

## The Attitude of Christianity Toward New Social Enthusiasms and Movements, Staten Island, 1894, by Henry George

Ladies and gentlemen: I am announced to speak on the attitude of Christianity towards new social enthusiasms and movements. It is not a topic of my selection and one, which to be treated adequately, would require more time than I have at my disposal tonight. And yet there is something to be said. The attitude of Christianity towards new social enthusiasms and movements! It depends much on what we mean by Christianity. If we take merely the external, there are those who will tell us and tell us with more than a semblance of truth that the attitude of Christianity has been that of hostility. But they look only at the external—at the letter, not the spirit; at the creed rather than at that which it embodies.

Eighteen-hundred years ago to the thoughtful man who endeavored to forecast the future of that mighty civilization that preceded ours, a civilization the most widespread, the most powerful, the most far-reaching and high-soaring of any civilization that had to that time appeared on earth, it would have been difficult to see any sign of hope. In the very day of its power that mighty civilization was rotten to the core. Spiritual life seemed to have died out among men. The one worship was the worship of power. And yet at that time, when there seemed no sign of life or hope, at that time when brute power seemed everywhere triumphant, when religion had degenerated into superstition, or in the reaction, passed into a denial of anything but mere materialism, when the state was absolutely rotten, there was a leaven and a seed.

Among the slaves, among the poor, the power was beginning to grow, not then discernible, that ultimately has revolutionized the world. Take the growth of our civilization from that Roman root. See what its advances have been. and I think he who does it may see that this is truly called a Christian civilization, that there has been the spring in that simple doctrine coming to Rome through outcasts and slaves, bringing into pantheism and materialism the seed of a great truth that had been cherished by a small and insignificant people—the truth that there is above one God absolute and eternal, the Almighty Father; bringing the truth that all men are created equal and through those simple truths ultimately revolutionizing the world.

It has been a slow process and it has been a checkered process. The triumph of Christianity was not won all at once. It has been won by slow degrees and won often against those who professed to be the very teachers of Christianity. It has done much but it has not done all. There is a sense of the word in which we may truly say that this is a Christian civilization, yet the spirit of Christianity is growing and growing, and in nothing does it show its power today than in the deep, widespread and rapidly growing feeling that this civilization of ours is not worthy to be called a Christian civilization.

Christian civilization! Think what a civilization really would be in which practical Christian duty was carried out! Think what the civilization would be in which men truly recognize that all human beings are the equal creatures of the Almighty Father; it would not be a civilization marked as it grew by the rise of the prison and the almshouse and the organization of charitable societies. It would not be a civilization in which men would consider not merely the first right but the first duty of man, that of working.

No, the advance has been slow. It has been against great odds. It is not given to man at first to comprehend the real full meaning of a great truth. Christianity came into the world only when it had made its first conquest to be captured in its organization by the powers that had existed before and to engraft upon the sublime truths that constituted its essential features, the old weaknesses and superstitions and injustices and vices. But the advance has been steady.

Even when that Christian truth, for it is a Christian truth, was engrafted into the solemn declaration of a new nation in our Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." Men signed this declaration, men applauded that declaration year after year while chattel slavery existed in the land. The time came when the conscience of the nation grew. Chattel slavery is now done and over.

But other duties yet remain. There are other triumphs to be won before that principle can be fully recognized. Chattel slavery? That form of slavery which consists in making property of the man, that is but a coarse rude way of compelling men to work for others. There is a finer and more insidious, a more far-reaching form of enslaving men than that of chattel slavery, than that of making property of their bodies. That is the form which compels men to work for others by making property of the land on which and from which men must live, if they live at all.

What difference does it make if I hold as mine, the land on which and from which another man must live? I am

his master and he is my slave, just as truly as though I held his body as my personal property. And it is a much easier way of enslaving men. The rude form of making property of the man is only adopted and is only maintained where population is sparse, where land is easy of access. But as population grows dense, then it is much easier, and from the point of view of the master, much more economical, much more convenient to make property of the land, than to make property of the man.

