THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOL. II.—NO. 24. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1887. PRICE FIVE CENTS

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

Some of the New York papers published last Sunday what purported to be an interview with me, in which it was stated that "Henry George had definitely decided not to be a candidate for the presidency next year, and not to put the labor party into the campaign."

The substratum of truth in this interview was a conversation held some time before with a man who represented himself as a reporter of the Boston *Herald*, in which, without making any declaration for myself, I told him in general terms of what was being said on the subject of the policy of the labor party by members of the party. I first saw the interview as published when it was submitted to me by the New York *Herald*, and also by the New York *Tribune*, to whom, as to other papers, it had been sent as a copy of what would appear in the Boston *Herald* the next morning. I at once repudiated it to these papers, and sent out a similar repudiation through the press association. Apparently, however, this failed to reach the *Sun*, *World* and *Journal*, as they published the article.

The truth is that I have *not* definitely decided not to be a candidate for the presidency next year in case our friends throughout the country determine to put up a candidate and demand of me to serve as such; and not only do I not presume to decide for the united labor party, but I have not definitely made up my own mind as to what its policy ought to be. The columns of THE STANDARD have been freely opened to expressions of opinion on both sides of the question of a presidential nomination, for I have felt this to be a matter that should be discussed among ourselves before the meeting of a national conference. But I have also felt it was too early to decide, and, as I have before said, I have felt that the decision ought largely to depend upon circumstances. I have never had any hesitation in expressing an opinion after I had once fairly formed it; but I have much hesitation in coming to an opinion that involves responsibility. This is the situation in which I now find myself; but since the question is in a manner forced upon me, it is perhaps well that I should say frankly just how it appears to me at the present time.

First, as to the personal equation:

Office, even the highest, has no attractions to my ambition, because I feel that the best and most lasting work that I could do would be of another kind. But for the same reason running without hope of election has no terrors. I dislike candidacy of any kind, and neither my taste nor my strength lies in the line of politics; but I would never shrink from taking a place in the forlorn hope of a political movement if convinced that the movement itself was needed; that I was, under the circumstances, the best available candidate, and that this under the circumstances was the best use to which I could be put. This last may be to one who wishes to be as useful as he can a most important consideration. Not only are the bounds of individual powers and activities extremely limited; not only does the expenditure of energy in one direction lessen the quantity that can be expended in another, but the attempt to be useful in active politics may, and to some extent must, reduce other opportunities of usefulness.

To say nothing of the gross blunderings and often times deliberate misrepresentations which under our system of press reporting put the most careful speaker who enters the political arena in danger of being presented as a fool or incendiary to far larger audiences than he can possibly reach with his voice, and the prejudices and antagonisms that are inevitably excited by political candidacy, there are many who, if he enters active politics, will regard as a demagogue the man they might otherwise be disposed to listen to.

All this I knew when I accepted the nomination for mayor of New York, and it was the great reason of my reluctance to do so. Under all the circumstances, however, that seemed to be the path of greatest usefulness to a cause to which I had pledged myself. My judgment as well as my disposition urged me not to become a candidate a second time; but when the time came to carry into the arena of state politics the movement that had begun in this city, the possibilities seemed so large, and the demand was so urgent, that I could not refuse.

But while I have not authorized any statement that I have definitely decided not to accept a nomination for the presidency if it is determined to run a presidential ticket upon the lines of the Syracuse platform, I certainly feel that my friends will not want to put me in the position of a sort of perpetual candidate, and that the movement has already developed a number of men who would serve the purpose of heading a national ticket as well, to say the least, as I could, leaving me free for work for which I am better suited.

Whether the united labor party should at the next election enter the national field, I regard as a question of policy. I do not believe in policy to the sacrifice of principle, and I am sensitive to the argument of Mr. Pentecost that the duty of men who see a truth is to follow it regardless of results. But I consider independent political action as only one of various means. As I have over and over again declared, the important thing is not how men vote but how they think. To advance the truth we need not so much to win political battles as to excite thought and arouse conscience; for what really stands in the way of the truth is not existing parties, but general ignorance, general prejudice and general carelessness. And the whole question as to whether we ought to enter the presidential field resolves itself into a question of the best way to call attention to the truths we would advance.

The question whether a great reform can be best promoted by independent political action is not capable of an unvarying answer. It depends upon the circumstances of time and field. When the struggle of existing parties involves no principle and independent political action can attract attention and provoke discussion, it is clearly the best means of bringing a principle into politics; but when existing parties begin to divide upon that principle, even if the difference between them is comparatively a small one, then it may be that the most effective means is to utilize their fight and to devote the energy that might be expended in a separate movement to urging them on.

Both as to the field and as to circumstances there is a wide difference between the campaigns in which the new party has already engaged and that in which it will engage if it enters next year the arena of national politics. In the campaign in New York city in 1886 the independent labor movement, concentrating on a single candidate in a narrow but conspicuous field, brought a great principle into what otherwise would have been but the contest for spoils of municipal rings. The field of state politics into which we entered in the campaign just closed was wider and much more difficult, especially as the shadow of the approaching presidential campaign was over it. But the political circumstances were the same. Neither of the great parties stood for any political principle, and the issue between them was merely as to which organization should control the offices and gather in the spoils. And the only possible way to make this state campaign a means of arousing thought upon vital questions was to run a ticket on a clear cut platform. We did not poll as many votes as we expected, but we did a vast deal of what is in itself more important than polling votes—setting men to think.

Now we come to a still wider and more difficult field. If the political circumstances remain as they were in November I should say that difficult as is the task of entering the national arena with a third party we ought to attempt it. Even if we could not hope to poll much of a vote, we could at least provoke discussion and push organization, and give the earnest men all over the country who are disgusted with politics that mean nothing but spoils, a chance to cast a ballot that would represent the vital principle of American democracy, even if they had to write it.

But since Mr. Cleveland's message and Mr. Blaine's manifesto there are strong indications of an important change in political circumstances, and it is now not improbable that the contest between the two old parties next year may turn upon the issue of protection or free trade, an issue which we must meet the moment we enter the national arena, and that cannot be thoroughly discussed without bringing up the economic principles involved in our platform. Should this prove to be the case, our entrance into the presidential field might put us in the position of urging people to vote against a candidate pledged to measures of reform, which though small in themselves are in the line of our principles, and which would be among the first we ourselves should adopt if we obtained the power.

We can at least keep up an organization, push the work of our anti-poverty societies and land and labor clubs, and in the states where we have strength run candidates pledged to our principles. But before determining what we shall do in the presidential contest it seems to me that we ought to wait until the political situation becomes more clearly defined.

Meantime the discussion of this question among our friends through the columns of THE STANDARD will clarify thought and pave the way to united action when the time for action comes. And we have this to congratulate ourselves upon. President Cleveland's message and Mr. Blaine's manifesto have already provoked a discussion that cannot fail to do enormous good in educating the American people in the direction of our principles. From our standpoint the protective system is a matter of small importance, but the protective idea is a matter of the first importance. It, more than anything else, stands in our way. The great truth to which we would awake the people is that what is necessary to solve social difficulties and abolish poverty is not the "protection" of one set of men at the expense of another set of men, not the doling out of charity by the rich to the poor, but simple justice—that justice which will give to every man the perfect freedom which is bounded only by the equal freedom of all others.

His third article on "The Work of Knighthood," in the *Journal of United Labor*, General Master Workman Powderly devotes to the subject of government ownership and management of the telegraph, making a strong argument in its favor, and declaring that—

Our members in aiding in the work of establishing this system will be furthering the legitimate work of knighthood in accordance with the eighteenth section of the declaration of principles of the order of the Knights of Labor.

Mr. Powderly seems at last to be awakening to the fact that a great organization like the Knights of Labor, banded together to improve the conditions of labor, must have some clear aim and adequate programme, or it will crumble away. But he is only toying with this need in attempting to meet it by presenting such secondary issues as postal telegraphy.

Important though it may be in itself, the question of government telegraphy is relatively a minor matter. Government management of telegraphs unaccompanied with more fundamental reforms will not in the slightest improve the condition of the masses of the people. It will not raise wages; it will not make it easier to find employment; it will not diminish the intensity of the struggle for existence; nor yet will it diminish the corruptions of our politics. On the contrary, there *is* danger that under present political conditions the government management of telegraphs would but add to the power of the "machine."

The control of the telegraph is one of the ways by which monopolists appropriate to themselves wealth they do not earn. But what does it amount to as compared with the sheer robbery involved in the protective system? What is its importance as compared with the monopoly of land?

We might have not only government management of the telegraph, but government management of railroads; we might have not only government telegraphs and government railroads, but an assumption by the people of all businesses in their nature monopolies; and what would it avail, so long as the monopoly of land continued? Given a people of whom some are absolute owners of the land on which all must live and work, and of whom a great body have only the power to labor without any right (save as they buy it from others) to the use of that indispensable element on which alone labor can be exerted, and no matter how minor monopolies may be abolished, wages must still tend to the point that will give but a bare living, and the "leave to toil" be deemed a boon.

Mr. Powderly is hacking away at the branches. What the exigencies of the times and his influential position demand, is that he should strike at the root.

A circular in opposition to the management which Mr. Powderly represents has been issued "to the rank and file of the order of the Knights of Labor and others," by, as they style themselves, "The Provisional Committee of Philadelphia." Of the charges which this circular makes or implies against the central management of the order it is not necessary to to speak, nor do such anonymous charges merit much attention. But there are in this circular some good statements of general principles.

For instance, of the disposition to avoid the carrying into politics of great principles, and of the disposition to make "labor movements" and "labor influence" a mere means of getting offices for "friends of labor," this circular says:

The principles contained in the preamble and platform of the order are essentially political and can never be made a part of the laws of our land except through the ballot; hence every effort for independent political action, having for its aim the enforcement of these principles, should have our unqualified support. Personal politics, however, which have for their object the securement of favors to individuals at the hands of political parties or their managers are injurious to the cause of labor and must be put down. The order was never established to advance the interests of any one man at the expense of the masses, and hence anyone making political merchandise of his standing or influence in the order in order to secure favors from political bosses cannot be else than an enemy of labor and of the order, and is better out of it.

The absolute necessity of regarding fundamental facts and coming down to first principles if anything real and permanent is to be done for labor is thus stated:

As the vast army of unemployed men tramping through the country, driven by necessity to take work at any price, is one of the chief causes of the depression of labor and of low wages; and as there is little hope for labor until the sharp competition for employment, which makes workmen scabs and enemies of one another, is removed, it becomes our imperative duty to strive by all means to arrive at an understanding of the best means to disband and dismember this great army of the unemployed; and as it is self-evident that the Creator has provided sufficient for all that have been permitted to be born, it naturally follows that if there are some who, while willing to work, are yet suffering from the want of means to continue life, it must be because others are permitted by law to monopolize the natural gifts that were created for all. Hence we must swear death to monopoly.

The largest and most useful work of such an organization as the Knights of Labor—a work that, if it be not educational, will be but a writing on water—is thus outlined:

No effort should be spared to make the sessions of the local assemblies interesting, instructive, pleasant and profitable. Discussions and debates on labor topics should be freely indulged in, labor literature should be liberally made use of, and no pains should be spared to make the sessions attractive. Intelligence is the foe of rings and monopolies alike, hence it is important that workingmen should so far educate themselves as to be able to master the great labor question in every detail, as the surest means, not only to break down the causes of their oppression, but also to secure honesty and fidelity in their chosen leaders.

It is a hopeful sign that ideas such as are expressed in these parts of the opposition circular are stirring among the Knights of Labor.

HENRY GEORGE.

HUGH O. PENTECOST'S OPINION.

It is very evident that a difference of opinion is arising among the leading men of the united labor party as to the wisdom of going into a national campaign, with an apparently strong inclination on the part of Mr. Croasdale, Mr. Post and others against such action It is a fair question for discussion; and if we admit that there is more than one starting point for argument, an open question. To me, however, there is but one starting point for argument—moral, and, if you please, religious principles. As to what is the best policy for us to pursue, as policy, for me at least there is no question. Policy, as such, should not enter into the discussion. What is morally right? This is the only question. There may be difference of opinion as to what is right; but that, and not what is politic, is the basic question.

The expense, the difficulty, the political unwisdom of a presidential campaign are easily demonstrated to those who decide questions in the light of possible consequences. But to those who do not regard consequences as a factor in determining questions of duty, all such considerations have absolutely no weight. Mr. Post, whom I revere, and whose opinions I profoundly respect, thinks it would be an injury for us to become such a political organism as the prohibition party, which, he thinks, cuts a ridiculous figure. Politically the prohibition party, in many places, is ridiculous; but if we ever develop the moral and religious fervor, consistency and persistency which characterize the prohibitionists, I shall consider that victory for our principle is a matter of comparatively short time. I do not believe in the principle of prohibition, and even if it were right the issue is not large enough, as I look at it, to form a successful national party about; but apart from the best element in our party the prohibition party is the only party in American politics to-day which commands the respect of those who believe that men should vote always and only for principles. Such a party is morally splendid though politically ridiculous, and we shall only win by emulating the admirable example of those who stand up, year after year, in hopeless contests, to be counted.

Now, we advocate a great moral principle, involving in its success the most significant reform in history. The hope of such a movement lies in men who are moved by the consciousness that what they do is the will of God, by those who ask questions of their consciences, and, having received the answer, act accordingly. It may be that such men are in a minority among those who hitherto voted our ticket; but in them lies the hope of the movement, nevertheless, and any decision regarding the next national campaign which overlooks this numerical minority but moral majority will inevitably retard the success of our undertaking. If there is to be no presidential nomination by our party next year, and no nominations for other than legislative offices, these men cannot vote except they write their ballots, for they will not vote for republicans, democrats or prohibitionists, as such. It may be said they have the option of writing their ballots, and so need not be disfranchised; but should these men be abandoned by their leaders, by their party, because there are many half believers in our doctrine who have not the moral courage to identify themselves with a politically ridiculous party?

It is said that Mr. Cleveland, in his message, has come toward us, or is going in a bungling way in our direction, on the question of free trade, and therefore we should vote for him as against Mr. Blaine, for instance, who represents a protective policy. But Mr. Cleveland does not believe in our doctrines and is not a partial free trader because his partial free tradism looks in our direction. He is a democrat always, allied with those forces in society which we diametrically oppose. If we vote for him we vote for the strengthening of a party which we believe ought to die and give place, not to the republicans, but to a new party embodying our basic principle. Free trade is merely a logical result of our position on the question of land taxation; but tariff for revenue only, which Mr. Cleveland advocates, is not even a logical deduction from our position. We are glad to have sentiment forming, however feebly, in our direction, but with either existing party as such we can have, morally, nothing whatever to do. Parties may come to us but we cannot go to them.

Such movements as ours do not receive their initial strength by compromise measures or in men who balance on a question of the result of this or that policy. Radical measures preached and practiced by men with the spirit of the old Hebrew prophets will be worth more to us for the next ten years than all the world wisdom of Solomon. It is my personal opinion that our recent defeat was no defeat at all; it was simply a revelation, that we once had with us some thousands of persons who voted our ticket the year before for reasons which had nothing to do with the land questions. We are for the present better off without them; and should a national campaign reduce the New York vote still further, we shall still be better off without those who desert our ranks. We shall only begin to grow when we get down to the actual number of men who believe in our principle and who will vote for it simply and only because it is the principle in which they believe, and they can do no other. Then shall we wield a moral power which numbers cannot give us.

Our question has been raised by accidental political circumstances in New York city and we thought the natural law of reforms would now be violated by a steady increase in numbers. We have been rudely awakened from our delusion. Many of us now see where our weakness was. Let us not be disheartened; let us not be frightened into miserable tricks of political sagacity for the sake of seeming to keep the appearance of being stronger than we really are. Let us do rather what real men must always do—stick to principle at all hazards. If the time has not come for us to go into politics—if that is what our recent defeats mean—let us abandon our political organization altogether and push forward the work of propaganda in anti-poverty societies. But if we go into politics at all let us go in with nominees for all the offices and at every election.

I certainly will vote for no presidential electors except they will cast their votes for a man who believes in our principles—not necessarily Mr. George. It would possibly be better for many reasons not to put Mr. George in nomination. For such electors I will vote if I have to write their names on my ballot.

HUGH O. PENTECOST.

Henry George's Lecture on "Cleveland, Blaine and the Tariff."

The Seventh assembly district organization of the united labor party recently adopted the following preamble and resolution:

Whereas, President Cleveland's message and Mr. Blaine's manifesto bring into issue the question of free trade or protection; therefore, be it

Resolved, That Henry George be requested to address the people upon the subject of the application to this question of the principles of the united labor party and upon the true remedy for financial and industrial distress.

Mr. George accepted the invitation, leaving the time and place for the address to be fixed hereafter.

These facts coming to the knowledge of the executive committee of the Anti-poverty society, it requested Mr. George to deliver the proposed address at its meeting at the Academy of Music on Sunday evening, December 18, to which Mr. George agreed. The announcement of the lecture will be found in our advertising columns.

Running a Presidential Candidate Is the Best Way to Provoke Discussion.

BRENTWOOD, N. Y.—By placing candidates in the field of national politics the principles so plainly emblazoned upon the banner of the new crusade will undoubtedly be brought more forcibly before the eyes of the American people. The newspapers that are devoutly kneeling before the shrine of the money-bag in the person of the rotten old parties will be obliged to take notice of and discuss the doctrines therein involved.

Those principles, so clear and defined so well by labors' ardent orators, will then undoubtedly force themselves upon the thoughts of thinking men.

The prohibition party would never have polled the vote it now polls if it were not for its untiring energy and perseverance. The 70,000 ballots cast in one state in support of the "single tax" is indeed an army in itself, if but a regiment compared to either of the old parties' vote.

THOMAS E. BOLAND.

The United Labor Club of Binghamton.

BINGHAMTON, N. Y.—At the last meeting of our land and labor club the name was changed to "the united labor club" and the following officers were elected: L. S. Hinman, president; Chas. Evans, vice-president; D. De Jong, secretary, and John Reidy, treasurer. The little band of determined workers here are not willing to acknowledge a defeat in the last election. We believe that when 75,000 votes were cast for the nominee of the united labor party a great work was accomplished and in the end victory will surely crown our efforts. God made this earth for all His children.

L. S. HINMAN.

What One Missionary Is Doing in Augusta, Georgia.

AUGUSTA, Ga.—Many intelligent laboring men here who think and act for themselves have sighted the beacon light that will lead them through the darkness to the shore. Dr. M. W. Mabry, who is a regular subscriber to THE STANDARD, and a stanch and untiring worker in the good cause, has, step by step, almost turned his place of business into a reading room. His drug store is situated on Twelfth street at the east end of the Augusta factory, and the operatives snatch a few minutes from their dinner time to visit him and read THE STANDARD or hear it read.

JAMES DAVIS.

Run a Candidate and Provoke Discussion.

CHICAGO, Ill.—By all means let us have a presidential candidate in the field for 1888. No matter how few votes we may receive it will cause people to inquire what we are running a candidate for, and the discussion that is necessary to bring our principles into practical politics will be greatly advanced.

W. B. STEERS.

Approves of Louis F. Post's Idea.

AUBURN, Me.—I think Mr. Post's idea a good one. Protection or free trade should be the issue in the next campaign.

H. G. CASEY.

The Disease in the Social Frame.

New Church Messenger.

When the chasm widens between the very rich and the very poor, it is a sign that there is disease in the social frame. The swelling of one limb and the depletion of another, in the body, is not a good thing for the body itself or for either limb. The circulation is badly impeded and misdirected, and until it is restored disease is in the ascendant. So in the domain of commerce, the phenomenon of monopoly on one hand and starvation on the other does not present a picture of financial good on the one side and financial harm on the reverse side. It is bad all round. Your monopolist is the complete serf of his wealth. He is as abject a victim of circumstances as the employe who is dying on starvation pay. He suffers quite as much social and moral injury as his worst enemy could wish him. The public weal is served only when the hard-working men of business abilities can grow rich with comparative ease, and every willing worker can make a decent and comfortable livelihood. When this is not the case there is obstruction and stagnation somewhere, and it behooves a people to recognize the disease before the time of national death arrives.

MAINTAIN THE ORGANIZATION.

I notice that a number of STANDARD correspondents, in commenting on an article in which I expressed doubt as to the wisdom of the nomination of a presidential candidate by our party next year, appear to assume that I have suggested the temporary dissolution of the party. There is no warrant in my article for such a conclusion. I took it for granted that our party would return and endeavor to strengthen its organization, and I am heartily in favor of a national conference with a view to extending and solidifying our organization.

The first question that would come before such a conference would be a declaration of principles. On that subject there is no doubt in my mind. The Syracuse platform expresses explicitly the views I hold as essential to any relief for our people from the gathering power of monopoly, and I would not sacrifice one iota of the declaration there made for the purpose of conciliating ignorance or cowardice. For instance, a national conference would be called on to make a declaration concerning the tariff question. The man who does not see that the transfer of all taxation from industry to land values involves the absolute destruction of tariff duties has not, to use Judge Maguire's expressive phrase, "seen the cat," and I for one would not consent in order to conciliate him to refrain from the most pronounced expression in favor of absolutely free trade. I would rather be one of only three thousand men who know exactly what they want than one of three hundred thousand held together by the avoidance of the open declaration of really vital principles. Hence I am only in favor of a national conference of the representatives of those who do understand and uphold our principles.

The second question that would come before such a conference would be one of mere expediency. It would know from the beginning that it could elect no candidate. How, then, could it best advance its principles and familiarize the public with its ideas? Many appear to believe that the proper answer to this question is "run a presidential ticket." If that be the party's answer, after full consideration, that settles it. Meanwhile, I, knowing something of the cut of elections, comprehending the tendency of men to desert a hopeless candidate in order to help one or the other of those between whom the choice really lies, have feared that we could not make a creditable presidential canvass or cast for our candidates so large an aggregate vote as we could if we maintained our party organization and devoted our energies to electing as many congressmen as possible. This is an open question. It is a question that must, however, be decided by the party. My individual opinion is unchanged, but I consider it entirely possible that the party might insist on the presidential plan. To urge the congressional nomination plan does not, however, involve the abandonment of the party organization, and this is a fact that I hope all who engage in this preliminary discussion will remember.

I wish to add, however, that I should not apologize even if I had recommended the course some of my critics seem to think I did. There is nothing sacred about a party in my eyes. It is simply a voluntary combination for accomplishing certain results. When it ceases to serve the purpose of its organization it not only ceases to be useful but it becomes a public nuisance. My interest in the united labor party is based entirely on the fitness of that party to represent and its readiness if called to power to carry out the principles of the Syracuse platform. If it ceased to be fitted for this purpose I would care as little for it as I do for the old parties. At present, however, it seems to me to be the only party to which we can look for the presentation of our principles, and hence I have no idea of even hinting at its dissolution. On the contrary, my advocacy of the congressional nomination plan was distinctly based on the belief that it would be more effective than any other in holding the party together and in making a good showing of its strength at the polls.

WM. T. CROASDALE.

On Reflection, Thinks No Presidential Ticket Should be Nominated.

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—There is no section of the Union that is better fallow ground than this state of Missouri. Our people are not only willing but eager to hear our land doctrines explained. And you can have little idea of the work a few of us have done to sow the seed.

The course to be pursued by us next year, so far as a presidential ticket is concerned, is a matter to which I have given much serious thought. At first I was inclined to the opinion that we should nominate a ticket and stand up and be counted; but on reflection I have concluded that the proper course for us to take is to nominate state tickets, candidates for congress and state legislatures, and local officers where we have organizations that will enable us to make any sort of showing.

This would enable us to show our strength about as effectually as we could hope to do by running a presidential ticket; and we may, possibly, by concentrating our energies in certain congressional and legislative districts, secure the balance of power in congress, and in a few close states. In this way we can carry on the work of propaganda as well, if not better, than by nominating candidates for president and vice president.

One reason that impels me strongly to this conclusion is that at this time we could nominate no one for president but Henry George; and we cannot afford to sacrifice him—nor can he afford to be sacrificed—just to enable us to stand up to be knocked down.

H. MARTIN WILLIAMS.

Interesting to Believers in Union County, N. J.

Residents of Union county, N. J., who may feel disposed to join an association for the purpose of furthering the work of propaganda in Union county, are invited to send their names and addresses to Read Gordon, Roselle, N. J., or 563 and 565 Greenwich street, New York.

A number of citizens have already signified their intention to join the association, and a public meeting will be held in Roselle early in January.

Dr. McGlynn's Friends and His Followers.

James P. Archibald and Mrs. Margaret Moore were the speakers at the meeting of St. Stephen's parishioners held on Friday of last week in International hall, the big "family gathering," as some of them call it. It was a jolly, crowded meeting, and as everyone contributed both money and applause, it was a very satisfactory one. Chairman Feeney announced at the close that the doctor's personal fund had been increased by the sum of $69.

ANTI-POVERTY.

DR. M'GLYNN AT THE THIRTY-THIRD PUBLIC MEETING.

His Lecture On "Heads and Hearts"—A Very Interesting Meeting—Well Attended In Spite of the Bad Weather.

Mr. Louis F. Post presided at the thirty-third meeting of the Anti-poverty society in the Academy of Music last Sunday evening. After the opening hymn by the Concordia chorus Mr. Post announced that there would be a business meeting of the society during the month of January. The collection was then taken up, the choir again uniting in song while the baskets were being handed around. Dr. McGlynn came in at the close of the hymn and was greeted with the usual tumultuous applause.

Mr. Archibald then rose and said: The executive committee of the Anti-poverty society desires the announcement made that there has been formed a Progress and Poverty club. It is for the purpose of analyzing and obtaining a clear idea of the theories advanced by Henry George. The class was formed on Tuesday last and the first lecture will be delivered on Thursday evening next, December 15, at eight o'clock, in the meeting room, 24 Cooper union. The succeeding meetings will be on Wednesdays at eight o'clock, in the meeting room, 22 Cooper union, and the fee for the course to the end of April will be one dollar. This dollar is not to fee the lecturer, but to pay current expenses. The lecturer will be Louis F. Post. Applications for the class should be made at once to the secretary of the Anti-poverty society in Cooper institute any time during office hours.

Mr. Archibald also announced that the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost would deliver a lecture in Greenpoint, on December 19, under the auspices and for the benefit of the united labor party of Greenpoint, on "The Cause and Cure of the Labor Troubles." Admission fifteen cents.

Mr. Post next introduced the Rev. S. B. Hershey of Ashtabula, Ohio, who was received with applause. He said:

I have come all the way from Ohio to spend this Sunday here, for the purpose of seeing this assembly and hearing your speaker to-night and having some conversation with him. Your chairman has said that among the things to be accomplished before the end could be reached was the sending forth of your representative men all over this country. Now it is somewhat in the line of that work that I am here to-night. (Applause). I hope before I leave the city to have secured a definite understanding, so that I can take the speaker of this evening some time during the coming winter months and drop him down in a number of towns in northern Ohio to preach to us that which you gather so bountifully from him and from other sources. This is the gospel truth that needs to be heard. I cannot say that I am a thorough convert yet. I am on the way. I am very sure that these men are making some very definite efforts in a very much needed direction, and, for anything I can see, they have found the shortest road to the Kingdom. (Applause.) And I hope through the inspirations I shall gather from the lecturer to-night I shall carry away from this enthusiastic audience a determination to go home and do even better work than I have been doing in this line. (Applause.)

Mr. Post then announced the lecture on "Heads and Hearts," and Dr. McGlynn arose and stood for several minutes overwhelmed with applause. Finally he was allowed to proceed and said that following the precedent of the previous Sunday he would read for them a brief portion of the New Testament. He read the beginning of the first chapter of St. John's gospel and continued as follows:

It may not be amiss, dear friends, to repeat what we have so often said, that while we meet here on the Sunday evenings consecrated to the service, the praise and the supplications of the Most High, while we are never tired of protesting that if it were not for the religion in the movement that has given rise to our society many of us who may seem to be somewhat prominent in the movement would have no part in it, yet it is not our purpose to establish a church, to teach a new religion, to take a new departure. It is our purpose simply to preach to all men who will hear us that great truth which is for us not only a truth of political economy, of wisest statesmanship, but so radical and fundamental that we believe it to be the very essence and the core of all religion.

The great movement in which we are engaged has for its maxim and its motto that God, being equally the Father of us all, He is the stepfather of none; that having placed us here with those unalienable right to life, to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness which can arise alone from equal brotherhood under the fatherhood of God, He would no longer be worthy of that title of Father if He gave to any of His children the right to oppress or enslave any of their brethren. And therefore we argue from this great truth of natural religion, which must be also the very essence of revealed religion, of anything worthy of the name of religion, that the general bounties of nature are equally the property of all God's children regardless of their differences of age, of strength, of sex, of knowledge, of condition; that the rights of property are simply those that men acquire, by their own industry, to the product of their labor, whether of mind or hand, and that the natural opportunities, the general bounties of nature of which and out of which labor has to produce all those things that constitute wealth, are not the property even of the whole human family. God alone is their owner, and He has simply given, as Jefferson tells us, the usufruct of these bounties to each succeeding generation of living men. (Applause). Therefore is it that that wisest and most philosophical of our statesmen went on to say that he held that the dead have no ownership or control over the land. (Applause).

