

"There was a man sent from God, whose name was Henry George."—Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn.

"Henry George lived only to benefit his fellowmen."

—John Russell Young.

"The teaching of George is irresistibly convincing in its simplicity and clearness."—Leo Tolstoy.

HENRY GEORGE'S

Land Question

In his own eloquent words

Abridged by WILL ATKINSON

Price 10 Cents

ANTI POVERTY CLUB

Capon Springs

West Virginia

No one should pretend to be well informed who is ignorant of Henry George's proposals. Nor can our over-burdened tax payers afford to neglect the relief he offers. He asks that all earned incomes be entirely freed from taxes, and that all taxes be taken from unearned incomes.

Henry George's books have had a circulation, of more than six million copies in English alone, and have been translated and published in Chinese, Japanese, Russian, Finnish, Danish, Swedish, French, German, Spanish, Dutch, Hungarian, Portuguese and Italian.

They have profoundly affected thought everywhere and legislation in many countries. No fundamental reform has ever before made such world-wide progress in forty-eight years and its growth today is more rapid, though more quiet, than ever before.

"*Land and Freedom*" bi-monthly, \$2 a year. A world review of Single Tax progress. Land and Freedom, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Progress and Poverty, by Henry George (Unabridged) cloth \$1.

Social Problems, by Henry George, cloth \$1.

Protection of Free Trade, by Henry George, cloth, \$1.

"Thirty years of Verse Making," by Joseph Dana Miller, cloth, Gilt Top, \$2. Approximately 145 poems, including tributes to Henry George and other leaders of the Single Tax Movement.

Among other Single Tax Publications, are:

"Land and Liberty" Monthly (34th year) 4 S. a year, 11 Tothill St., London, S. W. 1.

"The Commonweal," Weekly, 6 S. a year, 43 Chancery Lane, London, W. C. 2.

"The Standard," Monthly, 81 Elizabeth St., Sidney, N. S. W.

"The Square Deal," Monthly, 75 Yonge, St., Toronto, Canada.

"Ret," Danish, Lumbyesgade 50, Kobenhavn, Denmark.

"Revista del Impuesto Unico, (Spanish), Buenos Aires, Argentina.

"Revista do Imposto Unico (Portuguese), Porto Alegre, Rio Grand do Sul, Brazil.

"Progress and Poverty," abridged, 55 cents, and "Henry George's Land Question," in his own eloquent words, abridged by Will Atkinson. Mailed anywhere for 10 cents.

"What is the Single Tax?" by Louis E. Post, 50 cents, Vanguard Press, 80 Fifth Ave., N. Y.

"Moses" by Henry George, 10 cents.

"An Outline of Henry George's Progress and Poverty," by Will Atkinson, mailed anywhere for 10 cents, 20 copies for \$1. By freight or express (carriage extra), 100 for \$4.50, 1000 for \$40, 10,000 for \$200. "Moses," same prices. "Henry George's Land Question," abridged by Will Atkinson, same prices. "For Freedom," by Will Atkinson, Leather \$1, paper 50 cents. Anti-Poverty Club, Capon Springs, West Va.

FOREWORD

The greatest apostle of justice in nineteen hundred years was Henry George.

He asks us to abolish laws which reward evil and punish virtue; which penalize thrift, energy and industry and reward chicanery and idleness.

Henry George asks us to apply the land laws of Moses and the teachings of Christ to present day conditions and so give to Christianity and Democracy a rock foundation, in place of the quicksands of injustice on which we vainly strive to build.

No other writer equals Henry George in charm, in eloquence, in clearness; but what has carried his message to the very ends of the earth and made for him millions of disciples, is his absolute honesty and the spirit of self sacrifice which dominates all he has written.

As John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy at Columbia University has said, no man should pretend to be well informed who has not studied Henry George.

Critics of Christianity and of Democracy forget that neither Christianity nor Democracy have yet been tried.

This little book explains what we need to do to try either fairly.

But we hope you will read also Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," "Social Problems" and "Protection or Free Trade" and learn that it is not necessary to murder the unborn, nor to wage war in order to insure that in every land there shall be room for all, plenty for all, leisure for all.—WILL ATKINSON.

HENRY GEORGE'S LAND QUESTIONS

IN HIS OWN ELOQUENT WORDS.

Abridged by Will Atkinson.

Nothing Peculiar in Irish Distress.

When there is famine among savages it is because food enough is not to be had. But in any part of Ireland, during the height of what was called the famine, there was food enough for whoever had means to pay for it. The trouble was not in the scarcity of food. There was no real scarcity of food, and the proof of it is that food did not command scarcity prices. During all the so-called famine, food was constantly exported from Ireland to England, which shows there was no true famine. During all the so-called famine American meat and grain could have been poured into Ireland so quickly that the relief would have been felt instantaneously. The reason that so many of the Irish people were starving was—not that the food was not to be had, but that they had not the means to buy it. Had the Irish people had money or its equivalent, the bad seasons might have come and gone without stinting any one of a full meal. Their effect would merely have been to determine toward Ireland the flow of more abundant harvests.

The Irish famine was not a true famine arising from the scarcity of food. It was like the Indian famine—a “financial famine,” arising not from scarcity of food, but from the poverty of the people.

Are not all countries subject to just such famines as this Irish famine?

In the very centers of civilization, where the machinery of production and exchange is at the highest point of efficiency—where bank-vaults hold millions, and show-windows flash with more than a prince's ransom, where elevators and warehouses are gorged with grain, and markets are piled with all things succulent and toothsome, where the dinners of Lucullus are eaten every day, and, if it be but cool, the very little greyhounds wear dainty little blankets—in these centers of wealth and power and refinement, there are always hungry men and women and little children. Never the sun goes down but on human beings prowling like wolves for food, or huddling together like vermin for shelter and warmth.

This is “the home of freedom,” and the “asylum of the oppressed”; our population is yet sparse, our public domain yet wide; we are the greatest of food producers, yet even here there are beggars, tramps, paupers, men torn by anxiety for the support of their families, women who know not which way to turn, little children growing up in such poverty and squalor that only a miracle can keep them pure. “Always with you,” even here.

What is the week or the day of the week that our papers do not tell of man or woman who, to escape the tortures of want has stepped out of life unbidden? What is this but famine?

MORE THAN AN IRISH LAND QUESTION.

When the agent of the Irish landlord takes from the Irish cottier for rent his pigs, his poultry, or his potatoes, or the money that he gains by the sale of these things, it is clear enough that this rent comes from the earnings of labor, and diminishes what the laborer gets. But is not this in reality just as clear when a dozen middle-men stand between laborer and landlord? Is it not just as clear, when, instead of being paid monthly or quarterly or yearly, rent is paid in a lumped sum called purchase money? Whence come the incomes which the owners of land in mining districts, in manufacturing districts, or in commercial districts, receive for the use of their land? Manifestly, they must have come from the earnings of labor—there is no other source from which they can come. From what are the revenues of Trinity Church corporation drawn, if not from the earnings of labor? What is the source of the income of the Astors, if it is not the labor of laboring men, women and children? When a man makes a fortune by the rise of real estate, it means that he may have fine clothes, costly food, a grand house, etc. Now, these things are not the spontaneous fruits of the soil; neither do they fall from heaven, nor are they cast up by the sea. They are products of labor—can only be produced by labor. And hence, if men who do not labor get them, it must necessarily be at the expense of those who do labor.