When as yet, so-called Christian nations thought it no sin, and no shame to engage in the kidnapping of human beings, the slaves bought at the African coast were taken where? Not to England, not to Ireland, but to the new continent that had been just discovered. Imagine negro slaves taken to Ireland! What use for negro there?

The men, who by a long series of conquests, had parceled out the land of Ireland, knew quite well that in a country as densely populated as that, in taking the land, they were virtually assuming command over the labor of men. Men cannot live without land, and when you get land on which inhabitants must live, if they live at all, having no other land to go to, then just as you see in Ireland, it is utterly unnecessary to make slaves of the men, to attempt to chain them to prevent them from escaping; to put bloodhounds on their trail if they run away; to force them to work by punishment.

You simply hold the land and as men cannot live without land, the people who live on, and if they are to live at all, will come to you, hat in hand, asking permission to work for you and offering to give in return for that permission all that the most exacting master compel the slave to give, all that their labor will earn, save a bare living. The slavemaster must give that; the owners of land in Ireland and England and other well-settled countries give no more.

Why, it is a fact, stated to me by Col. Collins, one of the early abolitionists, who was sent over to England during the progress of the abolition movement here, in order to arouse the support of the English people, that he started in the large English towns by telling just what, under the slave code, the master was compelled to give to the slave by way of rations. To him it seemed horrible that men should get only that in return for their labor. Yet he soon found that it was an anticlimax. He soon found that many so-called free men, who heard him did not get even that for their labor.

Look over the world today in our boasted Christian civilization. At the close of the wonderful nineteenth century, everywhere you will see disquiet, discontent, a rapidly growing feeling of injustice. Even with all our advance, everywhere you will find the feeling deepening that this civilization as it is based cannot stand, nor can it. It is not in the nature of things. It is not in the law of God.

At the bottom of our social adjustments lies one primary injustice. That which God has given to all His creatures for their habitation and workshop and reservoir of matter and force is everywhere monopolized, is everywhere held as the private property of the few and from that primary injustice is arising a condition of things under which our very advance seems to bring but evil.

We progress and we progress. During our lifetime there have been added to the productive forces at man's command, powers of which our fathers never dreamed. In every direction, discovery and invention have been adding to the ability of human hands to provide for human stomachs and to clothe human backs. Everywhere the power of labor to produce wealth has been multiplied and multiplied and yet instead of it becoming easier to get a living, the universal report is, that wherever our civilization most progresses there the struggle to get a living seems harder and more intense.

The older men here, the men of my age, will well recollect their own feelings. Feelings that were expressed in the beginning of this century and that long continued, how the steady growth of invention, the rapid march of discovery was about bringing a time when even the poorest would enjoy comfort and leisure. The advance has been greater than was expected and yet what do we see? Social problems becoming deeper and more threatening. Tramps growing on our new soil; charitable societies organized in what, only a few years ago—it seems to us older men only a few years ago—were the wilderness or the unbroken prairie. And, on the other hand, we see fortunes arising, more monstrous even, than those monstrous fortunes which marked the growing rottenness, the coming decay of Rome.

You may look here and look there, everywhere, in which every direction you look, you will probably see some fatal something calling for reform, but if you take the conditions at large and when you ask what is the one cause that is producing this poverty in the midst of wealth, this growth of virtual aristocracy and tyranny under democratic forms, this growing and deepening social disquiet and discontent, and you will find, no matter how you start to trace it, that it ultimately resolves itself into this one great clear injustice. And how could it be otherwise?

Remember, that in spite of all our discoveries and our inventions, in spite of all we have learned and found out

how to make, man is yet a land animal. That it is only on land and from land that he can live. That all his making, all his production consists merely in changing in form or in place the matter of the universe that he has access to. Man creates nothing. He is merely a producer, a bringer forth, a changer of what he finds already here. Take from man all that belongs to land and what do you have but a disembodied spirit. Our very flesh and blood comes from the land. To the land it must return again.

