

THE NEW YORK ELECTION

The New York election is over, and I congratulate the readers of THE STANDARD. The result is not victory; but it is one of those glorious defeats that make future victories possible. Under the most difficult conditions we have secured a foothold all over the state, and we begin the new campaign with a body of men of whose principles and motives there can be no doubt—a small, but compact and determined army from whose ranks the holiday soldiers, the camp followers and the incongruous elements have all been swept away.

Our seventy-three thousand votes seem small as compared with the democratic 480,000 and the republican 450,000, but they represent a nucleus of intelligent and determined men, animated by principle, who can be counted on in any circumstances and against all odds—a nucleus that must constantly strengthen and grow; a leaven that has in it power to leaven the whole lump. There is in that seventy-three thousand, no man whose vote was bought; no man who was coerced; no man who was moved by motives of selfish policy; no man who was influenced by prejudice or passion. There is in this little body more soul—more of the stuff that brings great parties into being and accomplishes great political objects than there is in both the other parties.

To the active and earnest men in this city who have been working so hard in this political campaign the first intelligence of the result was a great disappointment. The vote in the interior of the state, where the work of organization was only begun within the last two months, was an unknown quantity, and Brooklyn, with its 15,000 votes, has done well, but a higher vote was counted on in New York city, and many of us, in the ardor of the campaign and the heat of enthusiasm, had begun to believe that we might elect some of our local candidates. But this, we now see, was preposterous, and with the tremendously powerful influences that were arrayed against us, and in the deluge of corruption that swept over New York city on Tuesday last, the matter for astonishment is that we polled so large a vote.

Last year I ran in a purely local contest, which did not involve the life and death struggle between the two great parties for the control of the next state and national administration. I demanded and received before I consented to run the signatures of over thirty thousand citizens, who pledged themselves to vote for me. I stood for the same principles and on substantially the same platform, but not only was there that prospect of success which is so necessary to secure the support of that great majority of voters who deem a ballot cast for a candidate who cannot be elected (even if they would prefer his election, were that possible) to be the "throwing away" of a vote; but there of course rallied around me large elements who neither understood nor appreciated the principles which alone induced me to accept a political nomination, but represented merely vague discontent and disgust with municipal corruption and ring rule.

This year a vote for me was "a vote in the air"—a vote for a naked principle, and that a principle that has been made so clear and plain, and so uncompromisingly and unhesitatingly asserted as to drive off not only the socialists, anarchists and cranks who constituted the "progressive labor party" and polled some five thousand votes in this city, but also the half-way men who, though they may be filled with vague notions of "reform," are always afraid of pushing a principle to its logical conclusion.

And not only was a vote for me this year merely a vote for naked principle, but it was a vote given in the heat of a contest between two great parties fighting desperately for power and spoils. If our wishes had been gratified, and we had polled in this city for our state ticket the vote we had hoped for, it would, in the present condition of American politics, have been the death knell of the party that now controls the city, the state and the national administration. New York was this year the battle ground of the nation—the election of last Tuesday was a preliminary skirmish which, as between the two great parties, would probably decide in advance which of them should win the great battle next year. Under such circumstances the votes that were cast for me were not merely the votes of men willing to "throw away their votes" for the sake of being counted for a principle, but the votes of men who considered that principle, even in the present, as of more importance than anything else; of men who had so far cut away from the old parties that they cared nothing at all as to what befell them. That there are thousands and thousands of men in this city and throughout the state who would have voted with us could their votes immediately determine whether our principles should be carried into effect or not, who yet, preferring republican success to democratic success, or democratic success to republican success, voted for one or the other of the old parties, is notorious to all.

Another thing that undoubtedly cost us thousands of votes which otherwise we would have had was the effort made by unscrupulous politicians to convince Catholics that a vote for our ticket was a vote

against their church. Patrick Ford, in this week's *Irish World*, takes to himself the credit of having in this way diminished my vote from 68,000 last year to 38,000 this year. As to how much of this is due to the stab in the back which he gave us on the eve of the campaign it is not worth while to inquire. But that the cry to which he lent himself, of an attack upon Catholicism, iterated and reiterated by tens of thousands of political "healers" who canvassed the districts and surrounded the polls, had a telling effect against us, there can be no doubt.

What may be termed the accidents of the campaign were also against us. In New York city the contest over the district attorneyship between Nicoll and Feltows became a personal contest and a newspaper fight, which almost absorbed the attention of the daily press, and consequently threw questions of principle in the background, while it spurred the rings to their utmost endeavors to carry the election at any cost.

But the great element which went to secure to the democratic party the sweeping victory it has won in this city and state was the opening of the very flood-gates of corruption. Our daily papers say nothing about this. Even the *World*, which, in the effort to elect Nicoll to office, fought at this point the democratic rings, has now nothing to say of the manner in which the triumph of these rings was bought through; and to read the New York papers any one who has no practical knowledge of our politics would imagine that the result represents the unpurchased expression of popular will. But in addition to the army of office-holders, in addition to the influence of the saloons, in addition to all the power that can be exerted through the city departments, there were engaged some fifty special workers at from five to seven and a half dollars apiece in each of the polling districts in this city. The vote of these men alone amounted to over forty thousand, and at many of the polling places, especially toward the close of the day, the voter had to work his way through a crowd of these workers—coaxing, bullying, threatening, cajoling every man whom they deemed susceptible. How true it is that "the destruction of the poor is their poverty" was never more strikingly illustrated than in the poorer quarters of New York city on election day. The very men whom we are trying to emancipate, the very men whom we would raise from degradation, are men whose votes are counted against us. Every poor creature whom poverty or dissipation made susceptible to the temptation of a few dollars was in some way or other secured. Not content with taking men into saloons and there buying their votes, workers were sent to the houses, and in some parts of the city women could be seen with baskets on their arms gossiping with each other as to the money that "Jack" or "Joe" had received for his vote, and how good a dinner they were going to have. It was almost enough to make one despair of the republic to visit the poorer quarters of the city on election day and see the crowds and hear the talk. Certain it is that in New York city the very springs of political life are being poisoned, the very foundations of democratic government sapped and mined by habitual corruption. And what is true of New York city is true in some places to an even greater degree throughout the state.

Large numbers of our people, whose votes count for as much as the votes of the most thoughtful and intelligent, are becoming habituated to regard their votes merely as something that can be sold once a year. Against this flood of corruption, although there are, of course, some individual instances to the contrary, it is to be said to their honor, that as a whole, and with but very few exceptions, the men of our organizations stood as firm as a rock. And, as illustrative of the influences which control a large number of votes that cannot be bought, it may be mentioned that our ticket unquestionably lost many thousands of votes by the failure to put out the ballots previous to election. This was designed as a precaution, it being known that strenuous efforts were being made, and large sums of money offered for mixing our tickets—"bunching" them, as it is technically called—with those of the other parties; but on the day before election many applications for these tickets were made by men who declared that they would not dare to take them at the polling places on election day. Tickets cut out from last week's issue of THE STANDARD were offered them, but they said they would not dare to vote these tickets, as they could be distinguished by the paper on which they were printed; and so, despite their will, we not only lost their votes, but their votes were counted against us.

The only remedy for all this is the adoption of the Australian system of voting. Good men of all parties ought to unite in a demand for this, but it is especially necessary to us who would bring principle into politics with any show of success. And to this we must lend all our efforts. Under all these circumstances it is proof of the amazing growth and strength of the anti-poverty movement that such a vote should have been polled for it. That it was principle and nothing else that gave us our vote is shown by the fact that the state ticket, which not even the most sanguine enthusiast dreamed of electing, ran in this city, by some thousands, ahead of the local ticket, for which alone there

could be any hope of success. The good cause has in New York state over seventy thousand men who can be counted for it, "first, last and all the time"—over seventy thousand missionaries who, each in his own way, is engaged in spreading its principles. In all the history of great reforms, what great reform is there that could in such a time make such a showing. Who, two years ago, would have dared to predict that in 1887, under such circumstances and against such odds, over thirty-eight thousand votes would be cast in New York city, and over seventy thousand in the state at large, for a platform of which the single tax on land values was the cardinal feature?

No, we may be disappointed, but we are not disheartened. We who have taken the cross of the new crusade did not enlist for a pleasure excursion. If our hopes had grown too high and in the ardor of movement we had come to look forward to a march that should be a succession of triumphs, we can yet face disaster and gather strength from disappointment.

"Rome was not built in a day," and such a tremendous social revolution as that at which we aim—the beneficent and peaceful social revolution which will emancipate labor and abolish poverty—must, in the nature of things, require time and work. What of it, if in this beginning, our vote, instead of the one hundred and fifty thousand which we hoped to get amounts to scarce half that number? If our seventy-three thousand votes seem small as compared with the four hundred and eighty thousand and four hundred and fifty thousand of the two old parties, we have something that they have not—a great truth, a living principle, and to it belongs the future.

That principle has been carried so far, has been already so brought to the attention of earnest and thoughtful men, that its advance must continue. We who rallied around its standards in this election might disband and go out of politics, but the principle for which we have contended would be certain to come up in ways we know not of and again re-enter the political arena. Every one of us might even turn his back upon it, recall all he has said, and strive to pluck up the seed we have sown, yet, though we might thus delay, we could not prevent the final triumph of the cause. Other hands would raise its standards, other voices would proclaim its truth, other thousands would take our places.

But of this there is no thought; the temper of all our organizations, the feeling of all who have been active in the "spreading of the light" in which we have been engaged, is that of strengthened determination and more vigorous effort.

I have always declared that I cared little for how men voted, and much for how they thought. I accepted the nomination for mayor of New York last year solely because my candidacy would arouse discussion and set men to thinking about a great truth. It was the same reason that compelled me this year to accept the nomination for secretary of state. And as it was with me, so it was with the others. During all this campaign we have proclaimed it on every stump that we cared nothing for the election of candidates, but everything for the education of the people. Our campaign has been a propaganda. We hoped for a larger vote, because we believed that the larger the vote the more powerfully could we arrest attention to our principles, and the more quickly force them into political discussion and political issue. But if we have not gained in this way all that we hoped, not only have we good reason to congratulate ourselves on what we have gained, but it may be easily seen how it may prove in the long run far better for the cause that we should not have moved forward too fast and triumphed too easily.

Who is there to whom "years have brought the philosophic mind," who, looking back over his own career, may not see how often what seemed at the time to be disaster has really proven a blessing in disguise; that opportunity has come out of disappointment, and that the thing which he at the moment most strove to gain would have proved the thing which it would have been worst for him to have?

So it is with movements such as ours. Had our hopes been fulfilled there would to-day have been rushing into our ranks the half educated and the self-seeking; responsibilities that we might not have as yet the experience or the wisdom to meet might have been thrust upon us, and the shock of our success might have caused the adoption of half measures, which would in the long run delay our full triumph. Looking back over the history of our civil war who cannot see that if Bull Run had been a victory of the Union forces instead of a reverse, human flesh and blood might have yet been bought and sold under the American flag; and that bitter disappointment and staggering defeat sealed the fate of chattel slavery as no victory could have done.

So it may prove with industrial slavery. Had we polled a great vote at this election it would have been to land speculation the handwriting on the wall; it would have forced into our national politics the pressing economic issues of the day; it would have staved off and modified the impending industrial depression and would have led to the adoption of many

half measures for the relief of social discontent. It would have been better immediately for the country, but it can be easily seen how it might have been worse for the cause.

As it is, while the land grabber deems himself secure, and politicians think that all danger of the deluge has passed, the impulse we have given to thought will continue, extending in ever widening circles, and our propaganda will go on the more efficiently that there are among us none but those who work for the cause. Then—possibly when we least expect it—seeming accidents will combine to so bring our principles into political issue as to clearly call upon every man to take his side, and then the advocates of "the land for the people" will seem to start, as it were, from the ground.

What we have to do in the meanwhile is to push on the work. We must never forget that time is an element in all things human. It requires a measurable interval of time for a sensation to pass from the fingers to the brain; how much more does it require time for an idea to enter and take possession of the mind? The speeches that have been made, the literature that has been disseminated, the discussion that has been provoked during this campaign, could only slightly, as we well knew at the time, affect the vote at this election; but the effect of it all will steadily and increasingly tell. Every day that passes will add to the number of those who accept our principles and press their acceptance on others. Let us push on the good work.

HENRY GEORGE.

THE AUSTRALIAN SYSTEM.

So long as our present system of voting is continued no sporadic election of good men to office and no occasional triumph of a reform party can break up machine rule. If we would have pure elections, we must adopt a better system.

Under the Australian system all candidates designated by a fixed number of voters or complying with certain conditions are registered. The ballots are printed at public expense, and contain the names of all registered candidates. On approaching the polls and proving his right to vote the voter receives from an election officer one of these official ballots, which he takes into a compartment so constructed that he is entirely concealed from observation, and in which (save in the case of a blind man or a voter who cannot read or write) no one else is permitted at the same time. Here he indicates by a mark made against it the name of each candidate he wishes to vote for. He folds the ballot, comes out and votes it. A blind man or a man who avers that he cannot read and write is entitled on application to the services of an election officer, sworn to secrecy, who is permitted to go into the compartment, and reading the ballot to the voter, make the marks he may request.

THE STANDARD printed some time ago the draft of a bill made by Allen Thorndike Rice, editor of the *North American Review*, for presentation to the next legislature, which adapts this system to our election laws, and, in addition, provides for the designation of candidates by voters on registration, and entitles each candidate who shall be designated by one-tenth of the number of voters registered to have his name printed upon the official ballots.

Whether this or some other method of designating candidates be adopted, the main features of the system give it enormous advantages over our present method. Under it intimidation is impossible and bribery becomes unprofitable. No one would care to purchase a voter to whose intelligence and good faith he must alone trust for the carrying out of his part of the compact, and thus the temptation to bribery, the temptation to hiring repeaters and fraudulent voters would be gone. In the second place, the regular machine would be shorn of a great deal of its power. Under the existing system the expenses of printing tickets and the organization and money necessary to distribute them gives such an enormous advantage to the regular nominees that the professional politicians in controlling the nominating conventions control to a large extent the vote of the party. Under the Australian system the regular nominee has no advantage over the independent candidate, the thoroughly organized party over the new party, in presenting tickets to the voters. Every candidate is presented to every voter, and the voter can no longer take and vote a party ticket, but is compelled to make a choice.

The adoption of this system would somewhat increase the direct public expenses of elections, but would enormously reduce the amounts spent by candidates and parties, which, in the long run, the public are required to pay with heavy interest, and by weakening the power of the machines, by putting an end to the shameless bribery that has been so common all over this state, and by making intimidation impossible, it would do more than any other single measure to purify our election system and make our elections really an intelligent expression of the will of the people.

A Rural New York Editor Comes to See the Light.

THROOPVILLE, N. Y., Oct. 25.—Till summer before last the name of Henry George was coupled in my mind with the caricatures of his doctrine drawn by his political opponents

But having received a copy of "Progress and Poverty" from a friend, I read it with pleasure and profit. I found in it many things that I had long believed, and some others that were new to me. I have since met the author, and have heard him lecture at Auburn, N. Y. I have no doubt that his views are correct, and that they will yet be a part of the policy of our nation. He who has the moral law and the multiplication table on his side must triumph in the end. L. F. BITTLE.

The Tramp "Saw the Cat"

"My friend," said a citizen to an able bodied occupant of a park bench, "why don't you go to work instead of loafing here all day?"

"Harder to find work to do than to do it," was the reply.

"Nonsense; I don't believe you would work if you got the chance."

"Try me, captain, and see?"

"All right, are you willing to dig?"

"Yes, sir; if you'll pay me decent wages."

"What is your idea of decent wages?"

"Well," said the tramp, reflecting a moment, "two dollars a day."

"Two dollars a day?" exclaimed the citizen. "Isn't that a little steep for digging?"

"Not when I can make a dollar a day by begging. You know I can live cheaper as a beggar; one doesn't have to keep up appearances."

"All right," said the citizen, "come with me."

The tramp left his bench with a briskness that would have astounded those dainty people who wonder why park loungers are so averse to work. After a ride in the street car the citizen pointed to a vacant lot and said:

"There; I want to build a cottage on that lot, and I will give you two dollars a day to dig the cellar. Clear off the loose stones and then call at my office and I will pay you for what you have done and rig you up with shovel and pick for the rest of the work."

The citizen told the tramp where his office was, and left him.

"Say!" shouted the tramp, with a few emphatic terms intended to be descriptive, as he broke into the citizen's office later in the day, "you are a nice specimen of a fraud, ain't you! That lot up there don't belong to you, and the man it does belong to drove me off. I want my day's wages!"

The wages were paid, and the tramp fell into a better humor.

"Now, my friend," the citizen remarked, "that lot does not belong to me; but it has never been used, the owner does not intend to use it, it is a good place for a house, I can afford to build a house, and I want you to do as much of the work as you can."

"That's all right, but why don't you buy the lot?" asked the tramp.

"I can't afford to buy the lot and build the cottage, too, without giving a mortgage, and I won't put a mortgage on my house."

"Then you'll have to go without the cottage," said the tramp.

"If so," replied the citizen, "you will have to go without the job of work; and I reckon that is what it comes to. I must rent a home instead of owning one, and you must be a beggar instead of an honest working man, unless you are willing to take somebody's work from him by doing it for less."

"Begging is easier and more humane, and pays better."

"Do you see the cat?" the citizen inquired.

"No," replied the tramp, looking around the room; "I don't see any cat. But I'll tell you what I do see. I see that if you could build on that lot I would be earning a respectable living. And I'll tell you what I don't see. I don't see what right any one who doesn't want to use that lot has to prevent you from using it."

"But," observed the citizen, gravely, "the other man owns the lot."

"What right has he to own it," asked the tramp; "he didn't make it?"

"I guess you see the cat."

"Is that the cat?"

"That is the cat."

"Good day."

The tramp left the citizen's office and went home.

The Silent Work that is Going On Everywhere.

NEW YORK CITY.—A little more than a month ago I had an entirely erroneous impression of your views and saw what I believed to be serious objections, but in reading THE STANDARD I have come to understand exactly what the doctrine that you teach is, and have become a convert. I am not now idle. Every week I buy several copies of THE STANDARD and send them around to friends, at the same time calling their attention to this or that article. In this way I have converted for rather THE STANDARD has several men who have "bought" for the war. Having once seen the truth they cannot get away from it, however much they may wriggle. A MISSIONARY.

In the Movement Till Death.

BROOKLYN, Nov. 9.—The result of yesterday's vote is not discouraging to me, as I look upon it as an avowal of the principle that God made the land for all His creatures, and I believe that it constitutes the "hard pan" or foundation of the united labor party. I hope none who are believers in its principles will be discouraged, but will keep right on. I write to show that there are men who will engage in the movement until death, and I enclose \$1 for the campaign fund of 1888. JOHN LOCKWOOD.

Carrying the Gospel Through Illinois.

BRACEVILLE, Ill., Nov. 2.—Last Wednesday we organized a land and labor club of twelve in Central City, with Robert Reed as president and Mr. Scorry secretary. This little band of enthusiasts will work early and late to "spread the light." There will be public lectures and discussion and a wide distribution of tracts. ROBERT CUMMING.

The Most Useful Gift He Has Received in a Life of Seventy-two Years.

BELLEFOSTE, Kan.—I have received THE STANDARD since its first issue as a gift from a friend in Passaic, N. J. It has proved the best and most useful gift I ever received from the hand of man. This is a great deal for a man seventy-two years old to say. Inclosed find twenty cents for a copy of "Progress and Poverty." J. D. ALLEN.

So Say We, All of Us.

SELMA, Ala., Nov. 10.—If returns are discouraging it simply proves that error does not yield to truth as our enthusiasm bade us hope. This is all the greater reason for redoubled effort on our part. I trust a national convention will be decided upon positively soon. BOLTON SMITH.

II Thessalonians, 2, 11.

Baltimore Methodist.

It is said that Henry George has lately made \$40,000 or \$50,000 by the sale of his books and by lectures, etc. This self contradiction of his anti-poverty theories may yet convince Mr. George that wealth honestly acquired and generously employed is not the great crime which he constantly affirms it to be.