Simple as this truth is, it is persistently ignored.

Miserable as is the condition of the Irish peasantry, sickening as are the stories of their suffering, for the worst instances of human degradation one must go to the reports that describe the condition of the laboring poor of England, rather than to the literature of Irish misery. For there are three things for which, in spite of their poverty and wretchedness and occasional famine, the very poorest of Irish peasants are by all accounts remarkable—the physical vigor of their men, the purity of their women, and the strength of the family affections. This, to put it mildly, can not be said of large classes of the laboring populations of England and Scotland. In those rich manufacturing districts are classes stunted and deteriorated physically by want and unwholesome employments; classes in which the idea of female virtue is all but lost, and the family affections all but trodden out.

But it is needless to compare sufferings and measure miseries. Land is necessary to all production, no matter what be its kind or form; land is the standing-place, the workshop, the store-house of labor; it is to the human being the only means by which he can

obtain access to the material universe or utilize its powers. Without land man cannot exist. To whom the ownership of land is given, to him is given the virtual ownership of the men who must live upon it. When this necessity is absolute, then does he necessarily become their absolute master. And just as this point is neared—that is to say, just as competition increases the demand for land—just in that degree does the power of taking a larger and larger share of the earnings of labor increase. It is this power that gives land its value; this is the power that enables the owner of valuable land to reap where he has not sown—to appropriate to himself wealth which he has had no share in producing. Rent is always the devourer of wages. The owner of city land takes in the rents he receives for his land the earnings of labor just as clearly as does the owner of farming land. And whether he be working in a garret, ten stories above the street, or in a mining drift thousands of feet below the earth's surface, it is the competition for the use of land that ultimately determines what proportion of the produce of his labor the laborer will get for himself. This is the reason why modern progress does not tend to extirpate poverty; this is the reason why, with all the inventions and improvements and economies which so enormously increase productive power, wages everywhere tend to the minimum of a bare living. The cause that in Ireland produces poverty and distress—the ownership by some of the people of the land on which and from which the whole people must live—everywhere else produces the same results. It is this that produces the hideous squalor of London and Glasgow slums; it is this that makes want jostle luxury in the streets of rich New York, that forces little children to monotonous and stunting toil in Massachusetts mills and that fills the highways of our newest States with tramps.

WHOSE LAND IS IT?

What, then, is the true solution of the land problem?

The first question that naturally arises is that of right. Among whatever kind of people such a matter as this is discussed, the question of right is sure to be raised. This, to me, seems a very significant thing; for I believe it to spring from nothing less than a universal perception of the human mind—a perception often dim and vague, yet still a universal perception, that justice is the supreme law of the universe, so that, as a short road to what is best, we instinctively ask what is right?

Now, what are the rights of this case? To whom rightfully does the soil of Ireland belong? Who are justly entitled to its use and to all the benefits that flow from its use?

Let me go to the heart of this question by asking another question: Has or has not the child born in Ireland a right to live?

There can be but one answer, for no one would contend that it was right to drown Irish babies, or that any human law could make it right. Well, then, if every human being born in Ireland has a right to live in Ireland, these rights must be equal. If each one has a right to live, then no one can have any better right to live than any other one. There can be no dispute about this. No one will contend that it would be any less a crime to drown the baby of an Irish peasant woman than it would be to drown the baby of the proudest duchess, or that a law commanding the one would be any more justifiable than a law commanding the other.

Since, then, all the Irish people have the same equal right to life, it follows that they must all have the same equal right to the land of Ireland. If they are all in Ireland by the same equal permission of Nature, so that no one of them can justly set up a superior claim to life than any other one of them; so that all the rest of them could not justly say to any one of them, "You have not the same right to live as we have; therefore we pitch you out of Ireland into the sea!" then they must all have the same equal rights to the elements which Nature has provided for the sustaining of life—to air, to water, and to land. For to deny the equal right to the elements necessary to the maintaining of life is to deny the equal right to life. Any law that said, "Certain babies have no right to the soil of Ireland; therefore they shall be thrown off the soil of Ireland," would be precisely equivalent to a law that said, "Certain babies have no right to live; therefore they shall be thrown into the sea." And as no law or custom or agreement can justify the denial of the equal right to life, so no law or custom or agreement can justify the denial of the equal right to land.

It therefore follows, from the very fact of their existence, that the right of each one of the people of Ireland to an equal share in the land of Ireland is equal and inalienable; that is to say, that the use and benefit of the land of Ireland belong rightfully to the whole people of Ireland, to each one as much as to every other; to no one more than to any other—not to some individuals, to the exclusion of other individuals; not to one class, to the exclusion of other classes; not to landlords, not to tenants, not to cultivators, but to the whole people.

This right is irrefutable and indefeasable. It pertains to and springs from the fact of existence, the right to live. No law, no covenant, no agreement, can bar it. One generation cannot stipulate away the rights of another generation. If the whole people of Ireland were to unite in bargaining away their rights in the land, how could they justly bargain away the right of the child who the next moment is born? No one can bargain away what is not his; no one can stipulate away the rights of another. And if the

new-born infant has an equal right to life, then has it an equal right to land. Its warrant, which comes direct from Nature, and which sets aside all human laws or title-deeds, is the fact that it is born.

Here we have a firm, self-apparent principle from which we may safely proceed. The land of Ireland does not belong to one individual more than to another individual, to one class more than to another class; to one generation more than to the generations that come after. It belongs to the whole people who at the time exist upon it.

If the land of Ireland belongs of natural right to the Irish people, what valid claim for payment can be set up by the Irish landlords? No one will contend that the land is theirs of natural right, for the day has gone by when men could be told that the Creator of the universe intended his bounty for the exclusive use and benefit of a privileged class of his creatures—that he intended a few to roll in luxury while their fellows toiled and starved for them. The claim of the landlords to the land rests not on natural right, but merely on municipal law—on municipal law which contravenes natural right. And, whenever the sovereign power changes municipal law so as to conform to natural right, what claim can they assert to compensation? Some of them bought their lands, it is true; but they get no better title than the seller had to give. And what are these titles? Titles based on murder and robbery, on blood and rapine—titles which rest on the most atrocious and wholesale crimes. Created by force and maintained by force, they have not behind them the first shadow of right.