Therefore it is true, as true now under our complex civilization as it was in the rudest state of productive arts, that where some of the people are the owners of the land on which and from which the people must live, that no matter what your political forms, you must have the aristocrat on one side and the slave on the other; that no matter how pure be the teachings of your religion, you must have that monstrous inequality among men that is the death of true religion.

But the spirit that is against everything is one timid step and then another until on the first firm ground gained another step has been planted—that spirit advances and yet advances, and there today is the hope of the world, the spirit of Christianity. The spirit that would treat men as brothers, the spirit that would recognize in the Almighty not a being who has ordered this world so that some should live in idle luxury and others should toil without gaining the fruits of toil or asking even for the leave to toil; that recognizes a God of justice, a God who has an equal eye to all His creatures—that spirit is beginning to revolt against this injustice born in the same spirit as that of slavery which still exists, though chattel slavery has gone. And I stand here to speak for men existing now all over the English-speaking world and beginning to show themselves, who recognize the injustice, who have pledged themselves to do what they can for abolition.

We call ourselves, or rather the name has come to us, of single-tax men. It has served a useful purpose for it has the effect of clearly setting forth our method. What we aim at is equal justice. What we aim at is equality of opportunities, not an equality of fortune. We are today the firmest upholders of the right of property. What we ask is simply equality as to the natural substances and materials that God has given men on which to work and security that whoever does work, that whoever out of this natural material without preventing his brother from using either by exertion of hand or of head brings anything to be, produces anything that properly comes without the category of wealth that that shall be his and his alone. His against individual and government as well. His as against all the world.

Now we know, no one more clearly, that in a stage of civilization like this, it is utterly impossible to secure equal rights to land by dividing land up and giving to each an equal piece. There are rude devices that in rude stages of civilization such as those that existed among our Indian tribes before we came here, by such as they are struggling to maintain today against the destructive system that would force upon them our system of land tenure and against such as existed in the pastoral state for which the Mosaic Code was framed where an allotment was made to each family and it was preserved by the institution of the Jubilee as an inalienable right coming back to them after every fifty years.

Those devices would not serve in a civilization like this. But if it be true and it must be true, if all men are equal creatures of one God; if it be true; if that be true, this must be true, that we are all here with equal rights to the use of land there must be some method, no matter how complex, no matter how high the civilization, there must be some method of making an adjustment that will conform to this right and this truth. Now that there is, whoever chooses to look may see.

Men have equal rights to the use of land. Now, those equal rights can be very easily adjusted by allowing any man to use land that no one else wants to use, but where two or more men want to use the same piece of land, charge the man who has it the highest price that this competition of desire will bring forth. Or, in other words, if we simply take for the use of the community that value which attaches to land by reason of its superiority in locality or in any other natural condition, if we take that for the use of the community then we have placed all men in that community upon an equal footing. That is what we propose by the single tax. And the closer that is examined, the clearer I believe it will be seen that it conforms with every dictate of justice, with every maxim of political economy, with every requirement of public policy, and with every principle of a true religion.

Now consider. Come to the lowest ground. It is absolutely necessary that in a civilized community public revenue should be raised. How shall we raise it? We are attempting as all civilized communities are attempting in one way or another, we are attempting to raise it by taxes on the produce and methods of industry, by taxes on the result of industry, that is to say, upon wealth. Right at the start it is perfectly clear to us that this is expedient. Today, let a man attempt to bring wealth in any form into the United States, or in almost any form, and he will be taxed for being permitted to do so. Let a man attempt to produce wealth in the United States and down again on him will

come the tax gatherer, fining him in proportion to the wealth he has produced.

