

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PENNSYLVANIA YEARLY MEETING OF PROGRESSIVE FRIENDS, HELD AT  
LONGWOOD, CHESTER COUNTY, PA , 1903

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, JR.

THE REAL ENEMY OF LABOR."

I am asked to speak today upon the burning question of labor, whose discontent is everywhere apparent. This has reached the acute stage of destructive strife and become a social menace. The active combatants injure not only each other, but the entire community, which is now called upon to take sides. Organized labor asks for sympathy against the aggressions of capital. Employers declaim against the tyranny of labor unions and assert the right of running their own business. Meanwhile the plain people who are in neither combination, but suffer steadily from both, are puzzled over the intolerable situation. As one who is convinced that the issue is obscured by false assumptions and concealments I deem it a privilege to present my view of the case.

There was a time when the chronic conflict alleged to exist between labor and capital seemed to me an insoluble problem. I accepted the teaching of the schools that labor is paid from accumulated capital and is dependent upon it; that the amount of the wage fund determines the scale of wages; that the pressure of population upon subsistence is a constant menace; that Malthus was a prophet; that there is only so much work in the world to go round; that those who get jobs necessarily crowd others out of a chance; that altogether the thing is a mystery and a muddle, and that preachers are right in affirming "the poor we have always with us."

I hold these opinions no longer. What I once stood for I now earnestly desire to combat. I do not believe that wages are paid from capital, but do believe that labor pays its own wages and hands over to capital the surplus; I consider the wage fund theory to be an academic fallacy, worthless in determining the righteous recompense of labor; that Malthus based his dismal prophecy of over-population on selfish man-made conditions of misery, which are neither natural nor permanent; that, under conditions of equal freedom, there is in every civilized country a certainty of subsistence outrunning human needs. I hold that instead of a dearth of occupation it exists "in wasteful and ridiculous excess" when not limited by power and greed; that because one obtains a job another is crowded out is a postulate of the dark ages. I believe that the more workers there are the more there will be to do; that there is no mystery in the situation, muddled as that may be; and that the gospel which inculcates the necessity of poverty and the perpetuation of pauperism, itself needs to be regenerated.

Until these popular delusions are exploded discussions upon the wrongs of labor, the oppression, and the proper remedies for both, must be blind and misleading. The professed teachers of economics, learned in details and deft in figures, fail to enlighten because they resolutely ignore the seat of the disease. Confusion results. The true cause of industrial wars is rarely suggested in the current multitudinous speeches and writings upon the subject which burden the forum and the magazines.

Let me make clear my ground of criticism. It is generally assumed that labor and capital are in conflict. I deny that any antagonism exists between the two. Economists concede that labor is dependent upon capital and imply that it must therefore be in subjection; a position, to my mind absolutely untenable. They assent to the superstition that employment is limited, and that a curtailment of the hours of labor is necessary to give occupation to a greater number. I hold, on the contrary, that employment is unlimited and that there is no necessity for interfering with the desire of men to work as long as they choose. On these three propositions I hold no middle ground, but draw a straight line and desire that my argument may be tested accordingly.

First, as to the conflict between labor and capital. I give labor precedence because labor had prior existence and from its loins capital was born. In origin and nature they are of closest kin, joined together by a beneficent universal law and put asunder by the enactment of unequal legislation. This forced and artificial separation has come to be accepted as normal and unavoidable; just as in ancient times the conditions of master and slave were thought to be divinely ordained and necessary. It required centuries to expose the cheat and assert the natural equality of human rights.

The same inherited idea and habit of thought attach to labor and capital. A newer morality is steadily changing this belief. Capital or stored-up wealth, is simply the surplus earnings of labor, the product of human exertion applied to land, which is the single source from which all wealth is extracted. Why then, if of like nature, should labor and capital seem to be always at odds? Certainly that is their chronic attitude.