THE GREAT-GREAT-GRANDSON OF CAPTAIN KIDD

The galleys that carried Caesar to Britain, the accoutrements of his legionaries, the baggage that they carried, the arms that they bore, the buildings that they erected; the scythed chariots of the ancient Britons, the horses that drew them, their wicker boats and wattled houses—where are they now? But the land for which Roman and Briton fought, there it is still. The British soil is yet as fresh and as new as it was in the days of the Romans. Generation after generation has lived on it since, and generation after generation will live on it yet. Now here is a very great difference. The right to possess and to pass on the ownership of things that in their nature decay and soon cease to be is a very different thing from the right to possess and to pass on the ownership of that which does not decay, but from which each successive generation must live.

Captain Kidd was a pirate. He made a business of sailing the seas, capturing merchantmen, making their crews walk the plank, and appropriating their cargoes. Let us suppose that he did not bury his wealth, but left it to his legal heirs, and they to their heirs, until a part of it has come to a great-great-grandson of Captain

Kidd. And a great-great-grandson of one whom Captain Kidd plundered—makes complaint and says: "This man's great-great-great-grandfather robbed my great-great-grandfather of things which have been transmitted to him, whereas but for this wrongful act they would have been transmitted to me; therefore, I demand that he be made to restore them."

Society would say, "We cannot entertain such a demand. If we go righting the wrongs and reopening the controversies of our great-great-grandfathers, there would be no end to disputes and pretexts for disputes. We must make continued peaceful possession, as absolute evidence of just title."

This common-sense principle is expressed in the statute of limitations—in the doctrine of vested rights.

But let us suppose that Captain Kidd, having established a profitable piratical business, left it to his son, and he to his son, and so on, until his great-great-grandson, who now pursues it, has come to consider it the most natural thing in the world that his ships should roam the sea, capturing peaceful merchantmen, making their crews walk the plank, and bringing home to him much plunder, whereby he is enabled, though he does no work at all, to live in very great luxury, and look down with contempt upon people who have to work. But at last, the merchants get tired of having their ships sunk and their goods taken, and sailors get tired of trembling for their lives every time a sail lifts above the horizon, and they demand of society that piracy be stopped.

Now, what should society say if Mr. Kidd got indignant, appealed to the doctrine of vested rights, and asserted that society was bound to prevent any interference with the business that he had inherited, and that, if it wanted him to stop, it must buy him out, paying him all that his business was worth—so that if he stopped pirating, he could still live in luxury off the merchants, and the sailors?

Society should tell Mr. Kidd that his was a business to which the statute of limitations and the doctrine of vested rights did not apply; that because his father, and his great and great-great-grandfather captured ships and made their crews walk the plank, was no reason why he should be permitted to do it.

Or suppose Mr. Kidd had sold out his piratical business to Smith, Jones, or Robinson, society ought to say that their purchase of the business gave them no greater right than Mr. Kidd had.

We will all agree that that is what society *ought* to say. Observe, I do not ask what society *would* say.

For, ridiculous and preposterous as it may appear, under these circumstances, society would not for a long time say what we have

agreed it *ought* to say. All the Kidds would claim that to make them give up their business without full recompense would be a wicked interference with vested rights, and the justice of this claim would at first be assumed as a matter of course by all or nearly all the influential classes—the great lawyers, the able journalists, the writers for the magazines, the eloquent clergymen, and the principal professors in the principal universities. Even the merchants and sailors would be so tyrannized and browbeaten by this public opinion, that they would hardly think of more than of buying out the Kidds, and, wherever here and there any one dared to raise his voice in favor of stopping piracy at once and without compensation, he would only do so under penalty of being stigmatized as a reckless disturber and wicked foe of social order.

I appeal to universal history to bear me witness and to the facts of today.

Show me a wrong, no matter how monstrous, that ever yet became ingrafted in the social system, and I will prove to you the truth of what I say.

The majority of men do not think; the majority of men have to expend so much energy in the struggle to make a living that they do not have time to think. The majority of men accept, as a matter of course, whatever is. This is what makes the task of the social reformer so difficult, his path so hard. This is what brings to those who first raise their voices in behalf of a great truth the sneers of the powerful, and the curses of the rabble, ostracism and martyrdom, the robe of derision and the crown of thorns.

Have there not been states of society in which piracy has been considered most respectable and honorable? Are there not states of society in which, in spite of the natural proportions of the sexes, polygamy is considered a matter of course? Are there not states of society in which it would be considered disreputable for a man to carry a burden, while a woman who could stagger under it was around?—states of society in which the husband, who did not occasionally beat his wife, would be deemed by both sexes a weak-minded, low-spirited fellow? How long has it been since the monstrous doctrine of the divine right of kings was taught through all Christendom?

What is the slave trade but piracy of the worst kind? Yet it is not long since the slave trade was looked upon as a perfectly respectable business. The proposition to prohibit it was first looked upon as ridiculous, then as fanatical, then as wicked.

Is it not but yesterday that in the freest and greatest republic on earth, among the people who boast that they lead the very van of civilization, this doctrine of vested rights was deemed a sufficient justification for all the cruel wrongs of human slavery? Is it not but yesterday, when whoever dared to say that the rights of

property did not justly attach to human beings; when whoever dared to deny that human beings could be rightfully bought and sold like cattle—the husband torn from the wife and the child from the mother; when whoever denied the right of one who had paid his money for him to work or whip his own nigger was looked upon as a wicked assailant of the rights of property? Look over American literature previous to the war, and say whether, if the business of piracy had been a flourishing business, it would have lacked defenders? Say whether any proposal to stop the business of piracy without compensating the pirates would not have been denounced at first as a proposal to set aside vested rights?

I appeal to other states of society and to times that are past merely to get my readers out of their accustomed ruts of thought. The proof of what I assert about the Kidds and their business is in the thought and speech of today.

Here is a system which robs the producers of wealth, as remorselessly and far more regularly and systematically than the pirate robs the merchantmen. Here is a system that steadily condemns thousands to far more lingering and horrible deaths than walking the plank—to death of the mind and death of the soul, as well as death of the body. These things are undisputed. No one who will examine the subject will deny that the chronic pauperism and chronic famine which everywhere mark our civilization are the results of this system. Yet we are told that this system cannot be abolished without buying off those who profit by it. Was there ever more degrading abasement of the human mind before a fetish? Can we wonder, as we see it, at any perversion of ideas?

In what does the claim of the Irish landholders differ from that of the hereditary pirate or the man who has bought up a piratical business? "Because I have inherited or purchased the business of robbing merchantmen," says the pirate, "therefore respect for the rights of property must compel you to let me go on robbing ships and making sailors walk the plank until you buy me out." "Because we have inherited or purchased the privilege of appropriating to ourselves the lion's share of the produce of labor," says the landlord, "Therefore you must continue to let us do it, even though poor wretches shiver with cold and faint with hunger, even though, in their poverty and misery, they are reduced to wallow with the pigs." What is the difference?

