means anything in this land of democratic promise, it means also fellowship. Whether he formulates it in speech or not, the intelligent workman is convinced of this. In the bottom of his heart every man not actuated by some base political or ecclesiastical expediency knows that Christ had but one errand on earth, and that was to forever destroy ecclesiastical pretension and forever exalt the dignity of human nature. In fact he glorified it in His own person. It is therefore a religious truth, that workmen have been influenced by the churches, and that in their conventual 'an adjunction to the church' is hissed, and the name of Jesus is greeted with wild enthusiasm." The great heart of the American republic knows that the function of democracy is the one of realizing a perfect society or fellowship on earth—of exalting every valley of inequality, the abasing every mountain of privilege—so that all flesh from the smallest to the greatest shall experience the unobstructed action of God's agencies here below. Why is it, that this passionate cry for the recognition of man by man ever goes up the cry which nothing on earth can stifle. The reason that this passionate rebellion against the existing order occurs, and is bound to keep recurring, is simply because it is getting to be more strongly felt that the brotherhood or equality is the legitimate state of man. The existing order has no right to exist, and it is bound to keep recurring, is simply because it is getting to be more strongly felt that the brotherhood or equality is the legitimate state of man. The existing order has no right to exist, and it is bound to keep recurring, is simply because it is getting to be more strongly felt that the brotherhood or equality is the legitimate state of man.

In Other Words, the Granting of a Railway Franchise Is "Simply the Granting of Power to Collect Taxes and Keep Them."

There are certain economic propositions, which although not as yet expressed in language that reaches the popular heart, are rapidly winning their way to the understanding of the masses. For example, the body of the people constantly see a syndicate of bankers get possession of the management of a railroad, to build and equip it costs \$50,000,000, without a dollar of additional expenditure, the company sells \$10,000,000 of new securities—in other words, by simply printing bonds and stock, this syndicate creates for itself ten millions of wealth, and this method is called "watering the road." It means that the stream of commerce flowing along this highway will be taxed (viz, subjected to a toll) sufficient to pay interest on the ten millions of fictitious wealth.

An illustration will make this matter still plainer. The state authorizes individuals to construct a bridge, and gives them the right to collect toll. The theory is that the amount of property to be taxed is the toll collected, that is, the amount collected shall be sufficient to compensate for the capital invested. If the bridge costs \$5,000, the tolls are fixed to yield a revenue of, say, \$5,000. Presently, as the population increases, the line of travel doubles, and the same rate of toll yields \$5,000, or six per cent on say, \$50,000. Thereupon the bridge company issues \$55,000 of new stock; this new stock is sold, and the individuals composing the company pocket the money. In other words, a line of travel which ought to be taxed to pay interest on only \$5,000 is now taxed to pay interest on \$55,000. This example illustrates probably the least objectionable of the methods by which colossal wealth has been suddenly acquired within the last twenty years by quite a number of men. It is a method which, in the hands of the people are waking up to the necessity of changing conditions so unfavorable to the common welfare. The politicians and place hunters do not see aggressively in this matter because unwilling to bring against themselves and their party the opposition of the railroad

WANTED—CRUSADERS.

Those who voted our ticket this year did so from conviction; they are all with us until the end, be it near at hand or in the distant future. From now on let us devote ourselves to convincing people of the eternal justice which is the foundation on which our demands for legislation are based. A few thousands vote more or less makes no difference in the truth of what we are working for, and the fact that that great truth received the support of only half as many voters as we thought we had secured, only shows that there is twice as much work to be done.

Now, how to do it. Every man and woman who has seen the full beauty of this great light must work without ceasing to bring others to see it. No matter how few may be our acquaintances, we can at least talk to them, induce them to read some of the literature on the subject, and what seems to me best of all, try to gather together those who are beginning to be interested, and discuss some particular point which is troubling them. This can easily be done without any trouble about formal organization, and will, I think, reach many who, if argued with singly, would feel bound to uphold their pre-conceived opinions.

This work can be done by all of us, but there are many places all through the country where the idea of the land for the people has not even a footing, and if we would succeed in writing this great truth upon our statute books all these places must be reached.

The suggestion of "Crusaders," in your paper of Oct. 15, that a corps of young men be raised to go through the country and preach the principles of our party, depending upon the people to whom they preach for support, seems to me the best way of accomplishing this end.

Such missionaries should, I think, go out in couples, and they should follow the example of St. Paul, who, when he went to Corinth, lived there working at his trade as a tent maker and preaching the gospel. To-day but little can be accomplished by long range firing in public speeches. We must go among the people in a neighborhood, work with them and stay among them until we have two or three earnest workers started there, and then go on to the next place. In this way only can we hope to spread the light.