We all agree that both factors are in themselves desirable. The dignity and worth of labor is a favorite theme for poets. And capital, which does not mean money but a fund of useful things which men desire, is a blessing which cannot be too plenty in a civilized country and has no security outside of civilization. Why should these two blessings fight? Labor asks only for just wages; capital is satisfied with a proper return of interest. Disagreement ought to come only when one of the partners is getting more than its fair share of the joint earning? If labor is taking too large a proportion capital naturally objects. If capital is appropriating what is labor's due, then labor has a right to protest. Now we are witnessing the greatest industrial conflict in the history of the country. If labor can show that capital is robbing it by taking more than is just from the joint earnings, it has a good case and should win. But when we come to investigate the returns of capital we find no evidence that it is getting more than properly belongs to it. How do we ascertain that? By its return. If we judge the condition of laborers by the amount of their wages we must also judge capital by the amount of its return, which is interest. Is interest excessive? On the contrary it is inadequate. Any of my hearers who has money to invest understands how difficult it is to find a safe investment which will yield a satisfactory return. He who has good credit or security can borrow money on terms very unsatisfactory to the lender. The advantage is with the borrower. Capital, therefore, cannot be convicted of wronging labor if this statement is correct.

Divorced from special privilege capital is beneficent and without menace. Its tendency is to dissipate itself, and before special legislation made it possible in this country practically to entail properties, it was a truism that it took only three generations for men to go "from shirt sleeves to shirt sleeves." Now, the fortunes of the Astors and the Goulds, built on appropriated land values

and railroad monopolies, are seemingly as permanent as the estates of the Dukes of Westminster and Buccleugh.

Having acquitted both labor and capital of the charges of receiving more than their just share of production, let us consider the second fallacy: that labor is dependent upon capital for employment and should be grateful when that is graciously conceded. But who employs labor in a *new* country? Not capital, for there is none. The first settlers are forced to employ themselves, and out of the forest and the field, hew and raise their own compensation. Our forefathers had no labor problems to bother them, except the problem of getting more help. When a pioneer needed assistance he bargained with a neighbor who could spare time to give it. In return he lent a helping hand to that neighbor or gave him a share of the profits in the form of wages. There was no condescension involved; the exchange of services was a mutual benefit and wages were what they always are and must be under conditions of justice, the most perfect system of profit-sharing that can be devised. Through all the complications and specializations of industry since the sturdy settler with his axe prepared the foundations for great commonwealths, the essence of employment, the giving of a service for a service, has never been changed, however much it may have been obscured by extraneous and invisible agencies, to be considered later.

We approach now the third fallacy: That employment is limited, that there are more workers than work, and, therefore, in order that all wage-earners may have some chance, the hours of labor should be shortened by law. Whenever it can be shown that a country where equal opportunity for work exists has insufficient resources to support its inhabitants and that over-population presses on subsistence, the popular contention must be allowed. But where is there such an instance? I know of none. Certainly this United States is not in that category. So far, although we are squandering with reckless selfishness the products of mine and forest, the soil is undiminished in extent and fertility. As compared with the older countries of Europe our population when reckoned by the square mile inhabits a vast wilderness. I have recently twice crossed the continent on different routes and have ridden days and nights at railroad speed over unused extents of territory out of which whole European kingdoms could be carved. Everywhere Nature's invitation to labor is vociferous. Yet, in crowded centres, in tenements unfit even for swine, in factories and sweat-shops where the air of heaven is too precious for human lungs, men, women and children, toil for a starving pittance, and the delusion that the avenues of employment are over-crowded universally prevails.

I am not denying that a fierce and dangerous strife between employers and workers pervades the industrial world, but I insist that the reasons advanced to explain its existence are not the true ones and that their tacit acceptance shields the real culprit. I acknowledge that the burden of proof is upon him who dissents from the popular view and that it is incumbent upon him to show where the blame lies, and to point out the wrong-doer. I affirm that special privilege and not capital is the only foe that labor has to dread, and that until the distinction between the two is clearly defined the struggle in the dark will continue. Special privilege in all despotisms has been the handmaid of tyrants, corrupting individuals and creating classes. Its nature is not changed by domesticating it in republics, with which it has no affinity and whose foundations it has ever sapped. It flourishes rankly in the United States and is so interwoven with government that an attack upon it is construed as an attack upon government itself. If labor would search with open eyes for its deadly assailant it would not find it in capital.

Special privilege is not a vague term. It is capable of a close definition. As applied to governments, it means a certain advantage conferred by law upon a part of the people for private ends. In other words, it is legal favoritism. A protective tariff is a perfect illustration of it. Ostensibly for the general good, a favored few are licensed to tax the many. It is at total variance with the principles of democracy, and has only to be incorporated into law and practice eventually, to destroy free government, just as the incorporation of the proslavery compromises in the United States Constitution, in time bred the Civil War and disrupted the Union.