This shows a distinction that in current thought is overlooked. Property in land, like property in slaves, is essentially different from property in things that are the result of labor. Rob a man or a people of money, or goods, or cattle, and the robbery is finished there and then. The lapse of time does not, indeed, change wrong into right, but it obliterates the effects of the deed.

We can neither punish nor recompense the dead. But

rob a people of the land on which they must live, and the robbery is continuous. It is a fresh robbery of every succeeding generation—a new robbery every year and every day; it is like the robbery which condemns to slavery the children of the slave. To apply to it the statute of limitations, to acknowledge for it the title of prescription, is not to condone the past; it is to legalize robbery in the present. The indictment which really lies against the Irish landlords is not that their ancestors robbed the ancestors of the Irish people. The indictment that truly lies is that here, now this year, *they* rob the Irish people. And shall we be told that there can be a vested right to continue such robbery?

This question of compensating land-owners is not merely of great practical importance, but its discussion brings clearly into view the principles upon which the land question in Ireland, or in any other country, can alone be justly and finally settled. Land-owners have no rightful claim either to the land or to compensation for its resumption by the people, and no such rightful claim can ever be created. It would be wrong to pay the present land-owners for "their" land at the expense of the people; it would likewise be wrong to sell it again to smaller holders. It would be wrong to abolish the payment of rent, and to give the land to its present cultivators. In the very nature of things, land can not rightfully be made individual property. The principle is absolute. The title of a peasant proprietor deserves no more respect than the title of a great territorial noble. Neither the sovereign power of Great Britain, nor the whole people of Ireland, nor the whole population of the globe, can give to an individual a valid title to a square inch of Irish soil or any other soil. The earth is an entailed estate—entailed upon all the generations of the children of men, by a deed written in the constitution of Nature, a deed that no human proceedings can bar, and no prescription determine. Each succeeding generation has but a tenancy for life. Admitting that any set of men may barter away their own natural rights (and this logically involves an admission of the right of suicide), they can no more barter away the rights of their successors than they can barter away the rights of the inhabitants of other worlds.

The only true and just solution of the problem, the only end worth aiming at, is to make all the land the common property of *all* the people.

To do this it is merely necessary to divert the rent which now flows to landlords into the common treasury of the whole people. It is not possible to so divide up the land of Ireland so as to give each family, still less each individual, an equal share. And, even if that were possible, it would not be possible to maintain equality, for old people are constantly dying and new people con-

stantly being born. But it is possible to equally divide the rent, or what amounts to the same thing, to apply it to purposes of common benefit. This is the way, and this is the only way in which absolute justice can be done. This is the way, and this is the only way, in which the equal right of every man, woman and child can be acknowledged and secured. As Herbert Spencer says of it (in Social Statics, Chapter IX, sec. 8):

Such a doctrine is consistent with the highest state of civilization; may be carried out without involving a community of goods, and need cause no very serious revolution in existing arrangements. The change required would simply be a change of landlords. Separate ownership would merge into the joint-stock ownership of the public. Instead of being in the possession of individuals, the country would be held by the great corporate body—society. Instead of leasing his acres from an isolated proprietor, the farmer would lease them from the nation. Instead of paying his rent to the agent of Sir John or his Grace, he would pay it to an agent or deputy agent of the community. Stewards would be public officials instead of private ones, and tenancy the only land tenure. A state of things so ordered would be in perfect harmony with the moral law. Under it, all men would be equally landlords; all men would be alike free to become tenants. . . . Clearly, therefore, on such a system the earth might be enclosed, occupied, and cultivated, in entire subordination to the law of equal freedom.

Now, it is a very easy thing to thus sweep away all private ownership of land, and convert all occupiers into tenants of the State, by appropriating rent. No complicated laws or cumbersome machinery is necessary. It is only necessary to tax land up to its full value. Do that, without any infringement of the just rights of property, the land would become virtually the people's.

How beautifully this simple method would satisfy every economic requirement; how, freeing labor and capital from the fetters that now oppress them (for all other taxes could be easily remitted), it would enormously increase the production of wealth; how it would make distribution conform to the law of justice, dry up the springs of want and misery, elevate society from its lowest stratum, and give all their fair share in the blessing of advancing civilization, can perhaps only be fully shown by such a detailed examination of the whole social problem as I have made in Progress & Poverty which I hope will be read by all the readers of this paper, since in it I go over much ground and treat many subjects which cannot be even touched upon here. Nevertheless, any one can see that to tax land up to its full rental value would amount to precisely the same thing as to formally take possession of it, and then let it out to the highest bidders.

The youngest child of the poorest peasant has as good a right to tread the soil and breathe the air of Ireland as the eldest son of the proudest duke. Private property in land, never rises from the natural perceptions of men, but springs historically from usurpation and robbery, is something so utterly absurd, so outrageously unjust, so clearly a waste of productive forces and a

barrier to the most profitable use of natural opportunities, so thoroughly opposed to all sound maxims of public policy, so glaringly in the way of further progress, that it is only tolerated because the majority of men never think about it or hear it questioned. Once fairly arraign it, and it must be condemned; once call upon its advocates to exhibit its claims, and their cause is lost.

The greatest enemy of the people's cause is he who appeals to national passion and excites old hatreds. He is its best friend who does his utmost to bury them out of sight. For that action and reaction are equal and uniform is the law of the moral as of the physical world. Herein lies the far-reaching sweep of those sublime teachings that, after centuries of nominal acceptance, the so-called Christian world yet ignores, and which call on us to answer not revilings with revilings, but to meet hatred with love. "For," as say the Scriptures of the Buddhists, "Hatred never ceases by hatred at any time; hatred ceases by love; that is an old rule."

It is not with the English people that the Irish people have cause of quarrel. It is with the system that oppresses both. That is the thing to denounce; that is the thing to fight. And it is to be fought most effectually by uniting the masses against it. Proclaim the universal truth that land is of natural right common property; abandon all timid and half-way schemes which attempt to compromise between justice and injustice, and demand nothing more nor less than a full recognition of this natural right.

If the land is rightfully the landlords', then is any compulsion as to how they shall let it, or on what terms they shall part with it, a bad and dangerous precedent which naturally alarms capital and excites the solicitude of those who are concerned for good morals and social order. For, if a man may be made to part with one species of property by boycotting or agitation, why not with another? If a man's title to land is as rightful as his title to his watch, what is the difference between agitation by Land League meetings and Parliamentary filibustering to make him give up the one and agitation with a cocked pistol to make him give up the other.

But if it be denied that land justly is, or can be, private property, if the equal rights of the whole people to the use of the elements gratuitously furnished by Nature be asserted without drawback or compromise, then the essential difference between property in land and property in things of human production is at once brought out. Then will it clearly appear not only that the denial of the right of individual property in land does not involve any menace to legitimate property rights, but that the maintenance of private property in land necessarily involves a denial of the right to all

other property, and that the recognition of the claims of the landlord means a continuous robbery of capital as well as of labor.