We must all see that it is not best to make such tremendous efforts to secure a large vote here or there. If our efforts are concentrated, so will those of our opponents be, and therefore our hope must be in teaching the whole people wherever we can touch them, and thus produce such a profound public sentiment throughout the country as shall reach above all trickery and corruption, and although it may be years hence, triumph most gloriously over all our foes.

In starting such an agency as this army of preachers, great care must necessarily be used to insure against the danger of men who will offer their services from a vain desire to thrust themselves before the public and to be prominent in the movement.

I do not think we need exact any pledge from them. Let them be free to go as they think best, and where it seems to them they can do the most good. It is such a novel method that no exact rules can be laid down; we must trust to the discretion and tact of those who are willing to devote themselves to the work.

I would only suggest that all such workers keep in communication with some headquarters, from which they can be supplied with tracts, STANDARDS, and the names of our people in the places they may propose visiting. There are two of us in this town who, although not entirely free from responsibilities and family ties, still intend to do a great deal of just such work this year through our own neighborhood, and as far as we can reach through the state. In all our work let us remember that it is conviction of the justice and truth of our principles, and not merely votes that we must seek.

And to all those who are willing to devote themselves to this work I say, "Forward, in God's name, and fear nothing," knowing that "only that good profits which we can taste with all doors open and which serves all men."

JAMES LAURENCE DUNHAM.
Sharon, Conn., Nov. 15, 1887.

A NATIONAL RELIGION.

Among the many true words spoken by Father Huntington there are none truer than these in his late letter to the *London Church Reformer*. He says: "As a nation we present a strange spectacle to the student of history. We are a people without a religion. . . . One feels that a change must come. . . . That the change has come no one will doubt; that is, no one will doubt it who is imbued with any serious desire to discern truth; no one will doubt it who cherishes any hope for mankind; no one will doubt it who in his heart believes that Christ came on earth for some nobler end than to receive a tawdry homage or the mere lip promise of carrying out His will. If Christianity means anything, it means fellowship. If human society means anything in this land of democratic promise, it means also fellowship. Whether he formulates it in speech or not, the intelligent workman is convinced of this. In the bottom of his heart every man not actuated by some base political or ecclesiastical expediency knows that Christ had but one errand on earth, and that was to forever destroy ecclesiastical pretension and forever exalt the dignity of human nature. In fact he glorified it in His own person. It is therefore a religious truth, that workmen have been influenced by the churches, and that in their conventual 'an adjunction to the church' is hissed, and the name of Jesus is greeted with wild enthusiasm." The great heart of the American republic knows that the function of democracy is the one of realizing a perfect society or fellowship on earth—of exalting every valley of inequality, the abasing every mountain of privilege—so that all flesh from the smallest to the greatest shall experience the unobstructed action of God's agencies here below. Why is it, that this passionate cry for the recognition of man by man ever goes up the cry which nothing on earth can stifle. The reason that this passionate rebellion against the existing order occurs, and is bound to keep recurring, is simply because it is getting to be more strongly felt that the brotherhood or equality is the legitimate state of man. The existing order has no right to exist, and it is bound to keep recurring, is simply because it is getting to be more strongly felt that the brotherhood or equality is the legitimate state of man.

Waste Land Assessed Low, but Valued High.

A few examples from our own town will show the justice of the (land value taxation) theory and the necessity for a change. In Freeport there is a tract of land in the heart of the village which, in its present condition, is a disgrace to the town. It is assessed for \$300. Owing to improvements it is probably worth \$6,000—the owners do not care to sell.

Another piece of property, worth perhaps \$1,000, is only assessed at \$1,000. It is a piece of recently improved property, reclaimed from the wild woods, is assessed at the same figure.

In Rockville Centre a similar condition of affairs exists. The great waste land is encircled by a large plot of land which the owners refuse to part with because it costs very little to hold and is being constantly improved by the owners of adjoining property. At Pearson's the transient traveler is once disgusted with the tract of waste land opposite the depot.

At East Rockaway much of the otherwise available land is wholly unimproved, solely because it costs nothing to hold. It is a piece of land which the owners refuse to part with because it costs very little to hold and is being constantly improved by the owners of adjoining property. At Pearson's the transient traveler is once disgusted with the tract of waste land opposite the depot.

The villages on the Rockaway branch are suffering from this "dog in the manger" policy even more than the stations on the main line. It is a common saying in Hempstead Harbor that the there have been several first class funerals before there can be any great improvement.

tion which must now become more and more a feature of the anti-poverty movement.