It is true of all great causes that they are essentially religious. Nothing can appeal to the deepest convictions and the profoundest sympathy of the minds and hearts of men unless it be religious, unless it take man away from his baser self, unless it tell him of something far above him, of something far beyond him, of something that was when he was not, of something that shall be when his baser part shall mingle with the common earth. It must appeal to an idea. It must be applied to the infinite, to the eternal, to the source of all truth and goodness, and beauty, and that is but another name for God. And this is so true that it is an actual fact, it is the clear truth, that the very men who hate and curse the name of God are doing so to-day because of the natural religion in their hearts. (Applause.) It is because under the name of God something has been presented to demand the allegiance of their minds and the love of their hearts at which their naturally religious minds and hearts revolt. A well known writer has said and had much reason to say: "If such be your God, I hate your God." (Applause.) And he was not so far astray when he continued: "Your devil is better, is wiser, is more lovable and adorable than the God that you have fashioned for yourselves." (Applause.) The men who are supposed to be the enemies of society, of order, of justice, of property, are impelled to do and to say, if you choose, the wrong, the blind, the violent, the insane things that they are doing. If they are insane, it is because they have had so long to wait for the fulfillment of the demands and the prophecies of the seers and sages of all times and all lands. It is because they have become tired of waiting for the accomplishment of justice. And, therefore, if apology were needed, all this is sufficient apology for our preaching religion from the stage of a theater; and while we continue to protest that we would establish no new church nor make any new departures, we have the right given to all men, whether priests or laymen, men or women, to speak God's truth to whomsoever is willing to hear it. And it is true that men who have gone away hungry and empty from the pews of churches have come to the theater, and there heard the word of God and believed it. (Applause.)

The portion of the Gospel of St. John that I have read for you was called from the first days in which it was read and heard the "golden gospel." The man who penned these lines is called "the eagle" and "the divine." While the other evangelists contented themselves with beginning their narratives with the description of the birth and genealogy of the Christ, this eagle, John, as some of the fathers have it, having rested his head upon the bosom of the Master at the last supper and an hour or two before the horrid agony began, imbibed thence larger draughts of heavenly wisdom and of heavenly love; and so it was but natural that when he began to pen the sacred story he should spurn the earth and pierce the clouds and go above the things of time and sense to that mysterious "beginning."

"In the beginning," when the first created intelligence sprang into existence, when matter and its correlatives, time and space, began to be, then there was a Something and that Something could have had no beginning, for in the beginning of all things else it was. "In the beginning was the Word;" and this word is extremely imperfect in its power to represent for us the original. It was the *Logos*. The Word, then, that was in the beginning, as the wondrous narrative tells us, was the very wisdom of God, that eternal, infinite, absolute, all-perfect intelligence, without which nothing is, nothing could be. "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was God. By Him were made all things that were made. Without Him was made nothing that was made." He is then the creative wisdom. He is the light. He is the power. It is by this infinite mind, the infinite, eternal, substantial wisdom of God that all things are. In that eternal Word, that transcendant mind, they find the reason of their being; they find their perfect ideals; they find their adequate end.

In the eternal idea, God sees all possible things and in the exercise of His very will He says to this and this, "Let them be," and they are. "Let there be light! And there was light." This is the philosophic and the true idea of the creation, that nothing could be if there were not an eternal Intelligence to give it reason for being, if there were not an eternal will to call it out of mere possibility into being.

But that infinite wisdom must work in a manner not unworthy of itself. It must have a purpose in all it does; and while it is not for our poor, weak intellects to measure and bound the wisdom and the works of God, yet it is within our power, and it is our duty as well, to discover something of his purposes, to admire his wisdom, to contemplate his goodness and to thank and praise his bounty.

And we may well discover in contemplating the plan of the universe how it would seem to have been without a rational and an intelligent purpose, if after the long evolution by which the world was fitted to be the habitation of man the Father had not at length led into this goodly scene, as if by the hand, His last, best work—a man. A clod of earth, it is true, with all the constituent elements of the visible universe, with an animal nature in common with the brute that perishes. But this, which is a scandal and a stumbling block to human pride, becomes but an additional evidence of the wondrous wisdom of the Father who gains His ends with so little expenditure of strength by simple processes, by a few simple laws evolving all things. It is not my purpose, dear friends, to discuss to-night the question of evolution; but it is entirely pertinent to say that the doctrine of the evolutionists has no terrors for me, that it does not disturb my faith in the Christian religion in the least. It does not diminish my admiration and my wonderment for the creation of man. It is immaterial for Christian theology and Christian truth whether man was created as if suddenly from the earth just as he is and then had infused into him a rational and an immortal spirit, or whether that body by a slow process of evolution through myriads of years may have been evolved from the sponge or the oyster into its present noble form. I say it is utterly immaterial; for it is and must ever be true that this body of ours is, as the first book of the scripture tells us, made from the slime of the earth. And it ever must be true that the mere clod of earth could never look up and say, "Our Father, who art in heaven," if the Father's spirit had not breathed into the nostrils of that mere clod a something which gave to the clod power to spurn the earth and with the penetrating gaze of the mind to perceive all the things of time and sense, and reach to a knowledge of the *Logos* —of the Word. (Applause.)

It is comforting for the religious faith that is in all of us—and I speak not merely of Catholics, of orthodox Christians or of religious men of the Hebrew faith, of men in a word who believe in one or another form of revealed religion—I speak of all those who believe in God, who believe in a spiritual essence, who believe in an eternal intelligence, who believe that this eternal intelligence is the spirit that has created and ruled the universe, who believe in an eternal will, who believe that there is a power for goodness and for justice and truth that is supreme, eternal, that is the master, the maker and the lord of all. It is for all these that I speak, and I say it is comforting for them all to learn from the most advanced of scientists that they themselves, while entirely convinced of the process of evolution, find in this process of evolution a series of breaks, of chasms, at the brink of which mere science stands simply staggered, appalled, bewildered. They have never yet been able and they never can be able—so many of them are willing to confess—to bridge over with mere science or scientific discovery the chasm that separates the vegetable from the mineral. And many of the more Christian minded of them are willing to admit a similar chasm between the brute and man.

We had a visit in this country a few months ago from a man who risked his life in the interest of geographical and ethnolgical science, in the exploration of central Africa, a civil engineer, a man entirely familiar with the teachings of the advanced modern scientists and entirely in accord with them in the doctrine of evolution, and yet, as some of them perhaps will think, strange to say, a Christian, an orthodox Christian, a man who, teaching science on week days, taught a class of workingmen religion, orthodox religion, on Sundays. Mr. Drummond, this civil engineer, has written a very remarkable book, entitled "Natural Law in the Spiritual World;" and the sum and substance of this very remarkable book is just this: that the whole orthodox system of creation, of original sin, of penace, of self-denial, of prayer, finds its perfect analogy in the processes of nature. He tells us that he discovered, as it were, this wondrous analogy, to his own great surprise and admiration, in teaching his Sunday class of workingmen the tenets of the Christian testament. He found himself, as was natural enough, trying to illustrate the religious truths that he believed by the similes with which he was familiar, by the truths of science. He found himself more and more explaining Christian tenets in the language of the advanced scientists. This brought new light to his mind. He actually found that what he was saying, simply because the language was that with which he was familiar, was substantially the very language of St. Paul, and that the doctrine of evolution and modern science generally threw a new and wondrous light upon Christian revelation.

Mr. Drummond remarks, in his book, the chasm that exists between the various natural things, and he finds a perfect analogy, so that he is not unwilling to admit a similar chasm between the mere brute animals and the rational man. And then he finds the peculiar illustration of these doctrines to be doctrines of orthodox Christianity; to be equally doctrines of the inspired singers of Israel and Buddha and Confucius. No man less than I can wish to disparage what I believe to be the peculiar pre-eminence of the Christian teaching. But I am happy to be able to say that in the Christian schools of Rome I have been taught a Christian philosophy and a theology that justifies me in preaching every word that I utter from this platform. (Great applause.)

It is a significant thing that the priests of the Christian church and ministers of every denomination, the monks in their solitudes and canons in their cathedrals, can to-day find nowhere utterances so ready and so apt and so wondrously well adapted to express their highest flights of religious enthusiasm, their highest idea of the contemplation of the fatherhood of God, their wondrous admiration of the glories of His handiwork and the love of their hearts and gratitude to the best of fathers, than in the inspired utterances of the king, the prophet and the psalmist of Israel. And so, I might add, utterances from Buddha, Confucius, Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, words surely not uninspired of God, coming from that unseen source of truth and light which can be none other than the Word.

And this is confirmed by what I have read for you: "The Word was in the beginning;" "by Him were made all things that were made;" "He is the light that enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." And so that Word of God, that Mind of God, is for the whole rational universe the sun, as essential to its being as is the sun of our system essential to the material life of all this solar system. And this truth was not hidden from the sages of pagan antiquity. It was clearly seen by Plato and Socrates, by Aristotle, by the sage Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius. And, in fact, it is not denied that this first gospel of St. John was but a translation as it were by the inspired sage, "son of thunder," as Christ himself called him, into platonic language of the truths that he had imbibed from the bosom of Christ. The very word that he uses is not mentioned in any other gospel, and this Word, this *Logos*, the evangelist had learned from Plato. (Applause.)

This view gives to these material forms of ours, to these material bodies, a grace, a charm that else they could not have. In speaking of "heads and hearts" we are speaking of the mind of man. We are speaking of the will, the affections. We are speaking of man's capacity to know the truth, of his capacity to enjoy the beautiful, to body forth in himself images of beauty and that wondrous capacity of the heart of man to spurn the earth and to rise to the level of the unseen and eternal good. The head and the heart of man are but the seat and the instruments and the signs and symbols of these spiritual faculties of the rational soul itself. The word that enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world, gives to each man the light of reason that makes the human head something totally different from all the rest of the visible creation; it is the light that comes to the mind of man, the truth that he thus perceives that gives to his will an object that is totally different from the objects that are the pursuit of the mere brute creation. It is that that gives men a law peculiar to man, a moral law that in a measure emancipates man from the law of mere force, of mere passion, of mere appetite and makes him stride the world, its master and its king, the monarch of all he surveys, although so inferior in strength, in agility, to so many of the brute creation. It is this power of thought, it is this love of unseen beauty, it is the power to conceive an ideal of a beauty that never was in created things; it is the necessity, not to say the capacity, to love an eternal and an ideal of beauty, that make man the lord of creation, that gives to human heads and human hearts an inexpressible grace and diguity, that makes all the wondrous beauty of our art, our poetry, our sculpture, our painting, our eloquence. It is this that gives all its charm to the dramas of the great bard of Avon. It is this that gives all its wondrous attractiveness to the wisdom of a Plato or a Socrates. It is, in a word, this power to know the truth and to love the good this creative efficiency that assimilates us to God, the creator of all things, that make men and women, that make the human head take on something of the divine.

It is this that gives to human heads and hearts their peculiar dignity. If there be no God, if there be no eternal intelligence, if this spirit within us, with its power to know the true and the good and the beautiful, has no adequate object, then is our whole life a mockery; then is this world a cruel jest, then were it better that we had never been born, then upon the tomb of all humanity—the sooner it should die the better. Or, if of human life there is nothing else than what we see and feel here, what we do and say and suffer; if this human life is but the wail of a child as it is born, is but the weeping of that child as it journeys on and toils and fights and suffers, is but the dying of that child with its ideals unattained, with its hopes vanished, with its illusions disenchanted, so that upon the tomb of a child may be properly engraven, as has been engraven:

He was born, he wept and died;
Brief history of the longest life.—

If the longest life can thus be summed up in so brief a history, and after this longest life there is nothing else, then might we well say that this life of ours, this power to think, this subtle feeling, these keen affections, were given to us not by the wisdom of a creative God and Father, but by a mocking fiend. Then would the manicheism be justified that taught that all this visible world is but the creature of a fiend, of a mocking god; of a god of evil, that there is an eternal principle of evil, of error, of darkness and of eternal conflict between the principle of good and evil. But this is a mockery; it is an absurdity; it is against right reason; it is but an insane dream of distorted human minds. Let us hold to the healthy and the wholesome view that truth is supreme in the world, that all things have been made in measure and in form, and that while we cannot always see their object or take in their meaning, we do see enough to say that there is a spiritual power in the universe that works for good, that the highest wisdom is that of the little child that looks up into the father's countenance with perfect faith and confidence in what He says, with perfect love for His holy will, with perfect assurance that in doing that Father's will as it has been written by the creative finger upon the heart of every one of His children, we shall do the highest wisdom, and in His good time shall be called to enjoy the reward of perfect service and perfect knowledge and perfect love, so that the wisdom of the child consists in this—in knowing that there is a Word that enlighteneth every man with the capacity of a fuller union. That Word makes all men equal. That Word calls man to a wondrous transformation into the image of the divine, and while we cannot all be learned, while we cannot all read God's book in the stars, as some of His gifted ones have been able to do, we all can, the least of us, the least gifted, read the handwriting of the Father upon the hearts of each of us, telling us that we are to promulgate the eternal teachings of God's law: "Blessed are the clean of heart for they shall see God;" "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice, for they"—somewhere, somehow—"shall have their fill;" "Blessed are the peacemakers;" "Blessed are ye when men revile you and say all manner of evil against you for my name's sake, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Applause).

All can read phrases or their equivalents that have been written in the moral law, in the instincts of men, upon their hearts, upon tablets of flesh, by the creative finger of God the Father. It is no part of Christian theology that we have been redeemed by some new and strange God. It is her teaching, it is her belief, and all other belief were a vain phantasy, that we have been redeemed and elevated, purified by the God who hath made us. "God so loved the world that He sent His only begotten Son." The Father was never unmindful of His original work. He had never forgotten the world. He had never for a single moment withdrawn the watchful care of His providence. And if He permits the wandering it is because He wishes the wanderer to enjoy more perfect bliss by his return to the Father's home. If He permits sorrow it is because of the more perfect joy that would come after the sorrow. If He permits sin it is because of the more wondrous redemption by which the sin should be more than atoned for. And so it is our faith that He doeth all things well, that the word that enlighteneth our minds is the very Word of God.

And we do believe that some eighteen centuries ago there stood in the midst of the world a man who spake as man never spoke before and came not to speak words of natural wisdom, to give us codes of jurisprudence, to give us treatises of astronomy, to teach us language, but to speak as man never spoke before the simple truths, the universal truths, the truths that concern best and most the eternal interests of man, the truths that go to the very foundation of human nature and human society, the truths that if rightly understood and practiced could cure all the ills that afflict human society and would speedily make this earthly habitation what the Saviour calls the kingdom of heaven on earth.

We of this Anti-poverty society have come together in order to do what we can to hasten the coming of that blessed day when men hungering and thirsting for justice shall begin even here to taste somewhat of that fullness which they must hope to attain to the perfect enjoyment hereafter. We are saddened, we are disappointed, and at times a few of us are made angry by witnessing the terrible distortion of God's will in civil society, by witnessing the practical denial of fraternity, the almost universal acceptance as a matter of practical politics, of practical political economy, that human society is not a brotherhood, but that it is a brutal competition between so many wild beasts, or slightly tamed, condemned to live together in one pit, the object of each one being, by scrambling, by getting ahead of his brother, by overreaching his brother, to get more of the few things that were cast as it were in contempt into that pit that the brute animals might snarl and fight and tear one another in order to enjoy a little more of the good things (applause), that they might enjoy a little more of the few good things that this Maker and Master of the animals in the pit has not provided in sufficient quantity to satisfy their brute, animal appetites.

Now, that is practically the teaching of your politicians; that is the teaching of your journalists. But something sadder still remains to be told, that is largely the practical teaching and in some instances the theoretical teaching of men who, after the example of Him whom they call Master, are ready enough to promote the building of hospitals and infant asylums, and homes for destitute children and the like, and tell us that it is by doing such things as these that a society that takes to itself the name of Christ and calls itself his Christian church will regenerate the world if we will only give it time enough (laughter), and by also teaching the rich that they can purchase heaven for themselves by giving the tenth part of their superfluity to the poor, and teaching the poor that they can purchase heaven by bearing patiently all their trials and accepting with gratitude the tenth part of the superfluity of the rich. (Applause and laughter.) . . .

Now, I say it is all very well to do all that, and entirely proper that that should be done; and the beauty of it is that where it needs to be done the doing of it reverently, religiously, is a tribute that we pay to the divine sacredness of humanity. Every man who believes in the brotherhood of man must believe that human life is inestimably precious. Thus love of the outcast, the mere waif and the insane, becomes inestimably precious, and the test of our regard for this sacred humanity is at its weakest point just as the test of the strength of a chain is at its weakest link.

I have lectured time and again upon all this, and am prepared to do so again, but I have always felt and I feel to-day and I assert that the highest charity, the divinest charity is to fill the minds and the hearts of men with the enthusiastic love of justice (great applause), and to teach all men to do justice and to do it not grudgingly, and that that charity means something far higher than doling out pittances. It means the love of God because he is infinite love, and the love of all our brethren because they are stamped with the divine image of so good a Father; and I assert with all sincerity and all conviction that that is the charity which animates the men who sit upon this platform and animates with wondrous enthusiasm the minds and hearts of those who are the members of this society. (Applause). . . .

It were a cruel mistake to make pain and suffering and poverty and filth and dirt and disease such blessed things that we should coddle disease and have a care not to do too much to exterminate ill-health and abolish poverty as if it were interfering with the plan of God. (Applause.) The mockery of such a doctrine is precisely like that of those who should assert that a continual war is the desired condition of humanity. Even pagans who professed no such sublime code of brotherhood and love of peace understood the wisdom and the maxim that war was simply intended to conquer peace. And yet there are preachers of religion who would actually have us coddle poverty like those who, while fighting cholera or small pox, would carefully preserve the germ, lest the world might be after a while entirely deprived of these great blessings of cholera and small pox. (Laughter.) These good Christian people—for they are Christians after a fashion, and I believe they will save their souls, a great many of them—are guilty of precisely the same folly. . . .

What a beautiful ideal is held forth to all humanity, in the person of that best friend of humanity, as He died that we might live a fuller, truer, holier, diviner life. He died crowned with the thorns of earth and His heart literally broke because of its unrequited love. And thus will it be with all those who would do something for humanity, with those who, having seen clearly a great truth, would make it known to the multitude. Let them go on and tread the steep and thorny and rugged path where He has led. They too shall die upon the cross and crowned with thorns, and if their hopes may too often seem to be dispelled as if illusions, even they, they may have to go beyond without catching in the midst of midnight gloom anything like a glimpse of the dawn of the coming of the day of the Lord. Let them die even with breaking hearts but still with perfect confidence that that day is destined to dawn, that the time shall come when, all the more because of the thorns and the breaking hearts, humanity shall rejoice in the perfect fulfillment of the Lord's Prayer: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

Loud and repeated applause, as Dr. McGlynn concluded, showed how deeply the audience appreciated his words. The proceedings closed with the singing of the "Cross of the New Crusade" by the Concordia choir, the whole audience rising and joining in the chorus.

Prohibition and the Single Tax.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—What has ever become of the promised discussion of the labor and prohibition questions between the *Voice* and THE STANDARD? I expect great things from it when it occurs, seeing that the labor party and the prohibition party are the only ones that have any principle to discuss, and that a union of their forces is greatly to be desired, though how it is to be accomplished yet, I cannot see, in view of the fact that so many of the labor party are not interested in the liquor question, and so many of the prohibitionists are blind to the evils of land monopoly. Nevertheless let us have the discussion, for nothing but good can come of it.

I am satisfied, judging by my own experience, that the probabilities are that far more prohibitionists will be led to relegate prohibition of the liquor traffic to a place second to prohibition of land monopoly than there will be of single tax advocates converted to subordinate their reform to prohibition. I judge by myself. I am an ardent believer in prohibition. For many years I believed and preached from hundreds of platforms that prohibition is the only possible solution of the liquor question. I believe that now. But, whereas I used to preach that the drink waste was the efficient cause of national poverty and bad trade, and that the diversion by personal total abstinence and national prohibition of the $1,000,000,000 or more wasted on drink and its results into the channels of trade would be sufficient to give us perpetual good trade and abolish all involuntary poverty, now I do not believe it. A close study of the simple and clear headed philosophy of Henry George has convinced me that great as is the drink evil there is a greater underlying it, and which is largely the cause of it—monopoly of land. I find that in all my delineations of the prosperity, morality and national advancement that would follow the turning of the drink money into the channels of industry, I had forgotten the all-absorbing landlord, who would be the great reaper of the new prosperity. It is easy to see—when properly pointed out—that no one has such an interest in the pecuniary profit of prohibition as he. A sober nation would be worth millions more to him than at present. The drunken people do not produce as much as the sober, and therefore cannot pay as much rent; and we can easily see that if some $1,500,000,000 could suddenly be devoted to building houses, producing furniture, clothing, and all other necessaries; the inevitable result, after the primarily consequent good trade, and the superabundance of work, wages, comfort and luxury to the working classes, would be the land boom, the paper city, the land speculator's free ride and free lunch, the high soaring rent and—things, economically, the same as now. The only benefit I can conceive to result from prohibition would be a sober people, who, being in a better condition to think, would be all the sooner ready to go to the ballot box and vote the landlord out.

I am a lifelong teetotaller; but for the life of me I have never seen what advantage, pecuniarily, it has ever been to me. When wages have been cut down, my employer never spared me because I was no drunkard; and when the landlord has raised my rent it has seemed to me that he did it because I could afford to pay it—not spending my wages in the saloon. As the rain is no respecter of persons, falling alike on the just and on the unjust, so the landlord falls on whomsoever he can, be he teetotaller or drunkard.

But are not multitudes of good and prominent prohibitionists totally blind to the gigantic curse of land monopoly? There are amongst them some of the greatest landlords, whose incomes, spent freely in the "cause," are derived from as cruel a wrong and injustice. The *National Temperance Advocate* this month quotes the Scottish-American millionaire, Andrew Carnegie, as an example of what early abstinence will do towards making a "self-made" man. Though not expressly asserting it, the article leads one to infer that the fact that he never entered a barroom is the basis of his success in life—when we all know that his millions were made by a government monopoly and a "protective" tariff, which simply enabled him legally to plunder his fellow men. And hundreds of others who put their names down for large amounts towards the prohibition cause derive their incomes from the same wicked injustice that has made Andrew Carnegie rich.

We may well ask then if the land monopoly robbery is not working as much evil as drink. Anyhow, wrong is wrong by whomsoever committed, and land rent robbery is not right because the liquor traffic is wrong. The prohibitionist's doctrine is that if a thing is wrong there can be no "licensing" of it; no half way toleration of it—utter abolition of it is the only logical treatment. Therefore, by their own reasoning, if land ownership, with its inherent power of blackmailing labor, is unjust, nothing short of total prohibition of it is logical; and consequently, for the united labor party, there is nothing for it but following their teaching—to attack the prohibitionist land owners as enemies of society, just as they attack the liquor dealers as enemies.

For my part I have given up prohibition as the hope of trade until we get monopoly of land broken up; then in a truly free state, where every citizen shall be invested with his natural rights, I would vote for prohibition.

F. SCRIMSHAN.

AT A RAILWAY STATION.

"Say, boss, give me enough to get some grub! I've had nothing to eat since yesterday."

So said a tramp at a Hudson river village railroad crossing one afternoon a fortnight ago. He seemed under forty, but was bent and wrinkled before his time. His clothes were tattered and filthy; his shoes worn and twisted out of shape, and his beard unkempt and matted. On his head was an old soft felt hat, riddled with holes, and under one arm was a bundle done up in a soiled yellow cloth. His face bore an expression of mingled humility and cunning, and when I gave him something he muttered thanks and shambled rather than walked away.

I asked the railroad gateman if many such men came that way.

"Not many as rough looking as that one," he answered, "but there soon may be. There are lots of men prowling around and it doesn't take long to get to the bottom of a grade. They come tramping along the track and when they ask for something to eat I can't refuse, for there may be honest men among them. Not long ago one came limping along and stopped and looked toward my house, near the track there, and he came over and asked for a piece of bread.

"'I'm no tramp,' he said. 'Poverty's got me down. I'm going home to get a job'—and he stopped and his eyes filled with tears.

"It broke me all up to see him humbled. Another fellow and I fixed him up and sent him home on a train. Two weeks after a letter came, and in it was the little money we had given him.

"There are plenty of men like that. They go tramping from place to place looking for work. They are ashamed to beg at first, but hunger brings them to it. Perhaps if they get a job it lasts only for a short time, and out they have to go again.

"You see, unless times are flush, some men must be out of work, and the only question is, who shall do the tramping?

"The average man does not last long under the strain. He loses courage and believes fate is against him. He finds that if he pockets his pride it is easier to beg or steal than to get work and earn a living.

"What's the result? Bums and dead beats. Men without homes. Fellows who live at the least cost. And that is why election day is a godsend to them. Besides money for their votes there are free drinks and cigars and in many cases lodgings. They make hay while the sun shines."

I could stay no longer. My train was at the station. But I did a good deal of thinking as I was whirled away.

H. GEORGE, JR.

How Large and Broad Were the Sympathies and Charities of "Society" in the Time of the Apostles?

The following letter, addressed by a Methodist minister in a large city—a sympathetic, honest man—to a correspondent of THE STANDARD, is interesting as illustrating the view which many earnest men take of the social problems of the day.

My Dear Sir: Your note is at hand. I observed your presence at church last Sabbath evening and was glad to see you. You have a hearty invitation to come often.

The slight reference to questions of social order was meant to be a thrust at socialism as now taught and to show that it could not be based on the spiritual communism of the New Testament. The pith of my meaning was in this sentence: "The regeneration of society depends upon the regeneration of the individual." If society was as large in its sympathies and broad in its charities and deep in its feeling of brotherhood as the little band of apostles was we would have less social inequalities; but as every man had need he would receive from such as had more. Instead of taking away the rich man's wealth (as the commune would), in order to ameliorate the poor man's poverty I would have the rich and poor meet together at the cross, believing as I do that the spirit of Christ in the heart of man is the solution of most of our problems of social disorder, and to quote from the Book that "whoso seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"

I do not profess to assent to all Mr. Henry George advocates. I think him a sincere man and am glad to read what he writes when time permits. To say that I agree with his proposed remedy would not be honest, and to refuse to read him would be narrow. So I read and sift and wait for the dawning of a better day. Yours sincerely, ——

The President of the Philadelphia Anti-Poverty Society Favors a National Convention.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—Believing that in deciding the question of a presidential nomination next year, the opinions of men, who, like Messrs. Post and Croasdale, bore the burden of the last campaign, should have great weight, I still think the subject should properly be settled by a national convention. As to the propriety of holding such a convention at the earliest possible date in January, there can be no question. The great encouragement to all workers that would come from the mere touch of heart with heart and mind with mind, the advertisement our principles would receive—the fact that the coming together in national convention of our representative men would compel the thoughtful attention of many "still in darkness"—are in themselves sufficient reason for the holding of the convention, even if there were no matters of vital importance to the future of the party to be discussed and decided. With native modesty, I think Philadelphia the best place for the convention.

We have ample railroad facilities and hotel accommodations, are sufficiently central, need just such a stirring up as the convention would give us, and then surely the doctrines of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man can be proclaimed from no more fitting place than the City of Brotherly Love and of the Declaration of Independence.

W. J. ATKINSON.

Not to Run a Ticket Would Look Like an Attempt to Bring Free Trade In at the Back Door.

MARBLEHEAD, Mass.—As far as my individual opinion is concerned I believe it would be best to run a straight, party ticket. Messrs. Post and Croasdale have declared themselves in favor of electing members of congress wherever possible and making no nomination for president. This would look to me like an attempt to "bring free trade in at the back door" and sink the main issue out of sight.

I believe if the united labor party sticks to principle it will triumph a great deal quicker, for right is bound to triumph in the end.

ALBERT H. RODGERS.

Sergeant Alphonse's Opinion.

EAST ORANGE, N. J.—Those of our friends whom I have talked with favor a presidential nomination. To bring on a full discussion I nominate Judge James McGuire of California. Henry George I think should take care of THE STANDARD. E. C. ALPHONSE.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

A Goodwill Value.

ITHACA, N. Y.—I understand that under the system of taxation proposed by Mr. George ground rents and the taxes collected by government would always be substantially the same. A friend with whom I have been discussing the matter says that it is incorrect to say that a landlord under the proposed system would pay as taxes neither more nor less than he receives from his tenants as ground rent. He might, he says, get many times the amount of his taxes under some circumstances. The aim would be for government officials to get at the average rental value of all like opportunities in any particular neighborhood or community and collect this, giving to each individual landlord always the enhanced value of his particular opportunity made by his own effort, but holding him accountable for an incomplete or poor use of this opportunity. The government, he says, will not be concerned if the landlord makes no use of a valuable opportunity, nor, if he, by erecting superior buildings and by judicious advertising or ingenuity in attracting attention to their particular locality, increases above normal the rental value of both his building and his opportunity or ground. This, he holds, gives a just reward for ability, industry and foresight.

I cannot see that any ability or industry or foresight by a landlord can affect the rental price of the land itself. Can you? Please reply in column of Q. and A. in STANDARD.

L. D. S.

Your friend is in part right. A merchant might by ability, industry and so on draw custom to his store which would give to it a value that similar stores on either side of him would not have. This value it is not proposed to tax. His tax would be the same as that of his immediate neighbors. But if his *land* increased in value, a fact that might be proved by inquiring whether the land on either side of him had increased, his tax should be raised. It is the value that attaches to the land, not that which attaches to good will, that the single tax is intended to reach; and as a matter of experience value does not attach to particular land without also attaching to adjoining land equally good.