The way to make land common property is simply to take rent for the common benefit. And to do this, the easy way is to abolish one tax after another until the whole weight of taxation falls upon the value of land. When that point is reached the battle is won.

The tax upon land values or rent is in all economic respects the most perfect of taxes. No political economist will deny that it combines the maximum of certainty with the minimum of loss and cost; that, unlike taxes upon capital or exchange, or improvement, it does not check production or enhance prices or fall ultimately upon the consumer. And, in proposing to abolish all other taxes in favor of this perfect tax, the Land Reformers will have on their side the advantages of ideas already current.

Landowners are in numbers but an insignificant minority. And, the more they protested against the injustice of having to pay all the taxes, the quicker would the public mind realize the quicker would the majority of the people come to see the landowners ought not only to pay all the taxes, but a good deal more besides. Once put the question in such a way that the British working man will realize that he pays two prices for his ale and half a dozen prices for his tobacco, because a landowner's Parliament in the time of Charles II. shook off their ancient dues to the State, and imposed them in indirect taxation on him; once bring to the attention of the well-to-do Englishman, who grunts as he pays his income tax, the question as to whether the landowner who draws his income from property that of natural right belongs to the whole people ought not to pay it instead of him, and it will not be long before the absurd injustice of allowing rent to be appropriated by individuals will be thoroughly understood.

Landholders as a class are not more stupid nor more selfish than any other class. And as they saw, as they must see, as the discussion progresses, that they also would be the gainers in the great social change which would abolish poverty and elevate the very lowest classes above the want, the misery, the vice, and degradation in which they are now plunged, there are many landowners who would join heartily and unreservedly in the effort to bring this change about. There is that in a great truth that can raise a human soul above mists of selfishness.

We have had free trade in land; we have had in our American farmer, owning his own acres, using his own capital, and working with his own hands, something far better than peasant proprietorship. We have had, what no legislation can give the people of Great Britain, vast areas of virgin soil. We have had all of these under democratic institutions. Yet we have here social disease of precisely the same kind as that which exists in Ireland and Eng-

land. And the reason is that we have had here precisely the same cause—that we have made land private property. So long as this exists, our democratic institutions are vain, our pretence of equality, but cruel irony, our public schools can but sow the seeds of discontent. So long as this exists, material progress can but force the masses of our people into a harder and more hopeless slavery. Until we in some way make the land, what Nature intended it to be, common property, until we in some way secure to every child born among us his natural birthright, we have not established the Republic in any sense worthy of the name, and we cannot establish the Republic. Its foundations are quicksand.

A LITTLE ISLAND OR A LITTLE WORLD.

Imagine an island girt with ocean; imagine a little world swimming in space. Put on it, in imagination, human beings. Let them divide the land, share and share alike, as individual property. At first, while population is sparse, and industrial processes rude and primitive, this will work well enough.

Turn away the eyes of the mind for a moment, let time pass, and look again. Some families will have died out, some have greatly multiplied: on the whole, population will have largely increased, and even supposing there have been no important inventions or improvements in the productive arts, the increase in population, by causing the division of labor, will have made industry more complex. During this time some of these people will have been careless, generous, improvident; some will have been thrifty and grasping. Some of them will have devoted much of their powers to thinking of how they themselves and the things they see around them came to be, to inquiries and speculations as to what there is in the universe beyond their little island or their little world, to making poems, painting pictures, or writing books; to noting the differences in the rocks and trees, and shrubs and grasses; to classifying beasts and birds and fishes and insects—to the doing, in short, of all the many things which add so largely to the sum of human knowledge and human happiness, without much or any gain of wealth to the doer. Others, again, will have devoted all their energies to the extending of their possessions. What, then, shall we see, land having been all this time treated as private property? Clearly, we shall see that the primitive equality has given way to inequality. Some will have very much more than one of the original shares into which the land was divided; very many will have no land at all. Suppose that, in all things save this, our little island or our little world is Utopia, yet inequality in the ownership of land will have produced poverty and virtual slavery.

For the people we have supposed are human beings—that is to say, in their physical natures at least, they are animals who can

only live on land and by aid of the products of land. They may make machines which will enable them to float on the sea, or perhaps to fly in the air, but to build up and equip these machines they must have land and the products of land, and must constantly come back to land. Therefore, those who own the land must be the masters of the rest. Thus, if one man has come to own all the land, he is their absolute master, even to life or death. If they can only live on the land on his terms, then they can only live on his terms, for without land they cannot live. They are his absolute slaves, and so long as his ownership is acknowledged, if they want to live, they must do in everything as he wills.

If, however, the concentration of landownership has not gone so far as to make one or a very few men the owners of all the land—if there are still so many landowners that there is competition between them as well as between those who have only their labor—then the terms on which these non-landowners can live will seem more like a free contract. But it will not be free contract. Land can yield no wealth without the application of labor; labor can produce no wealth without land. These are the two equally necessary factors of production. Yet, to say that they are equally necessary factors of production is not to say that, in the making of contracts as to how the results of production are divided, the possessors of these two meet on equal terms. For the nature of these two factors is very different. Land is a natural element; the human being must have his stomach filled every few hours. Land can exist without labor, but labor cannot exist without land. If I own a piece of land, I can let it lie idle for a year or for years, and it will eat nothing. But the laborer must eat every day, and his family must eat. And so, in the making of terms between them, the landowner has an immense advantage over the laborer. It is on the side of the laborer that the intense pressure of competition comes, for in his case it is competition urged by hunger. And, further than this: As population increases, as the competition for the use of the land becomes more and more intense, so are the owners of land enabled to get for the use of their land a larger and larger part of the wealth which labor exerted upon it produces. That is to say, the value of land steadily rises. Now, this steady rise in the value of land brings about a confident expectation of future increase of value, which produces among landowners all the effects of a combination to hold for higher prices. Thus there is a constant tendency to force mere laborers to take less and less or to give more and more (put it which way you please, it amounts to the same thing) of the products of their work for the opportunity to work. And thus in the very nature of things, we should see on our little island or our little world that after a time had passed, some of the people would be able to take

and enjoy a superabundance of all the fruits of labor without doing any labor at all, while others would be forced to work the livelong day, for a pitiful living.

But let us introduce another element into the supposition. Let us suppose great discoveries and inventions—such as the steam-engine, the power loom, the Bessemer process, the reaping machine, and the thousand and one labor saving devices that are such a marked feature of our era. What would be the result?

Manifestly, the effect of all such discoveries and inventions is to increase the power of labor in producing wealth, to enable the same amount of wealth to be produced by less labor, or a greater amount with the same labor. But none of them lessen or can lessen the necessity for land. Until we can discover some way of making something out of nothing—and that is so far beyond our powers as to be absolutely unthinkable—there is no possible discovery or invention which can lessen the dependence of labor upon land. And, this being the case, the effect of these labor saving devices, land being the private property of some, would simply be to increase the proportion of the wealth produced that landowners could demand for the use of their land. The ultimate effect of these discoveries and inventions would be not to benefit the laborer, but to make him more dependent.