The 73,000 votes in New York state attest what? They attest the fact that a national religion is about to be founded. I do not mean a religion which satisfies itself with building churches and allows 115,000 children under fifteen years of age to be at work in Pennsylvania factories, but a religion which concerns itself with insuring to these children some hope for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—a religion which recognizes that all men have but one source of life—any religion which does less than this is a sham. We may keep on ejaculating, "Lord! Lord!" if we will, and building cathedrals to the tune of \$7,000,000, as it is proposed to do in New York city; so long as those children go untaught, half fed and half clothed, God's house will be built in vain. If democracy means anything, it means fraternity among men. No man can be truly himself so as inequality exists between him and his fellow. For every man has an essential equality with all other men—an equality in God—because they all have but one source of life—any government which keeps on increasing the inequality of man with man by perpetuating laws which compel the subjection of the many to the few—human government confesses itself imperfect. So long as this is, just so long will man incessantly agitate society, incessantly urge it onward, until at length it realizes its own ideal by the legislative destruction of all privilege, or by the extension of an equal subsistence and an equal education to all its offspring. AN AMERICAN EPISCOPALIAN.

PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND THE NEW PARTY.

Why are the employees of the board of education so badly underpaid as compared with the employees of all other municipal departments, and why does the profession not possess that rank and influence which it, of all other professions, ought to have? The answer comes readily enough. The vast majority of teachers (the ladies) have no vote, ergo, they have no influence, ergo, the question of increased salaries, or of giving equal pay for equal work, is not so pressing as it is in the police department, for instance.

In view of the revelations of legislative investigating committees, from which we learn of the scandalous waste of money in the different branches of the public service; when we hear and know that there are scores of positions in the various departments which are practically sinecures; when we know that there are hundreds of others of which the labor, duties and responsibilities are equal to those of the lowest teachers in a primary department, and yet whose salaries are twice and thrice as great, is it not time to direct attention to the pleasing contrast afforded by the department of instruction, and to expect some adequate appreciation?

While the cause of public education is one nearest the heart of the people; while they are ever ready to stand up against any one who would assail the common schools or trifle their inestimable duty, yet the burdens and duties of those employed in them are of all things least understood or appreciated by the general public.

If the employees in the other departments of the city government were as capable and as poorly paid, as hard worked and hard working; were they as much superintended and held to as strict accountability for their work and its results as the public school teachers, the affairs of the city would be conducted with a minimum of ability and a minimum of expense. New York would then become a Utopia of good and economical government and there would be no use for periodical investigating committees to discover the leaks in the municipal treasury, only to lose sight of them again and evolve no means to prevent them.

When we consider the grave responsibility of the teacher's task—the management and direction of the human mind, the most delicate and complicated machine in existence—surely the question

RELIEVE THE FARMER.

Under the George system, the government will no more own and control land and "rent it out to the highest bidder" than it does now. Land, under his system, will continue to be owned by individuals precisely as it is now. It will descend to heirs and be devised to legatees precisely as it is now. Not a single law relative to land ownership and control now upon our statute books will be changed in carrying out his doctrines to the fullest extent. A man's right, under the present system, to enjoy the exclusive possession of a tract of land is conditioned upon the payment of a tax upon its value. And so it will be under the George system, without the slightest change in the machinery now in use for the assessment and collection of taxes on real estate.

Henry George simply proposes to reform our present absurd and barbarous system of levying taxes, a system which discourages enterprise and thrift and encourages monopoly and greed.

Take the case of a young man here in Texas, who, we will say, by working on shares, has finally saved up a little capital, and who now proposes to become the owner of a farm of his own. He is going to get a piece of wild land, break it up, grub it, fence it and cultivate it. He has a wagon, a pair of horses, a few household utensils, a wife, plenty of children and little money. He does not dream of getting rich; he merely hopes to secure a competency by faithful work. He looks around for a location. He naturally desires to settle near town, where he will be handy to market, and where his family can enjoy the society of neighbors and the benefits of church and school privileges. He finds just such a town. He finds tens of thousands of acres of vacant land all around this town and close to it. Just the kind of land he is looking for. No one is using it, and it lies there idle, waiting for the hands of industry to be applied to it. But he finds that the speculators have got there ahead of him. They are keeping it for an increase in value. In order to get hold of a hundred acre tract of this land he must mortgage himself to some speculator. He must bind himself to pay over to a speculator all that he can possibly save in excess of the bare necessities of life for a term of years. He feels that the land is already above his means, so he turns away, drives out twenty miles and buys a hundred acres out of a thousand acre tract held by another speculator, for which he pays \$200, and then settles down in the wilderness.