But your friend is wrong when he says that a landlord might receive in *ground rent* many times the amount of his taxes. If the single tax were imposed to the full extent he could not receive any greater rent than the house was worth unless it might be a rent for good will of the business, which would not be ground rent. I can understand that a landlord might establish a drug store to which people are in the habit of going and which therefore has a peculiar value, and he might rent this store for more than the tax and the value of the building together, but the surplus would not be ground rent unless he could rent the place for as much for another purpose.

Impoverished Farmers.

CLAY CENTER, Kan.—(1) If economy in government, co-operation, legislative enactments, improvement in machinery, etc., all result in enriching the land owner because he owns that without which wealth cannot be produced, why is it that a majority of the men who own farms in this western country are growing poorer?

(2) Is it not a fact that the alternate contraction and expansion of the money volume is at the bottom of this trouble?

W. D. VINCENT.

(1) Because their interests as land owners are trifling compared to their interests as laborers. The effect of improvements in machinery, etc., is to lower the margin of production, that is, to give value to land that before had no value and greater value to land that before had little value, and so on up to the most valuable land known. The owners of land profit by this in greater or less degree according as their land is just above or far above the margin of production. Now the land of farmers is at best only a little above the margin of production. It has but little value, and the farmer, instead of living on his land value must live by working. But for his work he can get only the current rate of wages for the kind and quality of work he does, a rate that is governed by what he could produce on the best land to be had for nothing. Fix your thoughts upon the most desirable land you know of which is not worth anything in the real estate market, and ask yourself what a farmer could make on such land. Whatever that may be, plus the rental value of land in your community, measures what your farmers can make where they are, and it is no doubt not much more than they could make on the best non-valuable land. They are really workers for wages, not land owners.

It is true that to some extent their land is made more valuable by improvements, but not in the same degree as mining and city land, because the supply of farming land is large compared with the supply of city and mining land.

Read "Progress and Poverty," chapters 2, 6, 7 and 8 of book 3 and the whole of book 4.

(2) The alternate contraction and expansion of the currency, debts being enforced by law, results disastrously; but if this were all remedied the fact would remain that any increase of productive power would lower the margin of cultivation, and would, by raising rent, lower wages and tend to impoverish all who relied upon their own labor for a living.

The Tobacco Tariff.

PHILADELPHIA.—Will you please answer the following? The tariff duty on Sumatra leaf (75 cents per pound) and Havana (35 cents per pound) puts the cost of these tobaccos so high that they can only be used on cigars that sell for $30 a thousand and upward and cigars of a lower price are made of domestic leaf. Remove the duty and Sumatra and Havana will be used in making cigars to sell for $15 a thousand, therefore the market for our home leaf in quantity used and price will be less. Without reference to the benefits derived by the small manufacturer and consumer, will not the farmer's condition be worse? For example: A farmer from his acre raises enough leaf to pay him $1,000 for a season under our present system and then under free trade raises the same quantity but demand being less prices fall and he receives $300 or $400.

J. B. D.

When you remember that the terms "producer" and "consumer" merely express different economic functions of the same individual you will see the absurdity of considering such propositions, coupled with the condition that no reference shall be made to benefits to the consumer.

If the farmer could do nothing but raise tobacco, and the tobacco tariff was the only one abolished, he would, benefits to consumer being omitted, be worse off. But considering the benefits to him as a consumer and bearing in mind that free trade would abolish all tariffs, he would be better off. In the item of cigars alone he would gain $15 a thousand, and on a hundred and one other things he would gain in proportion to the duty thrown off. If he could not profitably raise tobacco in competition with soils better adapted to tobacco than his, he would have to, and it would be better for all concerned if he did, either go to a better soil for tobacco or abandon tobacco production for the production of things that tobacco raisers and tobacco dealers want, and which, under a system of free trade, they would be better able to buy than now.

You may be perfectly sure of this, that not a pound of Havana or Sumatra tobacco will come into this country without sending some kind of domestic product out, and that the domestic product will demand as much value in labor for its production as tobacco does.

Notes.

H. G. CASEY, Auburn, Me.—The rank of general is a grade higher than that of lieutenant-general.

G. M. DANGHADAY, Cleveland, O.—The opinion expressed in the newspaper clipping you inclose is, I have no doubt, sound law. If it is true that your constitution requires laws to be passed taxing *by a uniform rule*, all real and personal property according to its true value in money, the single tax cannot be adopted in your state without a constitutional amendment.

GEO. F. LEWIS, Victor, Iowa.—To tax homestead land at half the tax of similar land held on speculation would open the way to fraud and lead to confusion. Nor does consideration for the poor home owner demand it. The removal of all taxes save taxes on land values would improve his condition so much that his land value tax even if improved to the full extent would be a bagatelle.

LOUIS. F. POST.

The Party Would be Handicapped by the Want of a Full National Ticket.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Never before has the world possessed such facilities for the dissemination of ideas. This is clearly shown by the fact that it is but a very short time since "Progress and Poverty" came before the public, and a still shorter time since the crystalization of the ideas in that book into the Syracuse platform, yet we see in THE STANDARD each week letters of encouragement—offers of aid and contributions, not only from Canada to Florida and Texas to California, but from all quarters of the civilized world. Such a story is in itself a revolution, but it goes to show the advantages which this generation have over those past in bringing about a reform in a peaceable and lawful manner. And just as quickly and certainly as the thought influenced by Mr. George's writings culminated—first in the petition signed by the thousands for him to run for mayor, then the formation of the Anti-poverty society, then the united labor party with the Syracuse platform—so quickly and surely will the movement become still more and more broadened and universal.

It is strange that at such a time there should be among the leaders a division of opinion as to the advisability of this same party having a presidential candidate in the campaign for next year. Still, however, since there is a difference of opinion, the question had better be well considered before being positively acted upon.

However it may appear as a matter of policy, surely, as a question of principle, there can be no doubt. That our government is concerned in the legislative rather than the executive, is true; but is not the office of president legislative as well as executive? Has not the president the power of veto, which is equal to a two-thirds vote of the house? Certainly it is a negative power, but it is a power, just the same.

Many of our people may not wish to vote in the air; but not so with the crusaders. In our state campaign not one of the 73,000 votes for secretary of state were cast with the idea that there was any hope of present success. Every county in this state stood up to be counted this fall, and by next fall every county of every state will do the same, because our principles are not simply novelties—are not narrow and questionable, as are those of the prohibitionists, nor shallow like those of the late greenbackers, nor altogether wanting, like those of the two large parties, but are based on the fundamental laws of justice and reason. The earnestness of each individual of our party is a novelty in politics, and the year will show what individuals can and will do. But should they be handicapped by the absence of a full national ticket they will be discouraged, and only go at their work in a half hearted manner.

That the prohibitionists have drifted into the slough of despond is true; but is it because of their consistency and persistency in always having a ticket in the field? The trouble with them is a constitutional one—the narrowness and smallness of their object, to which complaint our party can never tend.

Certainly a presidential campaign—in fact any campaign—means much work and expense; but can we call ourselves crusaders if we shirk duty—duty to such a noble cause? Is there not among us brain and muscle and money, combined with a willingness and desire to work and give, sufficient to carry us through next fall? Yes, surely. And have we not the tools to work with in THE STANDARD and the land and labor library, by which at almost nominal cost we can carry the war home to every one? What more do we want?

R. W.

The Anti-Poverty Society of St. Louis.

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—The fifth public meeting of the Anti-poverty society of St. Louis was held at Euterpe hall, Jefferson avenue and Walnut streets, this evening. H. Martin Williams was chairman, and after the singing of one of the new crusade songs by the Anti-poverty chorus, Mr. Mortimer D. Shaw was introduced as the first speaker. Mr. Shaw spoke for one hour on the subject of "Taxing the Land Values" in an interesting manner, making the subject clear to the audience. Mr. E. Clifton followed in a half hour talk on the subject of "Taxation," illustrating his points to good advantage by the use of the blackboard, showing that he had made a thorough study of the question. It was decided to hold the public meetings every two weeks, on Sunday evenings. We have called on all persons interested in the subject to contribute such sums as they may feel able to help the cause in St. Louis to the Anti-poverty society through the secretary, C. M. Wilson, postoffice box 416, the same to be acknowledged through the local labor paper (the *New Order*). We have done well so far, and hope through this method to do far more.

CHARLES M. WILSON,
Secretary, postoffice box 416.

"In Hoc Signo Vinces."

March on! ye heroes! battling for the right,
Lo! day is breaking—it will soon be light;
Be ready for the conflict when it comes,
Stand firm for God, for Truth, and for your homes!

From Thought's far heights a kindling splendor creeps,
Down to the vales and plains where darkness sleeps—
It is the dawn of an eternal day,
Whose conquering sun shall drive the night away!

With eyes uplifted to your dome of blue,
Where flames the sign that proves your cause is true,
March forth to battle! Front the vaunting foe,
And give him steel for steel, and blow for blow!

The False has triumphed oft in other years,
And stabbed the true to death with brutal spears,
Has forged its fetters for a world of slaves,
And filled the bloody earth with martyr graves;

The Wrong has built her monuments of shame,
That stand for aye in an accursed fame,
And still the harlot lolls upon her throne,
And calls, in drunken dreams, the world her own—

Then, fear not, ye who lead the battle-van
In the great fight of Faith for God and man,
Though Fate should, sometimes, blunt your battle-swords,
And Victory's eagles perch on Satan's hordes;

'Tis but God's way to try you, and to test
What kind of heart is beating in your breast,
The hero's or the coward's—fight on still!
There is no Fate save God's almighty will.

And God's will is that Babylon must fall!
His will be done! Is he not Lord of all?
God's will, I tell you, is the voice of Fate,
His sign is in the heavens—behold! and—wait;

Wait—for the glory of the noon-day sun!
Wait—till the will of God be fully done!
Wait—till the Angel of the Lord appears!
Wait—though the waiting be a thousand years!

Bear ye the cross if ye would wear the crown!
On with the fight! Nor lay your armor down
Till from her throne accursed Wrong is hurled,
And Truth, and Right, and Justice rule the world!

Atlanta, Ga. CHARLES W. HUBNER.

MR. PENTECOST'S RESIGNATION SERMON.

On Sunday morning last, Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost announced his resignation as pastor of the Belleville avenue church of Newark, N. J., in a sermon of which we give the full text below.

It was known beforehand that the announcement would be made, and the church was thronged with an attentive audience, who frequently testified their approval of the speaker's remarks by applause.

Mr. Pentecost announced his text and spoke as follows:

And why, even of yourselves, judge ye not what is right?—Luke 12, 57.

And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.—John 8, 32.

At the close of this sermon it is my purpose to tender my resignation as pastor of this church. I trust, therefore, it will not appear unseemly if I ask your consideration of the reasons which have led to this act. I shrink from thrusting myself upon you as exclusively as I shall be obliged to this morning, but fairness to you, especially that portion of you who recently voted for a continuance of our present relations, as well as to me, suggests, to my mind, the propriety of setting aside my personal preference in this regard. I ask you, therefore, to bear with any seeming display of self consciousness in this sermon and hear me to the end.

When I was asked by a committee from this church and society to consider a call from you, less than two years ago, it was not easy for me to accede to their request, chiefly because I was at that time measurably free from the restraints of an orthodox ecclesiastical denomination which, after leaving the Baptist communion, I thought I should never again submit to. I knew, however, that the Congregational is one of the broadest, if not the broadest, among evangelical bodies, and I said, before deciding to permit you to extend your call, to that member of your committee whom I considered most able to understand the significance of the remark, that it should be understood that I was not strictly orthodox in my theological beliefs. I was given to understand that this would be no necessary hindrance to my harmonious co-operation with this church in Christian work, and that assurance has been practically verified in so far as the church is concerned.

When I was before the council by which I was installed your pastor I made no attempt, in presenting my doctrinal statement, to conceal the real state of my mind. The ministers who sat in that council were trained thinkers, perfectly capable of appreciating what I said and also what I left unsaid in my statement, and with a complete knowledge that I was at that time one of the extreme liberals in our denomination I was installed without being subjected to a critical theological examination. This was encouraging and gratifying to me because I knew that my lot was now cast among not only good but thoughtful comrades in labor. I considered, however, that this fraternal tolerance of my opinions, as it must have been on the part of some members of the council, did not warrant me in my subsequent pulpit ministrations in departing from my position when before them, and while I have since then grown away from some of the statements I then made, I have been studiously silent upon those points. When I have spoken it has been quite in accord with what I then declared I believed. I mention this because some of you think that I now preach a different gospel from what I delivered at the first. It is not my intention to reproduce the paper I submitted to the council, because on many points there would be no question. But in two or three particulars I think quotations from the paper will make it plain that I have betrayed no trust or confidence by departing from it.

Some of you have thought that I have recently gone far toward a denial of the inspiration of the scripture, one member giving me as his reason for leaving the church that I "handle the word of God too freely," meaning without sufficient reverence. The paragraph in my paper concerning the Bible is too long to introduce here, but were it presented all of you would see that I have in no sense departed from it in my teaching.

I have been criticised for what has seemed a ruthless attack once or twice upon the substitutionary theory of the atonement. But of that doctrine my installation paper says: "I believe the mission of Jesus Christ was to proclaim the love of God to this world and to exemplify that love in His matchless life and vicarious death, through which we are reconciled to God." From this position I have never departed.

Much has been said of my repudiation of the doctrine of future punishment in its traditional form. But when I was installed I said upon that subject: "I believe in a future state in which those who have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ of such a quality that they are led into an increasingly righteous life shall enter into the joys and satisfaction of eternal goodness; and in which those who reject the gospel in such a way that they become morally and spiritually unfit for the society of the heavenly state, shall utterly lose all the blessings which are promised and laid up in store for those who love God and earnestly strive to keep his commandments." In my subsequent preaching I have elaborated the thought here and irradiated it with more hope for the wicked dead. In so far forth only have I departed from it.

I do not say that were I before that council now I would submit the same paper. I certainly would not. I merely say that when I have spoken in this pulpit I have not materially departed from the positions which the paper presented, and should another council be called no one could fairly say that in my preaching I have departed from the doctrine which was satisfactory to the installation council. I have tried to be conscientious in this matter. I have not restrained my thought in these last two years, but I have bridled my tongue.

But the greatest friction in our relations has resulted from my economic views and my conception of the relation which should exist between the church and those who are not members of the church. There would have been no trouble between us on account of my theological opinions. Our strained relations are really the result of my association with those who are engaged in the work of social reform. If I had never advocated the doctrines of Henry George in this pulpit; if I had never spoken in the Academy of Music, New York, before the Anti-poverty society on Sunday evenings; if I had not "entered politics" at our last charter election; if there had never been applause in this church; if I had never declared to the multitudes of non-churchgoers who have habitually thronged this building on Sunday evenings that they are the children of God along with us; if I had never exposed what is to me the fault and wickedness of the church in her unfaithfulness to these people and hence her departure from the teaching and practice of Jesus; if I had done none of these things we should yet be moving on peacefully and possibly prosperously together, because there are many other Congregational ministers who are as far from old time orthodoxy as I have ever been in public utterance. But these things, to which must be added that last straw which broke the camel's back, my declaration that the four revolutionists recently hung in Chicago were murdered, brought about a meeting of this church and society for the purpose of voting upon the question of my being permitted to remain pastor of the church, and which resulted in my favor, though the minority against me is large and positive.

In looking back over all this, I have nothing to regret, though, of course, that does not mean that I think my speech or conduct has been infallible. If I had to go through the same time again under the same circumstances I would say and do as I have done. My theological heresies have all been on the side of love and gentleness toward the weak and sinful, and are a spiritual joy to me. My economic views are but another expression of the gospel of Jesus; my politics is practical religion; my pity for the slaughtered revolutionists, expressed for them at the time simply because they were human beings, has been deepened into something very akin to sympathy by studying their case more thoroughly; sympathy, because, though violent men, who imitated Christian nations and constituted authorities in the wicked use of force, they were sufficiently heroic to fall willing victims to an unselfish purpose and in behalf of their fellow men; my sense of the false position which the church occupies toward Jesus and the people whom He loved is deepened by continued reflection.

Why should I feel that I am wrong in all this? Nobody has seriously undertaken to disprove my theological heresies; nobody has read "Progress and Poverty" and pointed out its fallacy or untruthfulness to me; nobody has taken the pains to read the history of the Chicago tragedy from first to last and demonstrate to me the justice of punishing an illegal murder by a legal one; no one has carefully studied the words of Jesus and from them shown me that the attitude of the church toward Him and the common people is right; no one has given a reason why clapping hands in church, which was practiced in the early Christian congregations, if we may believe the testimony of Chrysostom, is not as decorous as shouting "amen!"

On the contrary, the opposition which I have excited has been that for the most part of simple, stupid prejudice. Not all. Some has been intelligent, dignified, Christian. But there has been little of that. Most of those who voted against me in the recent meeting, certainly many of them, have not been attendants upon the services here for many months and would find it difficult indeed to write down in black and white precisely why I deserve the vote of censure which I received from them. Many of them have not the slightest conception of some of the subjects which I have discussed and persistently refuse to study them. I do not think they mean to be wrong in the matter, but they are wrong in so far as their conduct is unintelligent. I do not say that people have no right to an opinion based upon ignorance and strengthened by prejudice, but such an opinion, however subject to tolerance, is certainly not worthy of respect. But one of those persons who have during the past year neglected their church duties, some of them having no pews here, has approached me upon the subjects of disagreement, and he published my private correspondence in violation of every law of good taste and Christian courtesy. If I have gone wrong, which I do not admit, these have certainly not gone right, and I think the church will never be built up in reasonable faith and right practice if she is controlled by the counsels of those who think by the rule of prejudice, neglect all their duties and abandon responsibilities because the ministers happen to cross their opinions and oppose their policy.

If it is supposed that I speak thus from pique or ill will a mistake will be made; for while it would be false to say that I admire the mental type or Christian character of such people, I know many persons act so from conscientious motives, thinking they are doing God's service; I know also the rule of human conduct which governs certain types of character in such circumstances; I know the tendency of human weakness to be controlled by passion and prejudice rather than calm reason; and, furthermore, it is morally impossible for me to harbor resentment toward any one, no matter how unfair I may think they have been to me. They have a right to their opinions, however formed, and must shape their conduct according to those opinions in responsibility to God and not to me. I cannot respect their opinions nor admire their conduct, but some of them I personally like, and toward all of them I have the kindest feeling. That is all I have to say upon that subject. When I am out of the way and you have a minister more to their mind, they will, I suppose, take up their duties again and become active and, I hope, useful members of the church.

Now, with regard to the recent church and society meeting and its effects upon my mind. That meeting was called in order that you might decide whether I should be retained as your minister. After that question was decided in favor of my remaining, it devolved upon me to determine whether I wished, or rather, whether it was right, to retain you as a flock, for you know that a man who believes himself a true minister never regards himself as employed by a church, but, rather, as sent by God. If there had been but the vote of the church to consider, I should have resigned that evening, immediately after the vote was declared; which, indeed, I came near doing, being prevented only because I was not in a sufficiently calm state of mind to take so important a step and be sure it was right. But the action of the society complicated the question. The minority of thirty-seven per cent of the total church vote was as plain an indication that I should go as a majority against me would have been. The minority of only twenty-six per cent in the society vote, however, justified me in postponing any decision until a sufficient time for mature reflection had elapsed. Such reflection convinces me that one of two results would follow my remaining; either a large number of this minority will leave the church, or if they remain they will not accept the recent decision of the meeting as final, in which case that perfect harmony necessary to the spiritual prosperity of the church cannot obtain. It is impossible for me to give any assurance that I shall not continue in my present course; it is equally impossible for them to be reconciled to that course.

Now, reverting to the first contingency named, apart from the possible weakening of this organization by the withdrawal of a comparatively large number of members, I think I have not the right to drive them out. This church was organized not by me and long before I came. Some of these persons have invested money here. To all of them it is their church home. Their rights here, not technically, but morally, are greater than mine. It may be said in rebuttal that I have duties also to the majority who wish me to remain, and that if I go many of these may leave the church and I might thus weaken the church. There is some truth in this, but as my personal worldly interests are in the balance upon that side of the question I should suspect the absolute justice of any disposition I might have to give the claims of the majority even a fair hearing. My care in this case is not to do my whole duty to the majority, for in a certain sense I form part of that company, but to the minority. It is my privilege to wrong myself, and in a less degree my friends; but it is my duty not to wrong my opponents.

With regard of the danger of many persons leaving the church if I go, I have only to say: Such a thing is possible but not probable. In all such affairs the opponents of a pastor are more apt to leave if he stays than are his friends if he goes. But even if many persons should leave on account of my going I should not be responsible for their action. I should not drive them out. They would decide the question more or less for themselves.

With regard to the second supposed result of my remaining, I may say that it is already evident that the minority have not accepted the vote of the church and society as either final or satisfactory, as, indeed, I do not see how they can, being ordinary human beings, and as I certainly should not, looking at the questions involved from their standpoint. What I have to look forward to, then, is the continued opposition, more or less justifiable from their point of view, of a considerable number of persons. This would render my further ministry here comparatively fruitless and wholly uncomfortable. Under these circumstances I could not remain, for while I have never hesitated to say and do those things which to me were necessary, knowing they would provoke opposition, the result is none the less a disagreeable hinderance to my usefulness in this pastorate.

Let it be clearly understood that I make no complaint. The condition in which we find ourselves is no surprise to me. I blame no one for it, not even myself. Truth is not only a peacemaker but a disturber of the peace. I do not feel that I have been wronged by any one, much less do I think myself a martyr for anything. I have suffered nothing; am suffering nothing except in mind, for which the sense of having done right is more than compensation. I am, therefore, not an object of pity nor a candidate for sympathy. I have done what seemed to me right, knowing what the result would be, and therefore fully prepared for it. It is so ordered that truth is unpopular, and he who devotes himself to it cannot have his pathway strewn with flowers. I know this and I would not change it if I could; for were it not so there would necessarily be some abatement of the delicious joy of simply speaking and doing the truth for its own sake. One taste of that cup of joy cheapens every other possible possession in life and transforms the portentous threat of the future into the weak piping of a palsied enemy. Should poverty, toil, obscurity or worse await me in the uncertain future it requires no bravery to meet them, for they are not evils, and if they are God is greater than they; the soul knows no such things, and the jewel truth is a jewel still, though it lies in a casket of thorns or is fixed in a setting of dirt.

Nor do I wish you to think that any of the experiences through which we have passed have embittered me to the least extent. Why should they? Human nature here is as human nature everywhere—partly good and partly evil—and there is not a man, woman or child of you all whom I cannot honestly say I love, because you are part of that human nature of which I also am part, though there are some of you with whom I have no especial affinity, and whose prominent characteristics I do not particularly admire. No man is bad enough to hate; any man is good enough to love; and we are all so much like each other that for one of us to judge another is not more wicked than it is absurd. When, therefore, we part company as pastor and people, as we shall soon, on my part it shall be in friendly fashion. I shall go with as kindly feeling as I came, and if any of you feel otherwise toward me, the injury will never reach me, for it lodges in your own breast.

Up to this point I have confined my attention to those reasons which determine my withdrawal from the pastorate of this local church and would necessitate such action apart from other considerations. But it is proper for me to say further that I have reached at this particular time, no doubt, partly because of our peculiar relations to each other, the culmination of a mental and spiritual experience which makes it impossible for me to remain longer identified with orthodox Christianity, or possibly, although of this I am not so sure, with organized Christianity of any sort. Five years ago, while I was yet a Baptist minister, I began a course of study and reflection outside of orthodoxy and even of distinctly Christian lines, for the purpose of attempting to get at the truth with regard to certain vital questions which up to that time my habits of thought and theological training had led me to accept as practically closed in favor of orthodox Christianity. I had already rejected the Baptist doctrine of restricted communion, and having gone so far in discarding received opinion I found other doors of inquiry standing open before me, through which I entered, with the result of discovering the fallacy of the Baptist position with regard to immersion. This question settled I withdrew from that denomination, having acquired the habit of thinking more independently than I had always done.

I saw that what I had done strengthened my mind and deepened my spiritual life, and I was, therefore, no longer afraid to think or of the results of thinking. I then determined that I would search for truth, and having found it, accept it and go where it led me regardless of the consequences to my former beliefs, for I knew that truth is God's work, and is far more important than creeds and churches and bibles. It is no part of my purpose to take you through my processes of thought and study, and I have not the right, standing in this pulpit, the accredited minister of a Congregational church, to expose the results of those processes, for this might issue in unsettling the faith of some without pointing out the solid ground of what is to me, at least, a better faith which one finds as he needs it by threading his way through the swamps and tangled undergrush of inquiry. It is sufficient for me to say that the ascertained facts of science, and the results of what I consider the fairest methods of criticism, have led me to regard the Bible and all its teachings in a light which is not permissible for me as a pastor of an orthodox church. Not that many orthodox ministers do not hold substantially the same views, but that such views are inconsistent with orthodoxy, and either they or orthodoxy should and must be abandoned by an honest man and thinker. The Bible is dearer to me than ever before, but for a different reason than which evangelical Christianity assigns for its value. In like manner my studies of comparative mythology, comparative religions, primitive culture, folk lore, contemporary humanity and the application of reason and conscience to our ordinary theological problems have so modified my views of God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the doctrines of the Trinity, the fall of man, the plan of salvation, the future state and destiny of man, miracles, the church and its ordinances, that I am no longer in intellectual or spiritual sympathy with evangelical Christianity as a doctrinal system or the church as an organization, and must therefore withdraw bodily from both. It may be asked why this decision was not reached sooner? How could I conscientiously remain where I am so long and not longer? Surely this result is not one which may be arrived at in a moment, or if so it must be a mere whim indicating vacillating weakness. The reply which I have to make to such questions is that I have always felt that when the time should come for me to take this step circumstances would conspire to make my duty entirely plain. No man can do right until he knows which is right, and he must wait until his mind upon that point is without the torment of a doubt or the fear of regret. I have known for more than a year that I would be led out of the evangelical church, but when or how I could not know. I have just been obliged to go on from month to month balancing my duty to my own convictions, and my duty to this church in not going in public utterance beyond the statements of my installation paper, patiently awaiting the summons which I knew I should hear in good time. When the church and society meeting was held I thought the summons had come. But it had not, for I still found myself with no sure, open way before me. But on last Sunday morning, while I was reading to those members who were received into the church the confession of faith embodied in our manual, to which they were asked if they subscribed, all was clear to me as if flashed upon me from heaven. No prophet of old ever heard the voice of Jehovah more clearly than I the mandate of God at that time. The words stuck in my throat as I read them. I then saw how far away from this statement of doctrine I have grown, how impossible it would be for me to ever stand there again and ask others to believe what I do not believe as conditional to membership in a church of which I am pastor. I inwardly trembled, but rejoiced. My mental and spiritual agitation during the rest of the service cannot be imagined by one who has not experienced it. From that moment all has been indubitably clear. Though I know not to what I am called, I know that He who said to Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house unto a land that I will show thee," has said the same to me, and as he led Abraham he will lead me. The future is absolutely uncertain, but I know that in it somewhere is the land which He in whom I "live and move and have my being" will show me, and that is the only land in which I care to live.

"And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right," said Jesus. Upon that precept, not without the consciousness of God, I have come to understand the second text which I read: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." It is not needful to know all the truth or that all that you know is the truth. But if you discover some truth and go where it leads it will make you free. And while it is well to be free from some conditions which hinder the truth, the main delight is in that to which one becomes free. To be free to think and to work out your spiritual life, no man saying, "Thus far shalt thou think and no farther," is worth whatever it costs. I cannot take this privilege and yet remain in this church with due respect to you or for myself, for though the fundamental principle of Protestantism is the right of private judgment, it is unmistakable that evangelical Christianity, organized Christianity, does not accord that right, except on the condition of going without its bounds; organized Christianity says to its members: "Thus far shalt thou think and no farther," but truth makes one free to think and to worship and serve God in accordance with untrammeled thought.

I, therefore, with the best of feeling for you all, and fully appreciating that I have given you, as a church, considerable trouble, and with the hope, too, that my ministry here has not been wholly unfruitful, herewith present my resignation, to take effect not later than the 1st of January next. But if, after what I have freely told you, the board of deacons or the church assembled should deem it improper for me to occupy the pulpit again, even for this evening's service, I shall consider this nothing other than right, although should I remain until the 1st of January I shall, of course, feel under especial obligation to say no disturbing words. I leave the time of my departure within the limit named entirely for you to decide.

Educational Work in Brooklyn.

Many of the ward associations of the united labor party in Brooklyn have already perfected plans for an educational campaign during the winter. The Twentieth ward association, of which C. O'C. Hennessy is president, will give a series of monthly musical and literary entertainments, each of which will include a homely talk on the nature and scope of the single tax. The first of these meetings is arranged for Thursday evening, December 15, at Adelphi hall, corner of Myrtle avenue and Adelphi street. Professional musicians and elocutionists will make the opening affair attractive. Major A. R. Calhoun will supply the talk on the land tax.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
8 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.

TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.

One year, $2.50; six months, $1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

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

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

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

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

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 17, 1887.