Wherever a labor conflict is in progress privilege can be discovered at its centre. For privilege fattens, alike upon the earnings of labor and capital and is allowed to do so unchallenged, because it has, through cunning legislation, acquired the character of a vested right. It is dangerous to attack vested rights; and privilege, which has the status of a vested right, is simply an accomplished wrong legally entrenched. To reach it law itself must be altered. Until that is accomplished no substantial progress can be gained.

Let us try to disentangle privilege from capital. The greatest and most injurious privilege is land monopoly, that is, the power to withhold from use desirable land, thereby decreasing the field of labor. From this power springs the common confusion that land is capital. It cannot be too strongly asserted that land is the *source* of capital and not a part of it. Labor extracts capital from the sea in the form of fish, but the sea is not capital. Labor gets capital in the form of crops from cultivating the soil, but that does not make capital of the soil. This important distinction between the product and its source must be kept in view. Men may and do raise capital when they have privilege to give as security. When Philadelphia gives away a street franchise the electric railway company may borrow capital on its privilege. A protective tariff is a privilege permitting private taxation, but money made by exercising this privilege is not an earning of capital. Wherever enormous profits are made in business they will almost always be found to come from privilege and not from capital.

Let us take as an illustration Andrew Carnegie, a man who commands popular respect and is extolled for his bounties. He has accumulated a colossal fortune, which if gained solely by the legitimate use of capital would disarm all criticism, because intelligence, industry, sound judgment and probity are attributes of honor. Had Mr. Carnegie been restricted to the exercise of these qualities he could not have attained such abnormal wealth. It is evident that his chief advantage was that given him by the protective tariff on steel and iron which, by preventing foreign competition, in effect gave him a license to tax all the users of his wares in the United States for his private profit. The process, though varying in form, is essentially that used by the Sultan of Turkey in granting permits to his favorites to tax provinces for their personal benefit; a grant of might and not of right. In addition to this despotic privilege the law allowed Mr. Carnegie to control great deposits of ore and coal, of which the amount is limited in every country. If the oil deposits were not created for Rockefeller, nor the anthracite fuel for Baer, then the confiscation of these common riches by Mr. Carnegie, although done in legal form and without reproach to the distinguished Scotchman, must be laid to special privilege and not to capital. Capital may well enter its hearty protest when the sins of privilege are laid on its shoulders. And it is clear that the reason why Mr. Carnegie's gifts are not received with the gratitude naturally felt for deeds of generosity is that, whether consciously, or not the public mind discriminates between wealth gained by labor and that extorted by privilege. When Mr.

Rockefeller hands out millions to a University and Mr. Carnegie gives millions more for public libraries, no wonder that many view the transaction in the light of attempted restitution for profits unjustly acquired.

In a society where there is no monopoly of land, no private appropriation of public franchises, no interferences with the utmost freedom of trade, trusts could not exist to enhance the cost of materials, nor trade unions which shut out workers from occupation, have excuse for being. Both violate the inalienable rights of individual citizens who, in a really free community, are entitled to the benefits of competition in merchandise and labor. For privilege to control the oil or coal or lumber of a country and arbitrarily to fix the price is an outrage on consumers. For labor organizations to limit the number of workers in the various trades is equally unjustifiable. To deny a man the right of learning and plying any honest trade he chooses and to prescribe to him the hours and quantity of his work is, in a large measure, to take away his liberty. If monopoly were abolished trade unions would not and ought not to be tolerated for a moment.

I am not here to decry labor unions. I concede that many of their professed aims are worthy and benevolent. Their excuse for being is valid so long as oppression compels men to band together for liberty and life. They are the inevitable shadow of a baleful substance only to be dissipated when that is destroyed. Being organized to resist unjust demands my criticism of them is on other grounds. It is that their warfare is unintelligent; that they fail to discern the real enemy who is driving labor to the wall; that they are expending ammunition on the wrong party : that they are pitiless regarding their unassociated fellow laborers, and that they permit themselves to be used by privileged knaves or ambitious politicians.

Those of you who have read Henry George's masterly book, "*Protection or Free Trade*" can never forget the opening chapter with the famous illustration of the tethered bull. He says: "Near the window by which I write, a great bull is tethered by a ring in his nose. Grazing round and round he has wound the rope about the stake until now he stands a close prisoner, tantalized by rich grass he cannot reach; unable even to toss his head to rid him of the flies that cluster on his shoulders. Now and again he struggles vainly, and then, after pitiful bellowings, relapses into silent misery."

