

Daily Alta California, Volume 30, Number 10223, 7 April 1878

"The Coming Struggle."

Henry George repeated his lecture, "The Coming Struggle," last evening, at Metropolitan Temple. His audience, last evening, was much smaller than his first audience, but his lecture seemed to be appreciated, as he was often greeted with applause. His lecture was substantially the same, but he took pains to explain what he meant by agrarianism, which, he said, was not the pulling down of the Government, but the building of it up.

Sacramento Daily Union, Volume 7, Number 46, 13 April

"THE COMING STRUGGLE." -- Land Monopoly.

Henry George,

A large and appreciative audience greeted him at the theater. He was complimented by one of the very best audiences which we have seen gathered here for a long time, representing the intelligence, industry, wealth and respectability of the city. He was listened to with closest attention, and very often loudly and warmly applauded, and at the close received three hearty cheers. Mr. George, though reading from manuscript, spoke with ease, was self-possessed, earnest, and at several points rose in his delivery to real eloquence, his depth of feeling being so manifest as to call forth the heartiest responses from his auditors. His effort was an able one, evidenced careful preparation and close study of all the elements of his subject. In composition his matter was presented gracefully, in very simple and forcible language. His lecture occupied one and a half hours in delivery.

We present a summary of the points made. He feared that he would be both misunderstood and misrepresented. His subject embraced the whole range of political economy, and each proposition, he well realized, should be given hours alone for proper presentation.

It is time men are thinking for themselves. The symptoms of social and political disorder are ominous, and should arrest the attention of men the most thoughtless. The cry of distress is heard throughout the land, and men are begging for work at even \$1 a day. To the true student of social and political science the present suffering and disturbed state of society is the first, manifestation of that disease of which nations die. Despite all we say there is fearful want and distress not only fearful want and distress not only for daily necessities, but over the social condition there is deep trouble and anxiety, and men are troubled deeply over the future for their families and their children. With all our growth and progress, the situation of the working classes is growing worse, and will continue to in the future unless the only remedy is applied. Is it caused by the Chinese influx, that unmitigated evil? Not alone, for where the Chinese are unknown the same state of affairs prevails. It is not the result of our deplorable and unwise national financial policy. It is a problem which confronts the civilized world.

What causes the present reduced state of wages? What is the cause of all the evils under which we now groan? What makes the rich richer, and the poor poorer? We cannot charge it to any social condition which is the growth of ages, for we are a new community. Here, where but a brief time ago all were on the nearest possible plane of equality, we have seen the rich and the poor classes separate, and wages fall from the highest rate ever known to rates barely sufficient to support life. We want work, but not that alone. If that were all, work is to be had in plenty ; we want rather what work produces, and all that includes all that is embraced by the term wealth—all things to satisfy human wants and gratify human desires.

Talk of the supply of labor and the demand and all that; in point of fact the supply is the same everywhere—two hands for one mouth. The supply of labor is not too great and the demand too small when the people suffer for the want of that which labor produces. The truth is that the trouble is found in the evil which prevents the worker from gaining what his labor should produce to him. Land is the source of all wealth, and labor must have access to it. Land is at the foundation of all industrial occupations. Farming is the employment of all, for it is the source of all employment. Labor suffers now localise it is shut off from land. If a good part of the unemployed were employed on land they would not only employ themselves but even a greater number of others.

Why cannot labor get at land, for there is plenty of it? He did not mean that all should be farmers, but there should be enough to employ all others. The reason labor is shut off from land is because the land is monopolized, and held at exorbitant prices. Wages were high in the pioneer days, but have now fallen. Why? Because labor in the mines could make high wages for itself, yet in the California of today labor is more productive than then, i. e., the same number of men in different occupations will produce more of the articles men want, and because men work to better advantage now, with railroads and markets at hand, and machinery to aid; as a proof the State has increased more rapidly in wealth than in population. All wealth is the product of labor, and the product of the labor of a community ought to support all in that community.

The evidence of greater wealth is a proof that labor is more productive. Why, then, are wages lower? Wealth primarily must be divided between labor, capital and land. Interest has not increased, but land has in price enormously. In this increase in the value of land is found the solution of the question of the fall of wages. The intrinsic value of land is nothing; its value comes when its owners can command something of the product of labor upon it. The land values here far exceed the personal property values and improvement upon land, i. e., all that labor has produced. The placers were free to labor. Had they been monopolized wages could not have been high, for though as much gold might have been taken out, a smaller portion would have gone to the workers.

