

## ALL AMERICA RECIPROCITY UNION

As a short step to world peace we are forming the All America Reciprocity Union.

To carry out the principles of Washington, Jefferson and founders of the United States and of Blaine, Garfield, McKinley and Roosevelt as well as of Fremont, Sherman, Medill, Stanton, Chase and the fathers of the Republican party; we plan to amend the tariff, so as to provide for the free admission of the products of every American country which will admit our products free.

This will reinforce the Monroe Doctrine and insure amity and good will. Senor Jose Miguel Bejarano, Mexican Commercial Attache, objects because it would result in "the complete economic control of the Western Hemisphere by the United States."

Without involving us in their domestic problems it will bring about a solidarity of the interests of all America as close as between our states.

Our housewives will welcome the greatly reduced cost of sugar and other necessities.

Our manufacturers will welcome free raw material and wider markets.

As against a united America, Europe and Asia joined would not invite war.

So the crushing burdens of taxes for war preparations can be lifted from all peoples without binding us to a League of Nations dominated by secret diplomacy.

President Hoover's visit to American countries can have no valuable results so long as we maintain a tariff which repels their trade and impoverishes their people and our own, nor will anything else avail.

We now have Vice Presidents in nearly every state and the work is being enthusiastically pushed. We will welcome your help and your questions.

We will cut sugar costs to consumers, reduce living expenses, insure permanent world peace, reduce taxes and promote friendship with all America.

Charles H. Ingersoll, the Dollar Watch Man and the Dollar Pen Man, is President.

ALL AMERICA RECIPROCITY UNION  
Capon Springs, West Virginia.

*"This work by Henry George gets down to the fundamentals of the controversy. It is at the same time the most popular and the most scientific exposition of the subject which has ever been written."*—PHILIP SNOWDEN.

From a Foreword by Rt. Hon. Philip Snowden, Chancellor of the Exchequer, to an Abridgement of Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade," by F. C. R. Douglas, printed for the Henry George Foundation of Great Britain by Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., London, May, 1929.

## AN OUTLINE OF HENRY GEORGE'S Protection or Free Trade

WITH

VERBATIM QUOTATIONS

By WILL ATKINSON

*"It is the thorough fusion of insight into actual facts and forces, with recognition of their bearing upon what makes life worth living, that constitutes Henry George one of the world's great social philosophers."*—JOHN DEWEY, Professor of Philosophy, Columbia University, N. Y.

From a Foreword by John Dewey to "Significant Paragraphs from Henry George's Progress and Poverty" by Harry Gunnison Brown, Professor of Economics, University of Missouri. Printed by Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, New York, October, 1927.

PRICE, 10 CENTS

ALL AMERICA RECIPROCITY UNION  
Capon Springs, West Virginia.

Copyright, 1929, by Will Atkinson

7458

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*," \$2 a year. 150 Nassau Street, New York.

"*Land and Liberty*," Monthly (36th year), 4 S. a year. 11 Tothill St., London, S. W. I.

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

"*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.

"*Standard*," Sydney, Australia.

"*Progress*," Melbourne, Australia.

"*Liberator*," Auckland, New Zealand.

"*Thirty Years of Verse Making*," by Joseph Dana Miller. \$2.

"*An Outline of Henry George's Protection or Free Trade*," by Will Atkinson; or

"*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 \$1.50, 1,000 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 Virginia.

## FROM THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO "PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE"

"My effort has been to make such a candid and thorough examination of the tariff question, in all its phases, as would aid men to whom the subject is now a perplexing maze to reach clear and firm conclusions. In this I trust I have done something to inspire a movement, now faint-hearted, with the earnestness and strength of radical conviction, to prevent the division into hostile camps of those whom a common purpose ought to unite, to give to efforts for the emancipation of labor greater definiteness of purpose, and to eradicate that belief in the opposition of national interests which leads people, even of the same blood and tongue, to regard each other as natural antagonists."—HENRY GEORGE.

## FOREWORD

The birth of one man, and of one man only, is celebrated the world over by Jew and Gentile, Mohammedan and Christian, Buddhist and Parsee; by men of the most diverse faiths, races and creeds.

That man was an American, born in Philadelphia, in 1839. Fifty years ago he was an unknown printer. Today his books are an inspiration to the highest ideals in every country in the world.

Thrones topple, dynasties go down in the dust, but his proclamation of the inalienable right of all men to the bounties of the Creator, to all God-given natural opportunities, goes on conquering throughout the world. And wherever honesty, eloquence and self-sacrificing devotion to humanity move the hearts of men, the name of Henry George is revered. To those who have read his immortal works it will seem fitting and proper that the words Henry George used regarding Moses should be applied to himself:

"Leader and servant of men! Law-giver and benefactor! Toiler toward the promised land seen only by the eye of faith! Type of the high souls who in every age have given to earth its heroes and its martyrs, whose deeds are the precious possession of the race, whose memories are its sacred heritage! With whom among the founders of empires shall we compare him?"