"WORKINGWOMAN" AND "LADY."

Please find inclosed my check for \$5. I have been a subscriber from the beginning. I want to say a word about the "sisterhood of women" in a paper which sets forth so fully the brotherhood of man.

Women understand women better than men do each other. It grieves me to hear the terms "workingwomen" and "lady" used in antagonism so often, and generally by men. All ladies cannot be workingwomen, the latter term applying, as a rule, to hard workers who are such in order to earn a livelihood, but all workingwomen can be ladies, pure, true, refined, gentle, and with that personal dignity which commands the respect of men. Let no effete class distinctions be advocated to keep them all from meeting, just simply as women. What is the mysterious bond between them, making them so often unkind to the right? Is it suffering, "the badge of all their ills?"

Never in the history of the world were women so entirely on the right as when Christ was on earth. They had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with His crucifixion. It is to the tears of the "Daughter of Jerusalem," who followed Him to His death, the tears of all the women in the world could have been joined, on that dawning river the dark cross would have been swept away forever. ANN L. LIVINGSTON.

"Way Off" and "Right Here."

WARREN, Pa.—When I was a boy in a little country village, she who

With fingers weary and worn,
With eyelids heavy and red,
Sat in unwomanly rags,
Plying her needle and thread,

sang "The Song of the Shirt" in a London garret, thousands of miles away, across the ocean, and starved. When I was a boy 'twas the Irish who died with hunger for lack of the grain their own labor had produced. It was always people "way off" who were crowded into miserable huts and old rookeries, lived and suffered in poverty and filth, were born and bred in ignorance and vice, and grew up to low browed, grotesque, deformed maturity. Those beggars that came to town.

Some in rags, some in tags,
etc., and got the dogs to bark, so, came to a town that was "way off" and why they should beg was more than I could tell. It was landlords "way off" and foreign dignitaries that lived on the labor of toiling millions and ground the poor creatures in the dust. And those other, more harmless plunderers, called robbers, thieves, banditti, etc., all plied their trade in regions "way off."

And, all "way off," what a mild misery that of the poor London sewing woman! What gentle starvation that of the little Irish lad, while saying

Give me three grains of corn, mother!

And (to a child's imagination) what a queer but he died in—stagnant roof, mud walls, the ground for a floor, and for a window only one little pane in the whole hovel, because every bit of glass that let in the blessed light of heaven put so much more to the terrible taxes! Besides (it was all "way off" and very funny), this was the identical home in which

They kept the pig in the parlor,

only the pig wasn't there when they were starving; the landlord had long before lugged him off for rent. It is wonderful how much easier the magic "way off" then made it for all those poor creatures and also for me.

But years have passed, and that London garret has come across the seas "right here" to us. Americans are learning how to die with hunger now, and in a generation or so may be able to do it as well as the Irish. The landlords and the "nobility" are "right here" now, with heel upon the toilers. Plenty of Americans, born in hovels and rookeries and bred in ignorance and vice are "right here," and 'tis

Hark! Hark! How the dogs bark!

At the beggars now coming to our towns. And you needn't travel the old world in order to be robbed by the privileged; it can be done very conveniently "right here."

Those "way off" things are nearly all "right here" now, and they are getting "right here" more and more every year. The sheep walks and the deer parks are not far off, and it may be none too long before the American pig will be kept in the parlor and our landlords will take him for rent.

A. G. BRECHER.

The Landlord a Worse Master in Greece than the Turk.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.—I was much struck on reading a review in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of M. Francis Lemontant's "Grand Greece," with his remarks on the cause of poverty in Calabria. After describing how the field workers are herded like cattle and driven and goaded as their work like oxen and are only employed a portion of the year, he goes on to say:

"The cause of all this misery, sorrow, sorrow and wretchedness is chiefly owing to the fact that of all the rest of the earth, it is the least divided; it is owned by a very few."

He describes one estate that is eighty miles square, owned by the prince of Gerace. Twenty-five thousand head of cattle were feeding on the grounds. For this estate 4,000 men in certain seasons were required and again 250 alone did all that is necessary for the rest of the year.

The proprietor never visits his domain. All power is in his agent, who rebs his employee and exploits the laborers. There have been no improvements in cultivation since the day of Pythagoras. The plows even are of the same model as those the Greeks learned of the Egyptians. The evil the hand suffers is precisely that which Pliny the younger in his memorable sentence so well described, *Latifundia perinde Italiae*. Great estates have ruined Italy. D. W. VAUGHAN.

Commenced the Fight Afresh in Fenton County.

GLOVERVILLE, Fulton Co., Nov. 2.—I have begun the campaign for 1888, for the glorious cause we hold so dear, this afternoon. I have sent out a lot of tracts to the surrounding towns, where we have a few true men who will distribute them. Let the cowards sink to the rear. We shall go forward in open order at first, but soon with a well armed ranks—forward, until we win. W. C. WOOD, M. D.

A Yale Pro-poverty on the Declaration of Independence.

Prof. W. G. Sumner in New York Independent of October 7, 1887.

"Before the tribunal of nature a man has no more right to life than a rattlesnake; he has no more right to liberty than any wild beast; his right to the pursuit of happiness is nothing but a license to maintain the struggle for existence, if he can find within himself the powers with which to do it."

people in the state that poverty was not a divine institution, and could be abolished. "It will give me great pleasure," he said, "to carry back to the people of my state, who are watching this contest you are waging here with the deepest interest, the glad tidings that the united labor party has come to stay. I shall be able to tell the news that the wage worker will be emancipated and the toilers' shackles broken."

Dr. McGlynn, who had just spoken in Brooklyn, followed Mr. Williams, his appearance exciting tumultuous and long continued applause.

The other speakers were Henry George, Judge Maguire and Alfred S. Houghton. Mr. Post was introduced, but spoke only a few words. The meeting adjourned with three cheers for Henry George and Dr. McGlynn.

Anti-Poverty in Camden, N. J.

CAMDEN, N. J.—On Wednesday evening, Oct. 26, a few active friends of the Henry George movement assembled at the armory of the Sixth regiment national guard of New Jersey for the purpose of forming an Anti-poverty society. John H. Doerr was elected president and Harry A. Reier, Jr., secretary, with E. N. Daugherty as treasurer. The New York declaration of principles was adopted and the roll signed by fourteen Camdenites, among them the master workman, Aaron Hand, the worthy foreman, secretary, treasurer and other officers and members of local assembly 31, K. of L. W. J. Atkinson, president of the Philadelphia branch, made an encouraging address, and was well received. He was also the explanation of the principles of the single tax by Messrs. Hetzel and Halbach, also of Philadelphia. As soon as we began to collect funds enough with which to make an attack we shall distribute tracts and anti-poverty literature and do what we can to educate the people in this vicinity, using reason and powerful arguments and paying no attention to the willfully blind obstructionists who will offer no argument, but call us "cranks" and other complimentary names in their puny efforts to delay the progress of truth. Our work will soon show results, and you shall hear from us again.

HARRY A. REIER, JR., secretary,
632 North Sixth street, Camden.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE ECONOMICS.

NEW YORK CITY.—President Barnard of Columbia college writes in the November Forum:

"All the world's wealth put together, if equally distributed, would not suffice to make the world's people individually rich or even to relieve them from the pressure of want—a pressure which, in that case, would be universal. For what the world has to live on from year to year is only the aggregate annual product of all the industries of the world, and what this amounts to, in civilized lands at least, has been pretty well ascertained by inquiries elaborately conducted under public authority. From the results of such inquiries it is apparent that if this aggregate product were to be distributed with the most rigorous impartiality among all the inhabitants of the countries investigated it could at most only supply the simple necessities of life and nobody would be in what are called circumstances of ease. That statement is equivalent to an admission that vast numbers of human beings in civilized lands are without the simple necessities of life, because it is evident that many people have more. With such a state of affairs violent attempts to procure the simple necessities on the part of those in want of them should excite neither surprise nor anger, even in the mind of a Columbia college philosopher. It is natural that such attempts should be resisted, and it is natural that they should be considered vain efforts by any one who accepts as true the statement quoted. That statement, if admitted, proves that neither the equal nor the equitable division of existing wealth would be a satisfactory solution of social problems. President Barnard says further: 'The present struggle is over the distribution of the product that exists.' If that is really all he knows about the matter, he must be one of those economic bachelors who have learned nothing and forgotten nothing, notwithstanding the flood of light that has been poured on social science within the last ten years. His statement is not true of strikes, nor of boycotts, which Mr. Barnard specially detests; nor of anti-poverty societies, which he regards as a product of the erroneous idea that poverty is not inevitable. None of these aims at the redistribution of existing wealth, however acquired; the change they would make is in the distribution of wealth to be produced. And the anti-poverty societies, in addition to removing the obstacle to the equitable distribution of wealth to be produced, would also remove artificial obstacles to its production. Professors of political economy who do not know this, or who talk and write as if they did not know it, are no more qualified to hold their positions than would be a professor of mathematics who could not solve quadratic equations."

The cultivation of harmonious relations between labor and capital, upon which President Barnard seems to pin his faith, is impossible in the face of conditions which constantly tend to decrease their combined returns to the lowest point at which they will continue to engage in production. When, out of an aggregate product, sufficient only to supply the simple necessities of life to the whole population, labor and capital must support the owners of natural opportunities in the style in which they are supported, how can we expect that they will not quarrel over what is left? The harmonious relations of labor and capital will be an incident of new conditions which will give equitable returns to each.

If the Huns and Vandals should ever sweep away the literature of our civilization there will perish a good many magazine articles, the loss of which posterity will have no special occasion to mourn.

WM. E. MCKENNA.

Pushing the Work of Education.

KINBALL, Dakota Territory.—I enclose \$5.25 for my subscription for THE STANDARD (the best paper in the world), and the balance to be applied as you see fit in the propaganda work. I intend to get up a club for THE STANDARD. I will send and get some ten or twenty copies of "Progress and Poverty" and about five copies in German, as I want to see every person I come in contact with read that work. I can and will sell a goodly number of copies.

M. C. FELKER.

Spreading Out in Cleveland.

CLEVELAND, O., Nov. 7.—The land and labor club No. 9 of Cleveland meets every Monday evening at Fix's hall, Scoville avenue. Membership is growing, and a wider circle of men are coming to show a deeper interest in the subject and theories of Henry George.

G. M. DAUGHARTY, secretary.

The Fund for Dr. McGlynn.

The publisher of THE STANDARD acknowledges the receipt of \$2 for the fund for Dr. McGlynn—\$1 from Warner, \$1 from J. M. McGlynn and \$1 from L. N. Gage, San Jose, Cal.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

Land Limitation.

SAN MARCOS, Texas.—I have just read "Progress and Poverty." That you have struck the correct solution of the "great labor problem" there can be no doubt. I cannot yield entire assent to all, however, as on page 292, Lovell's library, you say: "Let those who now hold the land still retain it," etc.: "No owner of land need be dispossessed and no restriction need be placed upon the amount of land any one could hold." This surely cannot be true. If it is true, why cannot the small per cent of population who now own England merely put up their rents so as to pay the government tax and still have their wealth left? The tenants having no other taxes to pay, could, of course, pay higher rent. It appears to me that there must be a limit to what a man may hold or "claim as his own," and that limit what he can or does use. If some one is willing to pay the full "occupancy tax" and keep the place, as he claims to "own" the ground, pay the government tax and force me to pay more or "move on," so to speak.

GEO. W. KNIGHT.

You do not yet understand that a tax on the values of land cannot be sh. d to tenants in increased ground rent! You should read tract No. 37 of the Land and Labor library.

It is true that no man ought to hold more of the earth than he uses, but that limitation cannot be fixed by arbitrary law. Questions of what constitutes use would immediately arise that it would be impossible to adjust. But by taking land values for common use through taxation and thereby making it unprofitable for a man to hold more land than he uses, we shall fix the limit by operation of natural law.

The present owners of England could not put up their rents so as to pay the government tax until land values rise. With the imposition of all taxes on land values, land values would tend to fall in every country where land was kept out of use.

You do not see that a heavier tax on land values would force holders of vacant land to sell, and thus reduce values by increasing supply? Hence, landlords, instead of being able to raise rents to the extent of the tax, would be compelled to reduce rents in response to the greater market supply of land.

But in time, if the tax were not increased, owners would be able to add to it rents as increase of population made greater demands for land and raised values; and, just as you intimate, tenants would be able to pay higher rents because they would have no taxes to pay on labor products. It is therefore a fact that if population continued to grow and the aggregate of taxes remained stationary, the social and industrial evils that now afflict us would reappear. But taxes would not remain stationary. The principle having been established that land values belong to the people, taxes would be increased, for the purpose of making public improvements, as growth of land values justified the increase. In this way the margin for speculation would be so kept down that no one would hold land he did not continuously use at a profit, and land not in use, however good it might be, would be valueless and free of tax.

The land value tax would automatically accomplish with precision the object at which land limitation laws aim, but cannot accomplish.

Which?

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—A and B have each \$25,000 in cash. A invests \$5,000 of his money in a city lot and builds upon it a \$20,000 house; he rents this property (house and lot) for \$2,000 a year. B loans all of his money (\$25,000), and receives \$2,000 per year as interest on same. How under your theory should each of these men be taxed?

C. A. LEE.

A would be taxed on the value of his lot, or say \$5,000, while B would pay no taxes. But B pays no taxes now, for interest on loans would be less if lenders were not taxed.

Opportunities for Investment.

GRAFTON, N. S. W.—In the event of land values being taxed away, what provision could be made for absolutely secure investments as a substitute for land? For example: A father desires to so invest his earnings as to secure to his wife, children, or himself in old age a certain income. Under the present system, money invested in real estate in settled communities gives the very best security, except, perhaps, government bonds. What substitute could be provided? H. HARDING.

No substitute should be provided, and none need be. Investments in productive enterprises are the only investments that can yield a return to the investor without imposing a tax on some one else. Such investments are not now secure, for the same reason that a workingman is not now sure of employment; but when land values are taxed away, productive investments will be secure.

What Fixes the Value.

NEW YORK.—How shall we determine the value of land under the new system? We easily determine it now by what it will command in the market, but if it is confiscated by the state, which is what taxing land values really means, there will be no selling price. Will not the state be obliged to lease its land to the highest bidder? If I build a house on leased ground under such conditions, increase of population may so increase its value that I will be unable to pay the ground rent. What shall I do then? All the improvements I have made will be comparatively worthless, inasmuch as they cannot be removed to cheaper land except at great expense. It seems to me that under such a system I cannot hope for a permanent home.

INDEPENDENT VOTER.

At first, when taxes are merely shifted from labor products to land values, it is not probable that the selling price of land will wholly disappear; but as the tax increases the selling price will fall until it is practically nothing. Then the selling price of land will not afford a basis of taxation, but the rental value will be as definite as before, and the tax will be based upon that.

The state will not be obliged, however, to confiscate land and rent it. The rental value will be determined by private transactions as easily then as now, for selling price is not now an arbitrary figure—it is a capitalization of rental value, plus a speculative premium.

If you should build on a piece of ground, and pay increased so as to raise your land value tax, the increase would

not be beyond your ability to pay, except in unusual circumstances. If you built a home, and the locality afterward became a business center, you might find it impossible to pay the high tax for residence purposes, but the cases in which you would not find it profitable to tear down your house and erect a business structure, free of all tax, would be so few that any exceptional hardship might easily be relieved from the common fund. If, however, your improvements were for business use, there would be no increase of land value tax which would not be due to some superior advantage of location for which you could and ought to pay.

The effect of the land value tax when fully imposed is to equalize opportunities, taking from those who appropriate superior opportunities only the difference in value between that part of the common inheritance which they appropriate and that which others are compelled to resort to. If you believe this is just, no apparent hardships in individual cases ought to blunt your conscience.

As to your hope for a permanent home, there are thousands upon thousands who cannot hope for a permanent home now, to whom a home would be possible; and those who have homes now abandon them when the land value of their homes rise. The land value tax would not abolish homes; it would only prevent a man from making the community enrich him when he abandons his home.

The Palace and the Hovel Again.

NEW YORK.—Two men buy two equal adjoining lots. A builds a \$2,000 house and B a \$50,000 ten story building, tax being the same on each lot, and A getting \$1,500 rent, while B secures a rent of \$7,000 every year.

(1) Now, do you not think that the \$5,500 difference which B gets more each year will encourage the Goulds and Vanderbilts?

(2) Will not this widen the chasm between poor and rich?

(3) Is it just? If so, prove it!

M. LANER.

(1) No; the tax, being a part of a system, the Goulds and Vanderbilts will disappear.

(2) No; the chasm will be narrowed.

(3) Yes.

A injures himself as a producer by buying so expensive a lot for the erection of so cheap a building. He could do better as a producer and be of more service to the community by buying cheaper lots and erecting more buildings. It is only as a land speculator that he is benefited by pursuing the course you suppose, and land speculation is injurious to the community.

If B can profitably put up a \$50,000 building on his lot, A can, too, and by doing so he benefits all classes.

B's proportion of so much of any tax as is imposed on houses is added to his rents, and is paid ultimately, not by B, but by his tenants. Therefore a remission of taxes on improvements would directly benefit B's tenants rather than B. The benefit to B would not be due to a saving of taxes, but to the greater ease with which he could rent his building at lower rates with the same profit.

According to your figures, A, who has benefited the community to the extent of but \$2,000, receives 75 per cent, while B, who appropriates no more common property (land value), and has benefited the community to the extent of \$50,000, receives only 14 per cent. Do you think that just or politic?

Notes.

JAMES BORD, Riverside, Cal.—Your letter shows no exception to the truth of the free trade and free land doctrine. If wages in southern California are as high as you say, what would happen if eastern workmen accepted your cordial invitation to go there? Would the wages rise and the land be as easy to get? or would the land rise and wages fall? Your condition is temporarily exceptional.

It is difficult to understand how your country from being useless becomes useful when the speculator arrives. The speculator merely appropriates. He may make land more valuable, but not more useful, and greater value means nothing but a higher entrance fee. But if by speculation you mean a man who turns "a desert into a veritable Garden of Eden," as you probably do, he is a benefactor whom we would reward by exempting him from taxation.

GEO. H. HEBARD, Hartford, Conn.—Your chief difficulty in considering the interest question is in supposing that interest is a term which comprehends only what a lender pays to a borrower for a loan. It is a broader term than that. It is the increase which the product of anything can get over the value of his labor by giving certain directions to the use of that thing. Give a swarm of bees and you will get more value in honey than wages for your labor amount to; sow grain and the product will be more valuable than the labor expended, and so on. Interest on loans is merely incidental to the increase which is due to the element of time. Having something for which, if you — it yourself, you will get more than the value of your labor, you will not lend it, except in charity, unless you get back more than what you lent. Reduced to its last analysis, true interest is only a form of wages, bearing much the same relation to the producer of capital that higher wages bear to skilled workmen; and this is the position originally taken by Mr. George, as you will see if you read the last paragraph of chapter 5, book 3, of "Progress and Poverty."

E. B. H. Oberlin, O.—Senator Warner, who told you that products of labor as well as land have an unearned increment, and mentioned the case of last year's wheat when this year's crop fails, was properly answered by you when you said that such cases, when they occur, are accidental and balance one another. But with all parts of the earth open to us and linked by electricity and steam power, it may fairly be said that they cannot occur. After all, however, the vital point is that wheat is produced by labor, and the wheat itself, and all value attaching to it, therefore belongs by natural right to the producer, while land is not produced by labor, but is a creation of God for the use of men, and any values attaching to it belong to him in common.