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

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

How shall the laboring men who constitute the large majority of voters be made to see their real adversary? Now they shut their eyes to him and run amuck. The combinations which Mr. Baer represents are supreme because they control the anthracite coal mines of the country. This fact gives them their power to oppress the laborer and the consumer, but to blame capital on that account is without reason. Yet, because of Baer's action, capital is called bad names, men outside the labor unions are attacked when compelled by necessity to take the place of the strikers, and for the long-suffering public, labor unions cherish the same contempt which the late Mr. Vanderbilt expressed in a profane and memorable phrase.

#### THE STRIFE UNEQUAL.

Bear in mind the present inequality of the struggle. The advantage is largely with the employer. As a rule he has accumulated wealth and can stand a season of business suspension. In times of slack business a strike may be even a boon, a good excuse for shutting clown. The laborer rarely has a surplus because forced to live up to if not beyond his income. He can hold out a very short time, unaided, and must depend upon contributions from employed bodies of men. Moreover he has to contend not only with employers, but with unorganized workers whose necessities force them into rivalry. Idle or spasmodically employed men and women must rush into empty places as air rushes to a vacuum. Labor unions have, therefore, to combat employer and unemployed and the striker finds himself between the upper and the nether millstone. To achieve success assaults, boycotts, and often murder, are resorted to and justified, calling in another adverse and crushing element, that of civic force. The odds are overwhelming.

Although labor unions occasionally come out of a strike nominally victorious, the victory is in name only and won at enormous cost to the community. Who shall estimate the loss of money and life resulting from the Pennsylvania coal strike? The burden does not fall on the coal barons who can mark up the price of coal and recoup themselves. Nor upon the coal roads and vessels which carry the product to market; nor yet upon the local dealers who dictate the retail price. They are practically insured. But the strikers have used up their small savings, their fellow workers who have contributed to sustain them are poorer, and the great load settles down on the unprotected consumer who has no way of reprisal. He breathes a curse on both houses and longs for a compulsory court of arbitration which shall avert such disastrous occurrences. Yet while the monopolists, who are at the bottom of the trouble, are entrenched so firmly,

"You may as well go stand upon the beach  
And bid the main flood 'bate its usual height."

as to expect by courts or injunctions, or violence, or any device or machinery, to medicine the evil which is the outgrowth of bad laws, long continued custom and habit of thought. Until conditions are revolutionized, increasing labor revolts are inevitable.

#### WHAT REGULATES WAGES.

We are accustomed to say that wages are regulated by supply and demand; to use Cobden's phrase, that they are high "when two bosses are hunting for one man, and are low when two men are hunting one boss." This would be true if natural opportunity were open to all men. But such

is not the fact. Opportunity for self-employment is largely withdrawn from men by land speculators and in default of it their single alternative is to bid against each other in the labor market, thus forcing wages down to the minimum point. From this the economists deduce an "iron law." But it is the highwayman's law. With freedom of choice throttled and employers dictating terms, what can be expected but the lowest wage? When freedom is respected and nature's bounty unmonopolized, the economist will not be long in discovering a *golden law*, showing that under it wages naturally tend to a *maximum*. The measure of wages then will be determined by what a man is able to earn for himself outside of an employer, an alternative which will be ever at hand. No artificial legislation can accomplish what the natural law freely offers.

At present, as Bliss Carman affirms in a recent poem,

"There is no man alive, however how he may strive.  
Allowed to own the work of his own hands.  
Landlords and waterlords at all the roads and fords,  
Taking their toll, imposing their commands."

#### THE AGGRAVATING CAUSES.

We all agree that the suffering of the wage earner does not come from a lack of the necessities of life. There is no devastating famine, for crops were never more abundant; there is no lack of clothing, for the store houses are packed with goods; the accepted statistics of the nation indicate that material production exceeds all precedent. It overflows the home market and is seeking new outlets abroad, even prompting our government at immense cost of life and treasure to conquer weaker nations whose purchasing power is contemptible;—an indication that Yankee shrewdness, to say nothing of humanity and honor, has suffered paralysis.

We shall still farther agree, that the phenomenal increase of wealth noted has failed to bring greater content, to make employment easier to obtain, to lessen poverty, to diminish the army of tramps, or the crowded tenement houses, or in anyway to diffuse that general blessing which plenty ought to produce.