We are used to it. We do not much think about it. But when we do think about it, does it not seem stupid? Wealth is a good thing. We count that a progressive country, and it truly is a progressive country, that is increasing in wealth. Wealth! It is something that we all strive for. Why then should we tax men for increasing wealth? It is an unjust thing. If one man

has worked and saved and another man has remained idle, isn't it unjust that the man who has produced wealth should be taxed in proportion to the wealth he has? It is not merely stupid, it is not merely unjust, but we have got only to look at our tax laws and their effect to see that it is demoralizing.

Taxes on wealth or the processes that go to the accumulation of wealth in all their forms are not merely taxes on industry and on thrift, taxes against public policy in so much as they take what we all want, but we have only to look to see that they become in great measure taxes upon the very thing that we can spare least of all. They become taxes on honesty, taxes on conscience, they promote fraud and perjury and evasion. They give a premium to the entrance of private interest into governmental affairs, into the making and administration of the laws.

Now, look on the other hand and what do we propose? Tax wealth in many of its forms whether it be goods, or the bringing in of goods, whether it be houses or the materials that go to the making of houses, whether it be machinery or the thing that machinery is used to bring forth: tax wealth in any of its forms and you lessen the amount of wealth. Tax houses and there will be fewer houses. Tax grain and you will have less grain, but you can tax land values all you please and you will have none the less land. You may tax land values all you please, you will have neither less land nor will land be harder to get by the man who wants to use it.

On the contrary, the effect of taxing land values as we propose would be to make it easier for the man who wants to use the land to get land to use. Land lies out of doors. It cannot be covered up. Its value can be ascertained with more certainty and with more definiteness than any other value. A tax upon that value would require no army of searches and seizures, no investigation into any man's private affairs. It could be assessed and collected with the very minimum of governmental officials.

And as for justice, why consider. Lay aside for one moment, if you choose, that idea that all men are equally entitled to land and simply consider what this value is: this value of land. It is a value that does not come from any exertion of the individual. Why is that land around this Bay is now so enormously valuable? Why is it that it is so valuable now and when white men came here the whole island was bought for a jug of whiskey and a blanket?

Simply because this population is here. Take them away, settle them on a piece of land somewhere else that has now no value and your value will rise there where they go. As population increases, as public improvements are made, as civilization, in short, centers and advances, their land values rise and they rise without any regard whatever to whom this individual owner is or what he has done. He may be an alien living on another continent, he may be an idiot or a baby, he may be an utter idler and yet with the growth and the progress of the community value will attach to his land. There clearly is a value that belongs to the community as a whole.

Wealth, that which a man makes, that which his labor brings forth, belongs in natural justice to him alone. It is his and with his ownership goes the right to transfer it, but by the very same reasoning that value which the whole community produces, that value which comes not from individual exertion but from the social growth, that is a value that belongs to society as a whole and ought to be taken for society.

Now, what would that do, that simple measure. It would at once end the forestalling of land. It would at once end the grasping at the necessary and primary element of all production before it is wanted for use. That forestalling that has today (although we are as yet not seventy-million people on the temperate zone of a continent that would accommodate the whole population of Europe), has such a monopolization that wherever a settler goes from the Atlantic to the Gulf to find a piece of land on which to settle, he may find everywhere great quantities of unused or of partially used land; but everywhere that he finds land that would be worth settling and worth use now, he finds some monopolist ahead of him. Someone to demand that he pay a price or mortgage his labor for years for the privilege of turning up the virgin soil. That monopolization with all around our cities where people are crowded together gives an enormous price to the vacant lot.

It would break that down and in doing to that it would solve the labor question from the bottom. There is nothing complex, nothing difficult about the labor question. No man will work for another for less than he can get, all things considered, by working himself. And therefore, it is that wages in any community depend upon the opportunities that are open for laborers to employ themselves. The reason wages were higher here in the beginning than on the

other side of the Atlantic was simply from the opportunities to get hold of land. It is not any stupid protective tariff or from any virtue in our institutions. That does not bear on this question, that has maintained them here; and by simply opening, in this way, land now monopolized, wages would rise from their very foundations.