A FRIEND, Utica, N. Y.—Look again over the instances of poverty in Utica given in the *Lutheran* and ask yourself which one of these men would be in poverty if opportunities to work were as plentiful as workers. You may select the case of the consumptive, but would he not be cared for comfortably, as matter of right, and not of charity, if the value of Utica land went to the people of Utica, whose presence creates the value, instead of going into private pockets? You may select the case of the drunkard; but will you insist that it is drunkenness and gluttony that causes poverty when there are so many rich people who, though given over to drunkenness and gluttony, grow richer and without

working, too? In all the other cases if the people could have work without paying for the privilege when they were willing to work, they would not be in poverty. Mr. George never asserted that the world owes any man a living. What he has said and does say is that the world owes every man the natural right to make a living which God invested him with at birth. Does the editor of the *Lutheran* deny this? If he does not (for, though case-hardened with the religion of the Pharisee, as he appears to be, he will hardly dispute such a self-evident truth), how does he make that truth square with the doctrine of private ownership of land which enables some to live without working by selling the raw material for labor—God's earth—to those who work?—The personal reference to Mr. George is impertinent and false.

HOW IT WAS STARTED.

A loving father, leaving his children for a time, called them together before his departure.

"See, my children," said he, "how amply I have provided for your necessities. Here is an abundant store of fuel. Here are metals of all kinds, in which I have taught you to work. Here are fertile fields on which you can graze your herds and raise your grain and fruits. A very little daily labor will suffice for your subsistence; and as you grow in knowledge and experience you will learn how to fashion cunning machines, by means of which the fuel and the metals I leave you shall be made to do your work, that you may have the more abundant leisure." And so he went away.

But scarcely had the father gone, when some of the stronger of the children said: "Here! we will take charge of the fuel; and if any of you weaker ones want fire, you must first dig fuel enough for us, and then we'll let you dig some for yourselves."

And others of the stronger children said: "This store of metals is ours; and if you weaker ones want iron or lead or copper, you must first dig what we want, and then you may take a little for yourselves."

And other stronger children claimed the fertile fields as theirs, and forbid the weaker ones to till the ground except they surrendered half the crop. And still others of the stronger children forbid the weaker ones to build houses on the ground, or to stand upon it, or to be buried in it without first giving up a portion of the fuel and metals and fruits and grain which they had already paid other strong children for the privilege of getting.

After a time the weaker children grew tired of this sort of thing; and considering the matter, they made up their minds that they had just as good a right to the fuel and metals and the use of the fields as the stronger children had. "For," they said to the stronger ones, "you didn't make the fuel or the metals or the fertile fields any more than these did. These things were provided by our Father expressly for the use of all His children; and as children of the same Father, we have just the same right to them that you have, no more, no less. And we want our rights."

To all this the stronger children said: "Well, we don't deny that all that was true—once. Our Father *did* mean these things for the equal use of all His children—originally. But don't you see, you fellows have been working for so long, and we've got so used to treating the Father's gift as our own property that a change would be very inconvenient—to us and, in short, we consider that we have acquired VESTED RIGHTS." And that settled it!

But the weaker children simply answered, "Gammon!" For they realized that they weren't the weaker children any longer, but the stronger; and that if they wanted their fair share of the common bounties of the common Father all they had to do was to say so, and they would get them, all the "vested rights" in the world to the contrary notwithstanding.

And that was how the united labor party came to be started. T. L. MCCREARY.

Anti-Poverty in Boston.

NEW YORK.—Miss Frances Meeker (No. 770 of the Anti-poverty society), writes most enthusiastically of the good work of the Boston Anti-poverty society and of the spirit of Christian fraternity which breaks down the barriers of social exclusiveness among its members. She says: "Our meetings so promote the feeling of fellowship that all speak to the others, and it is wonderful to see strong men, with tears in their eyes, asserting that they now believe in the fatherhood of God—men who had been unable to accept that doctrine as taught by the churches."

At the meeting of the society on Sunday last a young New church minister presented the truth with great power, and stirred the hearts of his audience. The foundation of the new crusade, he said, is laid in the religious nature of man, the lever which will uproot and destroy mammon, and the kingdom of expediency is the sentiment of fraternity, of human fellowship, the manifestation of the Christ spirit now with new power entering those prepared to receive it, whether heathen or Christian, and inspiring them to "lift the heavy burden and let the oppressed go free." Here is a strength not to be resisted—it is the arm of the Lord. Here is a religion based upon human equality which must purge the churches of their atmosphere of injustice and fear and belief in an unjust God who bestows unequally his favors upon mankind, and in its place pervade the sacred precincts with the pure air of the new heavens and the new earth.

Fear that this is a very imperfect representation of the eloquent address, as I well know it to be of the deeply sympathetic letter of Miss Meeker, but trust that it will show you readers that the truths of the new crusade are taking deep root and being faithfully nurtured in intellectual Boston. Faithfully yours,

B. U.

Renewing the Fight in Brooklyn.

BROOKLYN, Nov. 9.—An enthusiastic meeting of the Tenth ward association of the united labor party of Kings county was held at 145 Douglass street on Wednesday evening, Nov. 9, when the following resolutions were passed:

Resolved, That the large vote polled by the united labor party in this county is a gratifying verdict to our efforts in this first campaign, and shows 15,000 courageous and enlightened freemen in Kings county despite evil influences of all kinds. We declare our unwavering fidelity to the principles of the united labor party for the emancipation of industrial slavery by striking down speculation in land values through the taxation of land values.

Resolved, That active and incessant work will be pushed from this day for the promulgation of our principles and the dissemination of our literature throughout the ward.

All believers in the philosophy of Henry George are invited to become members of our association.

Dr. McGlynn to Lecture.

Dr. McGlynn will lecture on "Temperance and Labor," in the large hall in Cooper union, on Thursday evening, Oct. 17.

THE MOON COLONY.

Itaheas.

The "man in the moon" still takes the same lively interest in the Henry George question. It was a little tiresome to stand out and listen to his moonshine talk the other night, but it might have been because we did not understand, as did he, the full meaning of his talk. So far as we can see he is a disinterested party; and it is only pure friendship for us, or perhaps love for all beings endowed with so many senses, that causes him to spend so much time thinking over our condition.

He is not a mere idle talker, as some of our labor and socialistic agitators. He evidently means what he says, and is willing to go to much trouble for our sakes. This week he makes a great offer—the use of the moon to demonstrate the Ricardo law of rent, and the injustice of private ownership in land. At a cost of much time and trouble he offers, if necessary, to run the moon regardless of the forces of attraction or gravitation. He also promises to overcome its momentum so that it can safely approach the earth. Moreover he has changed the climate and soil there, and supplied an atmosphere, so that it is in every way similar to our earth and is ready for colonization by our inhabitants.

It will make a clearer case to us, he says, if instead of arranging land, as regards productivity, so that the gradations are insensible as we are accustomed to find it, he has made three distinct grades, accordingly he will call first, second and third grades; or No. 1, 2 and 3 land.

No. 1 land will produce to the average laborer, working ten hours a day, twice more than enough to supply his needs. No. 2 land will yield him once more than enough to supply his needs. No. 3 land will only yield him a bare living for the same amount of labor. There is much more No. 3 land than No. 2 land and much more No. 2 than No. 1 land. It is now ready for settlement, and is making its first trip to the earth. Look out! Fortunate will be the first to occupy it. See! It is slowing up! It stops so that the trees on it brush the ground of the earth out in Nebraska.

A young married couple emigrating west, are the only ones within reach. They look up and see a veritable Garden of Eden pausing over their heads. Both being orphans as were Adam and Eve, and having now little of gravity, and but few relatives or friends, to attract them to the earth they do not hesitate to take their chances on the moon, which at once proceeds on its journey, so as not to disappoint any moonlight rambles. As we do not know the names of the new settlers, we will call them Adam and Eve. They get along nicely; apples and snakes are there, but Eve is acquainted with them. Besides, she has lived in our modern world, and no snake can instruct her in the art of sinning. The tree of knowledge is a chestnut, and they are at home under its branches. The "man in the moon" has also promised to exempt them from a flood. They use what little land they need, and with more knowledge of cooking, weaving and dressing than was known to our Adam and Eve, they begin housekeeping. We do not care to enumerate their different generations. Human events take their usual course. It was, however, difficult for the first month to borrow groceries or tools from their neighbors.

The moon makes monthly trips to some part of the earth, and at each trip at least one couple board her. It seemed very nice at first to Adam and Eve to meet people from the earth, learn the base ball score, get the news from the Chicago anarchists and read the latest market quotations. Our Adam and Eve had no such pastime. Is it surprising that they talked to snakes and ate bad apples?

But let us observe how they settle upon these three grades of land. Each takes what he needs and so long as there is any No. 1 land left, land can have no selling or rental value. Suppose that at the end of 100 years all the No. 1 land is taken, and the children born there and the immigrants from the earth begin to occupy No. 2 land. Now, it is possible that a landlord of No. 1 land can sell or rent his land. A new comer may prefer to give to this landlord, as rent, one-half, three-fourths, or, at the most, all the surplus that No. 1 land will produce over No. 2 land. He will then, if he works all the time, have left as his wages just as much as he could produce on No. 2 land. Now, cannot the landlord get his support without work? Is he not enabled to do this simply because he or his forefathers were first on the ground?

By the time all the No. 2 land is taken, all the No. 1 landlords may lie idle, and those who work their land will only get as much as they could produce on No. 2 land. If they are sick, or do not work all the time, their savings will not be as great, for they must continue to pay the same rent.

No. 3 land is now being settled, and there is a possible rent on No. 2 land of enough to support its landlords, and on No. 1 land of twice this amount, so that a landlord of No. 1 land can not only live from the labor of others, but he can grow rich from his ability to appropriate their labor. Notice now that the real estate of No. 1 and 2 land, as well as those of No. 3 land, are working for a bare living. When No. 3 land is all taken, what then? This is what is called the Ricardo law of rent illustrated in the moon somewhat as Mr. Post illustrated it a few weeks ago in Liberty Hall. It is not a theory peculiar to the George scheme, but is a yard stick with which all the leading economists measure rent. Let us carry it further while we show another kind of settlement; for, bad as is this system, we have a worse one in operation on our earth.

Suppose that, instead of our quiet, slow-growing rural couple, a young Astor or Gould on his way from Wall street to his bonanza farm, had first set foot upon the moon. He would at once interview the man in the moon, get his schedule and time tables. He would then begin to fence in all the No. 1 land he could; and if this were too slow for his speculative mind, he would only survey around it and make corner stones. His evenings would be spent in writing glowing descriptions of the soil, climate and scenery there. By the end of the first month he would have ready a large number of "Go to the moon" pamphlets. These would be used on the first trip to the earth, and, if possible, arrangements would be made to have the moon make a long stop over to New York city, for this and a few succeeding trips. As a result many poor families would move over to the moon, and a few millionaire friends would go over there to spend a month and work up business.

These speculators would form an incorporated land company, with our first man, Mr. Gould, as president. All the No. 1 land that had been surveyed or that in any way could be "gobbled up," would be theirs against all the world—and all the moon as well. Sites for towns, cities and railroads would be mapped out. No land, as yet, has any value, and its ownership will confer no advantages; but Mr. Gould has great faith, and Elijah was not a greater prophet, as we shall see. Agents supplied with tourists' guides and "own your own homes" are sent to the earth. Many get on to the moon at every trip. All have the land and speculative fever, and each takes more land than he at present needs. Other land and stock com-

panies are incorporated. In a very few years all No. 1 land will be fenced in, and now our big corporations can begin to think of buying out the smaller land owners and getting up a "corner" in No. 1 land. They can afford to pay bigger wages than can be obtained by working No. 2 land, and with the surplus from each laborer, they will rapidly grow rich.

No. 2 land is monopolized in the same way in this way so the market system, and long before there are enough inhabitants on the moon to occupy even all of No. 1 land, the day laborers and real producers will be working at starvation wages for those who own and control the greater part of the land on the moon. The majority there will be in poverty, but they can point with pride to their fine churches, paved streets, big railroads, and to some of the splendid private residences and magnificent parks. This might mean prosperity to them. It would not be at all strange if it did. I have heard that the inhabitants of one of the primary planets were in this way so stupid that they were proud of their hundreds of millions, and failed to notice the resulting thousands of paupers. Is it not true that, other things being equal, every increase of the millions of a country must be followed by a much greater increase of its poor? Are not the great gains of a few the small losses of many? Has it not been so in both of these systems of colonization? As long as No. 1 land lasted there was no rent, and the wealth was nearly equally distributed. When No. 2 land was pretty well taken, the rents on No. 1 land began to give No. 1 landlords a margin on the wealth of the newer settlers, and this margin increased even more rapidly than the rents which they could claim from their tenants; for, by monopolizing land each No. 1 landlord could take rent from many tenants.

By buying, by mortgaging, and by governmental steals, the No. 1 landlords would finally own and control the land, the mines, the water powers and privileges, and all other natural opportunities, as well as railroads, telegraphs and other large artificial opportunities.

Is not this the tendency of this system, modified only by the difference in health, intellect or morality of its settlers? The man in the moon says, "This thing has gone on long enough. I can and must be stopped. Why, here is my moon with land and opportunities enough to abundantly supply fifty times the population now on it, and yet nine-tenths of my inhabitants are actually glad to get work at starvation wages. Bosh, what loonies! And such political economy! It's a disgrace to any planet. I could give them a new start by drowning nearly all in a big flood; but this would only give temporary relief, so long as I continue to receive settlers from the earth. I know a better way; I am going to run their government and play 'Uncle Sam' to them for a while. If I can't give them all a farm I can give its equivalent to each, and I will do this simply by making all landlords pay to me as taxes all they can take as rent from their tenants. I can with this simple tax pay all the expenses of government, including the cost of running railroads, telegraphs, and all national highways or commodities, besides giving them free libraries, free street cars and many other charitable and educational institutions. More than this, I will have enough left to give bounties to encourage the arts and sciences; to give dovers to every one at maturity and to give pensions to the old."

This is not exaggerated talk. By simply paying their rent to me and not to all the landlords, they will be saved from all kinds of taxes and will get back much of their rent. But the greatest benefit to be derived from this system is in the equal opportunities that it will give to labor. It will practically do away with land monopoly and land landlords. If a man must pay up as taxes all he gets in as rent from ground, he will prefer to let his tenant pay it at once to the government, and will not himself hold more land than he can use to advantage. Consequently all land needed will be worked to its full capacity, and those who work it will get the biggest possible returns for their labor.

If I had begun this system when the No. 1 landlord first began to demand rent there never would have been any poverty on my moon. Those who do the most physical or mental labor will still have the greatest amount of wealth, but they will have earned it all.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.
Published weekly at
33 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.
TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, Nov. 12, 1887, as second class matter.

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

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

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

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsmen 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, NOVEMBER 12, 1887.

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

DRIFTWOOD WASHED AWAY.

That the united labor party met with a reverse in this city and state yesterday must be frankly acknowledged. On the other hand, the hope of its enemies to inflict on it a crushing defeat that would end our movement at a single blow has not been fulfilled. In order to understand the result and to form some comprehension of its effect it is necessary that we shall consider the causes of the great falling off from our vote of last year.

In the first place, the socialistic vote of about 5,000 must be deducted from our vote of last year, leaving about 63,000. The Irving hall vote was probably worth 3,000 more last year, leaving us 66,000. Of these we have apparently held about 37,000 and lost about 29,000. As a matter of fact, the real loss is considerably greater since we know that many new recruits have been gained during the year.

First among the causes in bringing about this defection was the wholesale corruption of voters. Money played such a part in Tuesday's election as it has not played before in this city since the final overthrow of the Tweed ring. Votes were bought in every direction, and all of the rum mills became shambles for the sale of men. In addition to this there was an enormous bribery of a less direct kind. From fifty to eighty men were hired in single election districts "to work for the democratic party." Of course no party can use so many men in any legitimate work, and its illegitimate work is not entrusted to men hired on election day. The only "work" that these men were hired to do was to vote the democratic ticket, and if forty such men were hired in each of the eight hundred and twelve districts, the total number, 32,400, would largely exceed the falling off in the so-called labor vote. It is unquestionable, however, that many republicans were also bribed to vote the democratic ticket.

The whole influence of the federal, state and city administration was thrown vigorously in behalf of the democratic ticket, and there can be no question that it was skillfully directed toward capturing the labor vote for the express purpose of eliminating it as a factor in the presidential election of next year.

All of the interests seeking legislative favors at Albany next winter, and all monopolies, corporate and individual, lent their sympathy and contributed their money to aid the democratic party in this contest.

The whole liquor interest was combined to raise an enormous corruption fund, to be used under its own direction for the support of the whole democratic ticket, state, city and local.

Lastly, and in some sense saddest of all, a large number of respectable people who called themselves saviors of society a year ago rallied under the lead of Mr. Hewitt and became the willing allies of all the abhorrent influences in this combination which aimed, above all else, at installing in the district attorney's office a man notoriously unfit to be trusted in that powerful position.

Could any party party having no offices or financial inducements to offer its adherents stand up against such a combination? The leaders of the united labor party thought so, and they entered the contest cheerfully and with confidence. They knew that all that money, official power and ecclesiastical influence could do, would be done against them. They simply thought that our men could not be bought. They were mistaken.

Of course, aside from the socialists, there were votes in the 68,000 cast a year ago that needed no corruption fund to take them away from us. We had but one candidate then, and democrats and republicans could vote for him and still vote with their party. This year that was impossible, and many such, when an exciting contest came, were drawn back by party ties to their old place.

Furthermore, it is not to be denied that there are men quite influential with organized labor who look with jealousy and suspicion on any movement that draws workmen into it as individuals, and thus relaxes the power that the heads of their trade organizations have over them.

This influence was quietly exerted, and it unquestionably tended to make men ready to return to the old parties, and when on, and even before, election day they learned that such a course could be made profitable they hastened to sell their birthright—but not for a mess of pottage. Such

prices for votes were never before paid in this city as were paid last Tuesday.

Yet, after all this explanation, the result is astounding to all who have borne the heat of the battle. The organization was far more perfect than ever before. The active members of the party were enthusiastic and confident, and they went to the polls at sunrise on Tuesday fully expecting to hold their own. The result astonished them, and they are bitter against the deserters who betrayed their cause. A car driver said to the writer on Wednesday, "After the sale of their votes made yesterday by workingmen, I am almost ashamed to call myself a workingman."

But the defeat has apparently shaken no man's resolution. Everywhere the expression is one of determination to go on with the work without cessation, and the expression is general that now we know who are to be trusted and who not, and we will now rebuild on a firm foundation. And such will be the result. We had a year ago 68,000 men who cast their votes for a single candidate from a variety of reasons, though nominally standing on the Clarendon hall platform. Today we have 70,000 voters in the city and state who have voted for a principle and who will stand by that principle against any and all odds. Every man of them is a missionary, and all are preaching the doctrine on which a party of principle, capable of rejecting all corrupt inducements and proof against all efforts to divide it, can be based.

Let our friends not be cast down and let our enemies not lay to their souls the flattering unctious that in buying the labor vote they have destroyed the party that will rescue the producing class from the grip of monopoly in business and corruption in government. We have seen one kind of slavery abolished without help from its victims in the work, and we will, if need be, continue to make our appeal to the conscience and intelligence of men until they release the masses from industrial slavery, whether the bondsmen help break their own chains or not.

Happily we need not fear that it will go that far, for there are thousands of honest workingmen in shops and factories and on the street cars of New York who see the great truth for which we are fighting, who are sick at heart and ashamed at the venality of some of their companions, and who have enlisted for life in the new crusade. They will henceforth test all men by their devotion to our principles rather than by their occupation, and thus one effect of our defeat will be to broaden not only the scope and membership of our party, but to relieve it from all the influences and prejudices that have tended to confine its membership to a class. It is the outgrowth of organized labor, and it offers the only possible solution of the labor problem. It will forever be true to that, but it will welcome to its ranks all who join sincerely in achieving that object.

WILLIAM T. CROASDALE.

INDUSTRIAL PATHOLOGY.

When the channels of trade are anywhere obstructed congestion is inevitable; and when there is congestion an unhealthy condition is generated throughout the entire industrial system.

The obstruction that brings about those business depressions which occur with such regularity as to have marked them as periodical phenomena, is that which interferes with the free access of labor to land. Land being privately owned, mere laborers cannot go upon any land and work for themselves, for they are unable to pay the entrance fee; they must, therefore, burden themselves with a mortgage, or sell their labor for wages or for a share of the produce; and as the entrance fee to land rises, while laborers become more numerous, new applicants for an opportunity to labor must assume heavier mortgages or sell their labor for lower wages or accept a smaller share of their produce. If they take lower wages, the wages of all others tend downward, and the laborers' share of produce falls also. This is one of the first symptoms of congestion.