"To dispute about the inspiration of such a man were to dispute about words. From the depths of the unseen such characters must draw their strength; from fountains that flow only from the pure in heart must come their wisdom. Of something more real than matter; of something higher than the stars; of a light that will endure when suns are dead and dark; of a purpose of which the physical universe is but a passing phase, such lives tell."

WILL ATKINSON.

AN OUTLINE OF HENRY GEORGE'S "PROTECTION OR  
FREE TRADE." By WILL ATKINSON.

SLAVES TO IGNORANCE

(Quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade," by Henry George.)

"Near the window by which I write, a great bull is tethered by a ring in his nose. Grazing round and round he has wound his rope about the stake until now he stands a close prisoner, tantalized by rich grass he cannot reach, unable even to toss his head to rid him of the flies that cluster on his shoulder. Now and again he struggles vainly, and then, after pitiful bellowings, relapses into silent misery.

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

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

Under all forms of government the ultimate power lies with the masses. It is not kings nor aristocracies, nor land owners nor capitalists, that anywhere really enslave the people. It is their own ignorance. Most clear is this where governments rest on universal suffrage. Workingmen may mold to their will legislatures, courts and constitutions. Politicians strive for their favor and political parties bid against one another for their vote. But what avails this? The little finger of aggregated capital must be thicker than the loins of the working masses so long as they do not know how to use their power." \* \* \* \*

"My aim in this inquiry is to ascertain beyond peradventure whether protection or free trade best accords with the interests of those who live by their labor. I differ with those who say that with the rate of wages the state has no concern. I hold with those who deem the increase of wages a legitimate purpose of public policy. To raise and maintain wages is the great object that all who live by wages ought to seek, and workingmen are right in supporting any measure that will attain that object. Nor in this are they acting selfishly, for, while the question of wages is the most important of questions to laborers, it is also the most important of

questions to society at large. Whatever improves the condition of the lowest and broadest social stratum must promote the true interests of all. Where the wages of common labor are high and remunerative employment is easy to obtain, prosperity will be general. Where wages are highest, there will be the largest production and the most equitable distribution of wealth. There will invention be most active and the brain best guide the hand. There will be the greatest comfort, the widest diffusion of knowledge, the purest morals and the truest patriotism. If we would have a healthy, a happy, an enlightened and a virtuous people, if we would have a pure government, firmly based on the popular will and quickly responsive to it, we must strive to raise wages and keep them high." \* \* \* \*

"Political economy is the simplest of the sciences. It is but the intellectual recognition, as related to social life, of laws which in their moral aspect men instinctively recognize, and which are embodied in the simple teachings of Him whom the common people heard gladly. But, like Christianity, political economy has been warped by institutions which, denying the equality and brotherhood of man, have enlisted authority, silenced objection, and ingrained themselves in custom and habit of thought. Its professors and teachers have almost invariably belonged to or been dominated by that class which tolerates no questioning of social adjustments that give to those who do not labor the fruits of labor's toil. They have been like physicians employed to make a diagnosis on condition that they shall discover no unpleasant truth. Given social conditions such as those that throughout the civilized world today shock the moral sense, and political economy, fearlessly pursued, must lead to conclusions that will be as a lion in the way to those who have any tenderness for 'vested interests'. But in the colleges and universities of our time, as in the Sanhedrim of old, it is idle to expect any enunciation of truths unwelcome to the powers that be."

While we may safely accept what specialists in many lines say of their special studies where there are no pecuniary temptations to warp judgment, yet the intelligence of the masses of the people must guide us in all matters concerning the production and distribution of wealth, for this common opinion makes our laws.

Fortunately only clear thinking about familiar things is needed to decide questions of political economy, and this is possible for unlearned as well as learned.

Macauley has said that the law of gravitation would be disputed if great pecuniary interests were concerned in denying it.

The heart of the tariff question is in its relation to wages.

Adam Smith proved that protective tariffs hamper production; but he was prevented by his surroundings or his self-interest from carrying his book through to its logical end.

His great inquiry was into the causes which reduced wages from

the original state in which wages were the entire products of labor to the present state in which labor gets but a small part of what it creates.

Following Smith came Malthus who blamed the result of men's unwise laws on the Creator of the Universe and by arguments and statements which any schoolboy can prove fallacious, yet barred the gates of discussion because they harmonized with the interests of those who profit by unjust laws.

If protection really "provides employment" and raises wages, why are many idle at all times and wages lowest in our most highly protected industries?

Protectionists and tariff reformers alike shrink from carrying their arguments to logical ends. Let us follow truth wherever it may lead.

Special interests in every age have succeeded by organized effort in passing laws giving them undue advantages over their fellows.