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

PLATFORM OF THE UNITED LABOR PARTY.

Adopted at Syracuse August 19, 1887.

We, the delegates of the united labor party of New York, in state convention assembled, hereby reassert, as the fundamental platform of the party, and the basis on which we ask the co-operation of citizens of other states, the following declaration of principles adopted on September 23, 1886, by the convention of trade and labor associations of the city of New York, that resulted in the formation of the united labor party.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And since the ballot is the only means by which in our republic the redress of political and social grievances is to be sought, we especially and emphatically declare for the adoption of what is known as the "Australian system of voting," in order that the effectual secrecy of the ballot and the relief of candidates for public office from the heavy expenses now imposed upon them, may prevent bribery and intimidation, do away with practical disenfranchisements in favor of the rich and unscrupulous, and lessen the pernicious influence of money in politics.

In support of these aims we solicit the co-operation of all patriotic citizens who, sick of the degradation of politics, desire by constitutional methods to establish justice, to preserve liberty, to extend the spirit of fraternity, and to elevate humanity.

A BILL TO ESTABLISH A CZAR.

If Congressman Adams represents to any considerable extent ordinary public opinion in Chicago we do not wonder at the sympathy with anarchy manifested there. This remarkable personage has, after consultation with the Union league club of that city, prepared a bill providing that whenever a district attorney of the United States shall have information in writing from three reputable citizens that any alien has aided, advised or encouraged the destruction of property or murder of any officer of the law *or has attempted to overthrow the laws or to excite domestic violence in any state*, such information shall be transmitted to the president of the United States, who shall issue a written order banishing such alien from the country for any length of time that may in his judgment seem best. One section provides that "whenever in the judgment of the president of the United States, the public safety shall require, it shall be lawful for the president to cause such alien to be arrested without notice and conveyed out of the United States."

Fortunately the degradation of politicians has not gone so deep that we need discuss seriously such a proposal as this. The much less arbitrary and tyrannical "Alien and sedition laws" passed by the old federalist party under the advice of a much more distinguished Adams brought to that party a death that knew no resurrection and paved the way for the presidency of Thomas Jefferson and the inauguration of real democracy in the United States.

But nevertheless the mere introduction of such a bill, framed, it is said, at the suggestion of the editor of a German paper in Chicago and indorsed by the Union league, is a sign of political degeneracy that is alarming. It is a proposal to overthrow, so far as one class of men are concerned, the rights of habeas corpus, trial by jury, and freedom of speech, and to put into the hands of the president of the United States a power infinitely more despotic than a parliament would vest in any constitutional sovereign on earth. When Bismarckism editors, union leagues, and representatives of property in general readily propose so complete an overthrow of all safeguards of liberty we do not wonder that men who believe the classes to be omnipotent talk about force.

Should a continuance of political decay ever give us a congress capable of passing such a law, a president capable of accepting such a responsibility and courts ready to uphold so monstrous a violation of every principle of liberty, the failure of the people to overthrow all concerned in the infamy by violent revolution would simply be evidence that what was once a race of freemen had degenerated into abject slaves. The man who would not rather die in fighting such a government than consent to the degradation of living under it would lack every element that enters into patriotism or the love of freedom.

Yet it seems that in Chicago there are a number of people who hail the proposal of such a law with satisfaction and formally approve it. Such men and such sentiments, while they fail to justify the folly of anarchism, make its advocates by comparison respectable.

A few weeks ago a New England person wrote to the *Sun* asking its aid in furtherance of a scheme to make the writer a successful Anti-poverty society of one. His simple plan was to have everybody in one country send him a single cent, which, while it would not be missed by the givers, would aggregate a sum sufficient to make him comfortable for life. The *Sun* made all manner of fun of the enterprising New Englander, though why it should have done so it is difficult to see, since most of our great fortunes are made in that way, with this difference, that the contributions are not voluntary and are not penny contributions. Here in the columns of that same *Sun* is an example:

About three years ago the Astors bought for $440,000 3,000 lots of land in the neighborhood of 153d street and Sherman avenue, in this city, 400 of which they sold last week to Cornelius Vanderbilt for $500,000. As the 400 lots which they sold were the least valuable of the whole plot, the plot is now worth at least $3,500,000, or an increase in three years of over $3,000,000. What does this increase mean? It means that the people of this country must pay about $200,000 per annum, or one-third of a cent a head, more for the use of that land now than when the Astors bought it, and yet the Astors give nothing in return. The plan of having the many contribute to the comfort of the few is evidently in full operation, and there is nothing funny about it—to the few.

The *Western Christian Advocate*, observing that the census of 1880 shows about one criminal in 837 of the population, while in 1850 there was only one criminal in 3,442 of the population, thinks this "throws light on the character of the foreign population that has been pouring in upon us." But inasmuch as the proportion of foreign born convicts to foreign born population diminished almost half between 1850 and 1880, while the proportion of native born convicts to native born population increased seven times in the same period, what kind of light is thrown on the character of our native population?

On the 24th of November last Police Justice Patterson had before him Policeman John Herrick, charged with violation of the election laws and refusal to perform his duty as an officer. The complainant was Lazarus Shapiro, chairman of the board of inspectors of the Twelfth election district of the Eighth assembly district. Mr. Shapiro testified that at the late election a man giving the name of Charles Smith attempted to vote illegally from No. 233 Broome street; that the inspectors knew he was not a legal voter from that house and ordered Officer Herrick to arrest him, but the officer absolutely refused to do it and allowed the offender to escape. One of the other inspectors at the same poll corroborated the chairman's testimony, and also swore that there was but one Charles Smith living at 233 Broome street; that the witness was personally acquainted with him, and that the man who tried to vote on his name was an impostor.

Another inspector at the same poll, August Schaller, complained that a man giving the name of Thomas F. Tully of No. 35 Norfolk street having voted, another man giving the same name and address offered to vote and his vote was challenged, whereupon he swore it in. The chairman then ordered Officer Herrick to arrest the last named man, but Herrick refused and the man escaped. That still later a third man giving the name of Thomas F. Tully of the same address offered his vote and it was refused, and that it was subsequently learned that the third man was the true Thomas F. Tully. This witness also corroborates the others as to the case of Charles Smith, and further testifies, in which he is corroborated by Louis Chapp, that he saw Officer Herrick, while in the polling place and standing in front of the ballot boxes and in full view of the inspectors, snatch a set of ballots from the hand of a citizen who was about to vote, and tearing these ballots up, hand another set to the citizen, saying, "You go on and vote."

Here is a clear prima facie case of a most serious crime—intimidation by a policeman and collusion between him and fraudulent voters for the purpose and with the effect of destroying the sanctity of the ballot; and Judge Patterson held the accused in $500 bail to answer at general sessions. The case throws light on some of the methods by which "principle" was vindicated at the late election, and for that reason will interest the curious. Serious people, however, will be more anxious to watch the future history of the case; for, perhaps, Herrick may be tried before the police commissioners, and possibly he may be prosecuted upon an indictment. His counsel is Civil Justice Steckler, in whose judicial district the alleged crime was committed.

The *Evening Post* having discovered of "natural resources" that "these are the gift of heaven," there is reason to hope it may some day learn to whom the gift is made.

In noticing the nomination of John S. Barbour by the democratic caucus of Virginia as the successor of Mr. Riddleberger, a Washington correspondent says Mr. Barbour's election will add another rich railway president to the United States senate. The correspondent feels thus encouraged to reel off the oft repeated list of senatorial millionaires, but he adds some interesting facts about the sources of their wealth. Looking over the list we find that in every instance where the fortune amounts to a million—except perhaps in the case of Jonathan Chace, the Rhode Island Quaker, who is said to have made a large fortune in cotton spinning—it was made by land monopoly (including of course mining, timber and oil land) or in railroads. Had the people retained the ground rents that were once legally as well as morally their own and had they refused to surrender the control of their highways to private owners only one of these men would have been a millionaire.

The *Sun* was just a little early in announcing last week that the Rev. Mr. Grumbine of Syracuse, had been requested to resign as pastor of the First Congregational church on account of his devotion to the anti-poverty doctrine. The congregation voted on the subject a day or two after the *Sun's* announcement, and refused to request the resignation by a majority so large that it made the instigator of the movement very mad.

President Cutler of the New York and New Jersey telephone company has a curious idea as to what constitutes a "luxury." He declared to the telephone investigating committee last week that he considered the telephone a luxury because "it is no more necessary than a typewriter or a stenographer, who facilitate business, but are not necessities." Tried by this rule, the railway, the telegraph and the perfecting press are not necessities. They merely "facilitate business" that was formerly done by the ox cart, the stage coach and the hand press. President Cutler has got an inverted view of this question. The telephone is a necessity, but the New York and New Jersey telephone company is a luxury, and a very costly one at that, with which the people will dispense as soon as they see the necessity of transacting their own public affairs through their own public servants. In that good time coming Mr. Cutler may still have something to do with telephones, but he will then do what he is paid to do, and he will only get paid for what he does. Then he will be relieved from all attempts to demonstrate that thirteen-hundredths of the whole money invested paid out annually to the investors only amounts to a dividend of less than five per cent. Mr. Cutler appears to be as much out in arithmetic as he is on definitions.

The family of a cigar packer named Geisler, who is described as a quiet, steady and intelligent man, was found in a horrible state of destitution in a Delancey street tenement the other day. Geisler lived in a single room. One of his children had been dead for several days, and he had been unable to get an undertaker to bury it. Many times the family were without even bread, and Geisler at the odd times when he could get work made only $3 or $4 a week. The home was neatly kept, although it exhibited evidences of extreme poverty. There was nothing to show that the father was either lazy, improvident or drunken; but he was undeniably poor. It is due to Mr. Carnegie to say that the case was not discovered until after that gentleman's announcement that there is no poverty here; and it is worth noting, incidentally, that the tobacco trade is satisfactorily protected by the tariff.

We Have Nothing to Fear—God Reigneth.

TOPEKA, Kas.—For the encouragement of the faithful of New York, they should remember that no other city in the country, and no other state in the Union, has so large a percentage of the abject poor, who are so debased as to feel obliged to sell their manhood, or perjure themselves as yours, and no other state has so large a per cent of corrupt politicians, or of aggregate wealth controlled by corruptionists. I am satisfied that the same earnest labor by the advocates of the single tax theory extended to and through all the states will work such a revolution in the minds of honest men that all the money of the earth cannot withstand it. Besides you must remember that no such far reaching principles have ever been brought into politics by any former party since politics began, and to the corrupt politicians, monopolists, corporations, combinations, rings and land grabbers, this theory of justice to all is tolling a death knell.

We have nothing to fear—"God reigneth."
I. M. DAVIS.

A Letter Such as Often Comes to "The Standard," and There's a Heap of Food for Thought In It.

———.—I inclose an article for THE STANDARD for your consideration, as you say such are invited; but if not considered suitable for publication no heart will be broken if it does not appear. However, do not publish it over my name, for I dare not let it be known that I am even interested in the party. I am a civil engineer, and as such my only employers are large corporations, and I am oftentimes called upon to do very dirty work for them. I am glad even to be allowed to do that in order to live. I am out of employment entirely now, and were it known that I stood in with united labor it would be all up with me for more work. But I don't intend to dwell on my history, past or present, for it has nothing to do with the case. ——.

"Keep It Before the People."

HOLLAND, Mich., Nov. 29.—As a workingman I desire to say a few words in regard to Mr. Croasdale's article in the last STANDARD. In my humble opinion we should by all means make a nomination for the office of president in 1888. It would be wrong, yes, an injustice, to the many who have severed their connections with the old parties to be even tempted to vote for what they have condemned, and it might make many who have hopes in the new movement and its principles feel discouraged, and a discontinuation of this social reform movement will breed revolutionists. Our principles must be kept before the people. To not organize for a national movement might be construed by many as meaning that the new party is making a deal with one of the old parties, and such an idea we cannot afford to encourage. JOHN O. ROOCT.

Had to Take a Row on the Sound to Cool Off.

NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.—After reading William McCabe's Thanksgiving story in THE STANDARD of December 3, I had to get into my skiff and take a row on the sound to get a good draught of salt water wind on my brow. It makes me blush to think that Thanksgiving day was originally a New England institution. (Capt.) GEO. W. LORD.

STATESMANSHIP IN NEW YORK.

The Sort of Man Whom the Australian Voting System would Deprive of a Living—He Made a Fortune by Enabling Rum Sellers to Defy the Law, and is now Selected for Chief Clerk of a District Court.

New York Sun.

Civil Justice Alfred Steckler's appointment of Barney Rourke to be the chief clerk of his court for six years, at $3,000 a year, has disappointed a good many solid citizens in the Eighth assembly district, and brought a wild howl from the republicans who have been associated with Barney for a good many years back. Detective Etienne Bayer, one of his friends, expected the place himself, and friends of Steckler did tell Bayer that he could have it. However, Bayer can't afford to grumble, and he will continue to assist Captain Allaire in running the Tenth ward.

Barney Rourke, who used to be called Bernard O'Rourke when he first came into notice in politics in 1872 in the Eighth assembly district, has been a thorn in the side of the republican politicians over on the east side since 1883. "Up to that time he was a faithful district leader," a friend of Johnny O'Brien said yesterday. "He did his work well. Yes, he did pay in his assessment. I do not think it was any larger than any other man's. When Barney started into politics for himself, he rather upset things. You know he went for Grant for mayor and White for sheriff; was against Tim Campbell twice, and for his opponent, Tom Grady, last year, and now he has defeated Botty. Why did he do it? Because he was opposed to Justice Jacob M. Patterson. Why was he against Patterson? How do I know? Patterson says that he doesn't know. Barney Rourke is a queer fish."

Rourke has owned more gin mills in the Eighth assembly district than any other man in it. Nominally he has owned but one, and that was in Forsyth street. His office is in the rear, where he does all his business. He lives above the saloon and is married. When a saloon acquired a shady reputation Barney was likely to come in as proprietor or partner, and then the saloon opened up and was not disturbed by the police. When Pat Hickey's saloon got too hot for him Barney Rourke took hold and went right along, and now Hickey has got it again. Owney Geoghegan's old place on the Bowery was run under the business partnership of Flynn & Rourke.

"There's one thing about Barney that people must admire in this age of wind," said a friend yesterday; "he always keeps a close mouth. He is an oyster. No one knows when or where he was born. His reply to the naturalization clerk when asked what his birthplace was was 'Ireland.' To-day there isn't a man in this city that knows a thing about him dating before he became acquainted with John J. O'Brien. He has to have a friend in politics. He got ahead of O'Brien. People are wondering now if he can get ahead of the Steckler family."

Barney's excursions are remarkable affairs. His excursion up the sound three years ago, on which he is credited with spending $8,000, created a sensation all over the east side. Champagne flowed like water. The police boat Patrol carried a large section of the force and a police commissioner or two to the grounds. His ball in Walhalla hall was another grand affair. The police commissioners were expected but failed him. Then Barney Rourke gave up entertaining, for the notoriety it gained him hurt his other business. He drives a spanking team, and may be seen on the road any afternoon. He is reputed to be worth $250,000.

Society in Chicago.

Chicago Herald.

Chicago is indeed a cosmopolitan city. Travelers coming into town by any one of the several east or west lines get here a glimpse of Europe quite as characteristic as anything that could be had abroad. The cars pass near the great cabbage district of Chicago, which is south of Forty-seventh street and west of State. Three hundred women may be seen toiling in the fields in true European fashion, with their thick bodies bent toward the earth and a red or yellow cloth, never a bonnet or hat, upon their heads. All along the railway yards women can be seen gathering coal from the tracks, and sometimes even from the cars. The poor foreigners along the railroads do not buy much coal. Poor Americans are too proud to get their fuel in this manner, and had a good deal rather run in debt for it and trust to providence for the payment of the bill. The foreign women are exceedingly bold in their coal raids, climbing upon moving cars and throwing the lumps off to their confederates, despite the ominous shouts of the trainmen. There is little use arresting these people, for the reason that it is almost impossible to identify them, and, besides, their pilferings are so small on any one occasion that the letter of the law scarcely applies. Nearer the city, in the elevator district, the Italian women have discovered a new source of profit. Scooping up in their big aprons the small quantities of grain which leak out of cars or from elevator spouts, they spend an hour or more if need be in cleansing the grain of the mud and bin-dust with which it is surrounded. An Italian woman on her knees on the cold ground running her black hands through and through a mass of grain that the winter winds may blow the dirt and dross away, is a familiar and suggestive spectacle to the passengers on railway trains. What the women do with the handfuls of grain thus procured it would not be easy to guess. May be they grind it up into flour in home-made mills.

"THE UNEMPLOYED—WHY?"

The *Christian Commonwealth*, one of the greatest of the English religious papers, now devotes one of its pages to the "Anti-poverty movement." Among its contributors in this department is Silas M. Burroughs of Medina, N. Y., who is well known to the readers of THE STANDARD as one of the stanchest friends of the Anti-poverty cause, both here and in England, where he is (temporarily, it is to be hoped,) making his residence and doing business. In the last number of the *Commonwealth* he has the following suggestive article under his *nom de plume*, "Silas Mainville:"

There are carpenters, masons, hod carriers, and representatives of labor of all kinds of workers among the unemployed.

A system of taxation could be readily devised which would keep them all permanently out of work, and it is very similar to the present system, varying only in degree, viz., taxation of all results of industry. If the tax on houses were 100 per cent., that would amount to immediate confiscation, and so nobody would build or live in houses, but all would betake themselves to caves and holes in the ground like foxes.

There would be great discomfort and much disease. Carpenters would have to learn to dig. The slate roofing industry would expire, and the only persons who would profit would be the owners of high and dry land suitable for living under.

If the tax on houses be 5 per cent that is some hindrance to building them; if 10 per cent, more; if 50 per cent, still more; and if 100 per cent, none will be built at all.

If a man has to give half his capital to another for the mere privilege of having a foundation for his homestead on the bed rock of this planet, he can only build half as good a house as he otherwise would build, which means that he would employ half as much labor. This would tend to keep men unemployed, and to make it difficult for any but the very well-to-do to have a homestead at all.

If unoccupied and unimproved land in a town is taxed very lightly or not at all, as at present, then all the value which it possesses goes to the land owner, who, if he cannot get his price for it, can well afford to hold it for a rise, especially if the community is increasing in numbers and wealth. In the meantime no one can work or build upon it. This is evidently a great hindrance to the employment of labor.

If men may put up buildings only upon agreeing to give them up as a present to the land owner after paying him ground rent for a term of years, this would hinder people from spending as much money or employing as much labor on houses as they otherwise would.

If the tax on incomes be 5 per cent., that is a discouragement to industry; if 10 per cent., more discouragement: if 50 per cent., more; and if 100 per cent., then nobody would have any incentive to do or earn anything, as it would be all taken from him.

Now, if on the other hand the taxes on houses and incomes were removed entirely and placed upon the land, the greatest possible incentive would be given to all forms of industry. That it would be eminently just is apparent, for land values exclusive of improvements are a creation of the public in common, and not of the landowner.

If the tax on unimproved land amounted to twenty-five per cent of its rental value the land owner could not afford to leave it idle, for the taxes would impoverish him. He would have to put it to some use by working on it himself or employing labor upon it, or disposing it to some one who would. It will thus be seen that the taxation of houses and improvements discourages the employment of labor and the creation of improvements, while on the other hand the taxation of land encourages labor, and really compels its employment.

It is therefore evident that a return to the old method of raising all the revenue by a land tax would speedily result in the employment of all the labor on the land, as in the old days, when there were no paupers and no men starving who were willing to work.

Forty-two Per Cent More People—One Hundred and Twenty-four Per Cent More Wealth—And More Poverty Than Ever.

London Catholic Times and Opinion.

Whether it be fair to take the unemployed who have been holding demonstrations in London as true representatives of the working classes or not, their agitation is undoubtedly a symptom of the acute poverty which reigns in our great metropolis. Nowhere, in truth, can one be more forcibly struck by the contrast between wealth and poverty than in this country. Within the past fifty years the population of the United Kingdom has increased at the rate of forty-two per cent—from 26,000,000 in 1837 to 37,000,000 in 1887—but during that period the increase in wealth has been at the rate of one hundred and twenty-four per cent, or nearly three times greater than the rate of increase in the population. Yet if the atmosphere and condition in which the humble classes live are considered it must be admitted that little or no headway has been made towards the elimination of the terrible destitution which is such a sad feature of our social life. Indeed, we appear to have gone backwards instead of forwards. The misery which abounds in our large centers of population, and the wretchedness of men, women and children who cannot obtain sufficient clothes or bread form a spectacle as appalling as any ever presented amongst us.

An Authentic Statement of the "Prosperity" of California Workingmen.

The Los Angeles (Cal.) labor unions send a circular complaining that employment agents are overcrowding southern California with workmen, in order to profit by their coming. The circular says: "Periodically the market has been overcrowded, and only a small number of the laborers who came have secured the great boon of all workingmen, 'a home free and unincumbered.' The greater number live from hand to mouth. Rents are enormously high; a cottage of four rooms rents for from $25 to $50 a month. Coal is $10 a ton, butter forty cents, eggs forty cents, and other things in proportion. The average of wages is about fifty cents per day more than eastern wages, but the cost of living more than counterbalances. Out of door labor can be pursued for about ten months in the year, but the man who attempts it is sure to break down. Tropical climates will not permit an unceasing round of hard manual labor. There is a gradual and stealthy undermining process which the victim heeds generally when it is too late to repair the evil. The el dorado of him who has but his two brawny arms to eke out an existence is not here. We, your fellow workmen, know whereof we speak; therefore, heed our warning.

Pushing Labor to the Outskirts.

On Saturday, 3d inst., Charles Pearson, a real estate agent, testified as follows before the Canadian labor commission:

I have been living in Toronto for twenty years. During that time land has advanced greatly in value. Workingmen pay much higher rent now than ten years ago, but to get a house at the same rent now as ten years ago I would have to go to the outskirts of the city. In places convenient to business rents of workingmen's dwellings have advanced from thirty to forty per cent in ten years.

STRAWS WHICH SHOW THE WIND.

One good honest worker is of more benefit to a town than two national banks. If there could be brought to this city the coming year and given profitable employment, 1,000 more workers—or, if those already here able and willing to work, could be given good wages the year around—dull times for the merchants would disappear like magic. When those whom the business men depend on only get $1.25 to $2 per day, and remain idle a portion of the year, lively times are not expected. —[Des Moines, Iowa, Herald.

Bloomington citizens who went to California sanguine and expectant, filled with hope of acquiring a fortune in a few years, are returning by every train heartsick, weary and thoroughly disgusted.—[Bloomington, Ill., Eye.

It is absurd to believe that a people who did away with an old world system of land tenure when it became oppressive, and who will probably not much longer be restrained from getting hold of land which the most sacred treaties have guaranteed to the Indians forever, can be induced to bear indefinitely the oppressive yoke of half a dozen coal corporations. Dr. Holmes tells us there is always a flaw in a donkey's will, and when a vast number of people want something very badly they can always be relied upon to find a weak link in the political reasoning which keeps it out of their reach. It will be the part of wisdom in the coal magnates to be reasonable, lest a worse thing befall them. —[Buffalo Courier.

Where a radically wrong system of land tenure exists it impoverishes not only those who live on and by the land, but all other classes in the community as well. It robs not only the cultivators of the soil, but every man in the community, of a substantial portion of the hard earned fruits of his labor, no matter what trade or calling he may follow for a living. As has been already observed the land of every country is the property of the people of that country, and consequently its exclusive appropriation by a class is a substantial wrong done to every man in the country whom it robs of his fair share of the common inheritance.—[Albany Press and Knickerbocker.

Farmers who mortgage their farms for capital should read the news from Russia. "The Agrarian bank of Moscow, recently put up at auction four hundred and sixty estates on which it was impossible for the farmers to pay the interest on the mortgages." The farmer who encumbers his land with a heavy mortgage assumes a load that may crush him.—[Kansas City Star.

Can nothing be done to cure Sir Henry Knight of the pestilent nonsense which he insists on addressing to the unemployed, the socialists and others? The extravagance of civic shows and banquets is justified, he told the deputation yesterday, because "every penny that was spent went into the pockets of working people." Now if a schoolboy in the most elementary political economy class were to trot out this fallacy about luxury being good for trade, he would be whipped. Can nothing be done to Sir Henry Knight?—[London Pall Mall Gazette.

In the "Free" Northwest.

Minneapolis Evening Journal.

A fairly well dressed young fellow with a stubby beard of about a week's growth on his face was brought into the inspector's office at the city hall this morning. An inspector had found him loitering about saloons and other suspicious places and had brought him into the office to question him a little. The young fellow was not more than eighteen years of age, and his face did not indicate by any means that he was a "tough" or a suspicious character of any kind.

"What's your 'lay,' young fellow?" sternly queried the inspector.

"I don't know what you mean," was the reply. "I haven't done anything."

"What are you hanging around these tough points for, eh?"

"For the reason that I have no other place to go."

"Busted, are you?"

"That's about it."

"Tried to get work?"

"Yes, sir. I've done nothing else but try since I came here a month ago. I think I'll get something to do now. Enough to earn my board, anyhow."

"Well, you can get out now. Either get work or leave town. If I catch you around again, I'll pull you for a 'vag' and you will go up to the workhouse."

Now that the Friendly Inn has been abolished charitably disposed people are wondering what will be done with the penniless, unemployed men that are sure to congregate in a large city during the winter. And there will be the usual number in Minneapolis this winter, there is no doubt of that. The indications are that the number will be even greater this winter than last. There is at the present time a large number of unemployed men in Minneapolis. To-day the entrances to the various employment offices have been crowded. In some instances the sidewalks have been blocked by men who were scanning the placards in front of the offices and waiting their turn for a chance to get in, with the hopes of getting work of some kind. This state of things has been noticeable for the past week.

No Demand for Labor?

Capt. Robt. C. Adams in The Open Court.

But it is questionable whether under the present system of employment the steadily decreasing demands for ordinary labor can be met by the opening of enlarged spheres for work in other directions, as the inventor is constantly invading all but the most subtile intellectual fields of effort. The compositor is threatened with discharge by the machine type setter; the amanuensis may soon be replaced by the phonograph; the laborer is being supplemented by the steam dredge, derrick and hod-lifter; the messenger is outraced by the telephone; a thousand girls were lately discharged from the London book-binderies by the introduction of one machine, and so on in every sphere of work invention is making the demand for human labor less. What is to be done with the unemployed? How can they escape the alternatives of starvation or pauperism? The only answer is, find them employment that will secure the means of support. But how can this be done when there is no demand for extra labor? Before replying, let us ask, why is there no demand? Are all the wants of mankind satisfied? Are machines and lands producing all that the world desires to consume? No, everywhere is unsatisfied longing and a demand for labor that, if answered, would not leave an idle person in the world. The reason why the demand is not answered is because the opportunities for labor are controlled by individuals who will not permit them to be used except for their own private property. There is the cause; and the remedy lies in giving free opportunity for men to labor for their own full benefit.

Time to Change All This, Sure Enough—And There Is Only One Way to Do It.

Christian at Work.

What is wanted for New York is an American Peabody, who will put up healthful, cheerful, comfortable dwellings for the poor, in place of the wretched tenement stalls in which so many poor herd like cattle. In fact they do not fare as well as cattle, for each horse, mule and cow has its own private stall. With the increased facilities of the elevated railways, and the extended area of the city north of the Harlem river, it does seem as if these might be provided in the country where the sweeter air and healthful surroundings would bring health and secure life to the little ones. When we read of a tenement house in this city where in a single year fifty-nine deaths occurred out of a total of seventy-six residents, we have an awful picture of the condition of our tenement districts—a picture which is at once an indictment of our Christianity and our latter day civilization. New York has 5,000 tenements whose fetid atmosphere and disease breeding filth, send the men to the saloons and the little ones to their baby coffins. It is time to change all this. One square mile of this city contains 290,000 population. The work is as important as the building of the new ten million dollar Episcopal cathedral.

THE PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION.

Thomas A. McCann of Detroit Replies to the Arguments of W. T. Croasdale and Louis F. Post—The Bull Must Be Taken Squarely by the Horns.

DETROIT, Mich.—I emphatically disagree with Messrs. Croasdale and Post in regard to the advisability of our placing a presidential candidate in the field in 1888.

It seems to me that the proposition of these gentlemen is an unfortunate one. Because of the prominent part they have taken in the work of the party from its inception, and of their intimate connection with THE STANDARD, it has been telegraphed to every part of the country as a solemn fact that our party would have no candidate in the field next year. The effect of all this will be to shake the confidence of a great many of the timid ones in the stability of the organization, and Mr. George's avowal of contrary views will not go very far toward eradicating the impression made.

Vacillation in the leadership of any party, movement or organization whose life and being depend on a strong aggressive policy, always results disastrously. Of this a conspicuous example is to be found in the Knights of Labor organization. By adopting the policy outlined by Messrs. Croasdale and Post, nothing more than a wretched palliative could be extorted from either of the old parties, and we would be simply postponing the day at which justice would be established. The majority of the old parties would unite quickly to resist it should legislation of a radical nature be proposed in congress by any man or set of men.