And since we are imagining conditions, imagine labor-saving inventions to go to the farthest imaginable point, that is to say to perfection. What then? Why then the necessity for labor being done away with, all the wealth that the land could produce would go entire to the landowners. None of it whatever could be claimed by any one else. For the laborers there would be no use

at all. If they continued to exist, it would be merely as paupers on the bounty of the landowners.

THE CIVILIZATION THAT IS POSSIBLE.

In the effects upon the distribution of wealth, of making land private property, we may thus see an explanation of that paradox presented by modern progress. The perplexing phenomena of deepening want with increasing wealth, of labor rendered more dependent and helpless by the very introduction of labor-saving machinery, are the inevitable result of natural laws as fixed and certain as the law of gravitation. Private property in land is the primary cause of the monstrous inequalities which are developing in modern society. It is this, and not any miscalculation of Nature in bringing into the world more mouths than she can feed, that gives rise to that tendency of wages to a minimum—that “iron law of wages” as the Germans call it—that, in spite of all advances in productive power, compels the laboring classes to the least return on which they will consent to live. It is this that

produces all those phenomena that are so often attributed to the conflict of labor and capital. It is this that condemns Irish peasants to rags and hunger, that produces the pauperism of England and the tramps of America. It is this that makes the almshouse and penitentiary the marks of what we call high civilization; that in the midst of schools and churches degrades and brutalizes men, crushes the sweetness out of womanhood and the joy out of childhood. It is this that makes lives that might be a blessing a pain and a curse, and every year drives more and more to seek unbidden refuge in the gates of death. For, a permanent tendency to inequality once set up, all the forces of progress tend to greater and greater inequality.

All this is contrary to Nature. The poverty and misery, the vice and degradation that spring from the unequal distribution of wealth, are not the results of natural law; they spring from our defiance of natural law. They are the fruits of our refusal to obey the supreme law of justice. It is because we rob the child of his birthright, because we make the bounty which the Creator intended for all the exclusive property of some, that these things come upon us, and, though advancing and advancing, we chase but the mirage.

When, lit by lightning-flash or friction amid dry grasses, the consuming flames of fire first flung their lurid glow into the face of man, how must he have started back in affright! When he first stood by the shores of the sea, how must its waves have said to him, "Thus far shalt thou go, but no farther!" Yet, as he learned to use them, fire became his most useful servant, the sea his easiest highway. The most destructive element of which we know—that which for ages and ages seemed the very thunderbolt of the angry gods—is, as we are now beginning to learn, fraught for us with untold powers of usefulness. Already it enables us to annihilate space in our messages, to illuminate the night with new suns; and its uses are only beginning. And throughout all Nature, as far as we can see, whatever is potent for evil is potent for good. "Dirt," said Lord Brougham, "is matter in the wrong place." And so the squalor and vice and misery that abound in the very heart of our civilization are but results of the mis-application of forces in their nature most elevating.

I doubt not that, whichever way a man may turn to inquire of Nature, he will come upon adjustments which will arouse not merely his wonder, but his gratitude. Yet what has most impressed me with the feeling that the laws of Nature are the laws of beneficent intelligence is what I see of the social possibilities involved in the law of rent. Rent* springs from natural causes. It arises, as society develops, from the differences in natural oppor-

*I, of course, use the word "rent" in its economic, not in its common sense, meaning by it what is commonly called ground rent.

tunities and the differences in the distribution of population. It increases with the division of labor, with the advance of the arts, with the progress of invention. And thus, by virtue of a law impressed upon the very nature of things, has the Creator provided that the natural advance of mankind shall be an advance toward equality, an advance toward co-operation, an advance toward a social state in which not even the weakest need be crowded to the wall, in which even for the unfortunate and the cripple there may be ample provision. For this revenue, which arises from the common property, which represents not the creation of value by the individual, but the creation by the community as a whole, which increases just as society develops, affords a common fund, which, properly used, tends constantly to equalize conditions, to open the largest opportunities for all, and to utterly banish want or the fear of want.

The squalid poverty that festers in the heart of our civilization, the vice and crime and degradation and ravening greed that flow from it, are the results of a treatment of land that ignores the simple law of justice, a law so clear and plain that it is universally recognized by the veriest savages. What is by nature the common birthright of all, we have made the exclusive property of individuals; what is by natural law the common fund, from which common wants should be met, we give to a few that they may lord it over their fellows. And so some are gorged while some go hungry and more is wasted than would suffice to keep all in luxury.

In this nineteenth century, among any people who have begun to utilize the forces and methods of modern production, there is no necessity for want. There is no good reason why even the poorest should not have all the comforts, all the luxuries, all the opportunities for culture, all the gratifications of refined taste that only the richest now enjoy. There is no reason why any one should be compelled to long and monotonous labor. Did invention and discovery stop today, the forces of production are ample for this. What hampers production is the unnatural inequality in distribution. And, with just distribution, invention and discovery would only have begun.

Appropriate rent in the way I propose and speculative rent would be at once destroyed. The dogs in the manger who are now holding so much land they have no use for, in order to extract a high price from those who do want to use it, would be at once choked off, and land from which labor and capital are now debarred under penalty of a heavy fine would be thrown open to improvement and use. The incentive to land monopoly would be gone. Population would spread where it is now too dense, and become denser where it is now too sparse.

Appropriate rent in this way, and not only would natural op-

portunities be thus opened to labor and capital, but all the taxes which now weigh upon production and rest upon the consumer could be abolished. The demand for labor would increase, wages would rise, every wheel of production would be set in motion.

Appropriate rent in this way, and the present expenses of government would be at once very much reduced—reduced directly by the saving in the present cumbrous and expensive schemes of taxation, reduced indirectly by the diminution in pauperism and crime. This simplification in governmental machinery, this elevation of moral tone which would result, would make it possible for government to assume the running of railroads, telegraphs, and other businesses which, being in their nature monopolies, cannot, as experience is showing, be safely left in the hands of private individuals and corporations. In short, losing its character as a repressive agency, government could thus gradually pass into an administrative agency of the great co-operative association—society.

Think of the enormous wastes that now go on: The waste of false revenue systems, which hamper production and bar exchange, which fine a man for erecting a building where none stood before, or for making two blades of grass grow where there was but one. The waste of unemployed labor, of idle machinery, of those periodical depressions of industry, almost as destructive as war. The waste entailed by poverty, and the vice, and crime, and thriftlessness, and drunkenness that spring from it; the waste entailed by that greed of gain that is its shadow, and which makes business in a large part but a masked war; the waste entailed by the fret and worry about the mere physical necessities of existence, to which so many of us are condemned; the waste entailed by ignorance, by cramped and undeveloped faculties, by the turning of human beings into mere machines!