To give our Federal Government an independent income without arousing opposition in the states, a revenue tariff was imposed whose duties were trivial compared with the British tariff, then or ours now. But our Constitution prohibited State tariffs and so has brought about free trade among a hundred million people over the greater part of a continent.

The early leaders of the Republican party were free traders.

The slogan of the Republican party in 1856 was: "Free trade, Free land, Free men, Fremont."

While mothers sent their sons to the battlefields of the Civil War, selfish interests secured protective tariffs never before dreamed of, and the fear of alienating the wealthy and powerful, whose aid was deemed essential to the winning of the war, closed the mouths of the eloquent free trade orators of the Republican party.

If protection were needed to revive Irish industries, how can we explain Ulster's industrial progress, including her shipbuilding, for which she has no natural advantages?

Superficial thinkers attribute Ulster's greater prosperity to her Protestant faith, ignoring the fact that in Presbyterian Skye industrial conditions are as primitive as in Catholic Connaemara.

In both, rapacious landlordism plunders producers and prevents the accumulation of capital, while in Ulster the land tenure leaves a larger proportion of wealth to producers. To claim that people who are annually stripped of all their produce save a bare living, are poor because of their religious opinions or lack of a protective tariff is to say that a scuttled ship sinks because she has lost her figurehead.

#### PROTECTION AS A UNIVERSAL NEED

Protection is popular here because its advocates have claimed that its purpose is to raise wages. Does it really raise wages? Protectionists talk to workingmen in the same soft phrases they use to catch a horse they wish to saddle and ride. The pretence of tyranny has always been the protection of the masses. Kings and

slave owners alike seek to justify their protection of subjects and slaves. British misrule in Ireland is said to be to protect the Irish. When has "protection" meant at any time or place anything but oppression? Special privilege "protects" labor just as farmers protect cattle—to live on them.

Does not labor produce all wealth, create all capital? Does not labor feed the world, clothe the world, house the world? Are not the three great orders of society, "workers, beggars and thieves"?

When the first man came into the world, what human laws were there to "protect" him? Yet he lived and raised a family. To say that England is prosperous because she has free trade or that the United States is prosperous because it has protection is to fall into an equal error.

On a ship's deck men pull a rope and a yard rises. A man aloft clings to the tackle. His weight may help or retard and we can only tell which by noticing what part of the tackle his weight is thrown upon. To decide whether any law helps or injures labor we must trace effects to cause.

Cities are not built on sites difficult to reach. Yet, if the protective theory were true, they would be. Pirates are not promotive of civilization. Yet a discriminating pirate who would seize only imports would be precisely as great a blessing as a tariff. Canals, railways, harbors, lighthouses, automobiles, everything which lessens the cost of transportation are benefits, but tariffs increase costs and neutralize these benefits.

We spend millions to make our ports more easily accessible, then erect tariff barriers to prevent our getting any benefit from that expenditure. Commerce is either a blessing or a curse. If a blessing, tariffs should be abolished. If commerce is a curse, lighthouses should be destroyed and the channels leading to our seaports filled.

If the protective theory be true, then mastery of the air for which men have longed for ages would be a misfortune. Not only are all improvements in transportation antagonistic to protection, but all labor-saving inventions and discoveries as well. Oil and natural gas diminish the market for coal far more than the free admission of foreign coal would. The avowed purpose of tariffs is to keep out the products of cheap foreign labor; yet machines are daily invented which produce goods cheaper than the cheapest foreign labor. Protection aims to prevent the importation of useful and valuable things in order to compel the making of such things here. But men seek not to make things, but to possess things.

Protection has no scientific basis. When Texas was part of Mexico, according to the protective theory, it needed a tariff against the United States. Now they assume it needs a tariff against Mexico. If the three British kingdoms do not need tariffs against each other now, then they did not need them before they were united.

If nations need protection by tariff from other nations, do not

states need it against other states? New Jersey against New York? Iowa against Illinois? City against city? Family against family? What argument for national protection exists which does not call equally for state protection and for family protection?

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

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

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

"No matter whether he call himself Christian or Deist, or Agnostic or Atheist, who can look about him without seeing that want and suffering flow inevitably from selfishness and that in any community the golden rule which teaches us to regard the interests of others as carefully as our own would bring not only peace but plenty? Can it be that what is true of individuals ceases to be true of nations—that in one sphere the law of prosperity is the law of love;

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

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

*From what or whom does a tariff protect us?* Protectionists say, against foreign producers. But no foreign producer can in any way force us to buy anything we do not want. Goods are not imported because Europeans want to sell them, but because Americans want to buy them. And what we import are goods; good things. Things we want so much that we are willing to pay for them.

Tariffs protect us only against ourselves. They prevent us from buying what we want and where we want and compel us to buy inferior articles at higher prices.

The natural protection to home industry given by burning deserts, stormy seas and towering mountains would, if protectionist argument were true, give us the first steps to civilization and its most rapid growth where isolation was most complete. But the exact contrary is true. It is on accessible harbors, navigable rivers and easy highways that cities rise and arts and sciences grow. Trade prevents war, eradicates prejudices and diffuses knowledge.