The entire organization of the old parties is manned by money makers, and when a reformer manages to slip in and assert himself he is promptly squelched. The dividends are larger when "things as they are," are simply skimmed over than when probing is attempted. Nothing is more indicative of the solidity of monopoly in the old parties than the relegation to the rear, or to places where they will be harmless, of such men as A. G. Thurman, B. F. Butler, Frank Hurd, Congressman Morrison, Senator Van Wyck, Land Commissioner Sparks and a host of lesser lights with a penchant for reform, who have made their appearance in primary politics. Therefore, to attempt to get anything real by adopting opportunist tactics would be equivalent to undertaking to demolish a stone wall by butting one's head against it. And, furthermore, should our own party ever to attain power, it will be only by practicing that "eternal vigilance which is the price of liberty" that it can be kept clear of the rocks of cupidity and avarice.

There can be no reasonable doubt that the speediest and the only way to bring about that condition of things we long for is to build up a great national party on precisely the same lines laid down by the prohibitionists. It may be a revelation to Messrs. Croasdale and Post, but it is a fact nevertheless that, narrow, tyrannical and impractical as its doctrines are, the true blue party as such has a steady and healthy growth. Consider now the many advantages we have that they have not. We have splendid leadership; principles that are simple, well defined, easy of application, when once we possess the power, and which when applied will be productive of no disturbance, while at the same time in them are embodied the fullest measure and widest range of justice. Our remedy for the abolition of poverty is to that of the prohibitionists as the electric light is to the tallow dip. Now, then, if they are gathering strength with the inferior principles, why, in the name of common sense, can we not, with our far superior principles and greater leadership command a development that will place us in power at the expiration of a reasonable period of time.

Sincere labor reformers are tired of this business of juggling with the old parties. A policy of fighting on this side at one time and on that at another, or running on one platform in one district and on some other kind in another begets suspicion, creates distrust and leads to alienation on the part of the masses, no matter how earnest or sincere the men in the van may be.

Mr. Post's fear of being laughed at amounts to an assumption that the party is composed of a lot of timid people. It is, moreover, a reflection on the general intelligence of the party, although it was certainly not intended as such. There can be no doubt that many will desert us when they see that loyalty to the cause may subject them to a certain amount of sneers and sarcasm. But on the other hand, the party will be left purer. In its composition as the foundation of a great party it will be more solid. The sloughing off will leave it healthier, hardier and more staple.

I am a young man and am willing to stand up and be counted for this "forlorn hope," if such it be, from now until I enter the grave. I believe a great majority of the party feel the same way. Why should they not? There is no personal inconvenience or physical danger involved. There is nothing to lose while there is everything to gain. Were it an assured fact that the party would only poll 25,000 votes in New York state at the next election, I would favor keeping up the fight on national and state as well as congressional lines—that is, nominating men for every office to be filled, from that of president down to coroner. That this is reasonable is obvious. It would be the best possible manner of propagating our doctrines, exacting discussion, arousing thought and advertising our principles generally. We should certainly attract more attention with a presidential candidate in the field than without. There are men scattered all over this country in every walk of life who are carefully studying the theories laid down in "Progress and Poverty;" men who have means, time and intelligence to devote to the cause; men who are uninfluenced in the communities in which they live; men, who, should they enlist under the banner of the new crusade would become leaders and bring hosts to our standard. These men would be very reluctant to abandon their old parties if they thought the new one, like the Irishman's flea, couldn't be found when wanted. If we should pursue the course mapped out by Messrs. Croasdale and Post, careful men would certainly be apt to regard as as a very uncertain quantity from the party standpoint. Most citizens are so constituted that they don't want to be in the shoes of the "man without a party."

I suppose the gentlemen look upon the adoption of their policy as anything but the abandonment of the political arena in which to fight the battles of justice, but I think the great majority would view the matter in a different light.

There is no alternative to taking the bull squarely by the horns, and it might as well be done first as last. We have a long and bitter struggle before us. Perhaps it will not be for any of us to see a realization of that beautiful state of society we are struggling to bring about. Perhaps it will come sooner than we expect. At all events it is clearly manifest that the only route to take is that considered by some as the most divergent, but which in reality is the nearest. Let our watchword be "'ammer,'ammer,'ammer," and I feel perfectly confident that we will get there in God's good time.

THOS. A. MCCANN.

A United Labor Man Who Is Also a Prohibitionist Urges a Presidential Nomination.

SCHENECTADY, N. Y.—I regret that the idea of not running a candidate for president next year is being seriously considered by the united labor party. I consider it as a confession of weakness that may dampen the ardor of many a supporter of the single tax.

A presidential election affords a grand opportunity to elevate the people of the whole country. Instead of injuring their cause by a national campaign the prohibitionists have brought the whole country face to face with an issue that will never be settled until it is settled right. So with the single tax, to be rightly understood it should go through a presidential campaign, and stand the fire, coming out as much stronger for the fight, as their principles have received wider attention.

If you leave the presidential ticket unfilled it will please the politicians of the old parties mightily. They will trade and dicker and tempt men to vote their presidential tickets, promising to support united labor local candidates only to slaughter them at the polls. If you want to turn the Bull Run of this fall into a Waterloo then abandon the presidential field to your enemies; but if you want an Appomattox stand to your guns all along the line from Maine to Texas. You can't elect a president next year, but you can elect the single tax into politics to stay till it does win.

Again, one of the old parties must give way to the new. You hoped to break the democratic party and recruit from it. You can't do it yet. The ignorance, the purchasable vote of the north and the solid vote of the south, where the united labor party has small foothold, will carry the democratic party safely through another campaign. The last election settled that. And as rats leave a sinking ship, so the monopolists and capitalists are leaving the republican party and drifting toward the democratic raft. Keep up a national organization by a national ticket, and all hope will leave the republican party. It will go to pieces, and it contains much better material to build a new party out of than the democratic.

I am a prohibitionist. I hope to see the two reform parties united in their final struggle when victory comes. Not yet. Neither is ready yet. Neither reform will be complete without the other. Prohibition of the liquor traffic with a single tax on land values will take us a long way on the road toward the millennium; while prosperity by the tax reform would largely reduce drunkenness among the workingmen, though it would not stop the fashionable tipling of young men in the saloons for the rich.

The prohibitionists aim to elevate society regardless of wealth or poverty by outlawing its worst social enemy, the drink traffic. The united labor party aims to abolish poverty by destroying monopoly in lands. We can help each other, but not as I too frequently see on both sides, by belittling the other issue. Writers in THE STANDARD often betray their ignorance of the prohibition question just as writers in the *Voice* often betray their ignorance of the single tax theory. Let us be charitable, not condemning what we don't fully understand. Separately next year the two reform parties can utterly crush the republican party. United in 1892 they can place a congress and president in Washington that shall do the people's will. On one side are reformers willing to allow the liquor traffic to be outlawed for the sake of winning the single tax; on the other are reformers willing to accept the single tax for the sake of prohibition. When victory is within reach we can win together.

H. B. SALISBURY.

Practical Politics in Troy—But the Fight Will be Carried on Just the Same.

TROY, N. Y.—In THE STANDARD of Dec. 3 I find a letter from Mr. George R. Bowen that expresses my views exactly. I say, by all means let us contest for the presidency in 1888. We must keep our party before the people, so that they shall be educated in its principles and understand the meaning of taxing land values. If we slacken our pace now there will be all the more ground to be gone over when we begin anew, and some of our work will have to be done again.

I, for one, am well satisfied with the result of the election. Just think of it! Over 72,000 true men battling for the truth, and, mind you, truth has always had a struggle for existence. When we take into consideration the force that was used against us, monopoly, ecclesiasticism, prejudice, money and ignorance of our principles, I think we did nobly. I must acknowledge that I was a little discouraged by my first practical experience at the polls. I had been distributing ballots but a short time when I was approached by a man who asked me what ticket I had. I told him the united labor ticket. He then inquired if there was anything in it. Thinking the man meant well, I replied, "Yes, there is principle in it." This was his answer, "Oh, h——! that is played out; you can't buy anything for that. Where is ——?"

A short time after that another man came and asked me how much I was paying for votes, adding that if I paid enough I could have his and two others. As I stood and looked at him it seemed as if the task of lifting such creatures from their degradation and ignorance was almost too much for this century; but he is our brother and we must make self a secondary consideration.

We have now made a good start, and having put our hands to the plow we don't mean to turn back. We have furnished them nicely and intend to keep at work, not only instructing others, but making ourselves better able to answer all the questions that may come up on both taxing land values and protective tariff. To enable us to handle the tariff question you will please send me two copies of "Protection or Free Trade?" paper cover, for which please find inclosed seventy cents.

JOHN BOYD.

Let "Observer" Have Patience and Urge His Fellow Workers to Make Converts, Each in His Own Neighborhood—When the Followers Are Ready the Leaders Won't be Wanting.

DETROIT, Mich.—The workingmen of this state are keenly alive to the fact that year after year their surroundings are steadily growing worse—that the opportunities for improving their condition are constantly being curtailed. They appreciate that in the competition that has sprung up among business men they are steadily but surely being crowded to the wall, and it is but a question of a few years when their condition in this boasted land of liberty will be no better than that class known in general as the "pauper laborer" of Europe. They see on every hand great monopolies, with special privileges obtained through the law making power of the land, reaching out and absorbing every natural advantage and putting up the bars against all comers to their fields. They see these monopolies fostered and petted by congress and state legislatures, but watch in vain for the passage of any measures looking to the bettering of their own conditions. As a consequence intelligent, thinking men have become disgusted and abandoned all hope of relief from either of the old parties.

The platform of the united labor party holds out to them a theory that is at once comprehensive and practical. It holds out the only hope of bettering their condition this side of the grave. Remove from the natural resources of this country—the bounties of God provided for the use of all His children alike—the sacrilegious hand of the speculator and monopolist and these men will be at once freed from the power that makes them all but slaves in this land of freemen. Few workingmen realize also that that this can be accomplished without serious injury to anyone, and with inconvenience to none but the drones in the great hive of humanity who have fattened off the labor and enterprise of their neighbors.

I believe this sentiment is far more universal than is generally supposed. It has taken a strong hold among that class of workingmen noted for their intelligence and conservatism—who generally vote, but never attend a caucus or take any part in active party politics—who could not be induced to accept a nomination for any office. Such men shun notoriety, are slow to change their political opinions, make poor "picket soldiers," but are reliable in the "reserve" when the hour of battle has arrived. An effective "reserve," however, needs an able leader or commander, without which it is soon thrown into confusion, defeated and driven from the field. And this is just the condition of the united labor party in Michigan to-day—they lack leaders. The wonderful growth of labor organizations within the past few years, and their manifest disposition to take independent political action, attracted the small politicians and barnacles of of the old parties—that class who like to be prominent in politics, but who failed to realize their ambition in the old parties. They thought they saw an opportunity in the new labor movement to come to the surface, and straightway allied themselves with unions or Knights of Labor assemblies, and became the most active element in the organizations—with their tongue. The leaders of the old parties, believing they possessed immense influence with their associates, tendered them appointments to petty offices within their gifts, with a view to keeping the rank and file of the labor movement within the lines of the old parties. None of these tenders were refused to my knowledge, and as a consequence these would-be leaders have gained the goal of their ambition, but have forfeited their influence, if they ever had any, with their associates. The earnest men of whom I have spoken never took much stock in them, and have mostly kept along in the rear of the old parties, hoping for better things in the future.

What we need are leaders—men who love the cause for the principle involved and are above being bribed by either of the old parties. We want leaders who can inspire the confidence of the more intelligent class of laboring men—that class which composed the gallant army of 73,000 in the state of New York at the recent election. All honor to that gallant band!

Our rural press is doing a grand work, but is hampered by the lack of proper direction. Michigan is a grand field for the united labor party under proper management, but who will be the Moses to lead the party to the promised land?

OBSERVER.

Success Will Not Strive for Us—We Must Strive for Success.

BRACEVILLE, Ill.—Mr. William T. Croasdale in No. 21 of your paper says: "As to how that strength (the strength of the new party) 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."

It cannot be that so clear and true an exponent of our principles as Mr. Croasdale estimates our success or failure by our ability or inability to carry elections. Care should be taken to prevent the discouraging or evil influence of such impressions. Our success lies not in the carrying of elections, but in the spread of our doctrines. Though the New York election was a disappointment, it was no defeat. We reasoned from an unsound basis, and made the mistake of over estimating results. The so-called defeat was a glorious victory. We can reach the goal only through such engagements and through such defeats which are bound to be more and more glorious till the truth and justice of the new crusade triumph over all. Whether it would seem folly or not to nominate a presidential ticket next year, we must be aggressive. Success will not strive for us; we must strive for success.

The work of to-day was unknown to the wisest of men yesterday. Let us do what we find first needs doing here and now—educate, organize, wage incessant warfare on monopoly, proclaim the simple principles which we know are just and will abolish poverty and make possible the kingdom of heaven on earth.

The spirit of this movement is divine. Trust that spirit and the faithful performance of the work of the movement will lead onward and upward to the duties and triumphs of all time.

ROBERT CUMMING.

The Duty of the Coming Kansas Convention.

LARNED, Kan.—I am very glad to see in THE STANDARD of December 3 a call for a united labor convention, to meet in Topeka, Kan., on the 9th of February next, for the purpose of organizing in this state. Allow me to offer a few suggestions as to the character of the good work before us here.

I am told that there are some in Kansas labor clubs who advocate the adoption in the proposed convention of a new platform, leaving out some of the planks or principles adopted at Syracuse, and instead unite on some sort of half-way measures.

Now, the success or failure of any new cause depends very largely upon the character of the men and measures that first challenge the attention of the public; and in this crusade its strength is derived wholly from the purity and righteousness of its principles.

Its platform proposes nothing less than the recognition and adoption of those broad and holy laws clearly manifested in the Divine Master Himself.

The glory and strength of this crusade must be precisely according to the fidelity with which we adhere to these principles. This movement is clearly unlike any and all former political movements, striking its roots deep down into the hearts of those whose supreme effort is to actually obey the Golden Rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." God Himself is at the bottom of this movement. His glorious footsteps are discernible all along its lines of march; His chariot wheels are heard rumbling throughout all the ranks and battlement of the hosts who have committed themselves to its principles; and whenever we begin to "daub with untempered mortar" then is the cause shorn of its strength—then is the handwriting visible upon the wall; for then is the Lord withdrawn from us, and we are let down into the slums and filth of expediency; of the time-serving, which now forms the canker worm of the old political organizations. This new movement is everything or it is nothing. If we are to compromise in one iota, then are we even worse than the old parties, because while such surrender would at once and forever rob us of God's blessing and succor, we should at the same time find ourselves utterly wanting in all those potencies which now place the old parties, in point of numbers and the other essentials of unholy strength, far in our advance.

I do not dwell upon these points because I fear that these cowardly counsels are at all likely to prevail in any of your deliberations, but because I wish to impress it deeply upon the minds of all those who shall take part in the forthcoming convention that we are to go to that meeting fully recognizing our allegiance to those God-given principles, and with an unalterable purpose to stand firmly by the flag flung to the breeze by Henry George and reiterated in the Syracuse platform.

It is the class of men holding these principles, as I understand it, that are called to meet in convention in Topeka on the 9th of next February. Let us have a large turnout on that occasion. Let us rally strong in the name of truth and humanity. I hardly see how anyone whose eyes have beheld the great light for one moment doubt its ultimate triumph. Even if I knew such triumph would be deferred for a whole century, yet I for one would feel that it is both my duty and my glorious privilege to work with might and main for such end.

God is in it, and it never can be defeated; but men are the instrumentalities by which success is to be achieved.

W. M. GARDNER.

Aflame With Enthusiasm, Undaunted by any Discouragement and Eager for a Presidential Nomination.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Mr. Croasdale and Mr. Post have spoken on the question of conducting a presidential campaign and are surprisingly one-minded against making the fight. If this is the general opinion of the leaders I am sure you will be glad to hear from the rank and file before a step is decided upon in that direction which may be a fatal blunder.

I am a private in the Tenth ward association of Brooklyn and I speak only for personal friends who are aflame with enthusiasm and undaunted by any discouragement.

We all agree with Mr. Post in regard to the folly of nominating men for offices which are not associated with the furtherance of our objects. But we are astonished at the signs of weakening displayed by Messrs. Croasdale and Post in advising retreat at this critical moment in our existence. We are in a position now where we must go forward and live or go backward and die, where we must be bold and aggressive or vacillating and scorned.

The references to former defunct parties by both gentlemen have been particularly unhappy. What crowned the republican party with success? Twenty five years of agitation by abolitionists of the anti-slavery idea. What killed the greenback party? Compromises; trying to find a short route to success; gentlemen who couldn't afford to have their votes, voices and pens temporarily count for nothing in public affairs.

Why do Mr. Croasdale and Mr. Post sneer at the prohibitionists? They are fighting for principle. They have won their way from a poll of about 1,000 votes in the state about six years ago to nearly 50,000 now. And what is most noteworthy about this steady increase is the fact that the greatest stride of the prohibitionists was made in 1884, in the face of the bitterest and most exciting of presidential campaigns. If in that year the prohibitionists with their narrow, warped ideas could increase their vote from 13,000 to 25,000, what should the united labor party do with 75,000 members and the noblest idea that ever stimulated political action or arrested thoughtful human attention?

We have a weapon that neither democrat nor republican has; and in the coming campaign we will have such an opportunity to use it to emphasize our earnestness, to train our leaders, to school our forces, to vote again for principle; we shall have such an opportunity to capture independent thinking men, disgusted with both the Blaine and Fellows-Cleveland combinations, as may never occur again. It is, therefore, imperative that we be prepared to fight our issue fully, squarely and vigorously all along the line, or the united labor party will crumble away in the dust, dirt and ashes of the national campaign; and once shattered and broken, its resurrection will be the most herculean task in modern politics.

We must nominate for every office that is vital to the ultimate success of our great principle. These offices are presidential and congressional in national affairs, gubernatorial, senatorial and legislative in state affairs. Our fight is for these, and it must be made for all, if the united labor party is to count for anything in public affairs. Our votes, our voices, our pens, our efforts, our hearts and souls are in this work for no half way measures, for no juggling with an income tax, for no balance of power or fatal compromise, but to win—to win by a long, a hard and continuous struggle on the line of legislative enactment and executive assent.

Do not arouse a suspicion that we are tools, to be played with or used by one or the other set of politicians. Do not ask us, filled with the ardor of a noble sentiment, to cast our presidential ballots on a question of filth. If you do you will forever shake the confidence of the rank and file; you will stab the labor party to its vitals, and find in 1892 that you will face the identical condition you do to-day.

We do not ask that the pomp of a national assembly shall nominate a national ticket. What we do want is that our state convention shall nominate a governor, a lieutenant-governor, and the thirty-six presidential electors, on a single land value tax platform, and perhaps name the presidential choice of New York state. Let other states, relying on their own resources, follow on the same basis, as our efforts should be concentrated. Cheering results in the New York campaign will be of more benefit than any amount of outside work.

We want fight. We should not, we must not give occasion for the finger of scorn to be pointed at us as being already defunct.

Very truly yours, TENTH WARDER.

Believes in Making a Presidential Nomination and Leaving the Party Name Unchanged.

HYATTSVILLE, Md.—So far as I am able to discover the feeling of those of the united labor persuasion in my neighborhood is in favor of a convention and a presidential candidate. We have cut loose from old organizations, and we want and must have some way of expressing our ideas in the most prominent way. We look to the party in New York for leadership, but if it fails we, or the party in other states, must take the initiative. The fact that we will be left behind in the number of votes cast is not to the point. If our opinions are worth anything we can stand defeat, and with every general campaign will come better understanding. If we so lack self respect as a party that we fear to place ourselves upon the same footing as other parties, how can we ever be regarded anywhere except as a faction? Is New York going to do its duty, or must we look elsewhere for leadership?

Again, with all due respect to those of different views, I must doubt the wisdom of a change in party name. The united labor party was born of the efforts of laboring men. Its voting strength comes from them. Its appeals must be to them first of all, for they are the greatest sufferers from existing conditions. And the man who refuses to vote for a party because it has the word "labor" in its name does not believe in its principles. Furthermore, the name "united labor" has become distinctive. It is associated with certain known ideas. If we change the name we will require a new process of education. A change of name is almost a change of front.

J. H. RALSTON.

Believes in Making Nominations for all Offices.

JAMESTOWN, N. Y.—I cannot agree with Mr. Croasdale that the party should not make nominations for president next year. It seems to me the only way to keep the strength we have and maintain a position at all, must be by thorough organization in every state. If the Australian or kindred system of voting were in vogue, a party organization would not be necessary, but as it is, there must be one. My observation of the late election in this state convinces me that the smallness of the vote of the party was due to lack of organization. The vote in this city could easily have been doubled if the believers in the doctrine of free land could have been organized.

I was greatly interested in the letter of Mr. Post and agree with him that much can be accomplished in a fight for Congressmen. Indeed we could accomplish nothing by electing an executive officer, but by making nominations for president and vice-president we shall maintain a political organization and we can maintain it in no other way.

Let us make nominations for all offices. Make a fight for members of congress in every district. Make a fight in every state for the Australian system of voting. But the great principles of the party should find expression in a national convention and those be adopted in all local fights so that the party may be solid and united whether in Maine or in Texas.

W. S. CROSBY.

Why Not Show the Same Bravery as the Prohibition Party?

NEW YORK CITY.—I see that some members of our party consider it inadvisable to contest for the presidency in 1888. Allow me for one to protest against such a view of the question. I would sooner be dead than vol untarily vote to indorse the crime and corruption represented by both of the old parties. We certainly will not gain any increase in vote by simply running for the legislature; and what good will the increase do us if we join with corruption in order to gain it? And I think it would be the best thing to happen to our party to know the exact number of people in the United States who are willing to cast their votes in the air for a just principle. If we only receive one hundred thousand in the whole of the United States, does not any intelligent man know that they are worth five times that number of chance votes and twenty times that number of bought votes? Why should the policy of expediency frighten us away from standing on our merits and showing the same bravery as the prohibition party? Have we not as great a religious and eternal truth embodied in our platform as they? Cannot we do what they dare do? Is our platform so poor that if we work faithfully for one year we will find fewer men who are willing to stand by us and vindicate our principles by indorsing the head of our ticket in 1888? I scarcely believe it.

GEO. R. BOWEN, M. D.

Give Every Earnest Man a Chance to Vote for Principle and Leave the Result to Providence.

OXFORD, Mass.—I am one of those who are in favor of "voting steadily for principle without regard to results." These are your own words in this week's STANDARD, which arrived here this morning. The communication from Geo. R. Bowen, M. D., on the last page, voices my feelings exactly. It will be cowardice to draw back now, because we have not had all the success we anticipated. You have, I know, to fear the possibility that your vote in 1888 in New York state may be even smaller than now, in a national contest between the old parties. So many men there are who, even though they see and believe, will hate to "throw away their vote," will want to help Blaine or Cleveland "just for once" and give the old party this one more victory. But if a presidential ticket is not nominated, the course of events may be such as to cause us to bitterly regret it. Let us give every earnest man a chance to vote for principle and leave the result to providence.

Go straight ahead, believing in everything right and just, and fearing nothing.

ALBERT S. CUSHMAN.

Warren W. Bailey Gives His Reasons for Favoring a Presidential Nomination.

CHICAGO, Ill.—At a meeting of Land and labor club No. 1, a resolution offered by the undersigned, that it was the sense of this club that preparations for the campaign of '88 should be begun at once and prosecuted vigorously, was animatedly discussed and finally adopted by almost a unanimous vote. Letters were read from Columbus, Ohio, and Charleston, S. C., expressing determination and great hopefulness in the same direction; and the general feeling in all quarters seems to be that it is our duty to carry the new movement manfully into the presidential canvass.

And there is really no tenable argument that I can see against such a course. Our party is here and it is here to stay. It is founded upon a rock. In its first state canvass, in the face of the most remarkable difficulties, it was able to poll a vote larger than any new party ever before received—almost as many as Peter Cooper received in the whole union, and more by a hundred per cent than the prohibitionists, with years of organization and with all their church influence, could command.

It would be a fatal blunder, I believe, to ignore these vastly encouraging facts and relapse from the activity that the situation demands. Conditions, I believe, are ripe for us. Mr. Cleveland, it is true, has furnished what the old party people are quick to call an issue. They insist that his attitude will drive his party into a square support of revenue reform and that this will prove the overshadowing issue of next year. But the democratic party does not mean to reform taxation. It may possibly lessen the immediate signs of *the evil, but the evil itself* will be as carefully preserved by Mr. Carlisle as by Mr. Kelley. Protection, by the very message that is denounced as a free trade deliverance by Whitelaw Reid and Murat Halstead as the mouthpieces of Mr. Blaine, is expressly and emphatically indorsed and defended as a matter of principle, and the promise is made and reiterated that no legislation shall be tolerated that does not recognize and sustain it.

The history of the past is being repeated. The slavery question was "settled" by every administration and every congress for years before the war; compromise succeeded compromise and "vested rights" were again and again "vindicated" by party platforms, executive deliverances and congressional enactments; but somehow the rights of man kept forging to the fore; Garrison, Phillips, Sumner, even poor, crazy John Brown kept agitating, agitating, and finally Abraham Lincoln stood upon the platform in New York and uttered the keynote of that "irrepressible conflict" which ended under the apple tree at Appomattox. "Slavery," said he, "is either right or it is wrong. If it is right, it is right everywhere; if it is wrong, it is wrong everywhere. There is no middle ground. This nation cannot continue to exist half slave and half free." And so, with one touch, he swept away the whole fabric of compromise, extenuation and political patchwork, and the people confronted the real issue. From that moment there was no doubt of the result. The flimsy pretexts that had served so long to divert the popular attention and to maintain party equilibrium were of no avail, and abolition became the inspiration of tens of thousands to whom it had been a nightmare. It was upon this that the new republican party rode into power; it was this growing primarily in nebulous parties which finally pooled their issues under the standard of the gallant Fremont, which annihilated the whigs and finally disrupted the democrats; and it was this that saved the Union. But suppose after '52 and '54 the leaders of that great and glorious movement had determined to stay out of the fight in '56. Without Fremont would Lincoln have been possible? Was not Fremont the pathfinder of Lincoln as he was of the pioneers who crossed the continent in his footsteps? Surely the lesson of history is plain. He who runs may read. The democrats may promise and promise; they may salve the wound with soft words and cover it over with silken bandages, but it will not heal; the germ of the disease is there; it is of their own planting; and it is no part of their purpose to destroy it. So the conflict will go on; the offices, as between the old parties, will continue to be the real issue; the tariff will be their stalking-horse, behind which they will make a sneak on the fatnesses of the land, careless of the impending disaster, indeed hastening it with reckless unconcern, as the old parties hastened the war and rendered it inevitable by their infamous dalliance with the painted harlot of slavery. I cannot but believe it to be our duty as patriots, as men who see the disease and know its remedy, to come boldly to the front. There is no room for a masterful inactivity here. We must fight if we would win. At this juncture, he who dallies is a dastard, and he who doubts is damned. The plain, open course lies before us. Shall we enter it and march on to certain and early victory, or shall we hang our armor up by the wayside and sit down waiting for the enemy to block the way and destroy the citadel that is the object of our solicitude?

Among the masses, among the crusaders that have come up out of the plain people, there can be but one answer. The foe is before us, therefore let us fight. We shall not win to-day, but the glory of our defeat will bring recruits and final triumph. Bull Run has been fought; now let us "On to Richmond!"

WARREN W. BAILEY.

An Open Letter to Louis F. Post.

OTTAWA, O.—Dear Sir: I am surprised and pained after reading your letter to Dr. A. S. Houghton. You say: "What we must be careful to avoid is the danger that now threatens us of becoming a mere pantomime party;" again, "unless we avoid the political routine adopted by the prohibitionists we shall cut the same ridiculous figure they do."

There is only one possible way by which we may become a mere pantomime party or cut a ridiculous figure and that is by the abandonment of principle to expediency. The fear that our party may be ridiculous because of its size cannot obtain among the faithful.

The prohibition party ought not to be regarded as ridiculous by any of us, because it is honest and sincere. To my mind the great parties that are conscious of no wrong in the existing order merit only our contempt. That we should feel ridiculous because of them is wrong.

We are agreed that a political party forms the best medium for propaganda. Therefore we build such a party. By we I mean only such as are George men; no others need apply. You will agree that there is only one way to build a party, and that is to build it. You advise, however, that we temporarily abandon the building process and go for some Buddensiek builders and elect a congressman or two, or even a respectable caucus of congressmen. Then what? Having gained a few congressmen by a partial sacrifice of the full plan, to retain our advantage we must make further sacrifice and then principle will go, and then we must commence over again, handicapped by a bad precedent.

Suppose we had a few congressmen, what good would it do the cause? With no party behind them and only a few in number that may be retired easily, their influence would be absolutely nothing. They would hang like millstones around a new party's neck.

My dear fellow-worker, there is only one way, and that way suggests itself without argument or debate. I entreat you to abandon your idle fears that a single tax party can be ridiculous. It never can. Our party has already assumed national importance, and if we fail to put a presidential ticket in the field next year we will lose much more from lack of action along the skirmish line than we can gain by fighting a retreat as you propose.

HENRY RAWIE.

Takes Issue With Louis F. Post.