As wages fall the class that lives by wages economizes, partly from necessity and partly from prudence, while the unemployed class economizes wholly from necessity. Whatever the motive, the effect is the same on independent laborers. Their market being restricted, those that are mortgaged fall into bankruptcy, carrying with them many that are not mortgaged, and all who become hopelessly bankrupt enter into competition for work at wages with a class already greatly in excess of the demand for wage workers. Thus at once a greater downward pressure acts both upon wages and the profits of business, and, wages falling, markets still further contract and bankruptcy spreads. By this action and reaction consumptive power is persistently diminished.

Meanwhile, the laborer who is employed, producing as much as before but consuming less, makes a few rich, while a great majority is impoverished. And as the gap between poverty and riches widens, the smaller class acquires a dangerous power over the other.

The obvious remedy is to remove the obstruction that causes the congestion. If land ownership be abolished, mere laborers will find in every community land upon which they may go and work for themselves, without paying an entrance fee, and, consequently, without either burdening themselves with mortgages or selling their labor for wages or sharing their products with another. Given that opportunity, and the supply of men willing to

sell their labor will be continually below the demand, no matter how much population increases. This will not only prevent wages from falling, but will cause them to rise; and as wages rise there is less economy, and consequently brisker trade, not spasmodically, but persistently and increasingly.

This is not a quack cure-all, but a purge which, by removing obstructions and allowing nature to take its course, purifies the whole system.

And the single tax, so far from being itself a medicine for the diseases that afflict society, is but a method of administering the medicine. By taking land values alone for public use it appropriates for the community what the community creates, and leaves to the individual the full value of his products. This prevents the direct robbery of producers for the benefit of non-producers; and by making it unprofitable to keep land out of use, it makes an outlet for labor that, by destroying competition for opportunities to work, compels employers to pay what work is worth, and benefits business by enabling producers to increase their consumption.

LOUIS F. POST.

GOOD WORK IN BROOKLYN.

The vote in Brooklyn is most gratifying. The new party there was only organized a few months ago, and those engaged in the work encountered the most stubborn resistance from the men who sought to prevent any declaration of radical principles, and to keep the movement on the old lines of a labor party composed exclusively of wage workers held together by class prejudice and vainly protesting against evils for which they offered no adequate remedy. All such timid and foolish counsel was rejected, and the party started fully committed to the land doctrine.

It polled on Tuesday nearly 15,000 votes for the state ticket, which is proportionately a larger vote than that cast in this city on Tuesday. This vote is cast directly in behalf of the principles of the new party, and by men who have definitely severed their relations with the old parties. The nucleus is a most satisfying one, and as this vote is the first cast, the party in Brooklyn is jubilant over the remarkable work accomplished in so brief a time.

The voters of the new party are filled with determination, and the resolutions printed in another column show that they are already preparing for a renewal of the fight.

WHAT NOW?

Nothing but to go right on with indomitable persistence, dogged determination and unwavering confidence in the truth. We have made our struggle not for office nor success, but because it is right, and we could do no other. We must go on in the same manner. There was a time when Jesus was followed by crowds, who spread their garments and flowers before Him. There came a time when most of His followers left Him, but He calmly and courageously pursued His way—about His Father's business. Those for whom He labored were precisely those who forsook Him, but He labored on for them just the same. Just when the disciples thought He would become a king He was crucified. For the moment they were stunned, but His spirit by and by possessed them, and they came to themselves and went on as He had in His dark hours.

A year ago 68,000 men were with us in New York city. To-day there are less than 40,000. What then? We must go on precisely the same. There is nothing else to do. Our principle is just as right now as it was then. It is worth just as much prayer, effort and devotion as ever. If some have gone out from among us it is because they were not of us. There is all the more reason why the true believers should remain faithful and hopeful for the future.

It is as I have always known. Those who have reason and moral sense—who cannot be seduced or intimidated—are the hope of the new crusade. Let them not be discouraged nor grow timid. "Let not your hearts be troubled," God lives. Truth is. The time must come when money shall no longer control elections; when corrupt men shall no longer be chosen to misrule the people. That time can only come, however, when poverty and want shall not tempt men to sacrifice principle for present gain. Poverty, which we are striving to eradicate, was undoubtedly the main cause of our defeat. All the more reason why this monster should be abolished.

"Fear not, little flock. It is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." I am sure of it. Never was I, for one, in better heart. What must we do? Clear the decks for the next engagement. Rome was not built in a day. Slavery was not abolished in a year, and perhaps would not have been till now but for Bull Run.

It is useless to deny that we would not have been pleased with better results last Tuesday. But we did the best we could. It was an earnest campaign on the part of those who worked. We must just go on doing the best we can, and if the end comes not in our little day we must be content to build for those who come after us. If we may not live in a world uncurled by poverty, it is reward enough to help prepare such a world for others. But I believe some of us will yet live in such a world.

HUGH O. PENTECOST.

The Anti-poverty society of New York has engaged the Academy of Music and Steinway hall for to-morrow (Sunday) evening. The speakers will be Rev. Dr. McGlynn, Louis F. Post, W. J. Gorsuch and Henry George.

Last spring a gentleman bought a corner lot up town and built a flat house upon it. The house was occupied before it was

fairly finished, and the builder was so encouraged that he recently undertook to buy a neighboring lot for the same purpose; but the price of that lot had advanced \$5,000 in the intervening six months, and the builder is afraid that he cannot pay so much for a place on which to build and make a profit out of his contemplated building. The result is that the building is not erected, and there is less work for the building trades, while a fine lot that is wanted for use lies idle. And yet the owner of that lot, although he prevents improvement, pays no more taxes than formerly, while the builder pays a heavy tax on the building, which is a benefit in a thousand different ways to the people of New York. Verily, we tax houses as if they were a nuisance to be discouraged, and we exempt land values as if, instead of being a nuisance, they were a boon to the community.

A CORRECTION.

In the report of the meeting of the Church association for the advancement of the interests of labor, printed in THE STANDARD of Oct. 29, the following paragraph occurs:

Mr. Goodwin, chaplain at Governor's Island, said the platform was very like a political platform. He was opposed to the clergy engaging in any crusade in behalf of the laborer against the men who hold wealth. A great deal had been said in favor of Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn (applause), but he did not see much difference between communism and socialism, and was opposed to anything like a political handling of the subject. He thought they should take care to show that their body was not committed directly or indirectly to the principles of these men. He called upon Father Huntington to give a clear exposition of the labor platform.

With reference to this statement, the Rev. Mr. Goodwin writes us:

GOVERNOR'S ISLAND, Oct. 31.—In THE STANDARD, Saturday, Oct. 29, is a report of a meeting of clergymen at Calvary chapel, on Wednesday afternoon, in which certain remarks are said to have been made by me. I did not say a word of what is there attributed to me, nor did I mention the names of Mr. George, Dr. McGlynn or Mr. Huntington.

I beg that you will correct the statement in your next issue with as much publicity as was given to it in the first instance.

E. H. GOODWIN.

We insert Mr. Goodwin's letter with pleasure, regretting only that the unavoidable pressure upon our space prevented the publication of his letter in our last issue; and beg him to accept our apology for having unintentionally misrepresented him.

The explanation of the error is very simple. Our representative took a stenographic report of the remarks quoted, and was informed by a clergyman present that the speaker was Mr. Goodwin.

Landlordism in Washington Territory.

SEATTLE, W. T.—A deep interest is being aroused here in regard to the single tax reform; and the time is fast approaching when the citizens, not only of Seattle, but of all Washington Territory, will organize for concerted action to protect their interests against the land sharks, railroad companies and thieving lumber companies that infest Puget sound. Even now the evil influence of the land sharks is felt here by all classes. Having the land all fenced in, and population being rapidly on the increase, they demand enormous rates from intending settlers for the privilege of using the land, and under the circumstances they have but few purchasers; their building being retarded, they have been able during the past month to elevate house rents on an average of about five dollars a month. Nor is this the only evil; there is not a square foot of water frontage in this city that is not already monopolized by railroads. Free trade once in vogue, this city would undoubtedly be destined to become a great ship building place; but alas! there is now no place left for the ship to slide from the land into the water, so awkwardly are we hemmed in. But it remains with the people of this territory to say whether the railroads or corporations shall rob their cities of their natural advantages.

Last week I sent to Portland for seven copies of "Progress and Poverty," for all of which I had eager customers.

F. P. MORROW.

Why Kansas Farmers are Ready for the Truth.

LINCOLN, Kan.—Many a Kansas farmer has already embraced the land tax doctrine and there are more coming to it.

Men in Kansas who have gone through, or are now going through with the privations incident to pioneer life can be easily made to see that it was the monopoly of land that drove them away from the old settlements in the eastern states and out upon the bleak plains of the west, and they can be easily made to see that this same monopoly of land will soon drive their children, no one can tell whither.

In the course of my reading I think I have seen about every state in the Union mentioned as being the worst monopoly ridden state of the United States. I won't say Kansas is worse than other states in this respect, nor would I admit that others are worse off than Kansas. I guess, in fact, there is not much difference. Monopoly is riding rough shod the whole country over, and the world at large as for that matter. But there are certain details of monopoly manners in Kansas that strike right close about the Kansas farmer's living place and he is apt to be sensible of it. This puts him in a good humor to think, and hence he finds out something sometimes, as a man with a headache finds out. Hence in the Kansas farmer's market for "Progress and Poverty" and like literature.

W. M. A. GARRETSON.

Preaching the Kingdom of God at the Forge.

PERRY, Falls Co., Tex.—I have been working in the way that a poor man can for the last twelve months, and I dare to believe that I have made at least a thousand converts while I repaired their tools at my shop. I have talked almost as much as I have hammered, and sometimes more. I sometimes think I am one of the jacksmiths, for I am sometimes told by my neighbors that I will starve if I don't blow the bellows more and my anti-poverty horn less.

IRA J. MCCOLLUM.

An Open Letter to Bishop Huntington. Right Rev. T. D. Huntington, Bishop of Central New York:

RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR SIR—As a most interested listener at the meeting of Episcopal clergymen at Calvary chapel last Wednesday morning, I have thought that it might prove interesting to you and might serve for some good were I to give from the lay point of view a few ideas on the subjects then mentioned.

I, as you know, brought up under the highest Christian influences and with the example of one ever before me whose life was a living illustration of the truth and purity of the

divine pattern, early professed belief in the tenets of the Christian religion.

In my youth, and when a certain deeper sympathy with and feeling for humanity took possession of me, and by gradual growth, I did not, and I say it with sorrow, consider it altogether strange that I, by the same process, lost confidence in the church and found myself at variance with many of her teachings.

If my attitude was wrong, it is such statements as you gave utterance to at that meeting that make me aware of it and feel that I must have misunderstood the attitude of the church.

For it has seemed to me that success without much regard as to how it was attained has become a passport to respectability and position and influence in the church, as well as outside of it, and I know that success in life, under present conditions of society, has become almost wholly impossible to one who follows in spirit and in truth the religion that she is supposed to teach. And when I said that the tendencies of commercial life have become those to a certain degree of the church, I felt that it was not the worst that could be said. For it did seem that not only into the congregation and its government, but even into the pulpit, an essentially false and unrighteous standard had crept, and that the teachings of the meek and lowly Nazarene had been twisted and distorted until they became confounded with the worldly maxims of the greedy seekers after power, influence and wealth.

And I felt that the burning, living words of truth, as He uttered them, preached in our churches, many who to-day occupy the front seats would be absent, and the people whom He loved so well would come flocking again to hear them gladly.

Now, one of those who spoke at the meeting mentioned that among workingmen—the poorer workingmen—ministers were regarded with suspicion, and while even as he spoke I saw the hand of deprecation raised and the smile of satisfied indifference, as it seemed, here and there among the audience, I thought of Viterbi's great picture, and felt in my heart that the assertion was verified in me, and even fear that there was a yet stronger feeling against those who with an understanding for truth have ears but will not hear.

And while I, like nearly all workingmen, I believe, am eager to reverence and love any minister of Christ's gospel who strives to live in his life the unselfishness and single heartedness of the apostles of old, no man even in his name can be as a shepherd to me who has adopted the church for a living or who by her liberality enjoys wealth and ease in the midst of poverty, wretchedness and crime.

But as one by one the ministers of the church come forward to preach the old truths all unalloyed, I, with many another, turn again to her teachings and realize that she is, after all, the church of the poor and oppressed, even as she was eighteen hundred years ago.

And if, in the fearless discussion of the theories which are now advanced in regard to the holding of wealth we may learn the way to more perfect justice, is it not at once the duty of the ministers of the church, if not as ministers, at least as students and leaders of thought, and, as men, to follow the truth and to advocate and vote openly for the principles that establish it in our government? And how can they dare to preach the gospel of peace and good will among men, or hope to be heard when the struggle for existence is becoming every day fiercer and the rich prey upon the poor and the strong oppress the weak and charity is done out with a sparing hand to those who clamor only for free opportunities to work, and for their share of what the bounteous hand of God hath given freely to all the children of men? I remain, dear sir, very sincerely and respectfully, yours,

E. M. TALBOT.

New York, Oct. 31, 1887.

Let Them Do a Little Thinking on the Other Side of the Question.

HUTCHINSON, Kan., Oct. 22.—When I read the frivolous objections to our views constantly urged by our opponents and doubting Thomases, I often try to imagine what kind of objections might be urged against our present system of holding land if it was being advocated as a theory to a people accustomed to holding land in common and granting all equal rights to it.

One would prove that the proposed system would very soon deprive a large majority of the people of any share in or right to the gifts of nature, and that children in vast numbers would be born into the world with no rights to a place in it on which to place their feet.

Another would show that large numbers of citizens would be driven by it from rural pursuits to seek employment in the large cities, and that thousands of those would be unable to find employment, and would be driven to commit crimes, to turn robbers and young women would be driven to lives of shame, and that from these would be developed a large class in all the large cities who would be more degraded and brutalized than the most degraded people of heathen countries.

Another would show that under that system a few would become enormously rich while doing nothing, and that the majority would have to live in poverty, though working hard for sixteen hours daily.

Another would show that large tracts of valuable land would lie idle from age to age and grow thorns and thistles, while thousands of men would live in miserable and crowded tenement houses from six to ten stories high. He would show that rich men would drive the poor out of the country and change the happy homes of the people into deer parks.

Another would show that large numbers of young men in cities would be too poor to marry and become the heads of families, and that this fact would lead to the worst forms of vice.

All these and many other evils could be predicted from the adoption of our present system. Let those who are trying so hard to study up objections to the principles of the united labor party try, for a change, to see how easy it is to find objections to our present system of injustice. Let those who are so much afraid of confiscating all the lands of the poor without any compensation and for no other purpose than to enable a few to live at ease without work of any kind.

J. G. MALCOM.

Anti-Poverty in Philadelphia.

PHILADELPHIA.—The Anti-poverty society in Philadelphia held two meetings on Sunday evening, October 30, one at Knights of Labor hall, 806 Girard avenue, and the other at Wheatley Dramatic hall, 513 South Fifth street. Mr. A. H. Stephenson presided at the first named meeting, and Messrs. Wm. H. Johnson and Herman V. Hetzel made addresses, while the second meeting was presided over by Mr. H. C. Lippincott, and addresses were made by President Wm. J. Atkinson, Secretary J. Henry McIntyre and Mr. J. C. Frost. The meetings will be continued on Sunday nights at Knights of Labor hall. News from the towns on the Camden and Atlantic railroad between here and Riverton on the Delaware, shows that our cause is growing strong in south Jersey, while Mr. Frost and other good workers preach it in the Pennsylvania towns surrounding Philadelphia.

J. H. M.

USURY, CAPITAL AND LAND.

How to Prevent a Dearth of Capital, and How to Promote Productive Enterprises.

HONDO CITY, Tex., Oct. 28.—The heaven of the Georgian land tax is at work even in this region of cheap land and rapid development. In this country improved farms are assessed at \$10 an acre, unimproved land of equal or superior fertility, at \$2 an acre. This gross injustice is awakening intelligent farmers to the inequity of the prevailing tax system. Progressive stockmen also are getting disgusted with this premium on laziness. Such incisive facts, penetrating to the home affairs of every man, are the fine edge of "Georgism"—ever present, thanks to THE STANDARD and its traducers!

Yet to many persons here the land question seems of minor import. The ruinously high interests and discounts prevalent are the obvious drawbacks to trade and industry. Even the ablest and most liberal of our western journals, the Galveston News, looks askance at "Georgism," averring that free money is more useful to us than free land. To them, as to the old world socialists, the "single tax" seems wholly inadequate to relieve current economic distress, because it apparently ignores these interests and discounts. Mr. George's theory of interest traces that element in value arising from the appreciation of some properties—as wine—from ageing, and, by the competition of capital, extending to all properties used productively. This theory, at first reading, seems to justify our baneful interests and discounts, and to contemplate as its result their permanence and even their increase. Nevertheless, interest as described by Mr. George differs both in origin and effects from what we know to our cost by that name. They are a money tribute, and should never be confounded with interest strictly defined. Let us call them usury, for are they not paid for use? Interest, as defined by Mr. George, springs from the appreciative effects of time; usury, from abnormal difficulty in obtaining capital needed by trade. The former is a further utility, added by time, as value by labor, to things; the latter, like rent, is a drain upon the necessities of the producer. With the abrogation of land monopoly interest may like specifically land value, distribute itself in higher wages among producers; usury must disappear with the ownership of the soil.

Where capital abounds usury approaches the vanishing point. A capital dearth always coexists with high usury. This is but a phase of "the law of supply and demand." Scarce capital and high usury characterize sparsely settled, growing communities like the southwest. This does not indicate the immediate and total home consumption of each year's wealth product here. There is no dearth of savings, of "surplus values." On the contrary, with us the men lay by savings more regularly and more certainly than in more developed communities. The gift between labor and competence is narrower with us. Nevertheless, in the older communities their capital, "the accumulation of ages," is reproduced every few years from the savings of labor. A more effective cause of capital dearths and usury is the wealth devouring power of appreciating land monopoly. Here in Texas is the labor in abundance, the best of raw material and a splendid market for a thousand commodities, but the capital is wanting. So the labor is misemployed or idle, the material unused, and the market is stocked with high priced products from distant factories. Domestic savings yearly sink in land investments. Foreign savings invested here in enormous quantities are engulfed in the same abyss. The rationale is simple. Where population is growing and industry developing, land is a rising property. Other things begin dear and by an undulatory course become cheap. Land begins worthless, but each wave adds value to it. It is the best investment. This is true. Realizing 20 per cent annually on lands bought, or 12 to 15 per cent on land notes and mortgages (absolutely without risk), Texas investors seek no other "reward for their abstinence." All savings, all "surplus value" which should become capital, is locked up in land. Domestic enterprise, requiring such capital are with us impracticable. Even what capital is needed by our crude industry can be had only on the payment of ruinous usury. In older countries land—still the safest investment—may not be rapidly advancing in value or may be difficult to get hold of. There surplus values cannot to the same extent be sunk in real estate; and savings of each year remain to seek investment in productive enterprise as capital for a moderate return. Thus usury falls from 13 or 15 per cent in Texas to 3 or 4 per cent in New York and 2 per cent in Holland. It is not because the Texan cannot compete with the pauper labor of Europe and the eastern states that Texas is without factories. It is because our 20 per cent land speculators and land note shavers cannot compete with manufacturing capitalists realizing six to seven per cent in New England, or two to three per cent in old England. It is to sustain the big usury of the land speculator that our Texan consumers pay double freights on the most bulky manufactures of Europe and the east. So it is to enable citizen and foreign investors to buy liens on the labor of their children that the people of the whole country have been paying big prices for European wares, or giving a crew of shrewd money wise capitalists a virtual monopoly of the home market under cover of a tariff to protect labor.