Take with reference to the simplification of government. Take it with reference to any social question you please whether it be the silver question, whether it be the temperance question, whether it be a question of prisons or a question of education, or a question of religion. And if you look at it closely and follow out the reasoning, you will see that it will in every direction tend to make life easier and more wholesome, tend to do away with corruption, tend, not by any patent medicine device, to make all men virtuous and all men good, but tend to a condition of things in which men will be free to be as good and as virtuous as they would like to be and not to be forced by the difficulties of getting a living, by the difficulties of maintaining wife and child, to the wont.

No man can in a short address like this go over the whole for such a question, but there is this aspect that I would like to present to your minds. We propose a single tax, a tax levied upon the value of land and we believe not merely that that is the best of all taxes but we believe that in the divine intent, in the order of human growth that tax was intended.

Now see: Here is this great universal fact. The advance of man is an advance in civilization, that is to say, in a condition of living closer together; all human advance is by the integration of society.

Now, with the formation of society and progressively with its advance there arises a need for public revenues. Social needs develop this and those social needs require social revenue. Now, if that be the order of civilization then it must be that there is some way in the nature of things provided by which needed public revenues can be raised without any injury to the moral sense, without any check upon production of wealth and without any tendency to the unjust distribution of wealth.

Now, what is that way? Is it not clearly pointed out in the natural law? Just as men integrate into society, just as social needs become larger and more complex just in proportion as larger public revenues are required, what do we find? That everywhere land rises in value; that what the economists call rent, what John Stuart Mill styled the unearned increment of land value, that value which attaches to land not by reason of the production of the soil, not by reason of any improvement in it or on it but by reason of the general thought that begins and arises, is the one thing that steadily grows as grows the need for larger revenues.

What does this mean? If there be a purpose in natural law it means clearly this: That there is the intended supply for the growing need. Here is the revenue here, steadily arising or rather a value which belongs to society as a whole which may be taken for the uses of society without checking a production, without promoting evasion and fraud, without tending to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and here is a value that must be taken if we would prevent the worst form of speculation. The very failure to get it by virtue of a natural law to take it must produce disaster.

By virtue of a natural law, as society advances a greater and greater value attaches to land. If that be left to individuals then there is everywhere a premium for grabbing and forestalling just as we see it here today; just as you see it in Australia where men are now, on that hardly touched continent, going to Paraguay to find free land. It is the law of the universe. Where a good is given to us and we do not take it evil must always result. It is the law of the universe, and see what it means for it throws a flood of light upon this most perplexing question of today. Here is this great natural fact of what the economists call rent: The rise of value touching all land with the growth and integration of society.

What does that mean in the natural order? It means this: That if we were to obey the golden rule, that if we were to treat men as equally entitled to the bounty of their Creator, the advance in civilization would be an advance to greater and greater equality instead of now when we have discarded that rule in an advance to a more and more monstrous inequality. For here in the rise of this great fund belonging to the community may be taken for the use of all without injury to any, there is a natural provision for equalization that as civilization went on would tend to bring the strong and the weak, the skilled and the unskilled more nearly to a common level.

I think in the attitude of the church, in the attitude of Christianity towards social aspirations and reform that one of the most cheering instances is suggested by the name of Dr. McGlynn. Here is a church that most of us have been long accustomed to look upon as the very home of all that was intolerant and opposed to social reform in the name of religion. Dr. McGlynn denounced by his Archbishop was put under ban, was removed from his powers, was excommunicated at last. Dr. McGlynn stood firm and that marvelous thing has happened that he is today recognized and justified by the higher authority of that church and the man who proclaimed that no Catholic could hold to the single tax; the Archbishop of New York has been forced, though not formally as yet, to take that back; it has been

shown to the world by his superior that he didn't truly state the Catholic doctrine.