#### MALDISTRIBUTION THE REASON.

The reason lies near at hand. Abnormal increase of congested wealth, coincident with extreme poverty and growing unrest among the industrial masses who feel that others gather their fruits, indicates an approaching social storm, of which the warning signals are plenty. It is evident that a small minority is fattening on the majority when 200,000 persons own seventy percent of the national wealth, and 250,000 (less than one in sixty of its adult male population), control seventy-five to eighty percent, or when, according to Thomas G. Shearman's uncontroverted statement, the taxes are so arranged as to take from the poorer classes seventy-five to eighty percent of their annual earnings while exacting from the rich only three to ten percent. What maleficent force accounts for this manifestly wrongful distribution? It is as though the water necessary to supply a great city yielded an enormous excess to a few people while the rest of the community suffered from extreme drouth. Would not there be an uprising to insist on a just



distribution of a common and natural bounty? The same question must be pressed regarding the misappropriation of the reservoir from which, alone, labor can draw its sustenance.

The answer is self evident. A few have grasped and retain for their own profit the natural bounty whose universal title is not impaired although its possession is now in private hands. Restitution is essential if justice is to be served. For the waterless people to combine and war with monopolists who were appropriating the water without attacking the right and title of the grabbers would be foolish and futile. For labor organizations to concede tacitly the right of land monopoly and fritter away their efforts on palliatives is to assure failure.

Landlordism and interference with natural trade, — *not capital*, — are the dangerous foes of labor. Capital gets its undeserved bad name from vicious association. Idle hands and idle lands are an anomaly sufficient to account for our labor perplexities and strikes. The fences that keep one from the other must be broken down. The land question underlies that of labor and must have the first solution. The labor unions, missing this truth are simply

". . . dropping buckets into empty wells  
And growing old in drawing nothing up."

#### THE FOLLY ILLUSTRATED.

There is a parable of a man who owned a fine herd of cattle and lived in a region of abundant grazing. Imbued with the modern ideas about social matters he inclosed his live stock behind a high fence and kept himself busy plucking grass from the rich fields around and thrusting handfuls through the bars to the hungry creatures. In spite of his faithful efforts the cattle grew lean and leaner, to the owner's perplexity. A passer-by, taking in the situation, asked why he did not take down the fence and let the cattle feed themselves in the luxuriant pastures. To this the owner responded in the spirit of the present day economist, "Go away with your theories. I do not see that taking down the fence will be a panacea for the poor condition of the herd. Instead of wasting time talking such nonsense, why not be practical and help me gather grass and feed it to the hungry things?" Be sure that when labor is let out of its present stockade to forage for itself in the productive pastures now unused and wasted, there will be fewer social problems and little need for labor organizations. Privilege will die of inanition, and instead of dreading the capitalist the working man himself will rapidly tend toward that desirable condition.

#### HOW ACCESSIBLE LAND PROTECTS LABOR BETTER THAN DO TRADES UNIONS.

One of the questions continually asked is: "How would accessible land help the wage earners in the great industries?" Let me cite in answer an illustration from current happenings in South Africa.

Recently the Chamber of Mines in Johannesburg, representing all the Rand mining companies as well as the forty odd Rhodesian companies, which represent nearly one hundred and seventy concerns, gold as well as coal, were forced to capitulate in a prolonged struggle with the native laborers, who had no labor unions and no organization of any kind. The old average rate of wages was fifty shillings a month, and the boys were lodged and fed in the mine compounds.



Although able to pay enormous dividends on this expenditure, the greedy mine owners desired to increase the dividends by reducing the laborer's pay to thirty shillings a month, and proceeded on that basis. The effort proved to be in vain. No mine could obtain its full complement of workers and, after months of determined effort, in November last the Chamber was reluctantly compelled to yield and the old rates were restored. The victory of the natives involved no organized strike nor walking delegates.

The correspondent of the Boston *Transcript* explains the secret without an apparent suspicion that he is illustrating the philosophy of Henry George. He says: "For the natives the eighteen months' contest has been the easiest win in the history of the industrial world. The native had no trade union to help him in the conflict which the Chamber of Mines had forced upon him. But all South African natives have a little land. A native can easily live out of his mealie patch; and when the powerful Chamber of Mines issued its decree that a native was worth only thirty shillings a month and determined to fix this as the rate at the mines all over South Africa, the natives called no meetings, held no demonstrations, nor asked for any sympathetic strike or boycott. They simply kept to their mealie patches; and while they remained there the mines on the Rand were at a stand still, and thousands of stockholders in England, Germany and France were without dividends on their mining securities."