Usury springs from a capital dearth, and capital dearth from land monopoly. Consequently the single tax, as it increases from year to year, emancipating trade and industry from one shackling tax after another, must abolish usury. Capital, then, must become plentiful, for the dragon which devours it shall be destroyed. All "surplus values" must then seek investment in productive enterprise or rot, and capital will be as plentiful and as cheap in Texas as in Belgium. Manufacturers will then spring up wherever labor, material and market are found, and the diversified industries, of which the reason having protectionists pride, will co-exist with living wages, and "worth" procuring a content yielding "wealth." J. THOMAS COOK, County surveyor Medina Co., Texas.

An Instance of How the Circulation of "The Standard" is Extending.

SAN JOSE, Cal.—Please acknowledge money order calling for \$2, \$1 to be applied to the recruiting fund and \$1 to the Dr. McGlynn fund. THE STANDARD's list of readers is increasing in number week by week. The paper is becoming a power on the Pacific coast and is planting the seed of the new crusade in good ground. Not long hence it will bring forth an abundant crop of earnest workers for the principle that the Creator intended this earth and all its bounties for all His creatures, without regard to race or color. The doctrine of the single tax is sure to triumph in the end. There are four places in San Jose where THE STANDARD is sold. At one of them the dealer, E. Davis, sold 150 copies last week and this week has ordered 140 copies. The other places are also selling quite a number of copies. The work goes bravely on.

L. N. GLAZE.

ABSURDITIES OF "PROTECTION."

Chapter IV of Protection or Free Trade? By Henry George.

To understand a thing it is often well to begin by looking at it, as it were, from the outside and observing its relations before examining it in detail. Let us do this with the protective theory.

Protection, as the term has come to signify a certain national policy, means the levying of duties upon imported commodities for the purpose of protecting from competition the home producers of such commodities. Protectionists contend that to secure the highest prosperity of each nation it should produce for itself everything it is capable of producing, and that to this end its home industries should be protected against the competition of foreign industries. They also contend (in the United States at least) that to enable workmen to obtain as high wages as possible they should be protected by tariff duties against the competition of goods produced in countries where wages are lower. Without disputing the correctness of this theory let us consider its larger relations.

The protective theory, it is to be observed, asserts a general law, as true in one country as in another. However protectionists in the United States may talk of "American protection" and "British free trade," protection is, and of necessity, must be, advocated as of universal application. American protectionists use the argument of foreign protectionists, and even where they complain that the protective policy of other countries is injurious to us, commend it as an example which we should follow. They contend that (at least up to a certain point in national development) protection is everywhere beneficial to a nation, and free trade everywhere injurious; that the prosperous nations have built up their prosperity by protection, and that all nations that would be prosperous must adopt that policy. And their arguments must be universal to have any plausibility, for it would be absurd to assert that a theory of national growth and prosperity applies to some countries and not to others.

Let me ask the reader who has hitherto accepted the protective theory to consider what its necessarily universal character involves. It is the realization of this that first led me to question that theory. I was for a number of years after I came of age a protectionist, or rather, I supposed I was for without real examination. I had accepted the belief, as in the first place we all accept our beliefs, on the authority of others. So far, however, as I thought at all on the subject, I was logical, and I well remember how when the Florida and Alabama were sinking American ships at sea, I thought their depredations, after all a good thing for the state in which I lived—California—since the increased risk and cost of ocean carriage in American ships (then the only way of bringing goods from the eastern states to California) would give to her infant industries something of that needed protection against the lower wages and better established industries of the eastern states which the federal constitution prevented her from securing by a state tariff. The full bearing of such notions never occurred to me till I happened to hear the protective theory expounded by an able man. As he urged that American industries must be protected from the competition of foreign countries, that we ought to work up our own raw materials and allow nothing to be imported that we could produce for ourselves, I began to realize that these propositions, if true, must be universally true, and that not only should every nation shut itself out from every other nation; not only should the various sections of every large country institute tariffs of their own to shelter their industries from the competition of other sections, but that the reason given why no people should obtain from abroad anything they might make at home, must apply as well to the family. It was this that led me to weigh arguments I had before accepted without real examination.

It seems to me impossible to consider the necessarily universal character of the protective theory without feeling it to be repugnant to moral perceptions and inconsistent with the simplicity and harmony which we everywhere discover in natural law. What should we think of human laws framed for the government of a people which would compel each family to keep constantly on their guard against every other family, to expend a large part of their time and labor in preventing exchanges with their neighbors, and to seek their own prosperity by opposing the natural efforts of other families to become prosperous? Yet the protective theory implies that laws such as these have been imposed by the Creator upon the families of men who tenant this earth. It implies that by virtue of social laws, as immutable as the physical laws, each nation must stand jealously on guard against every other nation, and erect artificial obstacles to national intercourse. It implies that a federation of mankind, such as that which prevents the establishment of tariffs between the states of the American Union, would be a disaster to the race, and that in an ideal world each nation would be protected from every other nation by a cordon of tax collectors, with their attendant spies and informers.

Such a theory might conform with that form of polytheism which assigned to each nation a separate and hostile God; but it is hard to reconcile it with the idea of the unity of the creative mind and the universality of the law. Imagine a Christian missionary expounding to a newly discovered people the sublime truths of the gospel of peace and love—the fatherhood of God; the brotherhood of man; the would condemn the interests of our neighbors equally with our own, and of doing to others as we would have them do to us. Could he, in the same breath, go on to declare that, by virtue of the laws of this same God, each nation, to prosper, must defend itself against all other nations by a protective tariff?

Religion and experience alike teach us that the highest good of each is to be sought in the good of others; that the true interests of men are harmonious, not antagonistic; that prosperity is the daughter of good will and peace; and that want and destruction follow enmity and strife. The protective theory, on the other hand, implies the opposition of national interests; that the gain of one people is the loss of others; that each must seek its own good by constant efforts to get advantage over others and to prevent others from getting advantage over it. It makes of nations rivals instead of co-operators; it incites a warfare of restrictions and prohibitions and searchings and seizures, which differs in weapons, but not in spirit, from that warfare which sinks ships and burns cities. Can we imagine the nations beating their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks and yet maintaining hostile tariffs?

No matter whether he call himself Christian or deist, or agnostic or atheist, who can look about him without seeing that want and suffering flow inevitably from selfishness, and that in any community the golden rule which teaches us to regard the interests of others as ourselves would bring not only peace, but plenty? It is not that want is true of individuals ceases to be true of nations—that in one sense the law of prosperity is the law of love; in the other that of

strife! On the contrary, universal history testifies that poverty, degradation and enslavement are the inevitable results of that spirit which leads nations to regard each other as rivals and enemies.

Every political truth must be a moral truth. Yet who can accept the protective theory as a moral truth?

A few months ago I found myself one night, with four other passengers, in the smoking car of a Pennsylvania limited express train traveling west. The conversation, beginning with fast trains, turned to fast steamers, and then to custom house experiences. One told how, coming from Europe with a trunk filled with presents for his wife, he had significantly said to the custom house inspector detailed to examine his trunks that he was in a hurry. "How much of a hurry?" said the officer. "Ten dollars' worth of a hurry," was the reply. The officer took a quick look through the trunk and remarked: "That's not much of a hurry for all this." "I gave him ten more," said the story teller, "and he chuckled the trunk."

Then another told how under similar circumstances he had placed a magnificent meerschaum pipe so that it would be the first thing seen on lifting the trunk lid, and when the officer admired it, had replied that it was his. The third said he simply put a greenback conspicuously in the first article of luggage; and the fourth told how his plan was to crumple up a note, and put it with his keys in the officer's hands.

Here were four reputable business men, as I afterward found them to be—one an iron worker, one a coal producer, and the other two manufacturers—men of at least average morality and patriotism, who not only thought it no harm to evade the tariff, but who made no scruple of the false or necessary, and returned with purchases which they smuggled through, even at the expense of a "custom house officer" and a greenback to the examining officer. Many of our largest under-valued smugglers have been men of the highest social and religious standing, who gave freely of their spoils to churches and benevolent societies. Not long ago a highly respected banker, an extremely religious man, who had probably neglected the precautions of his smoking car friends, was detected in the endeavor to smuggle through in his luggage (which he had of course taken a "custom house oath" did not contain anything dutiable) a lot of very valuable presents to a church.

Conscientious men will (until they get used to them) shrink from false oaths, from bribery, or from other means necessary to evade a tariff, but even of believers in protection are there any who really think such evasions wrong in themselves? What theoretical protectionist is there, who, if no one was watching him, would scruple to carry a box of cigars or a dress pattern, or anything else that could be carried, across a steamer wharf or across Niagara bridge? And why should he scruple to carry such things across a wharf, a river, or an imaginary line, since once inside the custom house frontier no one would object to his carrying them thousands of miles?

That unscrupulous men, for their own private advantage, break laws intended for the general good proves nothing; but that no one really feels smuggling to be wrong proves a good deal. Whether we hold the basis of moral ideas to be intuitive or utilitarian, it will be the fact that protection thus lacks the support of the moral sentiment inconsistent with the idea that tariffs are necessary to the well being and progress of mankind! If, as is held by some, moral perceptions are implanted in our nature as a means whereby our conduct may be instinctively guided in such way as to conduce to the general well being, how is it, if the Creator has ordained that man should prosper by protective tariffs, that the moral sense takes no cognizance of such a law? If, as others hold, what we call moral perceptions be the result of general experience of what conduces to the common good, how is it that the beneficial effects of protection have not developed moral recognition?

To make that a crime by statute which is no crime in morals is inevitably to destroy respect for law; to resort to oaths to prevent men from doing what they feel injured no one is to weaken the sanctity of oaths. Corruption, evasion and false swearing are inseparable from tariffs. Can that be good of which these are the fruits? A system which requires subterfuge and searching, such as that of the Amity to witness the contents of every box, bundle and package—a system which always has provoked, and in the nature of man always must provoke, corruption and fraud—can it be necessary to the prosperity and progress of mankind?

Consider, moreover, how sharply this theory of protection conflicts with common experience and habits of thought. Who would think of recommending a site for a proposed city or a new colony because it was very difficult to get at? Yet, if the protective theory be true, this would really be an advantage. Who would regard piracy as a crime of civilization? Yet a discriminating pirate, who would confine his seizures to goods which might be produced in the country to which they were being carried, would be as beneficial to that country as a tariff.

Whether protectionists or free traders, we all hear with interest and pleasure of improvements in transportation by water or land, we are all disposed to regard the opening of canals, the building of railways, the deepening of harbors, the improvement of steamships as beneficial. But if such things are beneficial, how can tariffs be beneficial? The effect of such things is to lessen the cost of transporting commodities; the effect of tariffs is to increase it. If the protective theory be true, every improvement that cheapens the carriage of goods between countries and countries is an injury to mankind; unless tariffs be concurrently increased.

The directness, the swiftness and the ease with which birds cleave the air, naturally excite man's desire. His fancy has always given angels wings, and he has ever dreamed of a time when the power of traversing those unobstructed fields might also be his. That this triumph is within the power of human ingenuity, who in this age of marvels can doubt? And who would not hail with delight the news that invention had at last brought to realization the dream of ages, and made navigation of the atmosphere as practicable as navigation of the ocean? Yet if the protective theory be true, this mastery of another element would be a misfortune to mankind. For would not protectionists insist that every island town and village, every road of ground on the whole earth's surface, would at once become a port of an embracing ocean, and the only way in which any people could continue to enjoy the bless-

ings of protection would be to roof their country in.

It is not only improvements in transportation that are antagonistic to protection, but all labor-saving invention and discovery. The utilization of natural gas bids fair to lessen the demand for native coal far more than could the free importation of foreign coal. Borings in central New York have recently revealed vast beds of pure salt, the working of which will destroy the industry of salt making, to encourage which we impose a duty on foreign salt. We maintain a tariff for the avowed purpose of keeping out the products of cheap foreign labor; yet machines are daily invented that produce goods cheaper than the cheapest foreign labor. Clearly the only consistent protectionism is that of China, which would not only prohibit foreign commerce, but forbid the introduction of labor-saving machinery.

The aim of protection, in short, is to prevent the bringing into a country of things in themselves useful and valuable, in order to compel the making of such things. But what all mankind in the individual affairs of every day life regard as to be desired is not the making of things, but the possession of things.

No Cause for Regret, but Much for Work.

JERSEY CITY, Nov. 9.—I read, with tears in my eyes, the sad news this morning—sad beyond expression to see a people so sunk in corruption as to rivet their own chains and to condemn their children to a life of the worst slavery the world has ever seen. No, sir, it was not a Bull Run. Bull Run was a blunder; this defeat is a crime. Yet methinks I see the wonderful hand of God in this thing. The black cloud that is seen in the distance by reflective minds is gathering strength and size, and will burst in terrific fury in the shape of the worst ban the world has seen. Supposing all had gone well last year and this, and our party had full swing. The cry would have gone up that we had caused the panic which no power can avert. Then, when men are being the dust in their misery, the thought will come home to them of their perfidy and wickedness, and they will curse their own treachery, and amid repentance and misery, rally once again to the flag they have so ignominiously deserted. They have sinned with their eyes open, and your hereafter labors for the time of no avail. Hereafter seems hopeless. Until the cup of human misery and degradation is drained to its last dregs, then, not till then, will the voice of God be heard in men's hearts. In the meantime, the just suffer with the unjust. When the storm has passed and men raise their quivering bodies better times will come in the shape of hope and strength begot of purifying influences, and the grand army will once more take the field to win the great battle against human wrong and injustice, and its victory will echo to the furthest corner of the earth.

In the meantime all true men must be patient and faithful unto death, and though they live not to see the day, they may yet leave the comforting assurance that their children will, God bless you and keep you for the great work.

WILLIAM SAUL.

Learn to Labor and to Wait.

NOVEMBER 9.—Inclosed please find check for \$10. to be used for campaign purposes of 1888. I am exceedingly anxious to be counted among the advance guard as color bearer in the cross of our new crusade.

At the battle of Waterloo, one of Napoleon's men, having his arm shattered by a cannon ball, and wrenching it off with the other, threw it up in the air, exclaiming "Vive la Empereur!" The loyalty of that brave man was not more to be depended on than the 37,000 of yesterday who, against an overwhelming array of corruption and a virulent and traducing press, boldly declared their unflinching determination to stand by their colors till victory crowned their efforts.

If we have to furnish the corpse on Sunday night next at the Academy of Music, it will be the most lively one ever furnished at a wake.

With reassurance of loyalty to the great cause in which we are engaged, I am, yours in the faith,

GEORGE WILSON.

Anti-poverty society, 358.

Ohio Waiting for a Signal from New York.

CINCINNATI, O.—Newport, Ky., has organized, and on the same day Willoughby, Ohio, at the largest and most enthusiastic meeting since war times, organized a very large club. Our number of organized clubs is now in both states, and the number of places ready to organize after the November elections would make a considerable list. They are scattered like beacon fires along the west. Union labor men are giving us their sympathy. Farmers are being reached and convinced. The flax is smoking and will not be quenched. The quiet in which we await the signal from the Empire state is not born of apathy nor weakness. The land reform men of Ohio are infused with the assurance of certain ultimate success.

CHARLES H. FITCH.

Acting secretary Land and labor club No. 1, Ohio.

Only the Beginning of the Conflict.

BROOKLYN, Nov. 9.—Now for one day of rest after the battle. If all good men and women are not saddened rather than rejoiced by the victory of corruption in New York city, by the defeat of principle and patriotism, justice and humanity, then, alas! for their patriotism.

But justice is eternal, and truth, though for the moment overborne by error, shall triumph; she always has, she always will, because truth is truth as God is God, and her votaries know not defeat.

In the apt simile of the grand leader of our ticket, "This is not Waterloo—it is Bull Run!"

And the best evidence of the peridy in New York city is the magnificent first vote of Brooklyn for equal justice—for the principles, not the men, of the union labor party.

E. STILLMAN DOUBLEDAY.

Nothing Can Stop the Agitation.

NEW YORK CITY, Nov. 9.—Don't give up the fight! Thirty-seven thousand men know what they voted for yesterday, and are ready to begin an aggressive campaign to-morrow. If the leaders will only keep courage there is an earnest host of determined men ready to follow.

There is a deep conviction among us that the single land tax is destined at an early date to remedy the bottom economic evil, and nothing can keep us from agitating the question.

E. D. BRINKERHOFF.

All Canadians Who Believe in the Doctrine of the Single Tax Should Act on This.

TORONTO, Nov. 7.—We are not idle here. Canadian political parties are undergoing a change, and each is sadly in need of a policy. The question of municipal land taxation will be thoroughly discussed at the coming sessions of the provincial legislatures. By advising all societies and individuals in Canada advocating a single land value tax to correspond with us, you will assist us in the formation of a permanent organization and enable us to give the question prominent place in C. A. politics. Respectfully yours,

S. T. WILSON.

Secretary Anti-poverty society. Address 85 Shuter street, Toronto.

THE RESULT.

The result of Tuesday's election in this city was a sweeping victory for the democratic party, the reduction of the so-called labor vote to the number of those who, to use Judge Maguire's amusing story, "have seen the cat," and the reduction of the republican vote to a figure that fills the party leaders with despair.

The result is regarded by politicians as definitely settling the conditions of next year's presidential campaign. Tuesday's election was, in fact, made the first battle of that campaign, and all the political power of the federal, state and municipal governments, backed by an enormous corruption fund, was thrown into the contest in this city. The effort succeeded and New York is now accounted as safe for the democratic candidates next year. This, it is thought, assures the renomination and re-election of President Cleveland and puts the republican party in a predicament that will prevent Mr. Blaine from desiring its nomination next year and make the party shy of tendering the nomination, even if Mr. Blaine did desire it.

The vote for the new party in this city was cut up in a fashion that is not indicated in the returns. A number of men who voted the union labor ticket scratched Mr. George and voted for no one for secretary of state, but, on the other hand, many who voted the democratic or republican ticket voted for George in place of Cook or Grant, and thus put the head of our ticket above the other candidates. The latest unofficial figures for this city are as follows:

Cook, democrat 110,781
Grant, republican 57,900
George, union labor 37,316
Hall, socialist 4,820
Huntington, prohibitionist 1,408

The vote in this city for other candidates of the union labor party was as follows:
Wildor, for state comptroller 36,329
Post, for district attorney 32,932
Doody, for city comptroller 34,028
McCabe, for board of aldermen 32,132
Mayer, for coroner 31,423
Tucker, for surrogate 33,375
Leubuscher, for judge general sessions 34,227

The corrected figures for the other judicial candidates have not yet been published.

The Herald's latest unofficial figures on Thursday for the whole state were as follows:

County.	Grant.	Cook.	George.	U. L.	Pro.
Albany	15,347	17,457	1,500	700	
Allegany	5,881	3,481	100	2,150	
Broome	6,479	3,838	304	1,006	
Cattaraugus	6,479	4,400	450	1,026	
Cayuga	6,621	3,949	495	1,027	
Chautauque	8,800	4,119	400	1,000	
Chemung	4,055	5,270	300	525	
Chenango	5,900	4,500	915	800	
Clinton	5,148	3,890	254	137	
Columbia	5,435	4,788	150	300	
Cortland	3,980	2,485	225	200	
Delaware	5,307	4,375	60	925	
Dutchess	7,388	6,713	547	820	
Essex	23,794	22,029	1,000	950	
Franklin	3,700	2,200	75	200	
Fulton-Hamilton	4,189	2,314	50	94	
Hamilton	4,107	3,782	48	500	
Greene	2,722	2,772	28	480	
Greene	3,800	4,156	71	493	
Herkimer	6,018	5,507	800	300	
Jefferson	8,241	6,801	306	861	
Kings	46,292	56,270	14,962	2,267	
Lewis	3,543	3,243	40	300	
Livingston	4,406	4,392	100	550	
Madison	6,017	4,591	300	825	
Monroe	11,529	13,125	850	1,968	
Montgomery	4,568	5,149	200	221	
New York	57,800	110,781	37,316	1,479	
Niagara	5,029	5,029	140	945	
Oneida	12,354	11,854	800	900	
Oranada	15,234	10,111	397	825	
Otsego	4,025	3,070	200	400	
Orange	7,796	7,722	500	824	
Orleans	2,862	2,535	96	893	
Oswego	7,039	5,016	600	600	
Otsego	6,550	6,600	70	850	
Putnam	1,935	975	27	157	
Queens	7,382	8,898	1,796	314	
Rensselaer	10,749	13,034	1,077	1,023	
Richmond	2,421	3,759	521	322	
Rockland	1,985	2,574	219	328	
St. Lawrence	11,525	5,075	125	625	
Saratoga	6,708	5,759	400	656	
Schenectady	2,719	3,067	225	200	
Schoharie	4,575	3,015	300	450	
Schuyler	2,205	1,674	25	285	
Seneca	3,298	2,924	24	200	
Suffolk	9,905	8,305	400	1,680	
Sullivan	5,102	5,028	313	644	
Tioga	3,266	3,457	150	250	
Town	5,009	4,149	300	515	
Tompkins	4,371	3,471	80	180	
Ulster	8,833	9,133	607	600	
Warren	2,788	2,253	64	407	
Washington	5,533	5,235	100	586	
Wayne	3,796	4,496	115	725	
Westchester	8,858	10,012	1,601	997	
Wyoming	3,894	2,568	45	531	
Yates	2,800	1,800	75	1,325	
Totals	450,503	480,355	72,781	41,907	

Cook's plurality, 20,552.