We allowed our mineral lands to be taken by those who did not want to use them, and that is the reason the few get so much and the many so little ; that some live in palaces and others labor at \$1 a day. **Men don't pay high prices for that they can get for nothing, and farming land rents here for one-quarter, one-third or one-half of the crop, the renter doing all the labor and most of the furnishing.** So when \$2 is made, \$1 goes to the landlord and the other to the renter, and out of his dollar comes all the cost, and he is left but a fraction. The more thus taken

by capital the less there is left for wages. Where there are no Chinese, no paper money, no tariff questions, everywhere it is the same where land is treated as owned by a class and not the property of the whole people. Where land is cheap is the best place for the laborer, and that we all know.

Wherever land is relatively low wages are relatively high, and vice versa. There is the greatest wealth where there is the densest population, other things being equal. The lands of this State should support 3,000,000 today, but they do not support 1,000,000. Labor-saving machinery ought to advantage labor and raise wages, but it does not. The railroads have not added to the value of labor, but only to the value of lands. The street railways of San Francisco have added millions to land values, but have reduced wages.

Suppose invention should produce machinery to abolish all necessity for labor, then the owners of lands would be absolute owners of all wealth. The thousands who can work in the harvests this summer will be forced to the cities to become vagrants when the harvest is over, and if land monopoly goes on we shall have no use for them at any season. If the working class is to be thus ground down it is best it be the Chinese -- better than that whites should be thus debased. If this State would but speak out, its voice would be respected by the powers, we are humbly imploring 3,000 miles to the East. The laboring class, the middle and merchant class, want to stop the Chinese influx ; the capitalist class and the landed proprietors do not. They know the connection between cheap labor and high priced lands, and men who debauch politics, balk legislation and testify before Congress that the Chinese are needed in California are the men who speak for those classes. Clear out the lard grabber, and the Chinese must go. Put the white race on the soil, and all the millions of Asia cannot dispossess it.

There is no conflict between labor and capital. The capitalist's power springs from the so-called ownership of land, in which there is really no ownership. Low wages indicate unemployed capital; high wages and high interest go together; the warmest friends of capital are the very men who strive to advance the rate of wages. Labor and capital are the representative elements of production, and their common enemy is the monopolist of land. To absolutely own the surface of the globe would be to absolutely own the people upon it.

Corruption, intemperance and public dishonesty cannot be destroyed until we root out the monopoly of the great producer—the soil. To compel labor to low wages is to compel it to intemperance and a state destructive of every essential to prosperous, ambitious, good citizenship in the Republic. To maintain a true Republic, we must not only prevent wages going down, but make them higher. If the working classes reduce their expenses one-half, wages would ultimately fall one-half. This is the statement of all the best essayists on political economy, who uniformly stand up for the maintenance of the physical comforts in the laboring class.

The Senate was frightened at Hayinoud's proposition to prevent bequests of land in excess of 640 acres, but something more than restriction is necessary. The State must assert her right to that she has the right to the soil. It cannot go on educating children in the school system and refuse them the right to live. There must come an end to the playing of the dog in the manger with the bounty of the Creator. No man must hold more land than he can use, and shall hold that only so long as he does use it. This is called agrarianism, but is a good word. It does not mean tearing down; it means building up, purifying society, and is the only thing which can save this Republic, as it

was the only thing which could have saved the Roman Republic. Pursuing his subject in this vein at still greater length, and elaborately arguing each point, Mr. George came finally to these three propositions: First, he would make the peaceable and actual occupation and use of land for one year bona fide, conclusive evidence of ownership or right of occupancy and use, and prior to any dispossession the occupant should be paid the value of his improvements; second, abolish all taxes for revenue, except the tax on the value of land exclusive of improvements, and an exemption of \$1,000 for the occupant; third, provide a summary process by which land not in use may be used by any citizen who wishes to and will use it, on the payment of its assessed value.

Mr. George then went on to show what the result of the adoption in the Constitution of these principles would produce, drawing a pleasing picture of the peace and prosperity which would ensue. He inveighed in strong terms against the law which forfeits the improvements the products of labor, because of the discovery of a flaw in the title of land, and cited the many cases in which men in California have had to buy their own improvements, erected on land they believed they had the right to live upon. He scored the system which allows a few men to seize the waters of the State and demand millions for their use, saying that they had as good a right to monopolize the air and the sunlight as to take the melting snows of the mountains and demand coin from the thirsty for a drink of the waters that flow from the hills. He prophesied a mighty revolution and an upturning of all the present evils, a more equitable distribution of rights, the destruction of land monopoly, the elevation of the laboring classes, the multiplying of homes and the final salvation, after a bitter struggle, of this Republic.