In a world created on protective principles, every part would have the same soil, climate and production so that each section could produce everything they need or wish at home.

But this world is one of infinite diversity in soil, climate and products. Man cannot fully satisfy his desires without trade; without exchanging wheat and corn for sugar and coffee, coal for marble, iron for fish, gold for lead, copper for tin.

If a farmer would increase quality and quantity, he must bring seed from afar, must cross native stock with imported. And with men's prejudices are worn down, wits sharpened, language enriched and new ideas enkindled by trade. "Home keeping youths have ever homely wits" is true of nations as of men.

Protectionist restrictions no more bring prosperity than ligatures promote the circulation of the blood. Trade enables us to utilize the highest powers of nature by obtaining products from the soil and climate best fitted for each and thereby increase enormously the returns from our labor.

But still more important, it enables us also to utilize the highest powers of the human factor in production. The benefits of specialization are through trade shared by all. Men of different nations trade for the same reason that men of the same nation do, because they find it profitable; because through trade they can satisfy their desires with less exertion.

If any government could enforce the prohibition of trade between

its own citizens, it would convert the most populous and prosperous country into a howling wilderness. And all interference with either foreign or domestic trade tends toward this—it reduces wages, increases living costs, and makes life harder.

The pioneer eats wheat of his own raising, fish caught by his boys, burns wood he cuts himself. But the wheat had to be ground, the fish brought from the lake to the pan, and the wood carried to the stove. Production is not complete until the product reaches the consumer, and whoever carries it even part way to the consumer is as really a producer as he who plants the seed or grinds the grain.

"Middlemen" save producer and consumer alike expense and trouble and their profits are trifling compared to the enormous savings effected, like the savings each consumer makes by sharing the cost of one great water supply system as compared with a separate system for each house.

And the middleman effects an enormous economy in the amount of commodities kept in store as compared with the amount needed if each family had to store for itself all its needs, while the saving from waste of perishable articles is equally great.

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"Nor should it be forgotten that the investigator, the philosopher, the teacher, the artist, the poet, the priest, though not engaged in the production of wealth, are not only engaged in the production of utilities and satisfactions to which the production of wealth is only a means, but by acquiring and diffusing knowledge, stimulating mental powers and elevating the moral sense, may greatly increase the ability to produce wealth. For man does not live by bread alone. He is not an engine, in which so much fuel gives so much power. On a capstan bar or a topsail halyard a good song tells like muscle, and a 'Marseillaise' or a 'Battle Hymn of the Republic' counts for bayonets. A hearty laugh, a noble thought, a perception of harmony, may add to the power of dealing even with material things."

"He who by any exertion of mind or body adds to the aggregate of enjoyable wealth, increases the sum of human knowledge or gives to human life higher elevation or greater fullness—he is, in the large meaning of the words, a 'producer,' a 'working-man,' a 'laborer,' and is honestly earning honest wages. But he who without doing aught to make mankind richer, wiser, better, happier, lives on the toil of others—he, no matter by what name of honor he may be called, or how lustily the priests of mammon may swing their censers before him, is in the last analysis but a beggar-man or a thief."

Tariffs for revenue are older than the Caesars, but have all the vices of other indirect taxes. They bear more heavily on the poor than on the rich, taking from the people, not according to what they have but according to what they consume.

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"As much sugar is needed to sweeten a cup of tea for a working-girl as for the richest lady in the land, but the proportion of their means which a tax on sugar compels each to contribute to the government is in the case of the one much greater than in the case of the other. So it is with all taxes that increase the cost of articles of general consumption. They bear far more heavily on married men than on bachelors; on those who have children than on those who have none; on those barely able to support their families than on those whose incomes leave them a large surplus. If the millionaire chooses to live closely he need pay no more of these indirect taxes than the mechanic. I have known at least two millionaires—possessed not of one, but of from six to ten millions each—who paid little more of such taxes than ordinary day-laborers."

It is because they bear far more heavily on the poor than on the rich that indirect taxes have been adopted. The rich are ever the powerful, while the poor are voiceless. The first payers of indirect taxes pass them on with an added profit by insidious ways so that the final payer does not realize what he is paying.

Hence indirect taxes are favorites with all who wish to plunder the poor under any form of government. If tax gatherers stood in stores and collected a twenty-five per cent tax on every article bought there would be an immediate outcry, followed by repeal or revolution. But even greater taxes are collected by the storekeepers in increased prices without the people's knowledge. And even when realized indirect taxes are difficult to fight successfully. They "pluck the goose without making it cry," but any people jealous of their liberties should insist that all taxation be direct and so take from the people as little as possible above the net return to the government.

Direct taxes would greatly lessen opportunities for governmental waste and corruption.