RESULTS IN OTHER STATES.

In New Jersey senators and members of assembly were chosen and the republicans made notable gains that assure them the control of the legislature. The labor vote was apparently strong here and there where splits occurred in one or the other of the old parties.

The democrats won a sweeping victory in Virginia, that apparently eliminates Mahone from all further political calculation.

In Massachusetts the republicans have largely increased their plurality and have a majority of the whole vote east. The labor vote is insignificant.

In Maryland the democrats easily hold the state, and Senator Gorman is master of the situation.

The republicans have elected Foraker in Ohio. The union labor party polled 11,053 votes for its candidate for governor. In Cincinnati, where it had made a deal with the democrats, its vote on the legislative ticket was higher, though the returns show that the democrats cheated it.

The republicans hold Pennsylvania by a reduced majority.

Iowa remains republican by a plurality of but a few thousands, and the union labor vote for governor was between 9,000 and 10,000.

In Chicago the republicans and democrats united to support the re-election of Judge Gary, who sentenced the anarchists, and he received 50,084 votes against Black, the anarchists' counsel, nominated by the socialists, who received but 6,258 votes.

The Worcester Land and Labor Club.

In Worcester, Mass., the tenth land and labor club of that state has been organized. In an address delivered recently by its president, Hon. Thomas J. Hastings, some interesting statements were made relative to what would be the effects of the tax on land values in Massachusetts. Mr. Hastings said:

"The Old South church site is an instance in point. The land was worth nothing when it was given to the parish; now it has been appraised at \$148,400. The church did nothing to cause this increase. The value was created by the increase of population, and the money must belong to the people rather than to the

church. This is the 'unearned increment.' In order to secure to the people their right to such land and to all land, it is proposed to tax it, say five or six per cent of its market or assessed value. . . . It would hardly be profitable to hold the land as a speculation if such high taxes were demanded. Refusal to pay taxes would be followed by the same consequences as at present. There are a good many land owners who would be willing to sell under such circumstances, and land would be cheap for the transfer would necessarily be made at a merely nominal price compared with present prices. This would be followed by a building boom which could be followed by no reaction, for there would be no fictitious or speculative land prices to fluctuate and fall." President Hastings estimated that ground rent in Worcester under a six per cent assessment on present valuations would amount to over \$1,200,000.

Growing Confidence in California.

SAN FRANCISCO.—We are having in this city an attempt at a moral revolution to put down the practice of bribing juries—a crime termed embezzlement. This crime has become so common as to alarm all good citizens, the more especially as the developments so far tend to throw a suspicion of collusion on a part of the judiciary and city officials whose affiliations with the political bosses are well known. What will be the outcome of the movement is still uncertain, but the vigorous ruling of the judge (Sullivan) before whom the trials take place, and rigid enforcement of legal precautions against the escape of the accused during the trial, gives hopes of a successful result.

The local press all join in condemning the crime, but, singularly, not one of them mentions a common crime from which the former primarily comes. This is the practice on the part of men of wealth in secreting personal property from the assessor or making undervalued statements under oath as to what such property they possess. This practice has grown to be very general among a certain class, some of whom are notoriously dishonest in making their statements to the assessor, and thus in time others, for self-protection, have to follow suit in a greater or less degree. The sanctity of an oath being destroyed, other and greater crimes follow. Were the direct tax levied on land, this system of perjury would cease, and land could not be concealed nor its value taken on owners' sworn statements alone.

H. D. D.

An Address Delivered Before the Anti-Poverty Society in Boston, Sunday October 23d, 1887, by Robertson James of Concord, Mass.

that something has been proved. When we are told that rent is not onerous because a man, woman and child need only pay \$8 per annum for it in this country, what sort of proof will this be when carried to the wretches who are tenants of poverty flat, with for the privilege of rotting in their filth, a compelled each to pay \$8 a month for a room. Statistics deal with numerals, and those who believe in the use of figures will tell us wealth in round or twist figures; they are firm and definite. Sentiment may be pleasant, to say, but it is not fact; they want history. Right, I accept that, and point them to a tale of statistics, the definiteness of which puts the bluish middest dream of perfection in numbers which the statistician has ever had. If they insist that numerals tell, here are 5 units concerning which there is no average or estimates or percentages. There is nothing abstract here. It is a living tale of statistics before whom the mere school man, and the professor and paper writer, must bow. Wealth, as it thinks of the rotten foundation on which our civilization rests. In that compilation known as the census, which is triumphantly pointed to as definite, and from which there is no appeal, I find no mention of this half hundred outcasts. No, their existence has been forgotten in those majestic averages and percentages which delude the eye, and the hoarse voice of famine and disease is drowned in the metallic clamor of the census as it sounds with shams of millions and of billions. Well, to proceed. By estimates of food for the body, and of the use of the body, there are forces at work in determining of economic situation at any given time which statistics wholly ignore. I can find no compilation of figures which tell of the number of men unemployed, either from lack of work or from sickness during any given year, a most important omission, it seems to me. Experts in figures draw entirely different conclusions from the same set of figures. Professor Harris finds that the ground rent per capita in the United States amounts to only one-eighth of the average annual product, and Mr. Edwards finds that it amounts to only one twenty-fifth. Against last winter, before the labor lull, Mr. Atkinson demonstrated that labor received ninety per cent of the product of manufacturing, but accepting his basic figures, Mr. Thomas G. Shearman and Brooklyn proves conclusively that labor cannot possibly find a return from manufacturers of more than fifty per cent. Now, in view of the elasticity of figures, I think the sensible people who care about definite knowledge will forsake these clouds of arithmetic and equations and come down to earth for their facts.

Professor Harris seems to assume that the benefit of rent is equally distributed. I do not see it. Rent is not a certain population being a given rent. Rent is a beneficent tax. I see nothing extortionate in this tax. I reply that wind is also beneficent, but in the commerce of the world stands still, and by the hurricane vast sums of wealth are extinguished. No one complains that land gets its share, but if there is a vicious force work called monopoly which gives to labor more than its share, then capital and labor must suffer. There is no statistic knowledge about the force of monopoly. It is because we have never estimated it before that we are so ignorant of its force. The exactions. Professor Harris says, "If the sum which we pay for ground rent, namely, one-eighth of the annual product, should be regarded as making any great difference in the wages of the poor, it is certain that grain of thrift or economy will much more than compensate for it." That sounds like a fair statement, does it not? Let us analyze. It pretends to state a fact, but it is as false from fact as east is from the west. It simply assumes what is not the case, namely, that the burden of rent and benefit of income are equally distributed. It is like saying, "The world is a beautiful picture, and let this be the picture." Here is a beautiful valley well-stocked with herbage and furnished with shade, and the little lambs disport themselves therein, and the placid cow suckle her calf, and the tame fowl build their nests. Behold, how sweet is this assurance that all the inhabitants of the valley shall find nourishment and shade therein. The grass will grow and leaves which never fade will shelter them from the sun and rain." Here the picture is torn to shreds, and we are left with no worked nothing. But he has overlooked a important fact—that all animals are not tame. He has forgotten to mention the presence of tiger, and wolf, and bear, and hawk, and eagle. No happy valley is without them, and they circumscribe the space in which the gentle animals can graze and feed secure, and the result is that many lead precarious existence. If the tame animals should complain, would it alter the situation to show them a beautiful colored chart exhibiting the total acreage, and showing that the animals are ample in its ability to feed and house them?

Professor Harris says he has found the cause of Mr. George's error. In saying that he has the ear of the social science association, a national organization. Well, we shall all be glad—those of us who have been awaiting an assiduous study of the question with a view to exposing Mr. George's fallacy. I say now our opportunity has come—that which we have been deiving for Professor Harris has found. Let us see what it is. quote now verbatim from his statements. "Mr. George in the first half of his 'Progress and Poverty,' he discovers that there is an account made of the difference between land used for agriculture and land used for building, and that the former is overvalued from demanding high prices by competition with suburban agricultural lands. The rapid transit of the railroad produces the competition, offering to the laborer in the city a better position and a good wage in the city farm, in a beautiful place. On the other hand, capital in the form of cheap transportation keeps down the price of farming land on the Atlantic coast by bringing into competition with the suburban lands of the city. Mr. Atkinson has shown us that today's work on the eastern laborer will pay for the transportation from the far west of all the meat he can bread he consumes in one year. Under this competition with a good wage in the city, the value of farms in the older sections of the United States, in those localities removed a distance of three miles or more from a railroad station. Capital has its hand on the throat of Mr. George's property, contrary to the view of Mr. George, and it is this that has the advantage over capital and labor."

Professor Harris says Mr. George makes no account of difference between agricultural land and that used for building sites. He loses here in his terminology. Every farmer has a building site. I suppose he means between agricultural and city land. Let us

sume it. Why should Mr. George or any one else make such a discrimination? Land in the country is subject to the same law of rent that pertains to city land. He is getting so close to the mountain called land that he only sees it in detail. He must look at all land. He is trying to show that rent is an extortion or an exorbitant price because of the uncertainty of the future, because cheap land is so valuable, land from bleeding the poor man. To do that he must show that the poor man has access to cheap land. If the poor man has not access to cheap land, cheap land falls out of the problem, and the professor's argument falls to the ground. The laborer has not access to cheap land; therefore cheap land does not compete with city land, as he asserts. That is my answer! Why does not cheap land not keep down prices of city land? Because it is not near enough. The laborer must live near his work. Let us see what the facts are. His work is near him, and, if, for the laborer to claim that he has not asked to walk more than two miles between his home and his work? That means that he shall only walk four miles daily. I ask does land in the suburbs compete with land in Boston to such an extent as to allow that laborer to buy a lot for any such sum as the laborer is able to pay? I reply no, that it does not. The center of value of land in Boston is say, at the state house. Now, draw circles about it, a half mile between each circle. On the circumference of the fourth circle you will find the facts that are going to show the laborer can after years of struggle possibly contemplate buying. There he settles and trudges home wearily after a day's work to avoid car fare. He may reach it at 8 p. m., and in order to get to work must take his breakfast at 5 a. m. Practically then, what has Arlington or Medford or Somerville or Cambridge land done for him? Professor Harris has forgotten two most important factors in his calculation, and those are time and distance, for both mean money. If the workman limits his day to eight hours, so that he may use two hours in walking to and from his work, he is just so much poorer. He will find that the vacant lot upon which he has conferred value, but he may not even dare to think of owning one of them or renting one. No, the owners of these lots will presently buy more vacant lots on the circumference of the fourth circle. What happens? Here is A. B., a mechanic of twenty-one, who to-day is starting out to lay up money. In ten years, with good luck, he proposes to lay up enough to make a partial payment on one in the neighborhood of our friend, the first laborer, who has just purchased a lot. Ten years hence A. B. goes out with the money in his pocket to get his lot. What does he find? A fifteen-cent piece. He has bought a lot, but he can find a lot within his means, he has had to walk four or five miles or reduces his wages by paying a railway to carry him and all he buys. He comes back sorrowful, poor man, and cannot understand it. But a minute's reflection will instruct him. While he has been saving, land has been accumulating in value far in excess of his capacity to save. When he began to save, ten years ago, the owner of vacant lots concluded also to buy more of them, and has taken up all those in the neighborhood where the first mechanic bought. The speculator has been buying, and working in his favor, which A. B. has not thought of. All the emigration from foreign countries which applies itself to industry in Boston has been working for the land speculator's benefit. Also all population previously existing. A. B., poor soul, has himself been working to increase the value of the land held by the speculator for ten whole years. Professor Harris's statement that land in the suburbs prevents the land in the city from demanding high prices is seen to be unfounded.

"On the other hand, capital in the form of cheap transportation keeps down the price of farming land on the Atlantic coast by bringing into competition with it the border lands of the west, and thereby it is seen. This statement seems to change something, as it will observe, and there is its danger. People who don't think would read or hear this, and believe that somehow the condition of all land is changed. But you will see that it has not. The value of all land remains as before. All land is benefited by railways. If eastern land is made poorer, as Professor Harris says, western land is made richer, a fact which he omits to state. You see, statements like these are designed to show that capital in the shape of railways has got its hand on the throat of land. Professor Harris says that such is the case, and his reasoning is so transparent that it defeats itself. Capital in the shape of railways has its hand on the throat of land, how comes it that owning land in a wilderness makes you a millionaire from the moment capital builds a railway through it? How comes it that every man owning land either in the east or in the west is usually willing to pay a bonus to induce capital to build a railway contiguous to his land? It is with some such argument as this that people who do not think are beguiled into not reading Mr. George's claims.

Again, Professor Harris says the production of the United States has risen to forty cents per day for each inhabitant from an average of twenty-five cents per day in 1850. Further, he declares that each person in a gainful occupation could not live on less than \$750 per month were the total annual product divided among those in lucrative occupations. If one has the leisure for computations of this kind, of course it may be considered an innocent pursuit, but as to any light which such calculations throw on the needs of society as we daily see it, I am at a loss to know. The pursuit of figures seems to me to lead one around in a vicious circle which ignores the great fact of distribution. Professor Harris points out through the medium of the figures that the laborer of to-day is better off than the laborer of fifteen years ago to the extent of fifteen cents per day, but the truth of history has not been altered thereby. We may admit that the laborer gets it on paper, but does he get it in actuality? If the laborer of to-day is wealthier to the extent of fifteen cents per diem than he was in 1850, let me ask Professor Harris and any one else who believes in figures to explain this fact: In 1850 there was no such thing known as a tramp in the little town of Concord, where I live. People there—those who were then called paupers—Professor Harris in thinking our community, was one. It is almost a distinction to be a pauper in Concord. We have strictly an agricultural population. Manufactures are unknown; there are, therefore, no interruptions to industry. A superficial view of things there must lead one to suppose that the world was a paradise. But let me ask Professor Harris to explain this fact: In 1850 there was no such thing as a tramp in Concord. He says we are now fifteen cents richer every day than we were then. Now, I ask him to explain why, in the view of the law of wealth, we fed and lodged last year in that little town no less than 1,117 tramps? Human nature was the same in 1850 that it is in 1896, was it not? He will certainly not claim that there has been a deterioration in virtue to the extent of forty per cent in thirty-seven years. He must either admit this or admit that, although his wealth has increased, labor does not share in the increase.

Examining all the elements which contribute to the problem, Professor Harris now ex-

are different kinds of labor to see if one does not hurt another with this result. He says if some laborers get more than the average of \$34.80 per month, it is clear other laborers must get less. Now, what has this laborer gotten to do with the other laborer, who is not to be made to trade for another, if he admits that some labor suffers, then all labor suffers. He says that strikes in one trade agitation for higher pay deprives another trade (farming) from getting what it is due. One trade may sacrifice its wages for a short time by agitation. How does that reduce the farm hand's wages? He would have to admit that the effect of raising wages in manufacturing trades would also raise the wages of the laborer on land. Why? Because farm labor would seek higher pay by going into mills, making fewer laborers on farms, thus raising wages on farms. No, if it does not as Professor Harris says, it does is because strikes in higher trades throw men out of employment. This makes the 1,117 tramps seen in Concord in 1836. Some tramps want work and apply to the farmers for it. It is this which reduces the wage of farm labor. The man who cannot find work in a woolen mill takes to milking cows and doing chores for his board. Professor Harris is wrong in supposing that one branch of labor can lose or gain in wages without all other labor participating.

He has attempted to show that if labor suffers it suffers because one trade can rob another. Labor is like air as Paine body, it is not like blood has functions. If the blood exact more blood than their share to feed them the other organs will suffer, but only for a moment. In a healthy body the blood will flow to one organ in excess of that to another just long enough to repair waste. When that is done it distributes itself equitably to all organs. If carpenters get higher wages for awhile, wages, being the blood of trade, flow for a moment in excess to satisfy the disturbance made by striking carpenters. When the disturbance ends the blood distributes itself again to other trades or functions. If one function of trade could rob another, it would cease to be a function of trade. If the function permanently robbed would die. The lungs, keeping up a chronic demand for more than their share of blood, and taking it all from one other organ, like the liver, or for instance, the liver would die. Hence, if farm labor is permanently deprived of its employment, all farm labor would seek other employment, and there would ensue the extinction of farm labor.

Professor Harris considers the question-of thrift and economy. He says, "While we see multitudes of individuals around us rise from poverty to affluence by energy and economy practiced for twenty years, yet the great mass of men are content with a few more, but not much energy." To this I answer that the mass of men do practice economy; were it not so, the race would be wiped out in a year. If the world stopped working, accumulated wealth would feed us, perhaps, not even so long as that. By the economy of many hundred years, the race has stored up enough wealth to keep it alive, say, at the utmost, one year. If mankind were taken sick for one year, or even for only six months, the accumulations of centuries would be wiped out. Have the mass of men been any too well fed or lodged in the past or present? Will Professor Harris say that the mass of men have been prodigal? He says that men have been looking at isolated cases of thriftlessness, and attaches it to mankind. Economy has never made the mass of men rich, and never will do it. What little wealth has been accumulated has not come from this. Labor-saving machinery has brought it. Secrets of nature have been revealed to us through the inventor. In other words, nature is beginning to co-operate with man, relieving him from the necessity of manual labor more and more. Now, if the powers of these inventions which are destined to enrich all men are perverted and freed from all men, will the race be ruined? These powers are from God and are meant to be used to man—to not to one family like the Vanderbilts, who get a monopoly on electricity, or to one family like the Vanderbilts, who get a monopoly on steam. Mark me well here. I do not say that the Goulds and Vanderbilts have not performed a useful function, so far, in the advancement of civilization. The desire for wealth is a legitimate desire; so legitimate is it that it is for that reason that we want more of it, but for that reason that the sources of wealth shall not be locked up by a few in steam, in electricity, and so on. If the rich man can operate with all other men, then the race will be blessed. If he does not co-operate with all other men, then he is a nuisance. Machinery in the United States now does the work of two hundred and twenty millions of men and workers. Do the poor reap the fruit of this?

Again, Professor Harris says: "Free individuality of labor cannot be secured in our modern society without the principle of absolute property in land." It seems to me that is like saying that a fisherman can have no individuality of labor unless he has the ocean. I have seen the down Gloucester street I think that you will be convinced that laborers on the sea achieve a free individuality in their sphere of labor. Here is a city built up from labor on the sea. So free is the ocean that individuality of labor has an expansion nowhere else seen. These fishermen, or some of them, actually went to sea because their individuality of labor was crippled on the land. Professor Harris would escape a great deal of mystification if he would face the truth once or all, and that truth is this: Land is not property any more than the sea is property or than the elements of the atmosphere are property.