The obvious moral is, that where land is locked up from the man seeking employment he must work on his employer's terms or starve. With open opportunity to work for himself no capitalist can oppress him, but must employ him on just and satisfactory terms.

I am not a believer in curing trusts by forming one great, government trust, or of escaping the tyranny of trades unions by forcing all workers into a common organization. The evil principle is unaltered by aggregation. The socialistic plan multiplies the functions of government which are already too complicated. We want less government and greater freedom. No artificial devices can work as well as the natural laws and we need only to abolish unjust statutes, not to enact new ones, to accomplish the destruction of privilege and the freeing of labor.

As Tolstoy declares, we are willing to do all sorts of things for the workingman; give him charities, soup-houses, lectures, amusements and the like, but we are not willing to get off his back. I would do nothing for him except to bring about conditions wherein he could help himself; and self-help is the only help that counts.

There is an agreement between the advocates of socialism and those who champion more liberty for the individual, regarding franchises, which go under the name of public utilities. Both concede that these cannot justly be alienated to private ownership, and that the distinction between private and public property should be made plain and each safeguarded. It does not necessarily follow that government must carry on the business of using the franchises. It may or may not do so, according to circumstances. If the same end can be reached more economically by leasing the property to corporations for full compensation, the public welfare may be better served by that method. Experiment will determine the proper choice.

In Glasgow, perhaps more than in any municipality in the world, the public utilities are in the city's hands. It is a step in the right direction, but only a step, because the first operation is to

raise rents and increase the cost of living for the poor. Nor does it make employment easier to obtain, the pressure for work being intense; the housing of the poor and the abject poverty calling for relief taxing the possibilities of philanthropy. While the municipality gets full value for the principal services rendered, such as water, gas, parks, galleries, tramways, especially telephones, electric lights, markets, wash houses, baths, etc., sixty percent of the people still live in one and two room houses. [note: rendered as "six percent" but the figure reported else where is sixty. -- ed (WCA)]

The political complications are not thereby averted in Glasgow; the same temptations to use party for personal ends continuing as in American cities where private corporations control and corrupt. Public ownership does not do away with labor organizations nor eliminate constant political intrigue for personal or party control of patronage. John Paul, editor of "Land Values," a most valuable journal devoted to the uplifting of labor, says: "We have 15,000 in the employment of the Glasgow council and every farther piece of municipal expansion adds to the number. Many of the workers are organized and are exercising more political power in the return of their own creatures to the council. The best interests of the city are a secondary consideration. In fact, the workers cannot see the city's interest except through their own, while the more vigorous of them work, for the return of candidates who will assist them and their friends into corporation jobs." And Mr. Paul notes that this pressure for jobs is due to the locking up of the land in the hands of a class, an evil "accentuated by effecting municipal progress and expenditures," and he affirms that the only thing that can purify government by municipal socialism or by private corporations "will be, freeing of the natural opportunities to employment, thereby making it as easy to get jobs outside of the corporation as inside."

There are other points that suggest themselves, upon which I should like to touch, such as the rise of living expenses which steadily keep pace with and often exceed the advance of wages, and of which rents form such a formidable item. The net disadvantage, it seems to me, is with the wage earner, as the increase of pay wrung by costly conflict is largely illusory. I should also like to call attention to the vast extent of valuable territory in this country held on speculation by syndicates and railroad corporations, not to mention the 21,000,000 acres owned a dozen years ago by foreign investors and probably increased since then. Travellers on the Santa Fe Railroad have their attention called in the guide book to the 2,000,000 acres which the railroad skirts (within forty-eight hours of Los Angeles) held by a foreign combination. But I have aimed only to suggest points for consideration and debate.

I desire to make clear my conviction, in closing, that just taxation is the effective weapon with which to slay monopoly and bring into harmonious relations those natural allies, capital and labor.

"Not until he is made the lord of his own trade,  
Can any man be glad or stroue or free;  
There looms the coming war. Which captain are you for,  
The chartered wrong, or Christ and liberty?"