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"Merely as a means of raising revenue it is clear that indirect taxes are to be condemned, since they cost far more than they yield, bear with the greatest weight upon those least able to pay, add to corruptive influences, and lessen the control of the people over their government."

"All the objections which apply to indirect taxes in general apply to import duties. Those protectionists are right who declare that protection is the only justification for a tariff, and the advocates of 'a tariff for revenue only' have no case. If we do not need a tariff for protection we need no tariff at all, and for the purpose of raising revenue should resort to some system which will not tax the mechanic as heavily as the millionaire, and will not call on the man who rears a family to pay on that account more than the man

who shirks his natural obligation, and leaves some woman whom in the scheme of nature it is intended that he should support, to take care of herself as best she can."

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"To make a protective tariff that would even roughly accord with the protective theory would require in the first place a minute knowledge of all trade and industry, and of the manner in which an effect produced on one industry would act and react on others. This no king, congress or parliament ever can have. But, further than this, absolute disinterestedness is required, for the fixing of protective duties is simply the distribution of pecuniary favors among a crowd of greedy applicants. And even were it possible to obtain for the making of a protective tariff a body of men themselves disinterested and incapable of yielding to bribery, to threat, to friendship or flattery, they would have to be more than human not to be dazed by the clamor and misled by the representations of selfish interests.

The making of a tariff, instead of being, as the protective theory requires, a careful consideration of the circumstances and needs of each industry, is in practice simply a great "grab" in which the retained advocates of selfish interests bully and beg, bribe and log-roll, in the endeavor to get the largest possible protection for themselves without regard for other interests or for the general good. The result is, and always must be, the enactment of a tariff which resembles the theoretical protectionist's idea of what a protective tariff should be about as closely as a bucketful of paint thrown against a wall resembles the fresco of a Raphael."

"The popular plea for protection in the United States today is not, however, the encouragement of infant industries, but the encouragement of home industry, that is, all home industry.

"Now it is manifestly impossible for a protective tariff to encourage all home industry. Duties upon commodities entirely produced at home can, of course, have no effect in encouraging any home industry. It is only when imposed upon commodities partly imported and partly produced at home, or entirely imported, yet capable of being produced at home, that duties can in any way encourage an industry. No tariff which the United States imposed could, for instance, encourage the growth of grain or cotton, the raising of cattle, the production of coal-oil or the mining of gold or silver; for instead of importing these things we not only supply ourselves, but have a surplus which we export. Nor could any import duty encourage any of the many industries which must be carried on where needed, such as building, horseshoeing, the printing of newspapers, and so on. Since these industries that cannot be protected constitute by far the larger part of the industries of every country, the utmost that by a protective tariff can be attempted is

in the encouragement of only a few of the total industries of a country."

"Yet, in spite of this obvious fact, protection is never urged for the encouragement of the industries that alone can profit by a tariff. That would be to admit that to some it gave special advantages over others, and so in the popular pleas that are made for it protection is urged for the encouragement of all industry. If we ask how this can be, we are told that the tariff encourages the protected industries, and then the protected industries encourage the unprotected industries; that protection builds up the factory and iron furnace, and the factory and iron furnace create a demand for the farmer's productions."

"Imagine a village of say a hundred voters. Imagine two of these villagers to make such a proposition as this: 'We are desirous, fellow-citizens, as seeing you more prosperous and to that end propose this plan: Give us the privilege of collecting a tax of five cents a day from every one in the village. No one will feel the tax much, for even to a man with a wife and eight children it will come only to the paltry sum of fifty cents a day. Yet this slight tax will give our village two rich citizens who can afford to spend money. We will at once begin to live in commensurate style. We will enlarge our houses and improve our grounds, set up carriages, hire servants, give parties and buy much more freely at the stores. This will make trade brisk and cause a greater demand for labor. This, in turn, will create a greater demand for agricultural products, which will enable the neighboring farmers to make a greater demand for store goods and the labor of mechanics. Thus shall we all become prosperous.'

"There is in no country under the sun a village in which the people would listen to such a proposition. Yet it is every whit as plausible as the doctrine that encouraging some industries encourages all industries."

"The only way in which we could even attempt to encourage all industry would be by the bounty or subsidy system. Were we to substitute bounties for duties as a means of encouraging industry it would not only become possible for us to encourage other industries than those now encouraged by tariff, but we should be forced to do so, for it is not in human nature that the farmers, the stock-raisers, the builders, the newspaper publishers and so on, would consent to the payment of bounties to other industries without demanding them for their own. Nor could we consistently stop until every species of industry, to that of the bootblack or rag-picker, was subsidized. Yet evidently the result of such encouragement of each would be the discouragement of all. For as there could be distributed only what was raised by taxation, less the cost of collection, no one could get back in subsidies, were there any fairness in their distribution, as much as he would be called upon to pay in taxes."