Professor Harris says abolish free ownership and you abolish the expression of man's innermost inclination and proclivity to realize the most valuable. "The owner of a leasehold—a man who rents—will be careful if he builds, to study how to build, so that in case the land passes away from his possession he may get the most for his building. Hence he adopts conventional style and there is no self-revelation in his work." Putting the thing into plain language, Professor Harris means that the man who rents will not build, but will always be afraid to build as his fancy dictates or fear that in selling he may not get back all the money he lays out. Now, as you see, this looks very plausible. I suppose there are some people who go to pieces on that rock more than on any other rock which is laid in the path of the new theory. It is only because they do not think. I ask of Professor Harris how the position of the lease holder is in any way changed from that of the land holder? The man who rents will build for his posterity just as the man built to-day for his owns the land. He will build, but he will not be debilitated. He will deed and deed, more, more and bequeath just as he does to-day. Even in theory he is as much the land owner as ever, because he owns the use of it, which he can all he ever had the right to own. He can deed and mortgage the use of it; he can will it to his children. The only change is his title. His title has been improved. He will obtain it now from the consent of all men instead of from one or a few, as is now the case.

Again, Professor Harris says: "With private property in land there is secured a province within which the individual becomes sovereign."

Why is a man, I ask, more sovereign on a farm which he has a deed than he would be on a farm which he rents? All that he can get out of it, in any event, is the use of it

He already pays rent to the nation for the privilege of using it. That rent consists in a tax now levied. The situation will be no less improved. He will pay a higher tax of his land and pay taxes on all other things of which he is now taxed. So, financially, he is just the same man. His tenure is unlimited now; it will be then. He can be just as sovereign as ever he was. The truth is that where few are sovereign now, many will be sovereign in time to come. Again, says Professor Harris: "When the individual obtains the perfect sovereignty over his own land, then the will of the community does not share with him nor subordinate him any longer." Professor Harris actually advances this proposition as showing the beneficent effect of private ownership in land. Here a master of private ownership, a gentleman, a woman is only to render to the community. In his knowledge he is as far from exhibiting this monstrous claim of what I can only call selfishness as a man very well can be. But I am answering him not in his private personal capacity, but as a teacher. He says that, as soon as a man becomes the absolute owner of land, then the community does not subordinate him any longer, "but re-enforces his own will." would have been absolutely impossible to have picked words which could more clearly express the awful wrong of private ownership in land. By them Professor Harris admits all that Henry George has said. As soon as a man absolutely owns land, from that moment the community does not share with him or subordinate him. Now, if this is so, with these words Professor Harris has unknown to himself, pulled down the whole fabric of that institution which we call absolute ownership of land. If there is any institution in America which prevents a man from sharing in the interest of the whole community, and releases a man from being subordinate to it, then that institution is a menace to the stability of the government, and must go. Professor Harris virtually says that under private ownership the community re-enforces the will of the man who alienates the land. That is the truth. We have done that, but no one will be blind enough to suppose that we are going to continue to do it. No, we decline hereafter to re-enforce the will of the man whom Professor Harris says does not share in the common interest, and is not subordinate to it.

Now we come down to what is called "unearned increment." If you own property which has a value beyond what it took to produce it, that value is what is called unearned increment. It is a value conferred upon it, not by the labor which creates it, but by something else. A house is simply labor which has gone into matter. It is labor stored up. Capital is labor stored up. Capital and labor are the same thing in this sense. The same may be said of a coat or a steamboat or any product of labor. If you could show that these articles could permanently retain some value beyond what it costs to produce them by labor, you could show that there is permanently attached to them what is called unearned increment. But you cannot show it. Some one will say it costs \$5 to manufacture a coat, but it sells for \$8. What is that added dollar? The answer is plain—it is still a part of the cost of producing the coat. The retail clothes' labor is paid by it, he brings it to the back of the store, he carries it to the exterior, he adds it in manufacturing the coat. If through a scarcity of coats, a high value is given them, it can be but temporary. Coats will quickly be made, and the value above their labor value will disappear. Unearned increment is a monopoly. The only thing to which unearned increment can permanently attach is a monopoly. Land cannot be produced by labor, and its value is a monopoly value. The value of the coat is itself—it is, in fact, concrete labor! The value of the land is not itself: it is only in the demand for its use, and this is the everlasting demand which we have here. The right to demand is not itself, but the right to demand. Do not be fooled by definitions! Definitions are only the scaffold we use to reach the truth with, and when the scaffold assumes to tell us that is the building, then we laugh at it.

A coat itself is value. The land itself is not value. The coat is value itself. Why? Because it is labor itself—labor stored up. You convert it into labor again when you pay a man with it for two days' digging. Then the labor stored up in the coat has assumed a new form, in a well, for example. Why is it so? Because the laborer has expended his labor. He is deemed to six dollars' worth of land, and he is compensated him, what happens? Don't you see that in doing that you are paying him more than six dollars! The transaction does not end with the sum of six dollars. That six dollars' worth of land is capable of producing, heavens knows how many thousands of dollars. Under it he may find a gold mine, a spouting well of oil or tons of coal. So we see that the coat is value itself and land is not value itself, but only the source of value. It appears that six dollars' worth of coat is the same as six dollars' worth of land, and it appears. Never forget that. When you pay a man with a coat, the transaction ends there: no one is hurt, it is an exchange of labor. But give a man an absolute deed of land and you are robbing God and man both. There is no value unearned attaching to labor. But value unearned attaches to land. The land cannot exert itself, consequently can give itself no value. Land only becomes valuable when man is present. A. B. buys a lot and builds on it and beautifies it. A. B. puts value upon the land, but gives none to the land. The land is the gift and arises from the demand for its use. Now, B. has also owned a hundred lots of vacant land. They are virgin soil. A mammoth city grows about them and makes them each worth \$50,000. How came this value? The land did not exert itself, neither did A. B. on the land. The value was conferred by the work of every one living in the city. Take away the city and A. B.'s hundred lots have no value. This value, then, of \$50,000 in each lot is called unearned increment. Now, Professor Harris says to confiscate what is called the unearned increment, and give the good luck and the good money outlay of labor and capital, and kill the goose that lays the golden egg. He kills the goose, a delusive one. The goose which laid the golden egg we do not kill because the goose did not exert itself to lay that egg. The land did not exert itself to make its unearned increment. If the land could exert itself like the goose, then his simile would be apt, but it cannot. If the goose claimed eggs which other fowls had laid, as the absolute landholders claim a value for their land which other men have made, then to confiscate the eggs and the land would be only to suffer the man who thinks he can appropriate the eggs which he has had no hand in producing.

Wages and Cost of Living in Toronto.
Toronto Globe.

One of the most valuable of all the Canadian official reports is the report of the Ontario bureau of industries on labor, wages and the cost of living in this province. Much labor has been gathered together, and the figures are trustworthy as such figures can possibly be. The report of 1896 has just been received. We are sorry to learn from it that the conditions of the workers are not much improved, and that while the cost of living has increased there has been no proportionate increase of wages. Indeed, in the wages

ward tendency for some years past. This attributed to the low price of agricultural produce and to the increasing application of labor saving machinery, and especially of the steam binder, to the operations of the farm. Except in 1884, however, the surplus of labor of this class was abundant, even in harvest time.

There was no material change in the condition of the wage-earners of the cities at the close of the summer, and the same place was not for the better on the whole. The total number of returns obtained was 27, and the total number of employes whose condition these describe was 19,236. The average wages of all classes for the month of October were, according to the reports of employers, was, for males over 16, \$9.90 per week. The average in 1885 was \$9.13. For female over 16, \$4.48; in 1885 it was \$4.37. Taking all the cities and towns together the average wages were, for males over 16, \$10.10 in 1884 and 58.13 in 1885; the average number of days' work was 255.17 in 1884 and 270.41 in 1885; the average rate of wages of all classes was \$372.29 in 1884 and \$381.58 in 1885; the average cost of living for each family was \$24.48 in 1884 and \$33.45 in 1885; the average surplus or savings was \$48.84 in 1884 and \$45.43 in 1886.

The amount which a prudent, careful man of family can save out of his earnings, after meeting all necessary expenses, is the best test of the country's prosperity and of the people's condition. The report deals with this matter very carefully. It is to be presumed that those who furnish the data from the report are intelligent and honest. Comparatively few of the wage earners take account of their incomes and outgoing. Those who can, it is reasonable to suppose, take care that no dollar is ever wasted of which they might have had the use. In the cities and towns named above. The aggregate savings of all these during the year was \$120,059. But this was only \$48.45 for each.

Out of the 2,344 only 1,061 who had families, were able to afford anything, even though in some cases the deficit was increased to some extent by the earnings of their wives and children. There were 2 men of family whose income was equal to the cost of living, and 384 whose income was less than the cost of living. The deficit was large, in some cases averaging \$90.33. Those who were so fortunate as to have a most constant employment, and whose families were small, were able to save a little better than the rest. In the case of the rest, however, the margin was on the average small, and might easily have been expended in a very moderate indulgence in those pleasures and comforts to which all may reasonably be deemed entitled. Those who from the nature of their employment, or from the necessity must deny to themselves and their families not only pleasures and comforts but cost money, but even some of the necessities of life, if they would keep out of debt.

The First Principles of a National Religion

The following extract from a letter from the Rev. J. O. S. Huntington of the Holy Cross mission, in this city, to the *London Church Reformer* deserves the attentive consideration of every Christian:

Here the movement has taken a distinctly political shape, and both the old parties in the political field have now to reckon with the new party which has sprung into the arena of politics the labor party. In the arena of politics the labor party is distinguished by its plainness and integrity, of unselfishness and religious enthusiasm long unknown there. The growth of faith, not merely in the correctness of principles or the honesty of motives, but in the wisdom and the beneficent assistance, is very wonderful. As a nation we present a strange spectacle to the student of history: we are a people without a religion. That is an anomaly. One feels that a change is necessary, and that the change must be a religious one. The religious movement, in its poverty meets one feels that the people as a mass are not only groping after, but grasping the first principles of a national religion—very simple principles, but thoroughly fundamental. The religious movement has created an audience of four thousand people in this greatest city of the New World near the close of the nineteenth century, hither breathlessly to the simple recitation of a few words of prayer, prayer, prayer. They come, on earth as it is heaven, and they break out into exclamations of thanksgiving and voices of joy; to see such an audience hail with cheer on cheer the declaration of the words of prayer, prayer, prayer. They say, "God, certainly makes one feel how good a host our blessed Lord's words have on the heart of men, and how sadly He must have been hidden from them by the errors and selfishness and cruelty of those who have borne Him out to the world. The last winter, when it happens, as last winter in Newark, N. J., that workmen in convention assembled his each mention of the word 'church,' and greet with wildest enthusiasm the name of Christ, and the words of prayer, prayer, prayer. They know where the divergence comes, and why it is the bride is not loved as her Lord. The common people heard Him gladly; if they do not love the church, it is because she is not like her spouse."

Here's a Paper That Thinks a Citizen Landlord is Affected by Sympathy for His Tenant's Welfare.

Chicago Herald.

In several states aliens are now prohibited ownership of real estate. Experience has demonstrated such holding detrimental to the welfare of the people. Public opinion, which to a certain extent affects the citizen in his attitude of such property, in the case of the alien is manifest. Hence, no personal acquaintance with his tenant, no sympathy for his welfare can affect him. The lands are worked for all they are worth and their fertility destroyed by such tenancies, for the object of the landlord is to get all the rent he can of the tenant to get all the profit he can during the lease.

Public policy demanded the legal abrogation of such tenancies. A corporation has been defined as a soulless entity, with a legal personality, but no moral personality. No individual can be held responsible. The only punishment society can visit upon it is the death penalty. For all those minor offenses for which individuals can be held and punished, the corporation is not responsible. It is incapable of sympathy with any one in its dealings. Public opinion can affect it only as some individual is generally recognized as its control and responsible morally for its actions. The corporation is a legal entity, but it is only in rare instances that any individual can be held for the reproof by public opinion. Morally speaking, whenever its charter is granted it is of necessity as alien and foreign to the people as the corporation itself. It can be any subject of Great Britain. If it purchases land it is never to use it for production, never to make its own ownership a liability to society. The purpose for which a land can be held is to be used to obtain legal possession of the more or less and to hold them out of market until at around its territory settlers have absorbed the lands in market, and when a society has been created, the land is to be used to create the energy and industry of others.

The same public policy that justifies the legal exclusion of the foreign landlord or land holder demands even more energetically the prohibition of corporate land holding.

What the "Evening Post" Has to Complain Of.

Down To.

Nashville American, Quoted in Evening Post.

(It Henry George's theory) is the old story of the man who came home and said to his wife: "Buddy, I've joined the lodge, and am going to have \$300 of my own." "And how will ye get it, Pat?" "Well, we're going to have a big society, and then make them divide all the money in the world equally between us. I'll do the talking and they'll do the work for us." "And when ye get yer \$300, Pat, ye'll keep yerself drunk and not work a lick till the money's gone." "Faith, an' I'll do that same, me darlin'." "And when it's all gone, ye'll go to the door and tell the laborer that Pat, scratching his head, 'frien will have another divide.'"

L
 har
 Gra
 trac
 he i
 con
 cit
 ent
 a h
 hen
 prie
 he l
 ents
 earl
 con
 was
 hav
 thr
 shly
 an
 owe
 ness
 in a
 em
 any
 thr
 com
 labo
 the
 of p
 firm
 bur
 G
 in h
 com
 fear
 her
 has
 don
 up t
 inst
 hap
 the
 Inde
 con
 feel
 as l
 J
 pow
 befo
 veit
 ceiv
 asso
 ever
 cent
 a m
 but
 thus
 visio
 is st
 time
 — it
 Gra
 and
 his o
 a he
 W
 for
 com
 cupi
 dail
 wil
 spee
 No
 the
 men
 anth
 out
 and
 stre
 west
 Fen
 broa
 stre
 pass
 one
 hap
 Amo
 the
 look
 for
 Gra
 peo
 crow
 will
 of a
 but
 or g
 opin
 been
 the i
 exce
 out
 stuff
 in th
 it fo
 bit t
 alive
 and
 wha
 att
 his l
 ing
 lying
 had
 had
 that
 prev
 and
 pap
 prin
 of
 let h
 in th
 grap
 quic
 an
 was
 Th
 this
 ing
 dler
 stea
 Sebl
 snap
 sold
 in De
 Fr
 in th
 life
 Thin
 only
 a da
 more
 in o
 day
 \$, b
 sadd
 was
 who
 ought

THE VIRTUES OF MR. JAMES GRAY.

Less than twenty years ago a young harness maker and saddler named James Gray was working at low wages at his trade in the East End of London. To-day he is living in the West End, secure in a competency, leading the life of a quiet club man and church member, and apparently oblivious of the fact that he ever did a hard day's work in his life. He is an honest man—he never illegally appropriated a dollar belonging to any one else; he has the reputation of having once been enterprising—he struck out for himself early in life, and gained a fortune as a consequence; he was industrious when it was necessary to be so—he could never have made his first business venture but through the fruits of his own toil. In his shy way, when drawn out of his shell by an acquaintance, he likes to say that he owes his fortune to the possession of business traits and Christian virtues. Though in all his life his bosom never swelled with emotion—his heart is too small to drive any considerable wave of warm blood through his frame—his pulse does throb comfortably when he reflects that his own labor and thrift have drawn him out of the quicksands of life in that borderland of pauperism, Stepney, and put him on firm social ground in semi-aristocratic Tyburn.

Gray had but two sources of solicitude in his earlier days—first, he feared to become a pauper in this life; second, he feared to become a tortured soul in the hereafter. The first fear his bank account has dismissed; the second is nowadays dormant, because he believes he has lived up to the injunctions of his church, which instruct him not to do many things, and, happily, being of a negative character, there is much that he has never done. Indeed, at times he finds himself mistily contemplating eternal judgment with the feeling that he has done as nearly nothing as lay in human capacity.

James Gray has very little imaginative power; his mental views do not bring up before him much of anything disconnected with his own experience. When he receives a new idea, which is but seldom, he associates it with one or other of the events of his past life. He is himself the center of a sphere that has the diameter of a mustard seed. He has been an actor in but few events out of the ordinary, and thus it is he is forever directing his mental vision to perhaps half a dozen scenes. He is surprised and pleased with himself every time he reviews these few mental pictures—it is so strange that he, cautious James Gray, was ever concerned in them at all, and, as he is the central figure of them, in his own eyes he takes on more the color of a hero as time moves on.

Well, so it is. James Gray is "fixed" for life—his money provides him bodily comfort, and all his faculties are fully occupied in arranging the little details of his daily life and in putting himself at peace with himself prospectively and retrospectively.

Now, I will tell you the few events in the life of James Gray on which his memory dwells so frequently and pleasantly. One day, soon after he had served out his apprenticeship, work was slack and he walked a long way through the streets of London. He wandered to the westward through Whitechapel road and Fenchurch street, and, keeping on in the broad ways, at last found himself in Fleet street looking at the great shops. As he passed along, stopping to gaze idly into one show window and then another, he happened to look into one in which American goods were displayed. Inside the shop he could see a crowd of people looking at articles arranged apparently for purposes of exhibition rather than sale. Gray entered the place with some other people, carried with the current of the crowd quite as much as directed by his own will. The exhibit drew forth expressions of admiration from many of the visitors, but Gray did not know enough about stones or grasses, or grains, or furs, to give any opinion. He looked on with a sober, not because he deemed it wise to do so, but for the reason that he had no thoughts at all, except a slight fear that he might be put out of the room into the street. A big stuffed animal labeled "grizzly bear" was in the display, and Gray stolidly gazed at it for a long while. He did think a little bit then. He thought that the bear when alive had been big enough to eat him up, and he put his fingers on its skin to see what kind of leather it would make. An attendant said "hands off," and Gray put his hands in his pockets and began thinking nothing again. The stuffed bear was lying on a rough wooden box, in which it had been packed. Part of a newspaper had been pasted on that side of the box that faced Gray. For awhile the crowd prevented him from making his way off, and his idle vision fell on the bit of newspaper. He could read easy reading in print, and fate directed his eyes to a column of "sized up" paragraphs. Fate further let him read a certain paragraph midway in the column. The contents of that paragraph made his heart beat several times quickly in succession, of which itself was an extraordinary event with him. This was what he read:

There is a great scarcity of saddlers in this city. Brown & McKisson, the enterprising proprietors of the Elephant corral saddlery and leather emporium, could give steady work to three more men, and Quirk & Stebbie are obliged to reject some of the snap jobs from the New Mexican mule trains. Saddlers may depend upon making \$5 a day in Denver.

Probably James Gray had more thoughts in the next five minutes than ever in his life, before and since. Saddlers scarce? Think of it, with hundreds of them idle or only half employed in London. Wages \$5 a day? What did \$5 mean? It must be more than a shilling, surely, for saddlers in overcrowded London made nearly 5s. a day. He had once known the value of a \$, but he could not now remember it. But saddlers were scarce somewhere. That was the point. If he could go to the place where that paper was printed he might get work. He read the paragraph

again. Some of it was Greek to him. "Elephant corral," "snap job," "Mexican mule trains." But—saddlers were scarce. He understood that.

Gray now summoned up courage and asked a question. He went humbly to the man who had spoken to him sharply for putting his fingers on the bear, begged his pardon for speaking to him at all, and said: "Ow much money, sir, is a big S with two strokes down it, sir?"

"Eh?"

"Why, sir, 'ere's a paper wot says a saddler can make five somethings a day somewhere."

"Oh! a saddler can make five dollars a day in Denver, I guess."

"Yessur; 'ow much is five dollars, sir? I fergit, sir."

"Well, it's just about a pound sterling."

Something seemed to strike James Gray so that it deprived him of his mind. Six pounds a week! Bountiful heaven!

The man whom he had spoken with took interest enough in him to wait for further questions. Denver, he informed Gray, was in Colorado. No, Colorado was not in Brazil. It was in the states, and the people there spoke English, not just as Gray did, but well enough to make him understand. There was no grave danger in Denver from the red Indians. The man then wrote directions on a slip of paper how to get to Denver, and tore the bit of newspaper off the bear's box and handed both to Gray.