His children can scarcely get to school at all. It is miles to any church. He has to haul his cotton five miles to the nearest gin. He wastes a great deal of time on the poor roads between his home and the town where he does his marketing, hauling his produce over thousands and tens of thousands of acres of land just as well adapted to raising it as that which he has been compelled to select so far away. He works for far greater disadvantage than he would have been permitted to settle nearer town, hence he produces less, and therefore must buy less.

Now, why have the speculators seized this vacant land and taken it out of the reach of this industrious farmer? Do they propose to use it? Do they propose to do anything with it by which labor can be employed, and the sum total of the world's wealth increased? Do they propose to invest a dollar in the cultivation and improvement of this land? By no means. They propose that some one else shall do the work and have the worry, and take the chances of the crops failing. Yet they propose, nevertheless, to get rich out of this land. How? By holding it in idleness, by driving labor off from it, and compelling labor to pass it by and settle on far less eligible and desirable tracts. One of these speculators paid \$1,000 for a piece of this land. It is now worth \$5,000. Whose labor has put this additional value of \$4,000 upon this piece of vacant land? Not the labor of the present owner, nor the labor of any previous owner, because no one has ever done a stroke of work upon the land. It has resulted from the increase of population. It has been put there by the community. The speculator sells the tract for \$5,000 and thus makes \$4,000. He has not, however, increased the sum total of the world's wealth one iota by the transaction. He has simply drawn to himself \$4,000 worth of wealth which other labor has produced—wealth which labor has been compelled to pay over to him for the bare privilege of access to one of the gifts of nature.

Well, our young farmer, after a year's hard work in fencing, breaking the sod, and putting up buildings, has added \$300 worth of improvement to this hundred acre tract of vacant land. By the sweat of his brow he has actually increased the sum total of the wealth of the world to the extent of \$300. What happens now? Why, the tax collector comes around and fines him for it by taxing these improvements. He has to yield up to the government in taxes on these improvements a portion of the fruits of his individual industry. He is robbed on account of taxes on these improvements of a portion of the values produced solely by his individual industry. The community did not put this additional value of \$300 upon his land. He put it there by his own hard work. But who is putting values yearly on the vacant and adjoining, which the speculator is holding in idleness? Is it not the community that does it? Now, why should our young farmer be taxed any more for using his hundred acre tract of land and giving employment to labor on it than the speculator is taxed for holding in idleness a tract of equal value and preventing labor from using it? Which act conduces most to the prosperity of the country? Why should not the speculator pay at least as much tax for the privilege of excluding labor from a hundred acre tract of land as the farmer has to pay for the privilege of employing labor on a tract of equal value?

Under the present taxing system our young farmer must pay the government say one percent taxes on his land and improvements, amounting to \$4 a year for the privilege of the exclusive possession of his hundred acre farm. If he doesn't pay it his farm will be sold for taxes. The speculator from whom he bought, however, only pays \$1 a year tax on the adjoining hundred acres of equally as valuable land. Has the farmer hurt any by improving his hundred acre tract? If not, why should he be fined for it? On the contrary, by settling on one hundred acres of that thousand acre tract he has made the nine hundred acres more valuable, and when other hard working farmers settle in the neighborhood, they, by their labor, by their common energy and enterprise, will add yearly to the value of the speculator's holdings. But will they get any advantage from this enhancement in the value of his land, which they themselves have caused? Will he give them any portion of this unearned increment which they themselves have produced? On the contrary, should one of these farmers desire to increase the size of his farm, or to settle one of his children on adjoining land, he will have to pay the speculator for the very enhancement in the value of the land which has resulted from the application of his own labor upon his own land.

The first step in carrying out the George doctrine in Texas is simply exempting by law

all personal property and improvement on land from taxation, and requiring taxes to be levied on land values alone. Such a law would be a direct benefit to every farmer in the state.

Here in Harris county, at least six-sevenths of the land is wholly unimproved, and probably one-third of the lots within the corporate limits of the city of Houston are vacant. On an average all over the United States about one-half of the taxable values of a community are in personal property and improvements on land, while the other half is in the land itself.

In Harris county we must raise say \$200,000 a year to cover state, county and municipal taxation. Now, in order to raise this sum on one-half the present taxable values in the county, as would probably be necessary were we to exempt personal property and improvements on the land from taxation, we should of course be compelled to double the tax on land values. This would double the tax now paid on any tract of vacant land. It would, however, reduce the taxes on farms and residences from fifty to five hundred per cent. A hundred acres in Harris county, the assessed valuation of which is \$1,000, pays a tax of \$10 a year. Now, what is the assessed valuation of wild land in the neighborhood similar in quality to such a tract, and which is likely enough owned by a non-resident speculator? Is it more than a dollar an acre? Is it more than one-tenth the assessed valuation of the improved farm? To the owner of such an improved farm I say, if the first step even in carrying out the George doctrine were adopted, the assessment of the speculator's land would be doubled, but your farm would be assessed at precisely the same valuation as his land adding precisely the same value to your own, regardless of the improvements. Your land would thus be assessed at \$200 instead of \$1,000, and your taxes would be \$2 a year instead of \$10, a reduction of taxation in your case of five hundred per cent. Yet people say that the farmers will never be such fools as to adopt the George theory. Time alone will show.