"This practical reduction to absurdity is not possible under the protective system, because only a small part of the industries of a country can thus be 'encouraged,' while the cost of the encouragement is concealed in prices and is not realized by the masses."

"We see the large smelting-works and the massive mill without realizing that the same taxes which we are told have built them up have made more costly every nail driven and every needleful of thread used throughout the whole country. Our imaginations are affected as were those of the first Europeans who visited India, and who, impressed by the profusion and magnificence of the Rajahs, but not noticing the abject poverty of the masses, mistook for the richest country in the world what is really the poorest."

"But reflection will show that the claim popularly made for protection that it encourages home industry (i. e. all home industry), can be true only in one sense—the sense in which Pharaoh encouraged Hebrew industry when he compelled the making of bricks without straw. Protective tariffs make more work, in the sense in which the spilling of grease over her kitchen floor makes more work for the housewife, or as a rain that wets his hay makes more work for the farmer."

"It may be to the interest of a shopkeeper that the people of his neighborhood shall be prohibited from buying from any but him, so that they must take such goods as he chooses to keep, at such prices as he chooses to charge, but who would contend that this was to the general advantage? It might be to the interest of gas companies to restrict the number and size of windows, but hardly to the interest of a community. Broken limbs bring fees to surgeons, but would it profit a municipality to prohibit the removal of ice from sidewalks in order to encourage surgery? Yet it is in such ways that protective tariffs act. Economically, what difference is there between restricting the importation of iron to benefit iron producers and restricting sanitary improvements to benefit undertakers?"

"To attempt to make a nation prosperous by preventing it from buying from other nations is as absurd as it would be to attempt to make a man prosperous by preventing him from buying from other men. What protectionists ask us to do to ourselves in reserving our home market for home producers, is in kind what the Land Leaguers did to Captain Boycott. They ask us to boycott ourselves."

#### EXPORTS AND IMPORTS

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"The aim of protection is to diminish imports, never to diminish exports. On the contrary, the protectionist habit is to regard exports with favor, and to consider the country which exports most and imports least as doing the most profitable trade. When exports exceed imports there is said to be a favorable balance of trade."

When imports exceed exports there is said to be an unfavorable balance of trade. In accordance with this idea all protectionist countries afford every facility for sending things away and fine men for bringing things in.

"If the things which we thus try to send away and prevent coming in were pests and vermin—things of which all men want as little as possible—this policy would conform to reason. But the things of which exports and imports consist are not things that nature forces on us against our will, and that we have to struggle to rid ourselves of; but things that nature gives only in return for labor, things for which men make exertions and undergo privations. Him who has or can command much of these things we call rich; him who has little we call poor; and when we say that a country increases in wealth we mean that the amount of these things which it contains increases faster than its population. What, then, is more repugnant to reason than the notion that the way to increase the wealth of a country is to promote the sending of such things away and to prevent the bringing of them in? Could there be a queerer inversion of ideas? Should we not think even a dog had lost his senses that snapped and snarled when given a bone, and wagged his tail when a bone was taken from him?"

"Yet, are these arguments for protection a whit more absurd when addressed to one man living on an island than when addressed to sixty millions living on a continent? What would be true in the case of Robinson Crusoe is true in the case of Brother Jonathan. If foreigners will bring us goods cheaper than we can make them ourselves, we shall be the gainers. The more we get in imports as compared with what we have to give in exports, the better the trade for us. And since foreigners are not liberal enough to give us their productions, but will only let us have them in return for our own productions, how can they ruin our industry? The only way they could ruin our industry would be by bringing us for nothing all we want, so as to save us the necessity for work. If this were possible, ought it seem very dreadful?"

"Exports and imports, so far as they are induced by trade, are correlative. Each is the cause and complement of the other, and to impose any restrictions on the one is necessarily to lessen the other. And so far from its being the mark of a profitable commerce that the value of a nation's exports exceed her imports, the reverse of this is true."

"In a profitable international trade the value of imports will always exceed the value of the exports that pay for them, just as in a profitable trading voyage that the return cargo must exceed in value the cargo carried out. This is possible to all the nations that are parties to commerce, for in a normal trade commodities are carried from places where they are relatively cheap to places where they are relatively dear, and their value is thus increased by the transportation, so that a cargo arrived at its destination has a



higher value than on leaving the port of its exportation. But on the theory that a trade is profitable only when exports exceed imports, the only way for all countries to trade profitably with one another would be to carry commodities from places where they are relatively dear to places where they are relatively cheap. An international trade made up of such transactions as the exportation of manufactured ice from the West Indies to New England, and the exportation of hothouse fruits from New England to the West Indies, would enable all countries to export much larger values than they imported. On the same theory the more ships sunk at sea the better for the commercial world. To have all the ships that left each country sunk before they could reach any other country would, upon protectionist principles, be the quickest means of enriching the whole world, since all countries could then enjoy the maximum of exports with the minimum of imports.