For Gray had still been having another thought. Might he not go to the place where saddlers were scarce and he could make five somethings a day that would be six pounds a week? He walked homeward rapidly, for him—he managed to keep up with the east bound sidewalk procession.

The question whether he would not go to that far away place burdened his mind for three long months. He spoiled more material in that period than usual, which is a good deal to say, as he was a botch workman. He really had not much to consider in working out a determination to leave London. No one was dependent upon him, he had £20 in the savings funds, and no one cared a farthing whether he went, nor whether. The only person in London who would experience the slightest emotion at his departure would be the man who would inherit his bench in the shop. Yet the disposer of the fate of empires never traveled with problems of state in greater perplexity than did James Gray with the question whether he should throw up his job and go to Denver. The first half of the question was at last settled by an agency beyond his will. His employer walked along back of his horse one day and saw that Gray had spoiled more work than his day's labor would pay for. The "master," wrathful and regardless of the fortnight's warning act, seized hold of Gray and threw him out on the sidewalk. As he landed with a bump on the pavement he decided to go to Denver.

Soon after he went to Liverpool booked third class; he crossed the Atlantic ticketed steerage; he traveled to Cheyenne at immigrant rates; he sneaked to Denver along with what in their strange jargon the rough drivers termed a "bull" train. His long journey was made on less than a hundred dollars.

The very morning that the ox-train wound its way up along the South Platte river and into Blake street, Denver, Gray, providing himself with the newspaper slip that had been taken from the bear's box, sought out the Elephant corral. There he rapped at the stable office door, where he stood, hat in hand, and inquired for the Brown & McKisson saddlery.

"What do you want to know for?" said a man, a prosperous looking westerner, standing in the office.

"I want work, sir."

"What kind of work?"

"Him a saddler, sir."

"How much a week do you want?"

Gray wondered why the man asked, but he did not have spunk enough to say so. He answered:

"Twenty dollars, sir."

He thought saddlers might have become plenty in the past few months.

"Well," was the answer, "you come along and I'll try you."

They were about to start away when another man in the office spoke up.

"Hold on," he said to the first man. "You don't get this saddler so cheap. Do you know your business, Johnny Bull?"

"Fassably well, sir."

"Well, I'll give you twenty-five a week. Come with me."

"You can't take him from me," said the first man. "He's a beauty; he comes high; I must have him. Look here, Johnny, I'll give you thirty dollars a week and take you pig in a poke."

"Oh, you may corral him for a maverick," said the other man.

His new employer conducted Gray to a small saddlery near by, and that afternoon saw him astride a shop horse and pulling away at saddler's threads.

On the Saturday of his first full week James Gray drew in wages three times as much as any week had ever yielded him before. As he looked at his money, he felt that he, Gray, meritorious Gray, was realizing on his industry and enterprise, and he thought of the poor, inferior fellows he had left in London earning less than ten dollars a week—those men who had not the daring to throw up a job, and come to America.

Gray's self-approbation, however, was not permitted to develop unobstructedly. His employer, with western freedom, abundantly criticized his work. He called him sarcastically an artist, a prince among horse tailors, a toe-fingered seamstress, and many other unflattering names; but, as saddlers were still scarce, Gray was retained at work.

Gray took his London habits with him to Denver and stuck to them there. His board was the cheapest he could find. He wore his coarse English working clothes, except on Sundays. He kept his own company. His only recreation was a walk every evening out across the Larimer street bridge over Cherry creek to West Denver, where there was a brewery. There he sat and watched the Germans drink and dance. When people made up to him he talked a little through fear of being thought unsociable, but he never followed up any acquaintanceship. In the

shop the three or four other saddlers soon learned to leave him to himself. They said there was no blood or "music" in him, that he was sole leather clean through, head and all. One day when two of them were admiring the magnificence of the great snowy range of the Rockies as seen from Denver, one of them asked Gray what he thought of it. He said: "Why, there is a deal of snow on the mountains, sure enough, sir." He was made the butt of the trade. He was derisively known as "Tugs," the shop name for heavy traces, the of thickest leather being used in them.

But Gray was not to be hurt by raillery. He knew what it was to suffer from hunger and kicks, and mere words gave him no pain. He worked along steadily in his blundering way. What he lacked in skill he largely made up by a dog like faithfulness, being ever ready to take hold of any kind of work at any time. "Snap" jobs for the wagon trains sometimes kept him at work right along for twenty-four hours. The other men would not work so hard as that. They were independent. They looked on Gray as the product of conditions which they could not imagine would ever affect them. They tried to get out of him his views of the world, his notions about the right or wrong of things social and political. His opinions were few and befogged in conservatism. He said he had been taught by his catechism that he must be contented in that condition of life in which divine providence had placed him; that he ought always to be respectful to his master and thankful to him for providing work. He believed that if he offended the law, punishment would surely reach him; that the nobility and gentry were his betters, of course, and that he was nothing but a common workingman, and at home he had no business to presume to think of laws or rights, or anything of that kind, which in the old country was all settled by the magistrates and folks of the higher quality.

When Gray had been in Denver a year the care of his savings grew oppressive to him. He had put away almost a thousand dollars. He did not like to trust the banks. He was afraid to carry the money on his person. While he was in a state of obfuscation over this matter, his employer asked him one day if he had any money. Gray told him how much he had.

"Is that so?" said Brown. "It is nearly as much as I have myself. You fellows keep me poor paying you such big wages. Wait till the railroad gets here and I'll bet that wages tumble."

"Why, sir?" said Gray, not prompted by curiosity, but for something to say.

"Tramp jugs always follow the railroad. There'll be a pressure of population on your job then, Tugsy. But, say, I want to raise some cash. You know those open blocks along by Lawrence and H streets, over near the Catholic church. I own them. I'll sell them to you for a thousand dollars. Look at them and tell me what you think of 'em."

That evening Gray varied his walk by going a little distance south instead of to the brewery. He stood at the intersection of two streets and looked around at the four squared off open spaces about him. Walks, each formed of a single plank, had been laid down around them. There was no structure upon the lots. For that matter, nearly all the lots thereabout were open.

Gray thought if he bought the four open blocks that no robber could carry them off, as might be done with his pocket book. The bank might burst, too, if his money were in the lots, and he need not care. The land would draw no interest, but people said that after the railroad came it would be worth more money. Gray could not see what the railroad had to do with building lots, but he liked the thought that they could not be carried off. He could not tell, however, what decision he might arrive at. In truth, Gray only arrived at decisions on compulsion.

The next day employer Brown said to workman Gray that he was "busted." He had no money, and McKisson, his partner, never had had any. He would now sell the lots surely to somebody, and he must sell the shop for a song. Gray took a day off, sought out a lawyer who could tell him how, why and whether Brown owned the lots, and give him as buyer a piece of paper when he paid the thousand dollars which would define his right to them. He and Brown then met at the lawyer's office, and Gray took some certificates from the side of his boot leg, where he had sewed them up, which showed that he had deposited six hundred dollars in two banks, and then he drew four hundred in bills from a calfskin belt which he had made and wore around his waist. The wealth was passed over to Brown. Some papers were transferred in turn to Gray, which the lawyer said stood for the lots. The lawyer walked outside his office with Gray and asked him for fifty dollars fee, and Gray promised to pay it when he earned it. Then the man of law re-entered his office, and took a commission of fifty dollars from Brown for having negotiated the sale of his lots.

Brown saw Gray again during the day, and endeavored to sell him the shop, but Gray had no money, and refused to be enterprising enough to borrow on his lots. That night Brown, unexpectedly to his creditors, departed from Denver. The day following a swarm of them pounced upon his possessions, and in a week every article in the shop had been auctioned off. Gray was thus out of a job, and he found on looking around that work was rather dull. His lawyer told him that Brown's creditors were after the lots, but that he would undertake to defend all suits brought if Gray would give him half their value and some cash. Poor Gray almost wished he had never strayed away from Stepney.

But he managed in a little while to find work that brought him in about twenty dollars a week. For more than a year he stitched away, paying his landlady and his lawyer about all he made. The suits were ended by that time and his lawyer told him he now owned the undisputed title to but one of the four blocks. The law had somehow taken from him the other three. Gray calculated awhile and made it out that the fourth of 1,000 was 250, but he thought that his remaining lots ought to be worth a little more than \$250. The railroad had come to town and he had heard people talk of ground getting scarce

and increasing in price. He had imbibed a distrust of his lawyer and he had almost made up his mind to try to find out what his lots were worth from some one else, when one evening after work as he was walking around his vacant block and wondering how it was that the other three had come to get away from him he overheard two dresy men talking about real estate.

"Now, these blocks here," said one, "are bound to be right in the heart of the coming city. I would not sell them to-day if I owned them for two thousand dollars apiece. There is no telling what they will be worth in five years."

"Let us find out who owns them," said the other, "buy them and hold them on spec."

A few days later one of these two men called at the shop where Gray was working, and presenting his card, which showed him to be a real estate agent, talked about buying Gray's vacant block. He offered a thousand dollars for it. Gray had grown wondrous wise somehow, and answered that he hardly thought he would sell. He had decided to settle in Denver and would help build up the city by remaining a land holder.

Gray did stay in Denver for five years longer. And Denver real estate went up by leaps and bounds. Leadville's mines poured wealth into Denver that stuck to real estate. While an army of builders were extending the city as if by magic, there were many people who wondered that a certain block near the heart of the business district was covered with shanties. It was Gray's block. He had leased the ground to people whose trade could be conducted in the shanties. But at the expiration of their leases they could not afford to maintain their business with the higher rents he charged. Gray would not sell. His rents had paid his taxes and assessments and a good deal over. He would hold on, he thought, and lease again. He did so. Fine brick rows of business houses went up on his block, and they yielded him the income of a man of wealth. It was then he quit working at the bench and decided to live in England. His virtues had realized a fortune. He traveled homeward in Pullman cars and as a saloon passenger in a fine steamship.

Thus it is that Gray has a very fair establishment in Tyburn, is a member of a club that needs his subscriptions, is a respectable pew holder in a church whose rector speaks of him as an example of unpretentious merit to ambitious young men, and he is enabled bunglingly to tell stories about his career—of the time when employers bid against each other for the boon of his work, he was such an expert; of his business foresight when he, as a member of the Denver real estate exchange, provided a necessary element for its future population; of his tireless assistance in building up one of the most beautiful cities in the states; of his now reaping the rewards of the labor of his earlier years, living on the income of the wealth he then accumulated.

No sentiment connects James Gray with the scenes of his youth around Stepney and Wapping. He never goes to the East End to look at the old shop or to treat the old boys. He is pleased not to be bothered with such vulgar things. He is not very tolerant with the non-successful. Why cannot they do as he has done, display enterprise, courage, foresight, intelligence—in brief, the business virtues—and leave poverty behind them?

HAGAN DWEX.

Making Headway Faster than Any Other Principle for which Any Party is Contending.

From every state and territory come reports of recruits to the ranks of the "new crusade." The STANDARD, George's eight page weekly paper, published in New York and devoted to the new movement, is well edited and well printed, readable and instructive, has now a circulation throughout the entire land, as well as Europe, and is an established and growing power. Those who seek to ridicule the "George movement," or to tear at the skirts of that movement, either do not know anything about it, or do not realize how far along that movement is. While the newspapers—or some of them—are sneering because of their own failure to make headway, the principle of the single tax upon the rental value of land, and the new movement, is the main plank in the platform of the George party—it is making headway faster than any other principle for which any party is contending. The limit of this article will not permit me to enter into a discussion of the platform of the united labor party of New York, which is the platform of the George party, or the "anti-poverty" party, as it is called for lack of a better name. But the cardinal principle of that platform may be mentioned.

Thomas Jefferson, whose figure looms up in our history above all its types and times as the incarnation of genuine democracy, said: "The land belongs in usufruct to the living." We know of no better illustration of his meaning than may be found in the law of the use of water as it has developed under the decisions of the supreme court of California. Through all these decisions one central line of policy has been maintained, and along that line rights have been adjudicated; it is that the one indispensable test of title must be the power to use the land for a beneficial purpose. The California law is a beneficent purpose, and the California law is a beneficent purpose, and the California law is a beneficent purpose.

Lockouts—strikes—boycotts—are wrong and productive of nothing but disaster. If inequalities and evils of our system of things did not provoke men beyond endurance there would be no excuse for the man or the fellow men who would divide the wages for which a man may work or which a man may pay. And even as it is, such attempted dictation is not only ineffective in the long run, but of evil result. That the system of things which makes such things possible may be so made that they shall be and that the wages for which a man may work or which a man may pay, and such a purpose would seem to strike responsive chords in the breast of every true American.

The object of government—if it has an object—may be the maintenance of the worth cost—is to give to every individual the most possible opportunity to use his energies, abilities, faculties as he may please, without

SPECIAL FOR NOVEMBER.

THIS STYLE SUIT TO ORDER	\$13.50
TROUSERS	3.50
OVERCOATS	FROM 14.00



This style represents the Four-Button, Round Cornered, Straight Sack, popular for business wear, made with flaps on pockets, double stitched on the edge, three-eighths of an inch apart. For a man five feet eight inches, the average length is twenty-nine and a half inches.

Vest—Made single-breasted, no collar, and has four outside pockets.

Trousers—Good dressers are wearing them quite wide, but the majority prefer a medium width, say about

eighteen inches at knee and seventeen and a half inches at bottom. Style of pockets optional.

Samples and Self-Measurement Chart mailed on application. Please describe, as nearly as possible, what is desired, as we can only mail about a dozen samples.

BRAHAM'S,

212 BOWERY, NEW YORK.

supervision, control or unjust discrimination, so long as by such use he does not infringe upon the same right of his fellow man. This is the "theory" of Henry George, and all of it.

Well, If You Want the Telegraph System Nationalized Vote the United Labor Party Into Power.

Real Estate Record and Guide.

Jay Gould is at last supreme in telegraph matters. He has added the Baltimore and Ohio system to that of Western Union, and it is well known that the remaining land lines as well as the commercial cable will soon belong to the companies he represents and controls.

Let us try and realize the position Mr. Jay Gould occupies toward the community. He is practically the owner of the most indispensable agent of modern commerce. His hirelings have an exclusive monopoly of all the news of the world. The market quotations of all the exchanges must come through them. They are in possession of all the most secrets and of every telegraph message between private persons. Mr. Gould has it in his power to misquote the price of stocks, grain, provisions, cotton, petroleum—everything, in short, dealt in on the great trading marts of the world. He can make a fortune every day, if he so wills it, with impunity, for he could easily throw the responsibility of the false report on a drunken or dishonest employee.

This power over prices, this control of the entire telegraphic system of the country, would not be tolerated by any nation on earth for twenty-four hours, except alone the United States. Our people have so far made no protest against this handing over the entire telegraphic service of the country to the control of one man, and he one of the most objectionable personalities that has appeared in modern times. There need be no doubt as to the completeness of Mr. Gould's ownership of the telegraphic systems. There is not any, the slightest probability of our seeing another opposition to Western Union. All the companies which have entered that field have lost money, and the fools among capitalists willing to build new lines are about all dead; so the business and news of the country must remain subservient to Mr. Gould's Western Union for many long years.

It does not follow that rates will be raised inordinately for the recent sharp competition has taught the Western Union people how to make money with moderate charges. But undoubtedly the telegraph will be made a very profitable property and the shares of the company will command a high market value.

But it is monstrous that this indispensable agency of communication should be under the control of any one man. Our telegraphic system ought to be owned by the government and form an indispensable part of the postal service. Congress at its next session should take measures to purchase the wires. The law provides a means by which this is to be done. The terms are to be fixed by a board of arbitration. If the company refuse to offer, then let the government build its own telegraph. We have an excellent postoffice department. It is worked with an economy greater than that of any private business, and is quite as efficient. Other countries find no difficulty in monopolizing the telegraph service, nor would we have any. We do not know what to do with the money in the treasury, and hence there is no excuse for delay. Let us nationalize the telegraph system.

Just So!—And When Men Begin to Buy Shares, and Vagabond, and Horace, Who? Wages Go Up with a Rush, and Nothing But Rents Go Down!

Buffalo Advertiser.

This new-fangled doctrine, however, would sweep away all taxes upon personal property and place the whole burden of taxation on the land. This would greatly increase the burden upon real estate, while the thousands of millions of personal property would go scot free. What is worse, the very fact that real estate was heavily taxed and personal property was exempt, would cause capital to slum the former and seek the latter.

The Berkshire Life Insurance Company of Pittsfield, Mass., organized in 1851, under a perpetual charter granted by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, offers to the public the benefit of over thirty-five years of successful experience. The security afforded by abundant assets invested in interest-bearing and non-speculative securities, and every liberal feature in its plans and policies which experience and prudence approve. The management of the Berkshire has always made security and economy their first care. The handsome surplus of the company shows its strength. The fact that its interest earnings have exceeded its total cash claims proves the care and judgment with which its affairs have been and are managed. Its reputation in the insurance world attests its economical methods and its fair dealing. Every policy which the Berkshire issues is subject to the Massachusetts law of Massachusetts, in accordance with which, in the event of the non-payment of any annual premium after the second, the policy holder receives, without any requirement of previous action upon his part, the full equivalent of all his interest in the company, in definite surrender value of paid up insurance or cash. And these values are greater in nearly all cases than those given by the companies or secured by the laws of other states. By this provision for a cash surrender value each policy issued by the Berkshire has in it the element of provision for one's own old age, and therefore combines the protection afforded by insurance, with the accumulative features of a savings bank. The usual conditions and provisions in life insurance policies have been so far eliminated from the Berkshire's policies that the only conditions for fulfillment by the policy holder are: 1. Payment of premiums when due. 2. Compliance with the restrictions and provisions regarding residence, travel and occupation. It is therefore a plan that when a person has become a permanent member of the Berkshire, by virtue of one of these policies, his membership and insurance can be terminated only by death, disability or withdrawal. It is equally plain that with such a policy, subject to the Massachusetts law, the policy holder in any event will receive full value for each dollar of premium paid, and is therefore secured against loss. These policies are issued upon alligant and approved plans, and are offered to the public in the belief that they embody all that is desirable in life insurance. For rates of premium and specimen policies, blank applications and further information address the Berkshire Life Insurance Company, No. 21 Broadway, New York. GEO. W. EGG, Life Manager.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

REV. EDWARD MCGLYNN, D. D., PRESIDENT.

The twenty-ninth public meeting of the society will be held at the

ACADEMY OF MUSIC

SUNDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 13.

STEINWAY HALL

engaged for an overflow meeting.

Addresses by

REV. DR. MCGLYNN

HENRY GEORGE,

LOUIS F. POST

and

W. J. GOBSCH.

Singing by

CONCORDIA CHORUS,

Under the direction of

MISS AGATHA MUNIER.

Admission free except to orchestra, boxes and balcony at Academy.

Seats in orchestra and circle boxes at Academy, 25 cents each; in proscenium boxes, 50 cents.

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

Tickets on sale from Thursday to members, or to persons introduced by members, at the Anti-Poverty Society office, 20 Cooper Union.

DR. EDWARD MCGLYNN

WILL SPEAK ON

"TEMPERANCE" AND LABOR."

IN LARGE HALL OF COOPER UNION,

for benefit fund of the Temple of Honor.

THURSDAY, EVENING, NOV. 17, AT 8 P. M.

Doors open 7:15 p. m.

Tickets to be had at the door; price 25 cents. No reserved seats.

Come and give him a rousing welcome.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

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, 23 Ann street, New York.

Henry George's Buch

Fortschritt und Armut

Eine billige deutsche Ausgabe von

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Preis 35 Cents.

ist feinen erdichten und durch alle Buchhändler und Colporteurs zu beziehen. Wird nach Empfang des Preises portofrei verhandelt vom Verfasser.

HENRY GEORGE

25 Ann Street, New York.

DR. MCGLYNN, HENRY GEORGE, GEORGE F. POST, 3 Cabinet Photos, 25c. MCGILL, 30 Henry St., N. Y.

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. 44. "Taxing Land Values." Henry George. 8 pages.
No. 45. "It