I know of nothing in all ecclesiastical history more cheering than the present attitude of the head of the Catholic Church. Here is an old man over eighty coming into power under conditions which certainly have heretofore made those who held his place too often concerned merely to strengthen and to use the power of the church to strengthen all that was reactionary and that was opposed to social aspirations. In Europe, as on this side of the water, he has clearly and distinctly taken in another line and is bringing the power and influence of the Catholic Church if not clearly on the side of social reform, at least to so far favor it as to tell Catholics that they might be good Catholics and yet believe and work for reform.

Dr. McGlynn has in that rendered a most signal service: Dr. McGlynn, and another man, another priest who is entitled to equal honor, Dr. Hurlsell.

At this point the speaker was interrupted by the following question:

Q.: How do you expect to bring the theory into practical operation?

A.: Here, simply by a process of abolition; by abolishing all taxes on land values and pushing that forward as we necessarily must as other taxes are abolished.

Dr. Funk: By an unfortunate mistake our friend Mr. Wakeman was invited out here tonight for the purpose of speaking. There was a mistake; they thought that Mr. George was West. It was a misunderstanding and I would be glad for one to hear Mr. Wakeman and I know Mr. George would be glad to hear him. Although Mr. George does not need any reinforcement on his theory.

Mr. Wakeman: The very fact that we would differ somewhat and the very fact that a thorough exposition of Mr. George's position would bring out more fully the practical method of application in which after all, all theories for their value must depend. I much prefer that the audience could continue questioning Mr. George. The time is too short to go over that ground now or to go into it, and I do not care to. The best thing is to use Mr. George (or all he is worth while you have him), and possibly some other day when I can have an hour I will take up a similar subject and go over it from a nationalist's point of view and show that although there is great method in his suggestion, the method does not carry far enough for the social reforms, and enthusiasms which the impulse of Christianity is forcing upon the world and which will ultimately make them victorious.

Dr. Funk: As we have Mr. George and Mr. Wakeman here I am sure that it would afford us much pleasure if Mr. Wakeman would just get that objection into a question and fire it at Mr. George and have Henry George's answer.

Mr. Wakeman: Mr. George knows these objections as well as I do. On the point that the nationalists make that in the complexity of civilization to which Mr. George referred, the land question, although important, becomes but subsidiary. With the social question is involved not only the property question of land but the question of the exchange of value that is money, the measure of value to provide means of exchange which is the terrible question of the day. We have to resort to barter now because we have no money and how is all the taxing of the land in creation ever going to give us money.

Second, the complexity of civilization which has introduced an immense power of machinery: and we live by machines; work by machines. Capital holds machines. Without land, without money, without machinery, we are nothing. We can get no living. Mr. George attacks the first element and apparently disposes of it, but in doing it he leaves the other two unprotected and uncared for.

And then thirdly, land property. "Man does not live by bread alone." He lives by knowledge. Relives by freedom and knowledge; doesn't come simply from owning land. Freedom doesn't come simply from owning land and freedom must come from the emancipation of the conditions of livelihood so that every person can obtain a hold under capital sufficient to enable him to take care of himself. No man can earn his own living in a complex civilization. We can only earn our living as partners with capital and unless the partnership with capital is such that every individual can have a share of it he can own a little land or more land and it will do him no good.

And then as to the other question at the bottom. The nationalist's object that Mr. George's system is not sufficiently Christian. The element of Christianity is that the impulse of life and law of life is love, human cooperation. Until human cooperation based upon love which is simply another name for Christ becomes triumphant, not only as to land, but as to money, as to capital, as to education, as to freedom, as to the control of individual conduct, all the way through the land question is a trivial question.

Those views Mr. George knows well enough. They are questions he has met with over and over again, whether he has sufficiently answered them, he will now I hope enable you to determine.