Henry George teaches that the more farms that are opened up and improved the more machinery, buildings and factories are erected, the more coal beds and mineral deposits are developed, the more residences are built, the more will labor be in demand and the better wages will the laborer get. The more wages the laborer gets the more will they have to spend, the more will they buy, and the better will times be all around. When, then, should the man who improves land, who builds a residence, a storehouse, a factory or a tenement on land be fined by a tax gatherer on account of his enterprise and his willingness to do something with his money which gives employment to labor? If any one is to be fined, why should it not be the man who, instead of putting his money into productive enterprises, attempts to forestall labor by buying up the vacant land, the undeveloped coal bed and mineral deposit, with the purpose of extorting blackmail from labor, a bounty for the bare privilege of making nature useful to mankind?

By taxing improvements, buildings, tenement houses and factories, we discourage the investment of capital in productive enterprises which give employment to labor. By taxing land values alone, by increasing the burden of taxation on land values, we do not lessen the amount of land, but we cheapen its price, we make the speculator who is holding it in idleness a little more anxious to sell, we make the land owner a little more anxious to improve. A tax on land values alone, therefore, instead of retarding enterprise, stimulates enterprise.

Now, suppose this first step had been taken when our young farmer went forth seeking land for his own farm. If he had cost speculators twice as much in taxes to hold vacant land around that town would they have been as eager to buy it up in the first place? Would they not have been a little more shy about investing in it, and hence would not its price have been considerably less? and hence could not our farmer have got just as good a piece of land for the same price as good deal nearer town? and hence would not his family have had more social advantages and better church and school privileges? and would he not have saved a good deal of time in going to mill and market, and would he not have worked to better advantage in a great many ways, and therefore have produced more and hence have been able to buy more? and if his merchant were relieved from the payment of taxes on his store house and stock of goods, would not this lessen the cost of his doing business, and hence lessen the selling price of his goods, also to the farmer's advantage? C. F. RING.

Houston, Texas.

Sure Enough, Why Doesn't It Discuss It?

Rockland, Me., Opinion
The *Weston Journal* admits that Mr. Henry George has made out his case so far as the evils of land monopoly are concerned, but it thinks it can name a remedy that would be an improvement on that proposed by the distinguished social and economical philosopher. All it thinks necessary is to limit the quantity of land that may be held by any one citizen. Neither of these measures are new, and those who have advocated them have failed to show how they would or could effect a real improvement on the present system of land tenure. As to the first, the evils of land monopoly would be just as bad whether the monopolists were Americans or foreigners. Take, for example, the case of Mr. Scully, the Irishman who owns vast tracts of improved farming lands in Illinois, and runs them on the same rack rent system that is practiced in Ireland. Suppose the *Journal's* proposed law were in force and Mr. Scully should come over here and declare his intention to become an American citizen, and so continued to rack rent his tenants, would the system be any less objectionable and dangerous? Obviously it would not. The evils of land monopoly would be just as bad with Americans as with foreigners. The remedy of limiting the quantity of land that may be held by one person, that would be entirely impracticable, as the *Journal* will soon find if it attempts to perfect the details of such a plan and put it in the form of a law. To forbid any person owning above a certain number of acres would prevent some persons having all the land they could use, which is not desirable, and would permit land to be kept out of use, which is the very essence of the evil aimed at. Suppose the limit were placed at 100 acres, it would prevent the carrying on of agricultural operations in the most profitable and efficient manner, and still permit the land monopoly that causes agricultural poverty, ignorance and crime. The remedies advocated by the *Journal* seem miserably cumbersome and ineffective as compared with the simple, just and radical expedient of a single tax on land values proposed by George. The very essence of the evil aimed at is what it conceives to be the objection to that. It says the subject is an important one that should be discussed. Why doesn't it discuss it?

Oh That's So, What's the Good of a Duty?

The American consumer pays but little, if anything, more for European goods than if they were admitted free of duty, for European manufacturers and merchants know what the traffic will bear, and, if the duties were remitted they could, and undoubtedly would, advance prices to the highest mark consistent with liberal competition. That is a law of trade which has been observed and acted upon ever since commerce was invented.

Oh That's So, What's the Good of a Duty?