BALLSTON SPA, N. Y.—I take issue with Mr. Post. Now, as he states, if our party will perfect a national organization and put up local candidates they will amount to something, but there are a great many districts that are not and will not be organized in time for next year's campaign, and yet in these districts there will be men who will want to vote for the principle. If we don't have a presidential candidate we will be a body without a head. As for the prohibitionists, I have repeatedly heard republicans complain bitterly of their "folly" in helping their enemies and showing that they (the republicans) have been defeated in this state by a plurality considerably less than the prohibition vote. And then I notice the republican endeavor to placate the prohibition vote by half-way measures. I hope we will be as steadfast in refusing any as they are.

I think his plan in regard to congressional candidates is a splendid one, particularly as the president has paved the way by his message.

Let us pitch in and commence the campaign at the earliest possible moment.

AITOUR.

The People in the West will Insist on a Candidate for President.

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—I think that our people of the west will insist upon having a candidate for president in 1888. Our party has completely absorbed the old greenback party, and they always insisted upon making the fight. If we fail to put up a candidate each of the old parties will insist that we are staying out the fight for the benefit of the other, and we, having no common rallying point, will go to pieces. We can now make our canvass on the merits of our ideas.

GEO. M. JACKSON.

MONOPOLY'S FINAL FORM.

The *Real Estate Record and Guide* recently printed an article on "The Future of Trusts," which deserves the attention of all students of our economic development. The writer describes the Standard oil, the gas, sugar, india rubber and other trusts as organizations each of which seeks to cover the whole of some industry or product by uniting all individuals and corporations engaged in a special business. These trusts are comparatively irresponsible; for whereas corporations exist by legislative permission and are subordinate to the law, the trusts do business without regard to state lines, and are under no legal restraints. "Take," says the writer, "the Standard oil trust, for instance. It has ruined rivals, monopolized the whole petroleum industry, and yet has no corporate legal status."

The writer predicts that the opposition to these trusts will grow, and that state and national legislatures will be called on to limit their power and preserve the community against their possible exactions. He foresees a great contest between the trust organizations and the individual manufacturers and dealers whose business they would destroy—a contest in which parties and newspapers will be forced to take sides. In this fight the writer predicts that the advocates of the trust will finally be successful, because "it will be shown that, properly managed, they can do better by the consuming public than can minor corporations or individual merchants or dealers."

This somewhat startling prediction is based on the declaration that these trusts "are a natural outgrowth of the business methods in vogue throughout the commercial world." Denunciation of them is therefore idle, "for they evidently meet a public want or they would not be multiplying." The Standard oil trust, he insists, has ruined some hundreds of refiners and dealers, "but it has so cheapened oil that it has benefited a thousand consumers where it has injured one would-be dealer." The writer has little doubt that the business trusts recently established will similarly benefit the consumers, but, he says, "individual merchants, dealers and brokers will be ruined, and their passionate outcries will move the public and may lead to legislation adverse to these great monopolizing corporations."

The writer in the *Record and Guide* pauses to reflect on the great change that has come over the commercial world since the Manchester school of political economy preached that "the ideal state of society was one in which every person had an equal chance, and there was no favor in the field of industry," while in this country the democratic party won victories by "fighting national banks and opposing all concentration of power, whether in the hands of government or in organizations of capitalists." The working people, he says, were the first to revolt against this state of things, alleging that free competition led to the impoverishment of those who worked for a living; hence, he says, came "the trades union and finally the Knights of Labor, the object of both being to make a monopoly of the labor field," and crush out individual competitors willing to work at less than the wages prescribed by the organization. On the other hand, the necessity of massing wealth in order to build railroads and other great public improvements "called into existence corporations which were necessarily of a monopolizing character," and the tendency of all corporations to get rid of competition has carried this movement on until "the latest of these organized trusts is one which aims to monopolize the whole sugar refining industry of the country." "If it succeeds," says the *Record and Guide*, "many individuals will lose their all, for competition will not be permitted, but the community which uses sugar will doubtless be benefited by getting a better average article at a lower price." The writer thus sums up: "The tendency everywhere is toward united action of this kind. Employers have generally found that if they unite they can hold their own as against organized labor; indeed, in all the conflicts between capitalists and their employes when both sides were organized, the bosses have come off victors."

There is nothing absolutely novel in the views here expressed; but the *Record and Guide* is one of the most thoughtful of the numerous business journals now published, and its clear and succinct statement is the best I have seen of ideas held not only by men interested in various monopolies, but frequently expressed by men who have no personal interests to influence their judgment in the matter. "The tendency is toward big things," said one such man to me recently; "and it must continue so, because nothing but big things pay nowadays." In reference to my suggestion that the people were the victims of all this, and that they might put an end to it some day, I was frankly told by a man personally interested in one of these trusts that it was none of the people's business, and that if it were, they would not attend to it. The best answer, he continued, to all that kind of talk was Vanderbilt's—"the public be damned." In language more smooth the writer in the *Record and Guide* says precisely the same thing. That the people will become excited over the growth of what he himself calls "these giant monopolizing corporations" that cause "many individuals to lose their all," because "competition will not be permitted," the writer admits, but he has not a moment's doubt that in the end the monopolists will win, not merely at the polls, but in their extra legal conflicts with the labor organizations. He not only believes that this will be so, but that it ought to be so, because, he thinks—though he does not say it in so many words—that these trusts are the natural outcome of a tendency toward the widest possible co-operative effort under the highest skilled direction, and that they therefore inevitably reduce the cost at which goods can be offered to consumers. It is extremely satisfactory to have the case so clearly stated, and, for myself, I have no hesitation in agreeing with the *Record and Guide* in the declaration that these vast trusts and other similar monopolies "are a natural outgrowth of the business methods in vogue throughout the commercial world;" and I even go further and say that they are the only possible culmination of such methods.

What are these business methods? Our own history is so brief that the question is easily answered. When the European people first came to this continent they found a fertile land practically unoccupied. Whosoever would till the soil had but to choose where he would and there make his home. Though attempts were made in England to confer the monopoly of vast tracts of land on favored individuals, the supply was then so limitless that no industrious man need long lack the opportunity of employing his labor for his own exclusive profit. The taxes requisite to maintain a simple government bore but lightly on the people, and as communities advanced in wealth and thrift new industries sprang up to meet their wants. The English government attempted to prevent the growth of these rude manufactures, but its efforts were resented and, in the main, they were ineffective. When the United States became an independent nation they had a considerable and growing industry. The need for a federal revenue first caused the levying of a tariff tax, and though even in the early days of the republic there were foolish utterances by able men concerning the effect of such a tax on "protecting infant industries," the sound common sense of the people kept the impost down to a limit that permitted comparative freedom of exchange between our products and those of other nations. This was the era of our wonderful natural growth, and though land monopoly had begun to exercise its baleful influence, its oppression was but lightly felt so long as the great free west was the easy refuge of those who felt the growing pressure in the east. Evil as this monopoly is, it was not without an excellent political influence in forcing the more rapid settlement of our vast territory, and thus creating on this continent a united nation. This excellent result was greatly facilitated by the beneficent invention of the railroad, which while it scattered the people over an ever widening area, yet united them more completely than was before practicable. But with this invention came a new departure in our business methods. Though turnpikes and toll bridges were not infrequent, not only the several states but the federal government had recognized the obligation to provide public highways for the people. The right to regulate tolls on bridges and turnpikes was also exercised. That the railway was simply a new form of highway was recognized by the exercise of the power of eminent domain to make way for it, and the right to regulate tolls was at first asserted, in one case very curiously, where the charter of a railroad in Virginia prescribed that toll gates should be erected across the road at stated intervals. But most of the early railroads were financial failures, and their public utility being unquestioned there was a general and natural disposition to give their managers pretty much their own way in controlling and operating them. Thus "corporations which were necessarily of a monopolizing character," as is admitted by the *Record and Guide*, were not merely allowed to use without compensation for the benefit of private owners one of the most sovereign of all governmental powers, but the precedent of permitting them to escape the obligations imposed from time immemorial on builders of turnpikes and bridges was well established before railways had begun to be a power in the land.

No serious ill effects were felt from this until after the civil war. The development of our western lands, though it had become profitable to speculators, still absorbed what we now call our surplus labor. A large measure of freedom of commerce gave us a splendid merchant marine, and a diversity of manufactures and commerce that maintained with rare exceptions prosperity in our eastern seaboard, while the development of the wonderful mineral and other resources of the Pacific slope added enormously to our general wealth as compared with that of other nations. Then came the great civil war. In the north every energy that we had was stimulated to the utmost and applied with such vigor to our hitherto undeveloped natural resources that the men in the field were scarcely missed from the busy scene of our labors, and our people bore easily the burdens imposed upon them. The north emerged from that conflict apparently richer than it entered it, but it emerged wedded to the business methods now in vogue. A high tariff, ever since maintained at war rates, has not merely driven our commercial marine from the seas and lowered enormously the exchange value of our grain, cotton and other raw products, but it has built up the monopolies that are now combining in trusts. The irresponsibility of railway corporations, endowed by public franchise with power of eminent domain, though at the beginning probably accidental, has not merely become a settled policy, but it has become the common expectation that these corporations will rule the governments that create them. Not only has land monopoly gone on unchecked, but limitless grants of public lands have been made to railroad companies and there has been apparently an actual fever to facilitate the alienation of every acre of land yet owned by the people in common.

What has been the result? The people have been ground as between the upper and nether millstone. Not only has their own government been eager to close their natural refuge to the westward against them, but, if they would escape from the fast diminishing land to the water, it has practically closed the sea against them. With frantic haste the government of the United States has, at the dictation of those who claim to be the chief representatives and spokesmen of our business interests, bent all of its mighty energies to the task of rendering it impossible for the majority of the American people to exist beneath the flag of our country, without paying the minority for the privilege of doing so.

This is no mere display of rhetoric. It is the plain, unvarnished truth. No man but a fool would even dream of a sugar, india rubber, or cotton seed oil trust if a practically prohibitive tariff did not render such a monopoly possible by preventing foreign competition. If the same cannot as clearly be shown of the Standard oil trust and the gas trust, it nevertheless can be shown that these monopolies could never have been built up but for the reckless disregard of public rights in granting powers and franchises to corporations. It was the great railways whose "pool" was forerunner of a "transportation trust" that built up the Standard oil monopoly, and the fact that these railways share the "swag" that the tariff enables the protected industries to steal from the public is no small factor in their ability to assist in creating other monopolies. If coal could be delivered free of duty in New York, would coal and railway monopolists dare reduce the Pennsylvania coal region to famine in order that more money might be wrung from the shivering poor of New York under the threat of freezing? We cannot leave out the tariff for a moment in considering the causes of monopolies, though it is easy to see that the destruction of all monopolies depending on the tariff would not of itself give complete relief. The overthrow of the tariff is, however, a step in the right direction, and it is well worth striving for, if for no other reason than that it would smash so many trusts now formed or forming and help bring all producers face to face finally with the giant monopoly that is the parent of all others. The tariff and the railway monopolies are the faithful allies of land monopoly, and both must probably be overthrown before the greater power for evil is finally destroyed.

One thing made very clear in the article under review is the essential identity of interest between workingmen and individual merchants and manufacturers in the battle soon to come between the people and the trusts. It is already demonstrated that in the contests between capital and labor capital can win whenever it is thoroughly united. The trust is a perfect weapon against the boycott. Take sugar, for instance. It might be practicable to boycott the product of a single refinery, or even of a group of refineries, but when the whole refining industry is controlled by a single trust, boycotting sugar is at an end. A whole people cannot be induced to do without it even for a day. The only blow at such a trust would be the throwing open our markets for the introduction of foreign sugar. But the working men are no more helpless than are the other victims of the new device of landed monopoly. The writer I have quoted, while defending trusts, admits the hardships to which their formation subjects not only individuals but smaller corporations. His entire readiness to sacrifice such private interests "without compensation" but reflects the sentiment of business men generally under such circumstances, and demonstrates the insincerity of the pretended sympathy of the same class for the hardships likely to be imposed by land tax reform. No conceivable sacrifice is regarded as a sufficient reason for checking progress that has for its object the satisfaction of private greed, but no individual must be subjected to any hardship for the sake of the public benefit. This theory was good enough so long as the working man was the only victim, but the new victims dedicated to perish on the altar of mammon will not consent to be quietly eliminated for the benefit of any trust, however beneficent may be its intentions. They will, doubtless, as suggested, make "passionate outcries," and possibly, for some time, like the "few hundred refiners and dealers" ruined by the Standard oil trust, they will spend much time and effort in fighting against fate, but in the end they must begin to inquire how and why it is they are thus thrust out of businesses that have in the past proved useful and profitable. When they do begin this inquiry they will find that it was answered long before they asked it, and in the name of men that they have despised—the working men, whom they must make their stanch allies in the battle that is to be fought with monopoly in this, its final shape.

I have thus far, beyond the admission that the development of trusts is a natural outgrowth of existing business methods and of governmental relations to business operations, made no attempt to consider the claim that the creation of monopolies is a good thing in itself. This claim is constantly made by those interested, and it is worthy of consideration. It is unquestionably true that the tendency of all industrial operations is toward large establishments and minute division of the details of work. That this is largely the result of labor saving machinery, and that it tends to reduce the cost to the consumer, is not to be denied. Neither is it to be regretted. The reason that it apparently works injury to some is to be found, not in the growth of invention that brings about such results, but in the conditions that prevent an equitable apportionment of the products of this addition to man's powers. A trunk railway stretching across the continent serves the public better than a series of connecting roads each under separate management. One great factory can produce goods more cheaply than several small factories. But there is a natural limit to this. A maximum is readily reached beyond which progress is made by duplication rather than by enlargement. If private ownership of railways were to continue there would be no advantage to the public in having two parallel railroads under the same management. The only purpose of such a scheme would be to prevent competition. It is this purpose, and not the facilitation of production by large operations, that animates the formation of trusts. Until the work is complete the new device may cheapen the cost of articles to the consumer. The claim is made, and apparently truthfully, that the creation of the Standard oil trust has improved the quality and cheapened the price of oil. Yet even this cannot be admitted without reservation. Since the oil business has practically been controlled by a single body no outsider knows what inventions have been made to lower the cost of the various operations. Had there been rivalry the public might have enjoyed the advantage of these inventions through competition without availing itself of the benevolence of this gigantic monopoly. One thing, at least, is beyond dispute, and that is that the Standard people have been able to make vasts sums of money out of the business.

But the people cannot afford to rely on the benevolence of monopolists for continued low prices. It was recently officially declared in a Titusville paper that there has been an overproduction of oil. The result as announced by the paper was "the most important deal ever consummated in the history of the oil business." Contracts were made for "a great shut-down," by which the production was to be reduced fifty per cent for one whole year. No new wells are to be opened during the "shut-down." In order to bring about this result the paper declared that the Standard oil company had set aside 5,000,000 barrels of oil at sixty-two cents a barrel. The profits on 5,000,000 barrels are to be divided among the owners of holes in the ground who shut down their wells, and the profits on 2,000,000 barrels are to create a wage fund for the laboring men who are thrown out of employment. What can be the object of such a scheme? Of course there is but one answer. Not only does the Standard oil company expect to make a vast profit on the rise in the price of oil through thus limiting its production, but it is expected that the rise on the $4,340,000 worth of oil that it sets aside will be so great that it will compensate one-half the well owners for ceasing operations and maintain, in some fashion, the large body of men thrown out of work so that they may be on hand when again needed. A community must have implicit faith in the good intentions of a corporation or trust before consenting that it shall have this kind of absolute control over the productions of one of the necessities of modern life. No possible reduction of the cost of production could justify a system that will, in the course of time, put the price of all subsistence at the mercy of a consolidated flour, sugar, meat, coal and oil trust.

The only people who can afford to contemplate the development of the trust system with complacency are the socialists. It is directly in their line, and if it were permitted to grow it would organize their proletarian army perfectly to their hands, and then, when the anarchists, aided by an exasperated public, had knocked off its head some day, the self-elected captains of industry would have but to step to the front, and lo! the industrial republic is here.

There is no reason why, in order to gain the natural advantages of invention and of co-operation on a large scale under skilled leadership, the artificial creation of monopolies should be fostered and encouraged. There is one simple and sufficient remedy for all the evils that now exist or those that are threatened, and it is as simple as the old formula of the Gallilean carpenter: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Let us put back into the hands of the government the powers that obviously belong to it, and private control of the people's highways will cease. Let us acknowledge the equal and common ownership of all men in the free bounties of their Creator, and we shall have an end to land monopoly. Let us acknowledge the absolute title of each individual to the full products of his own labor and his right to voluntary association with his fellows, and labor will not be oppressed in order that co-operation shall be made practicable. Under such circumstances and conditions we may again declare that the ideal state of society is one in which every person has an equal chance and no favor.

The reason that men fail to see this is that they cannot or will not bring free and untrammeled minds to a candid consideration of our principles and their logical effect. The truth is half heard and but dimly comprehended, and the misconception of it thus received is overwhelmed by preconceived opinions and prejudices. If men would but thoroughly admit it to their minds, even for purposes of controversy, they would in time comprehend that the restoration of their common rights to the people and the guarantee of their individual rights to individuals is the only way in which the real good sought by socialism can be reconciled with that preservation of individualism which is essential to the best development of man's natural powers.

Though the taking of the rental value of all land by taxation for the public benefit would of itself accomplish this, circumstances render it wise to consider the restoration of the government ownership of railways, canals and telegraphs and other public enterprises that are in their nature monopolies, and the restoration of the governmental control of our circulating medium as separate propositions in connection with that of land restoration. These abuses are less deeply rooted, and thousands who have never even considered the land question, have for a long time had their eyes open to the necessity for these minor reforms. Taking these reforms as a whole, then, it must be clear to any thinking man that a condition of affairs would be brought about that would render it impossible for a few men to combine vast fortunes for the express purpose of acquiring a monopoly of some industry or product.

There would no longer be any inducement to any man to hold land that he could not immediately use, since a tax to its rental value would absorb all increase in value of occupancy from year to year and absolutely destroy speculative values. There would therefore be no more land monopoly, and no more vast fortunes could be made in that way.

The governmental ownership of railways, canals and telegraphs and the municipal ownership of water, gas and other similar public conveniences dependent on the use of public streets would put an end to another set of monopolies that are already becoming a tempting field for pools and trusts.

The direct issue of all forms of currency by the government would put an end to banks of issue and throw a serious obstacle in the way of trust operations.

The largely increased revenues of the municipal, state and federal governments, after the whole ground rent of the country had been properly apportioned among them, would speedily put an end to public debts and thus destroy another of the conveniences for securely piling up colossal fortunes.

The abolition of the tariff and all other forms of taxation on products and consumption would not merely relieve industry and enterprise of needless and crippling burdens, but it would remove one of the most prolific causes of monopoly—for not only does the tariff promote monopoly, as I have already shown, but internal taxation also forces the growth of monopolies in every business affected by it.

Under such conditions there would be few corporations to consolidate into trusts, and no new fortunes could be gathered that would be so gigantic as to cause reasonable alarm. No dangerously large aggregation of money under a single control exists to-day that was not amassed through some one or more of the various forms of monopoly that the advocates of land reform propose to eradicate. The vast fortunes for which no real equivalent has been given by their possessor to the community have either been made by the monopoly of natural opportunities or of publicly created agencies, such as railroads, telegraphs, banks, water works, etc. Shut private greed out from such opportunities, and no man will ever obtain money for which he does not render some adequate return to his fellow men.

But it may be objected that the natural tendency toward large operations would still have full force and that trusts aiming at monopoly would still be possible. Hardly, unless they embraced the whole world in the field of their operations, since any artificial increase of prices here would cause an instant influx of goods from other countries. But there is a more effectual corrective of this tendency, and that is the land tax. In the future, as in the past, it will doubtless be found that vast numbers of men can work more effectively and profitably for others than for themselves. Labor saving machinery has settled it for all time that labor must co-operate under some common control. The socialist, recognizing this, would elect the captains of industry, and the monopolists of to-day elect themselves to these positions and arbitrarily prescribe the terms and conditions under which others shall work for them.

Under the system that I am advocating private individuals would doubtless put themselves, of their own motion, at the head of large bodies of workers, and the narrowing of the present field for investment would constantly tend to drive capital into industrial enterprises. But capital would no longer find itself in a position to dictate the terms for both parties to the bargain of industry. Land monopoly will have been destroyed. Not merely in the great west, but right here in the east, land comparatively useless can be had almost for the asking on which a man can get some sort of a living. Homes, at least, will be easily got. The workman dissatisfied with his wage will no longer find himself between the devil of eviction and the deep sea of submission. On the edges there will be a constant move of those qualified for agriculture toward the practically free land released from the grasp of monopoly, and the pressure on the crowded centers of industry will not only be relieved, but the market for their product will be widened. In short, the artificial band drawn around labor by stupidity and greed will be shattered, and men will no longer be compelled to work for a bare subsistence or get off of this man-owned earth. The mere fact that they can refuse to work without driving themselves to starvation will of itself cause an increase in their wages, and in course of time each individual's wages will rise to the exact equivalent of his work.

This is no fancy picture, for the exact truth of the statement can be shown by illustration. Take cigar making, for instance. Here is an industry that has been made a monopoly by internal taxation as well as by the tariff. If this taxation were removed the business would doubtless still be carried on in large factories and capable men at the head of such establishments would be able to make incomes proportioned to their business abilities. Remove all trade restrictions and what would be the result? Cigars can be made outside of big factories, and having been made, they can be sold. They could be peddled in the streets by their maker or they could be sold to wholesale dealers. It would not take long for men to find out how much they could thus make by employing themselves, and having found out there would be no likelihood that they would be such fools as to work for anyone else for less. Yet a skillful manufacturer could with his machinery and his facilities for reaching a wide market afford to pay men more than they could make by working alone and still make a handsome profit on his business. In fact, the natural law of wages, even though unformulated, would be practically applied in such an establishment. Taken a given quantity of tobacco, a certain amount of skill and labor would add a perfectly definite and ascertainable value to it. That value would be the exact wages of the man contributing that skill and labor. This value, plus that of the first cost of the tobacco, would be the actual cost price of the cigars to the manufacturer, and his skill and reputation as a business man would find their compensation in the addition to this cost value he could obtain from his customers. His profits would, however, be kept in moderation, not only by the competition of his rivals, but by the competition of individuals forced out of factories by inadequate wages.

To-day, with monopoly in this line of manufacture not merely sanctioned but created by law, there would be no difficulty in creating a tobacco trust that would unite all of the monopolies in one body, and then the difficulties thrown by the tax laws in the way of individual manufacture would put not merely the public but the tobacco workers at the mercy of the combination. At present the thorough organization of the cigar makers affords better protection than is accorded by most trade-unions; but suppose a tobacco trust were created, how could you boycott its products without inducing every person in America to stop chewing or smoking—a thing impossible in itself, and the very last thing the workmen would desire, even if it were possible. Under the system I am advocating, however, it must be clear that even the formation of a trust would not lower wages, while the freedom of each individual or group of workmen to start into business would render impossible such a monopoly as alone warrants the formation of so wide reaching an organization.

I have thus gone into minute details in the consideration of this subject because such a course seems necessary. The rapid increase of trusts has caused real alarm among many who have looked with comparative complacency on the less highly developed forms of monopoly. The fact that they have sprung into existence and attained tremendous power without the aid of the law alarms men. This demonstrates that the old panacea of regulating corporations is ineffective. The money kings have discovered a way of rising above mere national and state laws, and, like the sovereigns that they are, they make treaties and apportion out among themselves the trade of a continent and dominion over vast areas of territory and great bodies of men. Business men who view the movement with an alarm that is not wholly free from the apprehension that they may become the victims or slaves of this new power ask what is to be done. They talk of legislation, but confess in their hearts a fear that legislators may not be the most difficult persons for the trusts to control. To such men I frequently present the only possible remedy for monopoly, the only possible escape from the enslavement of our people by mere aggregations of money, but they turn away with impatience because they think the proposal an exhibition of that kind of devotion to one idea that constitutes the crank.

Yet somehow these men must be brought to see and acknowledge the truth. They must be convinced that it is useless to capture mere outworks here and there and leave the very citadel of monopoly untouched. They must be shown that there is abundant cause for their present alarm, because all the mighty forces of our present civilization are, owing to an original false start, dragging society with an ever accelerated speed to destruction or revolution. It is no longer, even in appearance, a mere contest between employer and employed, it is the preparation for the final and fateful battle between all who earn a living through useful service to their fellow men and those who attain princely wealth and power through the ability to compel others to toil for them. There is but one remedy proposed for this condition of affairs. Amid the clash of interests and ambitions between the two old parties there is not one voice lifted in warning, not one proposal of relief. Grover Cleveland, president of the United States, looks with complacency on a situation rose colored by his own astounding luck. His re-election has in it no promise of real relief. James G. Blaine, his most probable competitor, is the natural ally of the forces that culminate in trusts. None of those competing with Mr. Blaine for the republican nomination could be expected to lift even a warning voice against a tendency by which most of them have profited or against a power capable of shattering their hopes at a single blow. The house of representatives is a snarling mob of politicians divided by issues as dead as those that arrayed against each other the houses of Montague and Capulet. In the senate attorneys for monopolies occupy the seats once filled by the representatives of sovereign states. In the great centers of business men applaud the clubbing of socialists and the hanging of anarchists and account the whole matter settled.

> Not an ear in court or market for the low, foreboding cry
> Of those crises, God's stern winnowers, from whose feet earth's chaff must fly.

It was ever so; yet again and again nations have been saved despite such lethargy, and it has usually been the insolent aggression of the enemy, rather than the repeated warnings of friends, that has aroused them to action. Those of us who have just endured defeat in defense of the only political platform that offers a peaceful cure for the evils of monopoly, the only principle that would, without impairing individual liberty, render trusts harmless and even ridiculous, have some right to rejoice in the white terror produced in business circles by the new form in which protean monopoly now appears. Yet we must not shut our eyes to the advantage offered by this alarm. Men may turn away at first, but they must listen in the end. After the folly of the next presidential election has been duly perpetrated the real problems of the time will come up for consideration, and meanwhile we must prepare ourselves to show to all who will listen the one way out of the dilemma caused by the growth and the greedy appetite of this Frankenstein that the American people have amused themselves in creating. I welcome the trust as monopoly in its final and most dangerous form, and all who have not lost faith in the innate honesty and common sense of our people will rejoice that the death grapple is so near at hand. The fight is one between mere money and mere men, and the Syracuse platform, wherever it may be at the beginning of the contest, will in the end be incorporated by the triumphant people in the laws by which they will save all future generations from such a contest as that on which this generation is about to enter. Whether the army of land liberation musters for review next year or not, it must keep intact and ready for the call that will some day come to it to lead the assault on the last stronghold of all monopoly, the monopoly of land. W. T. CROASDALE.

Texas Believes in Running a Ticket.

WACO, TEX.—I think I voice the sentiment of nine-tenths of the friends of the anti-poverty movement in this section when I say let us have a ticket by all means.

S. L. JONES.

DR. M'GLYNN IN DUNKIRK.

Rev. E. P. Adams Tells of the "Isolated" Priest's Talks and Lectures—There is Hope For the Broken Church of God Yet, and the Kingdom of Heaven on Earth Shall Come.

DUNKIRK, N. Y.—A sort of fatality seemed to attend all the attempts of Dr. McGlynn to fulfill his campaign appointments in Dunkirk. Thrice was he advertised and thrice were good audiences assembled to be disappointed. Naturally many interpretations were given for his failure to come here.

But Dr. McGlynn came to us at last, and in such a satisfactory way as to balance all accounts. He came on Saturday and gave his lecture "Heads and Hearts" to a good audience in the opera house in the evening. On Sunday evening, in the same place, to a crowded house he gave us a regular anti-poverty, Academy-of-Music, nearly-three hours long, soul-rousing address upon "The Cross of the New Crusade." To be added to the credit side of the Doctor's account, are his talk at an informal levee at my house after dinner on Sunday afternoon, conversations upon the street, at the table, after the lecture for an hour or two. A mere campaign speech is nothing to all this. Dr. McGlynn is not one whit less interesting in private than in public. On the contrary, if one would be impressed with the great simplicity and breadth and liberality of the man; with his spiritual-mindedness, faith and humanity; with his freedom from the intoxication of human applause, as also from any taint of covetousness, let him walk and talk with him alone. One often meets with the liberality born of indifference or of agnosticism. But how impressive it is to discover a still larger and grander liberality that is begotten of high spiritual instincts, of familiar contemplation of the great free mind or thought of God. This man talks with you as familiarly of the ways of God as another would of civil service reform or of some matter of ecclesiastical routine or discipline; and in the talk there is a delightful blending of the human and the divine. Earth and heaven mingle and are no longer partitioned off from one another. God's holy altar is seen everywhere, and even our political duties are as sacred as sacraments.

Free converse with Dr. McGlynn, to the average Protestant, is a revelation. The Protestant enters the conversation with the secret thought that he will have to wink at occasional out-croppings of superstition and indications of slavery to form and tradition. He takes it for granted that this Catholic priest, though doubtless coming into light, must trail behind him a cloud of old medieval superstitions. A surprise awaits him. He begins to ask where this man got all this illumination. It dawns upon him that God may have been teaching to Catholics truth also all these years as well as to Protestants. And, strange above all, here is an excommunicated Catholic priest who is doing more to disabuse Protestants of their prejudice against the Catholic church and help them to see the good in it than any man, event or thing has ever done before. "Verily," he says to himself, "I have been blind. There is hope for the broken church of God yet. Out of all the discordant elements the kingdom of heaven on earth shall evolve. They shall come from the east and from the west, and their sitting together in peace shall be God's kingdom, which all our quarreling's have hitherto failed to establish." And thus a new hope for humanity is born in him and he begins to gird up his loins for fresh work for men.