Mr. George: They are well put. To be brief, and I will try to answer them briefly and as well as I can. Yes, we consider as of more importance than either money or machinery—man. Man lived before money was. He must have

existed before machinery existed. But he never lived until land was here nor could he live without land. The things to which Mr Wakeman alludes are of very great importance.

We do not hold that the land question is everything. It is only, we contend, that it is the fundamental thing, and that is the reason why we would concentrate force upon that and settle that rightly before going to anything else. And then we hold that not only would the settlement of this primary question enormously improve the general condition, but that it would make much easier the settlement of all other questions.

Now, the money question, we regard as very trivial. My own personal opinion is that it has been very much exaggerated. Our management of money has been bad, stupid. Nothing could be more stupid based on that for far greater value. But the real trouble about this question is that people think of the money question when it is really not the money question. What is the bottom of what is called this scarcity of money? Not an actual scarcity of money. There is as much money as there was before.

What it really is, is a failure of credit. How does that arise? Why, all over this country people have been booming on land. Go from the Atlantic to the Pacific, I do not know that the booms have struck the South further than Atlanta, but go to Kansas City or Los Angeles called boom towns, and *you* will find that they have been cutting up into lots an area of country two or three times bigger than London, puffing up too high prices.

You see how cleared land has been increasing in value. That has been going on throughout the country. There is the inflation of franchises. There is a great deal of fictitious credit afloat and assumed wealth that is not wealth, that is merely an expectation of being able to tax the rest of the community.

Well, when the people who have got these inflated values, try to get out they begin to fall and then there comes one of those spasms and that is what is called a money trouble. It is not a trouble, it is a speculative trouble, and the worst speculation that lies at the bottom of it is speculation in land that we by our measure would absolutely do away with.

Now, go to another phase of the question. Here are people through the West and in Kansas complaining of a scarcity of money. They have not got the money to get things with; scarcity of collateral. There is a scarcity of wealth in Ireland. Money is being drained from those countries to pay the landowners who lived abroad, to pay the people who have a great tract of land on speculation, to pay mortgages that were given for that land by people who wanted to use it, and so it is all through this country. The East is draining from the West and Europe is draining from the whole country. Mr John Jacob Astor, our great landlord of New York, goes to London to live. What does that mean? He is simply draining wealth from New York to use there. I do not grudge him that. It does not make any difference if I have to pay tribute too him, whether I pay it in New York or London: it only produces that phenomenon.

Now, as to machinery. The trouble is not with machinery. Machinery ought simply to increase wages because it increases productive power, and the reason it does not may be seen very clearly if you consider what land is and how it stands in relation to machinery. Now as to machinery; its effects what we call labor saving. It saves the interest for labor or enables the same labor to produce more wealth; now imagine that to go on as far as we can imagine. Imagine our labor-saving invention and we can now put no line where to say it is going to stop. Here, as Dr. Funk knows what printers have long said is impossible, the typesetting machine has come. In every direction marvels are being worked, new machinery, labor-saving machinery to go on to the farthest imaginable point where all labor would be saved and wealth obtained without labor

A while ago, when I was a boy, I would have said what a great thing it would be to live in those times. Everybody can get all they want without doing any work. But look at it. That would be the conditions of things if our powers to use land were equal, our rights to land equal, but imagine that in a state of things such as exists today or in the civilized world in which only a few own land. What would be the result? That then the necessity for labor being done away with, the landowners could get all the wealth the earth is capable of producing alone and they alone, and the men who had only their labor, the mere laborers: why there would be utterly no use for that. They could only live in that state of plenty by the bounty of the landowners.

Now then, the third point, as to the power of capital. We do not want to attack capital. What is the necessity of attacking capital if you have land. Capital comes from land by the exertion of labor. What has already been taken? Capital constantly tends to decay, to die, and pass away but it is the position of the land that gives you the power to produce capital. Capital is not an original factor; in production only a secondary factor

The original factors in production are land and labor. From them come capital and as for the power of capital to oppress labor that only exists where labor is deprived of its natural opportunities. Take from labor the power of using land and then labor is absolutely helpless. That is the reason today that a laboring man all over the world means a poor man. It ought not to. Labor is really the producer of all wealth. It is the divine ordinance that by labor we live,

we get all the things that sustain our life; and until the man who labors most (I do not mean merely in the sense of exertion), he who labors best ought to have most.