On the contrary, should one of these farmers desire to increase the size of his farm, or to settle one of his children on adjoining land, he will have to pay the speculator for the very enhancement in the value of the land which has resulted from the application of his own labor upon his own land.

The first step in carrying out the George doctrine in Texas is simply exempting by law

FROM PARISHIONER TO PASTOR.

A Former Parishioner of Dr. Strong Addresses to Him an Open Letter that Calls for an Answer.

To the Rev. Josiah Strong, D.D., Secretary Evangelical Alliance for America:
I have just returned from listening to your eloquent sermon on "The Signs of the Times," and gratefully acknowledged the largeness of heart which gave birth to such splendid utterances.

As one of your former parishioners, and a sincere admirer of you because of your personal worth, I do not forget while criticizing your modes of thought and work the debt which I owe to you, in the great impetus you have given to thought, not only in myself, but also in the communities within reach of your utterances.

You are considerably ahead of most of your ministerial brethren in the acknowledgment of the religious bearing of the social situation. In your pulpit utterances, and in that able work, "Our Country," you always desire to see the poor and downtrodden brought into the church. You acknowledge the evil in the great inequality of the distribution of wealth, you deplore the evils of tenements and the growth of pauperism, but the whole process by which you arrive at your proposed remedy is unsound, as is also the remedy itself.

The unsoundness of the spirit which prompts the remedy is very clearly indicated in "Our Country," in which you begin by showing the greatness of the country, present and prospective, and at once launch out into perils—perils—perils—one peril after another, and all the real perils have social wrongs at their root. And because the church is losing its hold on the masses, and because the existence of the nation is threatened, we must get the artisan into the church and put him on the back and teach him that his condition is the will of God, at the same time looking forward complacently to the time when, with a dense population, labor will be as cheap here as in Europe ("Our Country," p. 14). Justice, in its fullness to the artisan, is not considered as being within the range of the gospel or gospel workers.

In various places you admit by inference that the minimum of discontent existed and that progress made its greatest strides in this country before the effect of land monopoly had made itself felt. Yet you ignore the fact that perils great and many grow from our land customs and laws; even beneficent labor saving machinery is looked on with suspicion; deeming that the least change in the laws in new ways is a source of danger to the community, while the glaring injustice in the administration of God's land is not given any weight, and no distinction is drawn between wealth which God gives directly to mankind and wealth that men produce from God's direct gifts in considering the rights of property.

Furthermore, your thoughts on "the competition for existence becoming sharper," don't harmonize very well with your showing of the tremendous increase of national wealth, or "His tender mercies are over all his works," or "He satisfieth the desire of every living thing."

The remedy proposed is the application of the gospel, i. e., the bringing of the discontented about the rule, and the mode of the application suggests some thoughts. The plan is, whereas, "There is no way to bring non-churchgoers into the church, except by personal contact." "Let every church member, beginning at his own Jerusalem, preach the gospel to as many as he can reach."

The street car company director, or stockholder, and his wife will make a tour of the street car drivers and conductors' homes on Sunday evening after the cars have been run, and preach to these wicked Sabbath breakers that he who works on Sunday breaks God's law, and other doctrines equally consistent from the preacher's point of view.

The pious, leisure loving bondholder will have large opportunity to visit the homes of the artisans, whose possible savings are taxed 85 per cent, the benevolent visitor being supported by that tax, and he being in turn only taxed 3 per cent on his possible savings (see Shearman's "Distribution of Wealth"), will be well able to show forth the evil of laying up treasure on earth.

The large manufacturer will rent pews in the church around his own family pew for the men whom he has treated like so many dogs all week, while his wife's silks will harmonize nicely with her servants' cottons before her.

The landlord will, of course, attend to his *Journal* (that reads the *Standard*), and preach to his tenants (that read the *Standard*) of God's gifts, and the soundness of blankets and top boots to the Fiji Islanders, with an occasional reminder that "the earth is the (land) Lord's and the fullness thereof."

This sort of thing reminds one of putting a poisoned poultice on a boil, because poultices are generally recognized as being good for boils. Make the tree good and the fruit will be good. If the church truly followed Jesus, your elaborate plans would be superfluous.

Wherever the heaven has originated, whether it has been in the church or the world, both are thoroughly saturated with mammonism; and there is no chasm between the church and the world. The non-churchgoers, in the matter of the worship of the "almighty dollar," for both offer a perfect sacrifice to that deity; that heaven has perfected its way completely through the whole lump, and the church can under the circumstances teach no added lesson, except it be to cant about dead formulae, dead because based on injustice. The gospel! Jesus intended a real good spell to the poor, not the existing devil spell of "every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost," which is the ruling principle in our social system, and practiced constantly by the church.