Of course the magnificent enthusiasm of the metropolitan Anti-poverty meetings was wanting here. People are prejudiced—even the best of them. Many come out of curiosity to see the man and to be confirmed in their bad opinion of him. They take their seats with their prejudices bristling forward toward the speaker—something like cats with their skins put on back end foremost. And when the kindly speaker tries to stroke them the right way, and justify his faith by argument and lofty sentiment, the more grand and stirring, magnetic and spiritual, just and loving he is, the more antagonistic does he prove. Yet these people mean well. Their sole fault is in having prejudged the case. It is a wondrous and wondrously rare virtue, that of having the wide open ear. To grant to another the full right of free speech is to be pretty nigh to the kingdom of God. Some people imagine they grant it when they magnanimously accord to the truth speaker empty space from which they have done all they could to remove people's ears. Yes, you may speak freely—to the benches! They do not reflect that to turn away is to deny free speech. "Strike, but hear," is as good advice now as anciently.

But Dunkirk is not behind other places in liberality. The general sentiment here is that Dr. McGlynn spoke magnificently; that he is a wonderful orator, gifted with smooth speech, charming voice, unhesitating tongue, orderly thought and an honest, benevolent heart. Only the most set and bristling can be excepted; only such as stand at the door, glancing at the speaker and hunting for the offense, which they immediately seize and take home with them. Some, doubtless, became convinced that the doctrine of the single tax is reasonable, just and practicable. Some were struck with the fact that the movement is one of large humanity and genuine reform. Some who have felt the pressure and anxieties of poverty themselves, or who have hearts and imaginations sufficiently sympathetic and active to put themselves in the other man's place, saw, as for the first time, that "there is a cause," and that they will not be guiltless if they refuse to attend to it. Some are doubtless left half convinced, and therefore uneasy, touchy and belligerent. Sometimes they think they will, then again that they won't. These will be all right some day.

I do not propose to sum up the results. The good cause is ever in God's keeping. It is enough for us at present that Dr. McGlynn has been heard; that men have been set to thinking and feeling; that many hung on his lips entranced and could have listened for hours longer; and that thought impulses and the impulses of all true feeling, like impulses of physical force, never die. May all remember that the *doer* of the Word, and not the *hearer* only, is blessed. E. P. ADAMS.

Wants a National Ticket With the Single Tax as the Sole Issue.

SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, N. Y.—The election was something of a disappointment in the matter of votes throughout the state, but I was agreeably surprised in this county. When I went to the Syracuse convention I did not know one single tax man in the county, but the count showed that 141 had caught a gleam of light in this quiet county.

I am for making a national ticket next year, confining the issue to raising governmental funds from a tax on land values as near as possible.

The people I meet seem to be in the fog on what creates the value of land. I think if we could get the country awake so they could see what we mean by taking part of what the community creates for their support it would not be long before they would see the justice of taking the whole they created.

C. E. GOODING.

CHARITY WORK.

A few days ago, while sauntering along the river streets on the east side of the city, I saw a little line of men standing in the gateway of a lumber yard looking in—idle spectators of something going on inside and keeping within their rights just outside. Because they gazed I wanted to look, too. Two street urchins a little ahead of me shared my curiosity. One said to the other, "Chimmie, let's pipe off t'e broken down dudes."

I ranged myself at the gateway with the spectators. The scene presented was perhaps a score of men under a shed sawing and splitting kindling wood. They were of various ages, but chiefly young. To the two New York street boys, who were now gaping at them, some of them seemed to be wrecks cast away from dudedom, for they wore white shirts with collars and cuffs, and vests and trousers the cut of which suggested the artistic touch of the custom tailor's shears. Most of them were slender fellows, with the bleached faces that men get who live indoors.

I asked a comfortably dressed man who stood beside me what it meant, men doing a kind of work that could be done so much more easily by machinery.

He said it was charity. Men who would rather work than beg and didn't know enough to find work were given this job to prove that they were willing to work.

I asked him if there was work to be had if a man were to go hunting for it.

Oh, yes; if these fellows wanted a steady job, even at wood chopping, they could get it.

Where?

Why, anywhere.

Where in particular?

Well, at his uncle's farm in south New Jersey a lot of men were kept at work all last winter wood chopping, ninety cents a cord. Some chopped two cords a day. Not bad wages in an off season. Darkies did it mostly; whites wouldn't do it.

Was his uncle hiring woodchoppers now?

N-n-no!

I was sorry; we might have told these men in case he was. Where else were men wanted to work?

He didn't just happen to know.

We looked silently awhile at the workers. Most of them worked fast. The heads and shoulders of the sawyers see-sawed up and down rapidly while their elbows flapped like wings. Each stick of cord wood was sawed in four sections, and each of these cut into little sticks of a regulation size. The men handling the hatchets took it easy and sat down. What an odd thing it was, men working at made work—made to give them a chance to show that they needed work and were willing to work.

At the risk of being challenged as a trespasser, I stepped into the yard. The wood sawyer nearest me was a tall, shapely man, such a one as you might term a "likely chap" if you were buying a slave. I said good day, and asked him why he did such work.

Well, was the answer, if a man had no friends and no money he was likely to find himself in a strange predicament.

As he made this reply he straightened up and looked at me. His eye was a large, clear gray; his nose was long, straight and well cut; his mouth not too coarse. His countenance rated him an average man. He had a well groomed look; his hair and mustache were neatly cropped.

Could these men not get work?

If they could, he asked, would they be doing this? There was no work to be had by a man without acquaintance in New York. These men were mostly strangers in the city. They came here to seek employment, had done so until their means were exhausted, and now were down to doing work that was given them as part test, part charity; work that wasn't work, as it could be done better, cheaper and quicker by machinery.

What was the pay?

Married men, 50 cents a day's work, and nothing else; single men, no money, but two meals and a lodging. The meals were light, very light, hash and such; the lodging better than outdoors.

Were the men in this gang temperate?

Why, yes, as men go. Work was so scarce, though. There was an A1 stenographer who couldn't get work.

Now, but *was* he an A1? I interrupted.

Well, that was what they said. There was a bookkeeper.

But every one can call himself a bookkeeper, was my comment.

Yes, he agreed, that was true. And there was a salesman.

But that is not an occupation like a trade, I reminded him. A salesman in some lines require only a few days' training, in others years. The term was so general any one could use it.

That might be, but he took men here on their word, just as men are taken anywhere. Now, his own case. He mentioned a semi-professional occupation. He had had positions of responsibility. Through no fault of his, such as his firm changing or going out of business, his places had been lost. He had once saved some money, bought Florida land without seeing it, and found a living could not be made on it. He had come to New York in search of work, had spent his few dollars sparingly while seeking a place, and here he was. He had a wife and two children dependent upon him. All these men spent what time they could in hunting work. He had applied at every place where there was anything to be done, he said.

I talked with others. They had but one story. They wanted work.

A rod or two away from the gang at work were two other men of the sturdy and independent type that drive trucks here in New York. I wanted their testimony as to this interesting phase of social development, and so, after bidding them good afternoon, I said I supposed that a good many strangers like those there came and went in the course of a year.

Yes, they were always coming and going, said No. 1, a warmly clad man of fifty, who wore a fur cap. He couldn't blame old men for doing that work, but a young man had no business at it. A young man ought to stay in the country. These were all country fellows coming here, flocking to the city and not knowing what they were going to do. There was work enough in America yet if men would only look for it.

How about the five thousand just discharged from work on the subways?

Well, they were not this kind at all. They were our own. Take the boys in the ward; they could get board among their friends, and if their money ran out they would be kept until another job turned up.

No. 2 thought that the wood splitters were not paid enough even if they were tramps. No man ought to take work at fifty cents a day.

No. 1 said that these men only turned up in winter. The charity societies were not bothered with them in summer. They seemed to go off somewhere. This gang had been at work only since election. Before election they could all have their grub and lodgings provided for nothing by the politicians.

Could any man out of work come here and take up with this job?

No. 2 said not at all. Big fellows like Jay Gould bought packages of tickets from the charity societies, and when one of these fellows "panhandled" them or their friends a ticket was given him. It was only on presentation of a ticket that a job was given a man.

A man had to beg for a ticket which entitled him to work!

No. 1 explained further that a day's work only was given for each ticket. If a ticket could not be begged no work was to be had. Seventeen cordwood sticks was a day's work. You could see the fellows were at piece work, since they worked so hard. They wanted to get through quickly. And it could be noticed how each one tried to get the smallest sticks or those without knots.

No. 2 took up the story. Jay Gould had bought several loads of the kindling wood only a week before. It was sold at slightly less than market prices. But, then, if the society did not sell it you could see there would be no work for those fellows. Still, they had no business to work for any such wages.

No. 1 pointed out piles of wood and lumber that reached skyward. Our own ward boys did the piling of that wood, and got two dollars a day for it.

Why did not the wood yard owner get these fifty-cent men to do it?

Well, they could not be depended upon. Our own ward boys that hung around regularly knew how to do it, and there were always enough of them. The boss had taken two of those fellows to his residence up town to do some work. They skipped the second day. Cheap as they were, they could not pull the wages of the regular men down below two dollars a day.

How many of those strange fellows were there?

No. 2 thought there might be in any one season as high as three hundred. Some days there were forty and fifty doing their stent. During the Third avenue street car strike, and afterward during the longshoremen's strike, lots of them got the jobs of the strikers and held them long enough to beat the strike.

I walked out of the yard. On the sidewalk stood a crowd of our own ward boys. They wore coarse blue flannel shirts, and their faces were dark and red with wind and sun. They were lighthearted. I stood near them a few minutes and contemplated the river. During that time they talked about trucks and horses, about a scrapping match in Tom Flynn's place, about when the new board of aldermen were to go in and about John L. They said nothing about work.

HAGAN DWEN.

The Gospel of Christ and the Gospel of the Sunday School.

Last Sunday the Sunday school lesson in our church and in all Sunday schools of the Methodist Episcopal church was the parable of the sower as recorded by St. Matt., chap. 13, verses 1 to 9.

After the lesson had been studied in the class rooms on the plan and basis of thought laid down in the teachers' journal, the classes were called into the lecture room, where we enjoyed a season of most exhilarating music, after which the superintendent read from the teachers' journal some thoughts on the lesson.

I have no criticism to make on these teachings of the journal until we come to the text, "And some fell among thorns, and the thorns sprung up and choked them." In describing the thorns the journal defined them as bad practices of Christians, and instanced as the most notorious such things as dancing and going to theaters.

In the twenty-second verse of the same chapter Jesus himself described the thorns and their choking power as "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches." So we have a scriptural explanation of what the Savior meant and another explanation in the teachers' journal, in which the spirit and sense of Jesus is altogether misapprehended or ignored.

Jesus did not say anything about dancing or any other harmless amusement, especially in the family circle, nor about attending the theater. Some of the things which Jesus describes as thorns were thought by the church of His day and are thought by the church of our day as practically unavoidable, and the deceitfulness of riches was a fact winked at or practically denied by the church and the world in His day, and as practically winked at and denied by the church and the world in our day.

There are thousands of working women in single life who know well the wisdom of Jesus in naming the cares of this world as thorns springing up and choking the word; and there is not a woman in all the land who has raised or is raising a family but knows how the cares of life choke the word and make it powerless to give the comfort her heart requires. Anxiety for the future safety, success and comfort of her children, the worry of life, the fear of poverty or the battle with poverty already engaged in, enter like an iron shaft into her very soul. If Jesus had not explained in His glorious doctrine how these burdens could be removed He would have been a madman for charging any in the least degree with responsibility for the unfruitfulness of His word. J. W.

The "Standard" Converted Him, and "Progress and Poverty" Made Him a Red Hot Crusader.

DENVER, Col.—I have just finished reading "Progress and Poverty" and can now truly say that I am a soldier until victory is won. Your STANDARD made me a warm advocate of the land tax theory, but it took "Progress and Poverty" to make me a red hot crusader. Our cause is certainly a noble one, and that God might strengthen our hearts to push the good work should be the daily prayer of every true hearted man and woman in the world. CHAS. A. SIRINGO.

THE LAND QUESTION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

LONDON, Nov. 20.—The American reader of the daily newspapers may read the cable dispatches from Great Britain for a long time without learning a great deal about the real advance of reform ideas among the masses. The dispatch writers concern themselves much with tracing the progress of coercion in Ireland, fully describing collisions between the police and people at evictions, the incidents of the imprisonment of Wm. O'Brien, and the probable policy of the Parnellites, or they indulge in overwrought descriptions of the procession of the London people to Trafalgar square, and usually call the men marching in parade socialists. Neither do the newspaper letters sent from abroad do much better in the way of giving information as to the undercurrents of thought that in time result in the very events their writers are called on to relate. It is of interest, then, to glance below the surface of contemporaneous history of social agitation presented by correspondents who, when they mention such matters at all, write merely for the sensation-loving general public.

Leaving out of consideration the lines dividing the great parties of the ins and outs in British politics, it is seen that the various parties promoting reform shade off in aims from those that would merely change a few minor forms of law to those that would subvert all present forms of law.

The American reader, on seeing in an English newspaper an article with the heading, "The Free Land League," would expect to find in it a description of the proceedings of a society bent on giving the land to the people. Disappointment would await him. He would read that this league met at the Westminster palace hotel, that its members were "honorables" and "M. P.'s" and title bearers as a rule. These gentlemen meet to discuss amendments to the "Law of Real Property," or the "Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill," or the abolition of "Copyhold Tenure," indulging withal in a few words as to the "Laborers' Allotment Bill." A radical among them he would be who would have the league demand as a basis of effective reform what they term "Free Land"—that is, land free from all entail, settlement, life estates and mortmain. If these worthy reformers wage battle in their cause successfully, land in England will become precisely as free as is land to-day in New York.

Such a state of things may not call for much enthusiasm from one who believes that every man living has an inalienable right to his equal share to the land of his country, yet it is not perfectly clear to the sympathetic observer that the great Irish party is fighting for much more than are these conservative English gentlemen. Granted that the Irish nation should have its laws passed in Dublin by Irishmen, just as the Canadian provinces make their own laws, and that British absentee landlords should be obliged to sell their estates at government appraisal, what of the inalienable birthright of the laborers of all classes and of the artisans of Ireland's cities? There are only shades of difference between the reforms advocated by Mr. Parnell's followers and those calmly agreed upon by the titled aristocrats at the Westminster palace hotel, the latter meaning to make easy the transferral of land between voluntary sellers and the buyers of the land market, and the former intending to compel unwilling landlords to give way and have their shoes filled by another set of the same breed of men.

The Cork *Advertiser*, however, represents another degree of reform. It lately reprinted Bishop Nulty's famous letter, "Back to the Land," and called for a nationalization of the land of Ireland after compensating the landlords. While the *Advertiser* is in advance of the Irish parliamentary party, it has failed to grasp the bishop's conception of human rights and is certainly short of the thought of its many readers who asked for the publication of the letter.

The London *Times* recently printed a letter from an Irishman on the land question that has attracted much attention inasmuch as it speaks the sentiments of a growing party in Ireland. The writer said it is an undeniable fact that politicians of all shades of opinion are now forced to admit the imperative necessity of abolishing what is called the dual ownership of land, and that many maintain that it is expedient to precipitate a purchase bill by which nine-tenths of the cultivated area of Ireland shall be transferred from the proprietors to the occupiers. But this correspondent held that the only course open to the government was to empower the state to become the sole owner of that part of Ireland affected by dual ownership, reducing landlords and tenants to the dead level of occupiers, and recouping itself through a land tax. To transfer the absolute ownership of agricultural holdings from the present landlords to the tenants would be simply to allow a new class of landlords to spring up and intensify a hundredfold all that is objectionable in the landlordism of Ireland to-day.

The course of the journals that speak for the various schools of social reformers is encouraging to the believers in the single land tax as a sufficient remedy for land reform. Of the London daily press, the *Echo* and the *Pall Mall Gazette* print the news relating to radical land reform and allow full expression to correspondents writing on the question. The *Echo* has lately printed a running controversy between a writer who believes in the establishment of co-operative villages on the lines of M. Godin's "*familistere*," and one who asks how such schemes are to help the unemployed. It is felt that all such discussions tend to bring to light the true principle that the land was made for all.

The *Christian Commonwealth* now contains a department under the heading of the "Anti-Poverty Movement," in which it publishes the results of the work of the anti-poverty societies and the united labor party in America and of the Land restoration league in Great Britain. The letters in this department are of a most cheering character. "A Converted Landlord," writing in the issue of the 17th, said that it was a glorious thing that the *Christian Commonwealth* was so heartily and dispassionately taking hold of the great anti-poverty question. He himself was one of the tax appropriating landlords, but worked for the dawn of better days, and as a pledge of his sincerity he put his name down for £1 a week to send the paper to ministers of all denominations.

Brotherhood, Mr. Hyndman editor, took up its leader of the 18th in replying to a correspondent who believed that with land nationalization land would soon pay no rent. The reply was that the rental of ground in towns and cities (generally speaking) is not decreasing, but on the contrary is still merrily increasing, and it constitutes the greater part of the total rental of the British isles. Further, land within a radius of several miles from all the centers of population in the kingdom is also rising. When English farmers shall adapt themselves to the demands of the times, and raise the millions of pounds' worth of eggs, fowls, butter and vegetables now imported from France and Belgium, farm rents will cease to fall.

At a conversazione of the Land nationalization society at Essex hall, Strand, last week, the president, Dr. A. Russell Wallace, spoke of his tour in America. The most significant remarks he made were that the people of the United States have already everything that the English moderate land law reformers are contending for. For himself, he emphatically asserted that the experiment worked out before our eyes in America proved that the petty land reforms for which so many people are agitating would be utterly worthless, and that the only effectual remedy for the evils under which we are suffering is the abolition of private ownership in land. Although Dr. Wallace spoke of Henry George as "our founder and honored leader on this great subject," his scheme of land nationalization differs in detail from Mr. George's.

The arrest of William Saunders, the editor of the *Democrat*, at Trafalgar square, will impart fresh impetus to the discussion of the aims of the Land restoration league. Contrary to the orders of the police, Mr. Saunders and Rev. Stewart Headlam of the *Church Reformer*, a journal, by the way, which is doing excellent work for land reform, spoke at a gathering in Trafalgar square for the purpose of testing the legality of the order forbidding the assemblage. Mr. Saunders was arrested and admitted to bail in £200. Mr. Headlam was surrounded by a body of police and pushed off the square.

A vigorous campaign has been started in favor of taxing ground rents. Public meetings have within a fortnight been held at Woolwich, Chelsea, Brixton, Mile End, Haggerston and Trafalgar square. Among the speakers at the meetings were J. F. B. Firth, late member of parliament for Chelsea; J. F. Torr, Dr. Barrows, F. Verinder, Miss Drake, Mrs. Besant, Mr. Saunders and Mr. Headlam. The latter gentleman is issuing from the *Church Reformer* office a series of anti-poverty tracts. No. 1 is "Christianity and Poverty," an address to the New York Anti-poverty society by Rev. J. O. S. Huntington.

A subject of repeated comment among all classes is the dying away of Irish hatred for England. The castle government is no longer identified in the Irish mind with all England. The new spirit in liberal politics has kindled a response in Irish hearts. John Paige Hopps writes in the *Pall Mall Gazette:* "This Irish business has brought home to hundreds of thousands a sense of shame, a spirit of self-surrender, a feeling of brotherliness, quite new to us in party politics, and in a way that has given an entirely altered tone to our political meetings. One might almost say there is a kind of religion in it. We used to fight for our party; now we are on a crusade in behalf of our long misunderstood and ill used brothers and sisters across the sea. Once we fought to win something for ourselves; now we are willing to struggle and make sacrifices for others. Once we marched to the cry of 'Britons never will be slaves;' but now we burn with indignation at the thought of making other people slaves." Especially is this true of the poor throughout the whole kingdom, and with this feeling the conviction is gaining that the great source of poverty is the denial of the truth that all alike are children of a father who has provided bountifully for all.

Our Allies, the Enemy.

NEW YORK CITY.—Despite the fact that the pro-poverty press is our strongest opponent in the fight for equal rights and justice, do we not, now and again, get a wholesome screed that perchance is as potent to lead men to the truth as a whole STANDARD? When our editors curvet around that "absurd land tax theory" believers find amusement and thoughtful men instruction. The New York *Sun* since the election, beaming with brightness since voters and sheep have become synonomous terms, may be read by workingmen if not with pleasure certainly with profit. They have "peculiarly strong reasons for discontent." Again, "they must work hard, but that is no just ground for complaint." So also they "must remain painfully subject to casualty," and the *Sun* kindly concedes that therein they have some ground for complaint. "They are generally liable to die in the full knowledge that their families will be left penniless." Economy it is admitted is impossible, for the most that can be expected is enough saved to pay final doctor's bills and funeral expenses, and this even among those who can earn $20 a week. What the propovertyites will do to Mr. Dana for giving all this away can only be surmised. It is not deemed prudent by the *Sun* to hazard an assertion as to what workingmen want, but its beams discover what they need, and it is "insurance." If read through its tenor is simply this, and I again quote the *Sun:* "The great mass of employes, whether the service rendered be manual or mental, can never earn much more than their living expenses." To those who recently voted with the party styling itself of "unabated zeal for the welfare of the working classes" all this will be a revelation. Said welfare, according to one of its prominent organs, is plainly shown to consist of "hard work" for "living expenses."

The *Sun* shines and united democracy in New York still lives. R. ——.

The Twenty-first Assembly District in Their New Quarters, and Vigorously at Work.

Two excellent portraits of Henry George and Dr. McGlynn adorned the walls of the Twenty-first assembly district united labor party, New York city, Monday evening last in the new rooms of the association, at 922 Sixth avenue. The result of that election has not in any way discouraged the members of the association. They had passed through one fire and were ready for another. They immediately secured more attractive and commodious rooms, elected their officers for the year and prepared a plan of campaign for 1888. The meeting on Monday evening was the first in the new headquarters. It was largely attended and no one present seemed to be acquainted with the color of the "white feather."

Abner C. Thomas, Dr. William S. Gottheil, Hume H. Cole and others delivered brief and vigorous addresses. They encouraged a no-compromise-stand-up-to-the-last-and-light policy. The association will devote the greater portion of its evenings during the winter to the public reading of "Progress and Poverty," chapter by chapter, and to the discussion of principles laid down in that work. The meetings will be held every Monday evening at 922 Sixth avenue, and the public is cordially invited to attend.

It's Hardly Credible, but Here Really is an Editor Who Thinks His Landlord Isn't Charging Him the Highest Possible Rent Already.

Tulare, Cal., Standard.

Four women and 146 men are on the stump in New York trying to convince the people that the mere shifting of all taxes upon land will be the cure-all and end all of labor ills.—Kern Californian.

Should it ever happen—which it never will—that such a law be enacted, those misguided people will learn of their mistake when the man who owns the land and pays the increased taxes simply adds the increase to his little bill of rent for the houses the enactors of this folly occupy.

CURE FOR THE DEAF

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

Please mention paper.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

POPULAR EDITION.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

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

By HENRY GEORGE.

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

Now in press and ready for delivery September 12.

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

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

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

HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George's Works.

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

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

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

JUST ISSUED.

THE PRIMARY ELEMENTS OF THE NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY;

or the

HENRY GEORGE SYSTEM OF TAXING LAND VALUES IN A NUTSHELL.

By A. G. SULLIVAN.

12mo., paper.

This work, now in its second edition, has been favorably recommended by THE STANDARD. It says: "We think Mr. Sullivan's pamphlet will do excellent service in clearing away misapprehension and in leading many to make a more careful study of the whole problem."

Clubs, societies, ward associations of individuals, wishing to push the principles of the "NEW ECONOMY" will do well to order by the hundred or thousand, as their prices are made very low in order to facilitate their free distribution at meetings, etc., as an educational process among the people. Prices, $5.00 per 100; $40 per 1,000; 12 copies, $1; single copies, 10c. Please inclose silver or currency when ordering less than 12 copies as postage stamps cannot be USED.

Address

McHALE, ROHDE & CO.,

No. 9 Courtland street, New York.

Henry George's Buch

Fortschritt und Armuth

Eine billige deutsche Ausgabe von

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Preis 35 Cents,

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

HENRY GEORGE,

25 Ann Street, New York.

GERMAN TRACTS.

ISSUED IN THE LAND AND LABOR LIBRARY.

NOW READY.

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

Prices, free by mail: 2-page tracts—50 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 15 cents; 1,000 copies, $1; 5,000 copies, $4.25.
Four-page tracts—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 1,000 copies, $2; 5,000 copies, $8.50.
Eight-page tracts—25 copies, 30 cents; 100 copies, 50 cents; 1,000 copies, $4; 5,000 copies, $17.
Other numbers in preparation. Address

HENRY GEORGE,
25 Ann street, New York.

HEAVEN AND HELL,

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

Intercourse between the Soul and the Body, paper, five cents; and all other writing of Swedenborg and of New Church authors. Catalogue free. Address New Church Board of Publication, Room 30, Cooper Union, New York. J. C. JACKSON,
Business Manager.

HENRY GEORGE'S SOLUTION

OF THE LABOR PROBLEM.

WHY I PREACHED ON IT.

by

HUGH O. PENTECOST,

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

A sixteen-page pamphlet. Price 5 cents.

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

THE DEMOCRAT.

A RADICAL REVIEW MONTHLY.

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

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

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

TAX REFORMER.

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

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

M. BATTLE, 9 Spruce street, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

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

The following have already appeared:

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

Prices, free by mail: 2-page tracts—50 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 15 cents; 1,000 copies, $1; 5,000 copies, $4.25.
Four-page tracts—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 1,000 copies, $2; 5,000 copies, $8.50.
Six-page tracts—25 copies, 15 cents; 100 copies, 37 cents; 1,000 copies, $3; 5,000 copies, $12.75.
Eight-page tracts—25 copies, 20 cents; 100 copies 50 cents; 1,000 copies, $4; 5,000 copies, $17.
Twelve-page tracts—25 copies, 30 cents; 100 copies, 75 cents; 1,000 copies, $6; 5,000 copies, $22.50.
Sixteen-page tracts—25 copies, 40 cents; 100 copies, $1; 1,000 copies, $8; 5,000 copies, $31.

Other numbers in preparation.

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

NOW OUT.

THE GERMAN EDITION

OF

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

PRICE, IN PAPER COVERS,

Thirty-five Cents.

Address HENRY GEORGE,

25 Ann Street, New York.

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

California—Judge James G. Maguire, San Francisco.
Connecticut—Robert Pyne, 234 Asylum st., Hartford.
Eastern Pennsylvania—Henry George club, box 190, Philadelphia.
Indiana—Warren Worth Bailey, Vincennes.
Kentucky—Land and Labor Club No. 1, box 406, Cincinnati.
Louisiana—Jere. J. Sullivan, 705 Fulton street, New Orleans.
Massachusetts (Berkshire county)—F. Harvey Lincoln, box 115, Zylonite.
Maryland—T. H. Garside, 154 West Lexington street, Baltimore.
Minnesota—Central Committee, United Labor Party, 42 Third st. south, Minneapolis.
New York—John McMackin, 28 Cooper Union, New York city.
Ohio—Land and Labor Club No. 1, box 59, Cincinnati.
South Carolina—Benjamin Adams, Charleston.
West Tennessee, Eastern Arkansas and Northern Mississippi—Land and Labor Club No. 2. Rooms, 9 and 10, Cotton Exchange, Memphis, Tenn.

ILLINOIS.—Readers of the "Standard" in the state of Illinois, and all others interested in the great principles it advocates, are requested to send names and addresses to W. H. Van Ornum, president of land and labor club No. 1, Room 60, 147 Madison street, Chicago, with a view to effecting some plan of organization for the state. Persons in Chicago not already members of land and labor clubs, as well as secretaries of such organizations, are especially requested to write.

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

23RD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT MEETS every Monday evening. German speaking members every Tuesday evening at Vincent hall, 1897 Third avenue, corner 109th street. Open every evening for enrollment of members. Thursday and Saturday evenings free debates of the Progress and Poverty club.

VOTERS OF MARYLAND WHO ARE desirous to aid in propagating the principles of the united labor party, as set forth in the New York platform, adopted at Syracuse, Aug. 12 are requested to send their names and address to

JOHN SALMON,
415 N. Eutaw st., Baltimore, Md.

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

The publisher's desk in THE STANDARD office is a center to which come letters from every part of the civilized world—letters of advice, letters of remonstrance, letters of praise, of blame, of complaint and of thanks. It is pleasant to get them. The reader who thinks he sees some way in which the paper might be improved confers a favor by suggesting it even though his suggestion may not be adopted. The friend who, when he sends in a club of subscribers takes the trouble to narrate his experience in getting them points the way in which some other friend may work to most advantage. The man who likes THE STANDARD makes us happy when he says so; and the man who doesn't like it,—who thinks that its tone should be changed, or its opinions modified,—from him, too, we are glad to hear and receive suggestions. In this constant inpouring of correspondence beats the pulse of the great movement for industrial emancipation,—now full, strong and expectant, anon, it may be weaker, but never ceasing,—which tells how the principle THE STANDARD advocates is gaining ground throughout the world.