Yet all over the world there is this strange thing that the laboring class is a poor class. The reason is that the laboring class means today the disinherited class—the class that has nothing but their labor, and labor in itself without power to use land is absolutely helpless.

Now, as for the cooperation. Cooperation is a grand thing and a good thing. And if men choose to engage in cooperative institutions of their free will we say go ahead. No objection at all. But there is a deeper and finer cooperation. The first essential is to put all men on the plain of justice. Leave them free to compete with each other and then, as we believe, the national adjustment of society, the play of economic laws will produce a wider and finer cooperation than can otherwise be produced by any getting up of plans and still less by any governmental organization. What we want to do is to make the start fair

What we want to do is to make sure and true the basis, and then let things rise. Let us do this one thing, that is clearly, and I think that Mr. Wakeman will agree with me, that it is a matter of plain absolute justice that all men are entitled to the use of land because that means that all men are equally entitled to their own exertions to profit by its fruits. If that be so, then the first thing to do and the most important thing for us to do is to do that and pass on afterwards to those secondary things. Otherwise, there is no possible hope.

You might have all the money you choose; I don't care what system of money you have, you might have any system you please and as long as some own the land and others were the tenants and could not work without their permission you would have one class rolling in wealth and another class content to labor for a poor bare living and thinking even that a boon in the very nature of things.

It is the same way with all reforms, I care not what they be. Dr. Punk might carry out his prohibition scheme and they might give him power to do away absolutely with liquor so that no one could get it and that would be an improvement I will concede, but it would not go very far so long as this private injustice drove men into the hell of poverty. There would be a craving for liquor or something worse. So with your social or political reforms. If we had New York governed by archangels instead of by politicians of the class who now rule us, what would be the effect today? It would simply be to increase the value of land in New York. Good government in New York would mean higher rents for us to pay.

Mr. Wakeman: After all, your talk about your land is simply an impersonation of land. When you talk about taxing land you did not mean taxing land.

Mr. George: Land values.

Mr. Wakenian: You mean tax the labor of somebody who employs the time. When you get that tax out of somebody else, do you suppose that somebody else isn't going to put it onto the laborer, and when you put it upon the laborer and you have a competition of landlords as to who shall own a piece of land, that is owning the privilege of taxing someone else. Don't you suppose that someone else becomes just as much a slave to the landlord as ever?

Competition between landlords is just as bitter as can be. And the moment you undertake to introduce that competition at stated periods, year after year you get the rack-rent system, which has been so disastrous in Ireland, as the very basis of our social system and are letting loose the rapacity of Mammon on every other form of human enjoyment, comparison with which the proceeds of land are trivial. I don't want that. Talk of the people in New York, they don't want land, they want a chance to live.

Mr. George: Why do you live?

Mr. Wakeman: The mere chance of standing on land is a very trivial thing. How are you going to put the stuff into your stomach or clothes on your back. Land won't do that.

Mr. George: Why, there is a good deal in there for five minutes, or that is all I have before I take the train.

Mr. Funk: Three questions and one minute for each question.

Mr. George: I think Mr. Wakeman will decide when he thinks of it, that he certainly lives on land and pays a pretty high rent for land. And if his offices are where I think and he lives in the sort of house I think he does, I think he will find that he pays more for the use of land than does a very large farmer in such a state as Kansas. Now, as to how the landowner would raise his rent and therefore get it back, I would just like to ask him how the landowner who has no tenant would get it back? The only way he could get it back would be by getting a tenant or selling the land. And in doing that he would necessarily—