Think of these enormous wastes, and of the others which, like these, are due to the fundamental wrong which produces an unjust distribution of wealth, and distorts the natural development of society, and you will begin to see what a higher, purer, richer civilization would be made possible by the simple measure that will assert natural rights. You will begin to see how, even if no one but the present landholders were to be considered, this would be the greatest boon that could be vouchsafed them by society, and that, for them to fight it, would be as if the dog with a tin kettle tied to his tail should snap at the hand that offered to free him. Even the greatest landlord! As for such landlords as our working farmers and homestead owners, the slightest discussion would show them that they had everything to gain by the change. But even such landholders as the Duke of Westminster and the

Astors would be gainers. For it is of the very nature of injustice that it really profits no one.

This we may know certainly, this we may hold to confidently: that which is unjust can really profit no one; that which is just can really harm no one. Though all other lights move and circle, this is the pole-star by which we may safely steer.

THE CIVILIZATION THAT IS.

This is a most highly civilized community, yet every lower window has to be barred, every door locked and bolted; even door-mats, not worth twenty-five cents, you will see chained to the steps. Stop for a moment in a crowd and your watch is gone as if by magic; shirt-studs are taken from their owner's bosoms, and earrings cut from ladies' ears. Even a standing army of policemen do not prevent highway robbery; there are populous districts that to walk through after nightfall is a risk, and where you have far more need to go armed and to be wary than in the backwoods. There are dens into which men are lured only to be drugged and robbed, sometimes to be murdered. All the resources of science and inventive genius are exhausted in making burglar-proof strong rooms and safes, yet, as the steel plate becomes thicker and harder, so does the burglar's tool become keener. What sort of a civilization is this? In what does civilization essentially consist if not in civility—that is to say, in respect for the rights of person and property?

Yet this is not all, nor the worst. These are but the grosser forms of that spirit that in the midst of civilization compels every one to stand on guard. What is the maxim of business intercourse among the most highly respectable classes? That if you are swindled it will be your own fault; that you must treat every man you have dealings with as though he but wanted the chance to cheat and rob you. *Caveat emptor!* "Let the buyer beware." If a man steal a few dollars he may stand a chance of going to the penitentiary. I read the other day of a man who was sent to the penitentiary for stealing four cents from a horse-car company. But, if he steal a million by business methods, he is courted and flattered, even though he steal the poor little savings which washer-women and sewing-girls have brought to him in trust, even though he rob widows and orphans of the security which dead men have struggled and stinted to provide.

This is a most Christian city. There are churches and churches. All sorts of churches, where are preached all sorts of religions, save that which in Galilee taught the arrant socialistic doctrine that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God; all save that which in Jerusalem drove the money-changers from the

temple. Churches restful to the very eye, in which the weary and heavy laden can join in the worship of their Creator for no larger admission fee than its costs on the Bowery to see the bearded lady or the Zulu giant eight feet high. And then there are mission churches, run expressly for poor people, where it does not cost a cent. There are, in fact, more churches than there are people who care to attend them. And there are likewise Sunday schools, and big religious "book concerns," and tract societies, and societies for spreading the light of the Gospel among the heathen in foreign parts.

Yet, land a heathen on the Battery with money in his pocket, and he will be robbed of the last cent of it before he is a day older. "By their fruits shall ye know them." I wonder whether they who send missionaries to the heathen ever read the daily papers. I think I could take a file of these newspapers, and from their daily chroniclings match anything that could be told in the same period of any heathen community—at least, of any heathen community in a like state of peace and prosperity.

I do not say that such things are because of civilization, or because of Christianity. On the contrary, I point to them as inconsistent with civilization, as incompatible with Christianity. They show that our civilization is one-sided and cannot last as at present based; they show that our so-called Christian communities are not Christian at all. I believe a civilization is possible in which all could be civilized—in which such things would be impossible. But it must be a civilization based on justice and acknowledging the equal rights of all to natural opportunities. I believe that there is in true Christianity a power to regenerate the world. But it must be a Christianity that attacks vested wrongs, not that spurious thing that defends them. The religion which allies itself with injustice to preach down the natural aspirations of the masses is worse than atheism.

TRUE CONSERVATISM.

I do not appeal to prejudice and passion, I appeal to intelligence. I do not incite to strife; I seek to prevent strife.

That the civilized world is on the verge of the most tremendous struggle, which, according to the frankness and sagacity with which it is met, will be a struggle of ideas or a struggle of actual physical force, calling upon all the potent agencies of destruction which modern invention has discovered, every sign of the times portends. The voices that proclaim the eve of revolution are in the air. Steam and electricity are not merely transporting goods and carrying messages. They are everywhere changing social and industrial organization; they are everywhere stimulating thought, and arousing new hopes and fears, and desires and passions; they

are everywhere breaking down the barriers that have separated men, and integrating nations into one vast organism, through which the same pulses throb and the same nerves tingle.

It is not true conservatism which cries "Peace! peace!" when there is no peace! which like the ostrich, sticks his head in the sand and fancies himself secure; which would compromise matters by putting more coal in the furnace, and hanging heavier weights on the safety valves! That alone is true conservatism which would look facts in the face, which would reconcile opposing forces on the only basis on which reconciliation is possible—that of justice.

In any matter in which they are interested, the little finger of the great corporations is thicker than the loins of the people. Is it sovereign States or is it railroad corporations that are really represented in the elective Senate which we have substituted for a hereditary House of Lords. Where is the count or marquis or duke in Europe who wields such power as is wielded by such simple citizens as our Stanfords, Goulds and Vanderbilts? What does legal equality amount to, when the fortunes of some citizens can only be estimated in hundreds of millions, and other citizens have nothing? What does the suffrage amount to when, under threat of discharge from employment, citizens can be forced to vote as their employers dictate? when votes can be bought on election day for a few dollars apiece? If there are citizens so dependent that they must vote as their employers wish, so poor that a few dollars on election day seem to them more than any higher consideration, then giving them votes simply adds to the political power of wealth, and universal suffrage becomes the surest basis for the establishment of tyranny.

Even if universal history did not teach the lesson, it is in the United States already becoming very evident that political equality can only continue to exist upon a basis of social equality; that where the disparity in the distribution of wealth increases, political democracy only makes easier the concentration of power, and must inevitably lead to tyranny and anarchy. And it is already evident that there is nothing in political democracy, nothing in popular education, nothing in any of our American institutions, to prevent the most enormous disparity in the distribution of wealth. Nowhere in the world are such great fortunes growing up as in the United States. Considering that the average income of the working masses of our people is only a few hundred dollars a year, a fortune of a million dollars is a monstrous thing—a more monstrous and dangerous thing under a democratic government than anywhere else.