Here, for example, are three typical letters, each illustrating the feelings of a very considerable class of people. The first comes from Washington territory:

After this month my subscription to THE STANDARD will expire. For me to renew it is for you to change the monotony of the paper materially. To read one thing and nothing but that same thing in a newspaper is more than human nature can stand. A man who occupies his mind with one idea sooner or later will become a crank. Natural law forbids it. Your land theory is no more a "cure all" than a patent medicine.

As a political friend of yours and believer in your land tax I now take the liberty to criticise your taken course to bring it before the people. You have intermixed politics with religion and gone partnership with a Catholic priest who has not yet had the courage to attack the pope "at home."

Let the "saviors of society" cry religion—they made it what it is; in its name they enslave the minds of men to forge tools of bodies. Believe me, the days of crusades are over, and you nor all the preachers put together can start another. Take my advice, and appeal only to reason and the intelligent voters if your reform ideas shall ever become a reality. If put in force to-morrow by an ignorant vote, how long will the reform stand? Will not reaction follow? Is it not partly proven by the recent election in New York? As long as the mass of the people are not intelligent enough to form ideas purely their own, but form them by newspapers or any other outside influences—just so long, I say, it is better to educate them than to agitate. R. ——S.

The next is from a clergyman in Maryland.

I must write and thank you for THE STANDARD, since the close of the campaign, more than ever. I cannot, do not, agree with your views on many points, though I think I see—now—that the single tax would be a good and right step, even if I cannot see that it would accomplish all the good you hope from it. Rather, I am sure it would not fulfil your expectations, and I have been deeply disappointed a couple of times in your stand on imp rtant matters—such as the trial and execution of the anarchists—disappointed in a way I think you understand.

I sit, then, how your paper is crowded with true and noble words on a hundred important issues, where none speaks at once so firmly, so plainly, so nobly and so charitably as THE STANDARD.

I am a minister and receive a number of religious papers of all kinds; but in simple truth I can say that I nowhere find so true a religious spirit as in your paper.

You might rightfully inscribe "Faith, Hope and Charity" on THE STANDARD'S front; surely I have nowhere else in modern times found these three so well united as there. I believe you are conducting a spiritual revival on an enormous scale, and the spiritual atmosphere of America will be purer, nobler, more full of faith, hope and love, thanks to you.

The third letter is from a correspondent in this city.

Will you permit a suggestion in regard to THE STANDARD? The first anniversary of its existence is near at hand, and when it has arrived many of its readers will, I am confident, gaze somewhat mournfully, although with inner satisfaction, at some of the back numbers worn out, as they are, by lending and relending to friends, and wishing that such numbers were new and crisp, and searching in vain for others which were never returned. Will you find it convenient to issue, at the end of this year, a volume, simply but neatly bound, containing all the numbers of THE STANDARD for 1887? If you insert a suggestion of this kind in your columns stating the price for such a volume and other particulars, you will receive, I hope, applications enough from your readers to make the plan practicable.

Let us have THE STANDARD in the form of a book, that we may place it side by side with the family Bible where it belongs.

From what widely separated standpoints do these three correspondents look upon THE STANDARD and its purpose. The first is tired of the constant reiterated advocacy of one great central truth; and he seems to have a curious sort of unconsciousness that the only reason for publishing THE STANDARD is that that truth may become more widely known and accepted. Human nature, he thinks, can't stand persistent consistency. And so, unless THE STANDARD will drop the single tax for awhile, and give over trying to show its readers that the movement for obtaining equal justice to all men is essentially a religious movement;—why it must lose his subscription after the close of the present volume.

How different the attitude of the second writer. He rejoices in the religion he finds in THE STANDARD. He finds no monotony in its pages. On the contrary he recognizes that, while never losing sight of the great basic truth it is here to advocate, THE STANDARD holds up that truth to view from many different points, showing how by its application alone can the most important social problems of our day be solved. He doesn't accept this truth in its entirety; neither does he absolutely deny it. His attitude is one of thought and study. His mind is disquieted; he wants to know; and he rejoices that in the columns of THE STANDARD he finds food for thought and arguments for consideration. Such men are often the hardest to win over to our side; some of them doubtless never will be won, but when they once *do* see the truth, when the last scale drops from their eyes and they really see all the glorious possibility of establishing God's kingdom upon earth—they are converts worth the winning indeed.

And the third letter. What a spirit of earnest hearty commendation it breathes. What a story it tells between its lines of missionary work done, of efforts to enlist others in the army of the new crusade. What a promise it contains of future labor for the cause. Men like the writer of this letter are enlisted for the war and know no turning back. They may despair of victory in the near future but they know it will come sooner or later, and they can't help fighting for it while they live.

We wish, by the way, we could carry out this correspondent's suggestion, and offer the readers of THE STANDARD a supply of our first volume; but the demand has already exceeded the supply, and our stock of volume is well nigh exhausted.

Two more issues will complete the current volume of THE STANDARD. There is ample time in which to renew your own subscription, but there is none too much time in which to canvas for subscribers among your neighbors.

These are our terms for subscriptions to THE STANDARD:

One subscription, one year,	$2 50
One subscription, six months,	1 25
One subscription, three months,	63
Three or more subscriptions:	
One year, each,	$2 00
Six months, each,	1 00
Three months, each,	50

After the first club of three has been sent, subsequent subscriptions may be forwarded at the same reduced rates.

Recruit subscriptions, for *four weeks*, will be received, singly or in clubs, at fifteen cents

---

We have a number of interesting letters from friends sending recruit subscriptions, which want of space prevents our quoting this week. As the campaign of 1888 opens, advocates of the single tax reform are beginning more and more to utilize these subscriptions for missionary purposes. They afford a means of reaching friends and acquaintances whom it may be impossible to approach with verbal appeals or arguments. For fifteen cents we send THE STANDARD to any address in the United States for four consecutive weeks. Hurry along your recruit subscriptions, friends, and spread the light as far as possible.

The recruiting fund has received the following contributions during the past week:

J. S. L.	$2 50
J. F. Atkins	1 00
Georgian	75
'Ammer, 'Ammer, 'Ammer	2 00
E.	40
Total for the week	$6 05
Previously acknowledged	1,972 32
Total to date	$1,978 37

How They Work, and What They Think in Indianapolis.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—Our Anti-poverty society here is holding regular weekly meetings every Sunday evening. We have rented a room for headquarters, and are stirring the old sleepy heads out of their trance-like sleep. Our attendance is increasing every meeting, and we mean to try to have Hugh O. Pentecost here soon to lecture. We intend to organize a choir and learn to sing some of the songs of the new crusade.

I see by THE STANDARD of week before last that Mr. Croasdale thinks it would not be advisable to put a presidential ticket in the field next year. Now I beg to differ with him in that matter for these reasons: 1. If we should only nominate congressmen, our vote would ne essarily be cut up into congressional districts and would be so small in some districts that it would be counted as scattering, and we would not get proper credit for it. 2. In a congressional canvass the nominees of the different parties would be more or less known to every voter in their district, and, as is generally the case in such elections, they would conduct a personal canvass and our weaker members would be drawn into one or the other of the old parties. 3. If we nominate a presidential ticket we will show a solid front all over the country, and every man who believes in our principles will stand up and be counted. Men are not so likely to be influenced when the candidate is an entire personal stranger, as the presidential candidate would be to most voters.

I hope the united labor party will 'nominate a presidential ticket and I think it will be a mistake if they do not. For one I will never give up the fight. I am enlisted for life or during the war.

GILBERT SIEBERT, Pres't. A. P. S.

Iowa Men, Please Take Notice.

FARMINGTON, Iowa, Dec. 2.—The ball has been opened in this section in dead earnest. The first meeting of the Farmington Anti-poverty society was held last evening with a good attendance, the writer in the chair. L. B. Allison, principal of our schools, explained the objects of the society, and Rev. James McKiernan followed with a stirring address. We had fine singing and a good attendance, and the land doctrine is the talk of the town now. A business meeting was held late in the evening, at which the writer was elected president and A. T. Church secretary and treasurer of the society. About twenty-five members to begin with. We meet again next Wednesday night.

Talk about the land doctrine not going in the country communities and among the farmers, I tell you that is just where it will go with a rush. The tracts we have scattered are bearing fruit rapidly. We are going to start a small state organ here for the party, for the purpose of collecting the scattered brothers together and organizing them by counties, districts, etc., and get our state ready to fall into the procession in the glorious year of jubilee. Will all who hold the faith in Iowa please write me their address so we can get them on our list. Come, friends, let us unite and pull together. By the way, when I came to Farmington in September of last year, George was almost unheard of in this section. Our secretary-treasurer is the missionary. He keeps the ball rolling all the time. F. W. ROCKWELL.

Land Monopoly, Water Monopoly, Electric Light Monopoly—A Henry George Club and a Clergyman Not Afraid to Speak the Truth.

AUBURN, Maine.—The two cities of Lewiston and Auburn, separated only by the Androscoggin river, have a population of about 35,000. Auburn's business is chiefly boots and shoes, and Lewiston cotton mills. I think, perhaps, that wages are higher than the average through the county, but even here the employes have no independence at all. We have the land monopoly which "owns" some of the most valuable land in the two cities, and some of it covered with buildings and improvements, but taxed as farms, and rack rents are not uncommon. We have the water monopoly, the electric light monopoly, and a Henry George club, who propose to fight it out on this line if it takes a life time. And more than that, we have a minister, the Rev. Mr. Root, pastor of the Congregational church of Auburn, who began a second course of lectures on the labor question last Sunday night to a large and appreciative audience; his subject, Dr. Howard Crosby's article in the *Forum*, he treated in a very able manner. Mr. Root is the only man who occupies a pulpit in Auburn who dares to discuss political economy in the church—the most influential church in Auburn. H. G. CASEY.

Two Reasons for Nominating a Candidate.

KALAMAZOO, Mich.—I think we should by all means put a presidential candidate in the field next year for two reasons:

First—A candidate for the presidency will keep our aims and principles before the public and stimulate inquiry and discussion, what we most desire.

Second—If we do not have a candidate it will be interpreted by our enemies as a confession of weakness and an indication that we are really "playing out," as they have constantly affirmed and hoped that we would. We must not give them any excuse for thinking or pretending to think that we are giving up the fight. U. G. LESLIE.

THE TARIFF QUESTION.

Chapter I of "Protection or Free Trade?"

Near the window by which I write, a great bull is tethered by a ring in his nose. Grazing round and round he has wound his rope about the stake until now he stands a close prisoner, tantalized by rich grass he cannot reach, unable even to toss his head to rid him of the flies that cluster on his shoulders. Now and again he struggles vainly, and then, after pitiful bellowings, relapses into silent misery.

This bull, a very type of massive strength, who, because he has not wit enough to see how he might be free, suffers want in sight of plenty, and is helplessly preyed upon by weaker creatures, seems to me no unfit emblem of the working masses.

In all lands, men whose toil creates abounding wealth are pinched with poverty, and, while advancing civilization opens wider vistas and awakens new desires, are held down to brutish levels by animal needs. Bitterly conscious of injustice, feeling in their inmost souls that they were made for more than so narrow a life, they, too, spasmodically struggle and cry out. But until they trace effect to cause, until they see how they are fettered and how they may be freed, their struggles and outcries are as vain as those of the bull. Nay, they are vainer. I shall go out and drive the bull in the way that will untwist his rope. But who shall drive men into freedom? Till they use the reason with which they have been gifted, nothing can avail. For them there is no special providence.

Under all forms of government the ultimate power lies with the masses. It is not kings nor aristocracies, nor land owners nor capitalists, that anywhere really enslave the people. It is their own ignorance. Most clear is this where governments rest on universal suffrage. The workingmen of the United States may mold to their will legislatures, courts and constitutions. Politicians strive for their favor and political parties bid against one another for their vote. But what avails this? The little finger of aggregated capital must be thicker than the loins of the working masses so long as they do not know how to use their power. And how far from any agreement as to practical reform are even those who most feel the injustice of existing conditions may be seen in the labor organizations. Though beginning to realize the wastefulness of strikes and to feel the necessity of acting on general conditions through legislation, these organizations when they come to formulate political demands seem unable to unite upon any measures capable of large results.

This political impotency must continue until the masses, or at least that sprinkling of more thoughtful men who are the file leaders of popular opinion, shall give such heed to larger questions as will enable them to agree on the path reform should take.

It is with the hope of promoting such agreement that I propose in these pages to examine a vexed question which must be settled before there can be any efficient union in political action for social reform—the question whether protective tariffs are or are not helpful to those who get their living by their labor.

This is a question important in itself, yet far more important in what it involves. Not only is it true that its examination cannot fail to throw light upon other social-economic questions, but it leads directly to that great "Labor Question" which every day as it passes brings more and more to the foreground in every country of the civilized world. For it is a question of direction—a question which of two divergent roads shall be taken. Whether labor is to be benefited by governmental restrictions or by the abolition of such restrictions is, in short, the question of how the bull shall go to untwist his rope.

In one way or another we must act upon the tariff question. Throughout the civilized world it everywhere lies within the range of practical politics. Even when protection is most thoroughly accepted, there not only exists a more or less active minority who seek its overthrow, but the constant modifications that are being made or proposed in existing tariffs are as constantly bringing the subject into the sphere of political action, while even in that country in which free trade has seemed to be most strongly rooted, the policy of protection is again raising its head. Here it is evident that the tariff question is the great political question of the immediate future. For more than a generation the slavery agitation, the war to which it led and the problems growing out of that war have absorbed political attention in the United States. That era has passed and a new one is beginning, in which economic questions must force themselves to the front. First among these questions upon which party lines must soon be drawn and political discussion must rage is the tariff question.

It behooves not merely those who aspire to political leadership but those who would conscientiously use their influence and their votes to come to intelligent conclusions upon this question, and especially is this incumbent upon the men whose aim is the emancipation of labor. Some of these men are now supporters of protection; others are opposed to it. This division, which must place in political opposition to each other those who are at one in ultimate purpose ought not exist. One thing or the other must be true—either protection does give better opportunities to labor and raises wages or it does not. If it does, we who feel that labor has not its rightful opportunities and does not get its fair wages should know it that we may unite, not merely in sustaining present protection, but in demanding far more. If it does not, then, even if not positively harmful to the working classes, protection is a delusion and a snare, which distracts attention and divides strength, and the quicker it is seen that tariffs cannot raise wages the quicker are those who wish to raise wages likely to find out what can. The next thing to knowing how anything can be done is to know how it cannot be done. If the bull I speak of had wit enough to see the uselessness of going one way he would surely try the other.

My aim in this inquiry is to ascertain beyond peradventure whether protection or free trade best accords with the interests of those who live by their labor. I differ with those who say that with the rate of wages the state has no concern. I hold with those who deem the increase of wages a legitimate purpose of public policy. To raise and maintain wages is the great object that all who live by wages ought to seek, and workingmen are right in supporting any measure that will attain that object. Nor in this are they acting selfishly, for, while the question of wages is the most important of questions to laborers, it is also the most important of questions to society at large. Whatever improves the condition of the lowest and broadest social stratum must promote the true interests of all. Where the wages of common labor are high and remunerative employment is easy to obtain prosperity will be general. Where wages are highest there will be the largest production and the most equitable distribution of wealth. There will invention be most active and the brain best guide the hand. There will be the greatest comfort, the widest diffusion of knowledge, the purest morals and the truest patriotism. If we would have a healthy, a happy, an enlightened and a virtuous people, if we would have a pure government, firmly based on the popular will and quickly responsive to it, we must strive to raise wages and keep them high. I accept as good and praiseworthy the ends avowed by the advocates of protective tariffs. What I propose to inquire is whether protective tariffs are in reality conducive to these ends. To do this thoroughly I wish to go over all the ground upon which protective tariffs are advocated or defended, to consider what effect the opposite policy of free trade would have, and to stop not until conclusions are reached of which we may feel absolutely sure.

To some it may seem too much to think that this can be done. For a century no question of public policy has been so widely and persistently debated as that of Protection vs. Free Trade. Yet it seems to-day as far as ever from settlement—so far, indeed, that many have come to deem it a question as to which no certain conclusions can be reached, and many more regard it as too complex and abstruse to be understood by those who have not equipped themselves by long study.

This is, indeed, a hopeless view. We may safely leave many branches of knowledge to such as can devote themselves to special pursuits. We may safely accept what chemists tell us of chemistry, or astronomers of astronomy, or philologists of the development of language, or anatomists of our internal structure, for not only are there in such investigations no pecuniary temptations to warp the judgment, but the ordinary duties of men and of citizens do not call for such special knowledge, and the great body of a people may entertain the crudest notions as to such things and yet lead happy and useful lives. Far different, however, is it with matters which relate to the production and distribution of wealth, and which thus directly affect the comfort and livelihood of men. The intelligence which can alone safely guide in these matters must be the intelligence of the masses, for as to such things it is the common opinion, and not the opinion of the learned few, that finds expression in legislation.

If the knowledge required for the proper ordering of public affairs be like the knowledge required for the prediction of an eclipse, the making of a chemical analysis, or the decipherment of a cuneiform inscription, or even like the knowledge required in any branch of art or handicraft, then the shortness of human life and the necessities of human existence must forever condemn the masses of men to ignorance of matters which directly affect their means of subsistence. If this be so, then popular government is hopeless, and, confronted on one side by the fact, to which all experience testifies, that a pople can never safely trust to any portion of their number the making of regulations which affect their earnings, and on the other by the fact that the masses can never see for themselves the effect of such regulations, the only prospect before mankind is that the many must always be ruled and robbed by the few.

But this is not so. Political economy is only the economy of human aggregates, and its laws are laws which we may individually recognize. What is required for their elucidation is not long arrays of statistics nor the collocation of laboriously ascertained facts, but that sort of clear thinking which, keeping in mind the distinction between the part and the whole, seeks the relations of familiar things, and which is as possible for the unlearned as for the learned.

Whether protection does or does not increase national wealth, whether it does or does not benefit the laborer, are questions that from their nature must admit of decisive answers. That the controversy between protection and free trade, widely and energetically as it has been carried on, has as yet led to no accepted conclusion cannot therefore be due to difficulties inherent in the subject. It may in part be accounted for by the fact that powerful pecuniary interests are concerned in the issue, for it is true, as Macaulay said, that if large pecuniary interests were concerned in denying the attraction of gravitation, that most obvious of physical facts would have disputers. But that so many fair minded men who have no special interests to serve are still at variance on this subject can only, it seems to me, be fully explained on the assumption that the discussion has not been carried far enough to bring out that full truth which harmonizes all partial truths.

The present condition of the controversy, indeed, shows this to be the fact. In the literature of the subject, I know of no work in which the inquiry has yet been carried to its proper end. As to the effect of protection upon the production of wealth, all has probably been said that can be said; but that part of the question which relates to wages and which is primarily concerned with the distribution of wealth has not been adequately treated. Yet this is the very heart of the controversy, the ground from which, until it is thoroughly explored, fallacies and confusions must constantly arise, to envelop in obscurity even that which has of itself been sufficiently explained.

The reason of this failure is not far to seek. Political economy is the simplest of the sciences. It is but the intellectual recognition, as related to social life, of laws which in their moral aspect men instinctively recognize, and which are embodied in the simple teachings of him whom the common people heard gladly. But, like Christianity, political economy has been warped by institutions which, denying the equality and brotherhood of man, have enlisted authority, silenced objection, and ingrained themselves in custom and habit of thought. Its professors and teachers have almost invariably belonged to or been dominated by that class which tolerates no questioning of social adjustments that give to those who do not labor the fruits of labor's toil. They have been like physicians employed to make a diagnosis on condition that they shall discover no unpleasant truth. Given social conditions such as those that throughout the civilized world to-day shock the moral sense and political economy, fearlessly pursued, must lead to conclusions that will be as a lion in the way to those who have any tenderness for "vested interests." But in the colleges and universities of our time, as in the Sanhedrim of old, it is idle to expect any enunciation of truths unwelcome to the powers that be.

Adam Smith demonstrated clearly enough that protective tariffs hamper the production of wealth. But Adam Smith—the university professor, the tutor and pensioner of the duke of Buccleugh, the prospective holder of a government place—either did not deem it prudent to go further, or, as is more probable, was prevented from seeing the necessity of doing so by the atmosphere of his time and place. He at any rate failed to carry his great inquiry into the causes which from "that original state of things in which the production of labor constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labor" had developed a state of things in which natural wages seemed to be only such part of the produce of labor as would enable the laborer to exist. And, following Smith, came Malthus, to formulate a doctrine which throws upon the Creator the responsibility for the want and vice that flow from man's injustice—a doctrine which has barred from the inquiry which Smith did not pursue even such high and generous minds as that of John Stuart Mill. Some of the publications of the Anti-corn law league contain indications that if the struggle over English corn laws had been longer continued, the discussion might have been pushed further than the question of revenue tariff or protective tariff; but, ending as it did, the capitalists of the Manchester school were satisfied, and in such discussion as has since ensued English free traders, with few exceptions, have made no further advance, while American advocates of free trade have merely followed the English free traders.

On the other hand, the advocates of protection have evinced a like indisposition to venture on burning ground. They extol the virtues of protection as furnishing employment, without asking how it comes that any one should need to be furnished with employment; they assert that protection maintains the rate of wages, without explaining what determines the rate of wages. The ablest of them, under the lead of Carey, have rejected the Malthusian doctrine, but only to set up an equally untenable optimistic theory which serves the same purpose of barring inquiry into the wrongs of labor, and which has been borrowed by continental free traders as a weapon with which to fight the agitation for social reform.

That, so far as it has yet gone, the controversy between protection and free trade has not been carried to its logical conclusions is evident from the positions which both sides occupy. Protectionists and free traders alike seem to lack the courage of their convictions. If protection have the virtue claimed for it, why should it be confined to the restriction of imports from foreign countries? If it really "provides employment" and raises wages, then a condition of things in which hundreds of thousands vainly seek employment, and wages touch the point of bare subsistence, demands a far more vigorous application of this beneficent principle than any protectionist has yet proposed. On the other hand, if the principle of free trade be true, the substitution of a revenue tariff for a protective tariff is a ridiculously inefficient application of it.

Like the two knights of allegory, who, halting one on each side of the shield, continued to dispute about it when the advance of either must have revealed a truth that would have ended their controversy, protectionists and free traders stand to-day. Let it be ours to carry the inquiry wherever it may lead. The fact is, that fully to understand the tariff question we must go beyond the tariff question as ordinarily debated. And here, it may be, we shall find ground on which honest divergencies of opinion may be reconciled, and facts which seem conflicting may fall into harmonious relations.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

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

BY HENRY GEORGE.

CONTENTS:

I. Introductory.
II. Clearing ground.
III. Of method.
IV. Protection as a universal need.
V. The protective unit.
VI. Trade.
VII. Production and producers.
VIII. Tariffs for revenue.
IX. Tariffs for protection.
X. The encouragement of industry.
XI. The home market and home trade.
XII. Exports and imports.
XIII. Confusions arising from the use of money.
XIV. Do high wages necessitate protection?
XV. Of advantages and disadvantages as reasons for protection.
XVI. The Development of manufactures.
XVII. Protection and producers.
XVIII. Effect of protection on American industry.
XIX. Protection and wages.
XX. The abolition of protection.
XXI. Inadequacy of the free trade argument.

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

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

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

ALLEGHENY COUNTY COMMONERS.—NOTICE.—The regular meeting of the "Common Ers" will be held on Friday evening, Dec. 16, 1887, at 7:30 o'clock sharp. The place of meeting is our hall above the bank on the corner of Fourth and Wood streets. Free discussion on land and taxation.
W. J. NESBIT, Secretary,
142 Market street, Allegheny, Pa.

CHARLES B. SCHAIDNER,
PHOTOGRAPHER.
2280 Third avenue, cor. 124th street,
New York.
Children's Photographs by instantaneous process a specialty

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

JUST OUT.
AN ACCOUNT OF THE GEORGE-HEWITT CAMPAIGN.
By Louis F. Post and Fred. C. Leubuscher.
1 vol., paper covers. Price, 25 cents.
Address HENRY GEORGE & CO.,
25 Ann street, New York.

THE PHONOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE.
JEROME B. HOWARD, Editor.
A 24 page monthly. The authentic exponent of the Benn Pitman System of Phonography. $1.50 per annum. Specimen copy free. The Phonographic Institute, Cincinnati, O.

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

RUPTURE. NEW TRUSS. Holds any case. Heavy lifting cause not to be the hindrance. It is the workingman's friend, and a comfort to the aged and feeble. Only $5. Advice free to all. PEET & CO., No. 113 West Sixteenth street, New York City. Open daily and evenings till 9.

HOLLAND'S
COFFEE AND DINING ROOMS,
145 Fourth avenue,
Bet. 13th and 14th sts.

PRINTING.

CONCORD CO-OPERATIVE PRINTING COMPANY (Ltd.)
47 and 49 Center st., N. Y.
BOOK, JOB AND NEWSPAPER PRINTING.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.
REV. EDWARD McGLYNN, D. D., PRESIDENT.

The thirty-fourth public meeting of the society will be held at
THE ACADEMY OF MUSIC
SUNDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 18,
ADDRESS
by
HENRY GEORGE.
Subject,
CLEVELAND, BLAINE AND THE TARIFF.
Singing by
CONCORDIA CHORUS,
Under the direction of
MISS AGATHA MUNIER.

Admission free to Family Circle. Balcony and Circle Boxes 10 cents. Orchestra and Orchestra Circle 25 cents. Proscenium Boxes 50 cents.
Tickets on sale at the Anti-Poverty Society office, 30 Cooper Union.
Box office at Academy open at 6:30 p. m. Sunday.

THE ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY
In Philadelphia will hold meetings every Sunday evening during December at Knights of Labor hall, 906 Gerard avenue. Commencing Jan. 1, 1888, at Lincoln hall, Broad street and Fairmont avenue. The monthly business meeting will be held Thursday, Jan. 5, 1888, at Odd Fellows' hall, corner Broad and Spring Garden streets. Everybody invited to attend.
By order Executive committee.
WM. J. ATKINSON, President,
J. H. McINTYRE, Secretary.

WHO WOULDN'T BE DRESSED WELL
PRINCE ALBERT COAT AND VEST, SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE..... $18.00
TROUSERS TO MEASURE, FROM..... 4.00
BUSINESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM 16.00
DRESS SUITS TO MEASURE, FROM.. 20.00
BLUE, BLACK OR BROWN CORKSCREW CUTAWAY COAT & VEST TO MEASURE, FROM..... 12.00
OVERCOATS, QUILTED SILK OR SATIN LINED THROUGHOUT, TO MEASURE, FROM..... 20.00
GRAHAM'S
OPPOSITE RIVINGTON ST.
Samples and Self-Measurement Chart Mailed on Application.

THOUSANDS OF THE BEST
$38 GOLD WATCH
EVER MADE ARE SELLING IN OUR
CO-OPERATIVE CLUBS.
This is the Best, Cheapest, Most Convenient.
And *only* co-operative System of selling watches. The watches are American Lever Stem Winders, containing every essential to accuracy and durability, and have, in addition, numerous patented improvements found in no other watch. They are absolutely the only *Dust and Dampproof Movements* made in the World, and are jeweled throughout with *GENUINE RUBIES*. The *Patent Stem Wind and Set* is the strongest and simplest made. *They are fully equal for appearance, accuracy, durability and service, to any $75 Watch.*
Our Co-operative Club System brings them within the reach of every one.
We want an active, responsible representative in EVERY CITY and TOWN.
Heavy profits guaranteed on limited investment. Write for full particulars.
The Keystone Watch Club Co.
P. O. Box 928, Philadelphia, Pa.
REFERENCES:—Keystone National Bank, or any Commercial Agency
AGENCIES:
New York, N. Y. Harrisburg, Pa.
Chicago, Ill. Denver, Col.
Pittsburgh, Pa. Baltimore, Md.
Boston, Mass. St. Louis, Mo.
Philadelphia, Pa. Wilmington, Del.
Detroit, Mich. Etc., etc.

EXCELLENT BLACK COPIES of *anything written or drawn* with *any* Pen (or Type Writer) by the Patent AUTOGOPYIST. Only equalled by Lithography. Specimens Free.
AUTOGOPYIST CO., 166 William St., New York.

Piso's Remedy for Catarrh is the Best, Easiest to Use, and Cheapest.
CATARRH
Sold by druggists or sent by mail. 50c. E. T. Hazeltine, Warren, Pa.

PRICES
WE SELL DIRECT TO FAMILIES (and Agents and Dealers whose profits and expenses double the cost on every Piano they sell) and send this Piano (as illustrated) CARE FREE, 7 1-3 Octave Rosewood Piano, Warranted 6 years, for $193! We send it—with Beautiful Cover and Stool—for Trial in your own Home before you buy. Send for circulars.
Marshal & Smith, 2167 East 21st St., N. Y.

Canned Goods
WITH THIS STAMP IN THE BOTTOM OF CANS ARE
Free from Poison,
AND ARE MADE BY
Trade-Mark.—Registered. ORGANIZED LABOR.

COOGAN'S HOTEL
125 COOGAN BRO'S 125
COOGAN BROS.,
CARPET AND FURNITURE DEALERS,
COR. BOWERY AND GRAND STS.