"It must, however, be borne in mind that all exporting and importing are not the exchanging of products. This, however, is a fact which puts in still stronger light, if that be possible, the absurdity of the notion that an excess of exports over imports shows increasing wealth. When Rome was mistress of the world, Sicily, Spain, Africa, Egypt, and Britain exported to Italy far more than they imported from Italy. But so far from this excess of their exports over their imports indicating their enrichment, it indicated their impoverishment. It meant that the wealth produced in the provinces was being drained to Rome in taxes and tribute and rent, for which no return was made.

"Many Englishmen already own American land by the hundred thousand, and even by the million acres, and are only beginning to draw rent and royalties. Punch, recently, had a ponderous joke, the point of which was that the British House of Lords had much greater landed interests in the United States than in Great Britain. If not true already, it will not under present conditions be many years before the English aristocracy will draw far larger incomes from their American estates than from their home estates—incomes to supply which we must export without any return in imports."

#### ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

We have seen that low wages do not mean low production costs and that high wages are an advantage.

But protectionists claim a country of great natural advantages needs protection to develop them and also that a country with less advantages cannot produce in competition.

But any country always increases its wealth by foreign trade.

Where one country has marked advantages in some branch of production and equal disadvantages in another it is evident that free exchange will benefit both. But take two countries in which one

has advantages over the other in all production. Would one country do all the exporting and the other all the importing? Evidently not. Would trade, then, be impossible? No. Trade would go on to mutual benefit. The country of greater advantages would import those products in which its advantage was least and export those in which its advantages was greatest. Both would gain.

One because it thereby shared the greater advantages of the other and the other by being thereby enabled to concentrate production where its advantages were greatest. Just as a skilled workman gains by having an unskilled helper to do the rougher work.

So neither advantages nor disadvantages afford any real reason for restraining trade. Trade never arises unless both parties are benefitted.

Tea used here can be produced in the United States at less labor cost than in China because of savings in transportation, packing, etc.

But in many other things, such as oil, cloth, clocks, watches, etc., our advantages over China are enormously greater than in growing tea. Hence by producing these things and trading them for tea, we get tea here for less than by growing tea here.

Free trade is voluntary. It benefits both parties, but more relatively undeveloped countries than those already rich.

To trade with Robinson Crusoe would be of mutual advantage. But how infinitely greater the benefits to Crusoe!

Some admit that free trade is good in itself, but would injure us if we adopt it before other countries do.

But they ignore the fact that it is our own people who are restrained from trading by tariffs and who are thereby the greatest sufferers. Our tariffs curtail our trade with all the world, but restrain foreigners only in dealing with us. Protective tariffs injure everyone, but that injury is diffused and slight to other nations as compared with the direct injury to ourselves.

He who does most good profits most by it. Who so does evil injures, most of all, himself. Those who advocate a policy essentially bad because other nations embrace it, are preaching, "Lie because others lie; be idle if others are lazy; refuse knowledge if any are ignorant."

#### PROTECTION AND WAGES

Advocates of protection claim that it raises wages or prevents wages from falling, but both claims are mere unproved assertions.

The direct object and effect of protective tariffs is to raise the price of commodities. But men who work for wages are buyers of commodities, not sellers; they sell their labor in order to buy commodities. How can any increase in the price of commodities benefit them?

Imagine a country of high wages and one of low wages, side by side, separated only by a wall which freely permits goods to pass, but not men. Would the high wage country do all the importing

and the low wage country do all the exporting? That would be absurd, for it would mean that the low wage country would get nothing for its goods. What would happen is an exchange of products to mutual advantage, based on the comparative cost of production.

If, now, we imagine a wall impassable to goods, but passable to men, would that prevent a reduction of wages? Manifestly not. The aim of protection is not to protect labor, but to protect the buyers of labor. It is intended to increase profits, not wages.

The effect of encouraging any industry by taxation is to discourage other industries and thus force labor into protected industries by driving it out of others.

Nor could wages be raised by bounties paid direct to workmen. That was tried in England a century ago with agricultural laborers. Just as these grants were made did the wages paid by farmers sink.

To claim that raising wages in the protected industries would raise all wages is like saying that you can raise the level of the Atlantic Ocean by a dam across the Hudson River. To raise the level of all wages it is necessary to raise the wages of unskilled labor.

This was shown by the discovery of placer mines in California in 1849 which raised all wages so long as access to these mines was free.

But when the land there became private property, shutting off men's opportunities for employing themselves, wages went down.

Theory thus shows that protection cannot raise wages and facts prove it just as conclusively. In Spain, in France, in Mexico, in England during protection times and always and everywhere that protection has been tried.

#### THE ABOLITION OF PROTECTION

Beneficiaries of protection claim that since capital has been invested and industries organized under tariffs that we are bound to continue tariffs.