If the Evangelical alliance wants to do a worthy thing, let it clear its skirts of the responsibility for land monopoly, and social injustice generally, and the artisan will not have to be exasperated back into the church, but the common people will hear it gladly.

While the battle of the emancipation of the worker is being fought, are you and the Evangelical alliance going to look on and busily prescribe formulae? I hope not. Remember Mercoz. (Judges, 5:23.)

But one thing must not be forgotten—that artisans will not be patronized, nor receive charities, as palliatives for social wrong, for their voice is even now heard above the babel din.

Louder than them all exclaiming,

Give us justice; we are men.

As a working man, and a believer in the divine agency, I would warn you of a peril you have not seen. If the churches exist to-day do not incorporate justice for all into their religion, the artisan will incorporate what is good of their religion into his justice, and God will spew the rich churches out of His mouth. (Rev. 3:16-17.)

R. W. HARRISON.

Cincinnati, O., Oct. 30.

What is True of Burlington, Iowa, is

Equality True of Every Town in New

Haven. In Burlington Evening Post.

Some fifty-five years ago Uncle Sam traded Black Hawk out of his and a people's claim to the forty-mile strip along the Mississippi

from the Missouri line to a point opposite Prairie Du Chien for some old flint locks, red blankets, beads and other good considerations. Soon after an old settler bought a 600 acre tract, which is now near the center of Burlington, of Uncle Sam at \$1.25 an acre, and a few years later sold out to another old settler at \$60 an acre. In 1862 another old settler bought two-fifths of an acre for \$350, or \$700 an acre, and sold part of his purchase to another old settler at the rate of \$2,500 an acre or \$500 for an ordinary sized lot. During the constant rise in value the taxes appear to have remained stationary until it was discovered that the final purchasers were not speculators. They actually used the ground, built dwellings thereon, and their taxes had to be multiplied in accordance with the laws, and now average over \$60 an acre, whereas the speculator only paid \$1.50! The user of land must pay forty times the tax of non-using speculators. It is to be wondered that Burlington does not improve?

Thirty years ago the Iowa farmer owned his farm, and the Burlington workman lived in his own house. Now the farmer is a mortgaged slave working for a renter, and never hopes to earn his own dwelling. A few of us seized opportunities and bought land, and we keep all others off unless they can pay us for permission to use it. We don't build, we don't improve, we don't pay taxes, and if we would the tax gatherer would be bound to punish us. Our young men have to emigrate because land in their native city is too dear for them to secure a home in it. In the days of hard labor one man's labor supplied food for a family of five or six, notwithstanding all inventions and improvements, child labor is required to keep the parents out of the poor house.

Business is dull because industry is oppressively taxed. Our territory is hardly made use of; two-thirds idle and untaxed (or very lightly taxed)—"held for a rise." If this unused land was taxed equally with what is used we should in a short time have six houses to the acre instead of two. What a demand for labor, and consequently for farm products and merchandise, and dwellings and other necessities for the workers and their families.

Abolish all taxes on industry, such as taxes on crops, livestock, furniture, money and all personal property, and a suitable tax on the land values of our city will yield three times the revenue we now get from all sources. The change will benefit all—even the land speculator, for he will dispose of his unproductive property and invest in business.

We should protect American farmers and other workers by making the products of the farm and earnings of labor buy as much as possible of the necessities and comforts of life—such as coal, shoes, clothing, groceries, etc. We should encourage the production of cheap commodities and give more purchasing power to the wages of the worker, and wages would rise steadily because of the demand for homes. The mere use in the working population of land values, and the fact that thereon would enable the city to furnish light, water, heat, transportation and many other conveniences to the public, and keep out of debt. Other cities and other states would follow the example, and the most beneficent change in all history since Solomon made silver to abound as stones in the streets of Jerusalem, would take place. It was not by "the best financial system," but by setting labor at work that Israel's wisest king made his country rich, and prospering, it was the taxes on industry that turned the same region into a wilderness under the Sarcenians. Taxing the olive made the people cut down their trees. Taxes on the date palm made the dates disappear. Taxes and rents have about ruined the city of New York, and America are about making up their minds that this country shall not much longer remain the prey of the land holder and the tax gatherer.

Something for the "Evening Post's" Agricultural Editor to Read.

Cor. Dunkirk—Four Y. In your issue of last Saturday you give from the *New York Evening Post* what you deemed a "hard nut to crack." Previously you gave us some from a *Dunkirk Farmer*. Let me take up at present the Oyster Bay nut. Mr. Oyster Bay describes himself as having a farm of 100 acres, which with buildings is assessed at \$5,000, the buildings being rated at \$2,500. This land is, therefore \$25 land. Mr. O's own tax is \$75. A rich New York owner and buys five acres adjoining, and puts a \$50,000 house, the assessed valuation of which is \$10,000, on which the town tax is \$450. It is a remarkable house for that kind of land, but never mind!