Social development is in accordance with certain immutable laws. And the law of development, whether it be the development of a solar system, of the tiniest organism, or of a human society,

is the law of integration. It is in obedience to this law—a law evidently as all-compelling as the law of gravitation—that these new agencies, which so powerfully stimulate social growth, tend to the specialization and interdependence of industry. It is in obedience to this law that the factory is superseding the independent mechanic, the large farm is swallowing up the little one, the big store shutting up the small one, that corporations are arising that dwarf the State, and that population tends more and more to concentrate in cities. Men must work together in larger and in more closely-related groups. Production must be on a greater scale. The only question is, whether the relation in which men are thus drawn together and compelled to act together shall be the natural relation of interdependence in equality, or in the unnatural relation of dependence upon a master. If the one, then may civilization advance in what is evidently the natural order, each step leading to a higher step. If the other, then what Nature has intended as a blessing becomes a curse, and a condition of inequality is produced which will inevitably destroy civilization. Every new invention but hastens the catastrophe.

Now, all this we may deduce from natural laws as fixed and certain as the law of gravitation. And all this we may see going on today. This is the reason why modern progress, great as it has been, fails to relieve poverty; this is the secret of the increasing discontent which pervades every civilized country. Under present conditions, with land treated as private property, material progress is developing two diverse tendencies, two opposing currents. On the one side, the tendency of increasing population and of all improvement in the arts of production is to build up enormous fortunes, to wipe out the intermediate classes, and to crowd down the masses to a level of lower wages and greater dependence. On the other hand, by bringing men closer together, by stimulating thought, by creating new wants, by arousing new ambitions, the tendency of modern progress is to make the masses discontented with their condition, to feel bitterly its injustice. The result can be predicted just as certainly as the result can be predicted when two trains are rushing toward each other on the same track.

This thing is absolutely certain. Private property in land blocks the way of advancing civilization. The two cannot long co-exist. Either private property in land must be abolished, or as has happened again and again in the history of mankind civilization must again turn back in anarchy and bloodshed. It is not conservatism which would ignore such a tremendous fact. It is the blindness that invites destruction. He that is truly conservative let him look the facts in the face; let him speak frankly and dispassionately. This is *the* duty of the hour. For when a great social question presses for settlement, it is only for a little while

that the voice of Reason can be heard. The masses of men hardly think at any time. It is difficult even in sober moments to get them to calmly reason. But when passion is roused, then they are like a herd of stampeded bulls. I do not fear that present social adjustments can continue. That is impossible. What I fear is that the dams may hold till the flood rises to fury. What I fear is that dogged resistance on the one side may kindle a passionate sense of wrong on the other. What I fear are the demagogues and the accidents.

The present condition of all civilized countries is that of increasingly unstable equilibrium. In steam and electricity, and all the countless inventions which they typify, mighty forces have entered the world. If rightly used they are our servants more potent to do our bidding than the genii of Arabian story. If wrongly used, they, too, must turn to monsters of destruction. They require, and will compel, great social changes. That we may already see. Operating under social institutions which are based on natural justice, which acknowledge the equal rights of all to the material opportunities of nature, their elevating power will be equally exerted and industrial organization will pass naturally into that of vast co-operative society. Operating under social institutions which deny natural justice by treating land as private property their power is unequally exerted, and tends, by producing inequality, to engender forces that will tear and rend and shatter. The old bottles cannot hold the new wine. This is the ferment which throughout the civilized world is everywhere beginning.

"IN HOC SIGNO VINCES."

The Irish Land Question is not a mere local question; it is a universal question. It involves the great problem of the distribution of wealth which is everywhere forcing itself upon attention.

It cannot be settled by measures which in their nature can have but local application. It can only be settled by measures which in their nature will apply everywhere as readily as in Ireland.

What I urge the men of Ireland to do is to proclaim, without limitation or evasion, that the land, of NATURAL RIGHT, is the common property of the whole people and to propose practical measures which will recognize this right everywhere.

Ask not for Ireland mere charity or sympathy. Let her call be the call of fraternity: "For yourselves, O brothers, as well as for us!" Let her rallying cry awake all who slumber, and rouse to a common struggle all who are oppressed. Let it breathe not old hates; let it ring and echo with the new hope!

In many lands her sons are true to her; under many skies her daughters burn with love of her. Lo! the ages bring their oppor-

tunity. Let those who would honor her carry her banner to the front!

The harp and the shamrock, the golden sunburst on the field of living green; emblems of a country without nationality; standard of a people down-trodden and oppressed! The hour has come when they may lead the van of the great world-struggle. Types of harmony and of ever-springing hope, of light and of life! The hour has come when they may stand for something far higher than local patriotism; something grander than national independence. The hour has come when they may stand forth to speak the world's hope, to lead the world's advance.

Torn away by pirates, tending in a strange land a heathen master's swine, the slave boy with the spirit of Christ in his heart, praying in the snow for those who had enslaved him, and returning to bring to his oppressors the message of the Gospel, returning with good to give where evil had been received, to kindle in the darkness a great light—this is Ireland's patron saint. In his spirit let Ireland's struggles be. Not merely through Irish vales and hamlets, but into England, into Scotland, into Wales, wherever the English tongue is spoken, let the torch be carried and the word be preached. And beyond! The brotherhood of man stops not with differences of speech any more than with sea or mountain chains. A century ago it was ours to speak the ringing word. Then it was France's. Now it may be Ireland's, if her sons be true. And, the agitation must spread to this side of the Atlantic. The Republic, the *true* Republic is not yet here. But her birth struggle must soon begin. Already with the hope of her; men's thoughts are stirring.

Not a republic of landlords and peasants; not a republic of millionaires and tramps; not a republic in which some are masters and some serve. But a republic of equal citizens, where competition becomes co-operation, and the interdependence of all gives true independence to each; where moral progress goes hand-in-hand with intellectual progress, and material progress elevates and enfranchises even the poorest and weakest and lowliest.

And the gospel of deliverance, let us not forget it; it is the gospel of love, not of hate. He whom it emancipates will know neither Jew nor Gentile, nor Irishman nor Englishman, nor German nor Frenchman, nor European nor American, nor difference of color nor of race, nor animosities of class nor condition. Let us set our feet on old prejudices, let us bury the old hates. There have been "Holy Alliances" of kings. Let us strive for the Holy Alliance of the people.

Liberty, equality, fraternity! Write them on the banners. Let them be for sign and countersign. Without equality, liberty

cannot be; without fraternity, neither equality nor liberty can be achieved.

Liberty—the full freedom of each bounded only by the equal freedom of every other.

Equality—the equal right of each to the use and enjoyment of all natural opportunities; to all the essentials of happy, healthful, human life!

Fraternity—that sympathy which links together those who struggle in a noble cause; that would live and let live; that would help as well as be helped; that, in seeking the good of all, finds the highest good of each!

“By this sign shall ye conquer!”

“We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by the Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness!”

It is over a century since these words rang out. It is time to give them their full, true meaning. Let the standard be lifted that all may see it; let the advance be sounded that all may hear it. Let those who would fall back, fall back. Let those who would oppose, oppose. Everywhere are those who will rally. The stars in their courses fight against Sisera!

HENRY GEORGE.