Oyster makes this calculation: That the New Yorker and himself are assessed on \$15,000, the united tax amounting to \$225. He then reasons: "For the necessary expenses of the town \$225 has to be raised from my own tax payers, and property; consequently the same tax percentage of 1 1/2 per cent must be raised from \$5,000 now on both house and land to \$33,300 on my land alone, and my wealthy neighbor's assessment reduced from \$10,000 to \$1,700, that being the proportion of value to mine of his five acres. The tax collector therefore calls upon the struggling farmer (i. e., Mr. Oyster) for an annual tax of \$500, when formerly he paid only \$75."

Now this is either the reasoning of an oyster or it is a very peculiar town. That town contains only two landed proprietors having a domain of only 105 acres. It must be so else that \$450 taken off from New York would not all come on Oyster and his 100 acres. An owner sized town would be \$100 an acre, containing of course 3,040 acres. Now, if Oyster Bay were not so wonderfully small, said \$450 would be distributed over (say) 23,040 acres, which would be something under two cents per acre, or 29 for Oyster's 100 acres. Oyster's tax therefore would be \$77 instead of \$75. In other words the intelligent farmer has been burdened to the extent of about 100 postage stamps!

This is in accordance with the oyster's own reasoning. I don't claim that it is the Henry George theory.

Let us suppose that New York has just this season finished his grand house, and suppose he is not going to be taxed on it. How is Mr. Oyster any worse off for the building of that house? Does it make his tax any larger than it was the year before? How? He says that it has raised it from \$75 to \$500. Let him thank God that it was not two New Yorkers with equally grand houses, for then of course the tax would have been \$1,000. But what terrible New York put up a \$500,000 house the tax on Mr. Oyster, namely \$5,000, would have swept the poor man's property all away! Left to myself I should have supposed that putting up the house would have brought money into Oyster Bay, and improved the market for its vegetables and claims, to supply the host of summer friends of New York, but since it is going to ruin our country Oyster if it is not taxed, I should by all means have Oyster Bay where oyster logic, mathematics and political economy exist, exempted from the operation of Mr. George's theory. But where the laws of nature are in operation—why it might be different.

Mr. Editor, I am not a Statesman, and do not pretend to solve all the deep problems which are sure to confront the paucity of a great reform; but if you have some more kind little soft nuts like that of the New York Post, be kind enough to bring them to the NUTCRACKER.

Two Ways of Getting Rich.

One is to go on making wealth by creation; the other is to allow other people to make it for you. The first is a business; the second is a game. The first is a permanent; the second is a passing show. The first is a real; the second is a sham. The first is a true; the second is a false. The first is a good; the second is a bad. The first is a right; the second is a wrong. The first is a just; the second is an unjust. The first is a fair; the second is an unfair. The first is a honest; the second is an dishonest. The first is a brave; the second is a coward. The first is a noble; the second is a base. The first is a great; the second is a small. The first is a high; the second is a low. The first is a deep; the second is a shallow. The first is a wide; the second is a narrow. The first is a long; the second is a short. The first is a far; the second is a near. The first is a high; the second is a low. The first is a deep; the second is a shallow. The first is a wide; the second is a narrow. The first is a long; the second is a short. The first is a far; the second is a near.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and supposing a certain measure of passable government, and a fair amount of peace, and growth is certain. Men may embark in trade and ninety per cent of them come to grief, but in running their career they will have expended money, and money attracts population, and people must have land to live upon, so that the crafty fellow who sits down and absorbs his unearned increment must get on top in the long run.

The Berkshire Life Insurance Company,
Pittsfield, Mass., incorporated 1851. The definite surrender values in cash, or paid up insurance, guaranteed by the Massachusetts non-forfeiture law, in accordance with which all policies of the Berkshire are issued, the solid financial condition of the company, its large surplus, its handsome dividends, its liberal policies and its promptness in paying all legitimate claims, makes the Berkshire a most desirable company for the policy holder. For circulars and rates address GEORGE W. ENGLISH, Manager, 271 Broadway, New York.

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.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

POPULAR EDITION.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TARIFF QUESTION WITH SPECIAL 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 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, 20

" cloth, 25

" half calf or half morocco, 2.50

Social Problems, paper, 20

" cloth, 25

" half calf or half morocco, 2.50

Protection or Free Trade? paper, 20

" cloth, 25

" 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., 25 Ann Street, New York.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

</