But there can be no vested right in a wrong. What is created by a legislative act may be destroyed by another legislative act. The true doctrine is as stated in our Declaration of Independence, the self-evident doctrine that men are endowed by their Creator with equal and inalienable rights and that any law or institution which denies or impairs this natural equality may at any time be altered or abolished. Justice is an element in the safety of investments and whose trades upon any people's ignorance or enslavement does so at his own risk.

Any community loss by flood, fire, war or any cause, will fall more lightly on the poor and more heavily on the rich if met promptly by taxation.

If the expenses of the Civil War had been met by taxes levied at the time, they would have been paid by the rich. But by the device

of a public debt (a twin invention to indirect taxation) the cost of the war was met by taxation spread over a term of years and fell upon individuals not in proportion to their means, but to their consumption, thereby inflicting far heavier relative burdens on the poor than on the rich. One of the surest ways to discourage war and war profiteers is to adopt the pay-as-you-go principle and adhere to the idea of no public debts and no indirect taxes.

#### INADEQUACY OF THE FREE TRADE ARGUMENT

"If the protective theory is really so incongruous with the nature of things and so inconsistent with itself, how does it still obtain such wide and strong support?"

We have gone farther than most free traders, but what have we proved? Merely that free trade tends to increase the production of wealth and protection tends to decrease it and to foster certain monopolies. But what benefit is there here for labor?

In our own time the working man has seen wealth enormously increased without adding to his earnings, so even where he knows the fallacies of protection he makes no effort to abolish it.

And when an interest is already entrenched in law and habit of thought those who are not against it are for it.

Statistics may be marshalled so as to prove to those who wish to believe it that the condition of the average man is better today than ever. The rewards to unusual ability and unusual opportunity are more glittering. Millionaires are common, multi-millionaires abound; but the lot of the average man is harder, his job less secure, his chances to rise, to employ himself are vanishing. No one who reads the papers can doubt these things.

Five centuries ago the wealth-producing power of men in England was trifling as compared with today. Mechanical industry was undreamed of and even agriculture ruder and less productive. Potatoes, turnips, carrots, beets and other vegetables had not been introduced. Cattle averaged half the size; sheep gave but half the fleece. Roads were bad, wheel carriages scarce and rude, and places within a hundred miles practically as far apart as San Francisco and New York are today.

Yet patient students of those times, like Professor Thorold Rogers, tell us from the records of manors, colleges, and public offices, that the English laborer was not only relatively, but, absolutely, better off than the English laborer of today.

He did not work so hard and lived better. Plagues came and, occasionally, famine, for poor transportation made it impossible to relieve scarcity promptly. But men did not, as they do now, starve in the very midst of abundance. If this be the result of five centuries of astounding increase in productive power, what hope is there for the laborer in the mere abolition of protection?

In the fact, ignored by both protectionists and free traders, that modern machine civilization produces more laborers seeking employment than can find it, makes work a privilege and work itself is deemed a good, lies the real strength of protection.

Protection lessens the amount of wealth a given amount of exertion can produce. It "makes more work" in the same sense as Pharaoh made more work for Hebrew brickmakers when he refused them straw; in the same sense that grease spilled on the floor makes more work for the housewife. To the scrubwoman that spilled grease may be a boon. Rain on his hay harms the farmer, but how does it look to the day laborer who gets an extra day's work by it?

In most civilized countries the majority of the people cannot employ themselves, and without employers are helpless.

Hence they regard work as desirable in itself and all labor-saving devices as an injury to them. And this constitutes the real strength of protection. No man ever wanted work for its own sake. The natural reward for work is the product of that work. But under modern conditions most men get, not any portion of what they produce, but wages in money.

So the idea has grown up that what men want is work when what they really want is the wages. But the fact that the wages are apparently not based on the work done tends to eliminate from the minds of the workers the fact that the natural wage of labor is what that labor produces.

Most men today have only the power to labor. Labor on land produces all wealth. But divorced from land, labor is helpless and can produce nothing. So landless men are forced to sell their labor to those who have access to land.

Who so sells goods may hold them for a future market, if today's does not suit him. But who has naught to sell save his labor must take what he can get today. If his work produces nothing today, that day is forever lost. And those who have nothing to sell save their labor are the poorest class, the least able to bear the loss.

Even when in good health and in the best of times some men find it difficult to sell their labor and suffer from anxiety, privation and even physically.

So has grown the belief that capital employs labor; that the employer is a benefactor. This colors all our thought, speech and literature. This idea that work is a boon, is desirable in itself, leads men to welcome a system which assumes that it "benefits one country to take work away" from other countries.

And it makes workers indifferent to the fact that protective tariffs really reduce the effectiveness of labor.

The burning of a city is a real economic loss, but the fact that men by thousands are idle even in good times because they are unable to employ themselves or to find others willing to employ

them, involves a loss far greater. And when such a catastrophe gives employment to those idle, is it any wonder that they see in it only the advantage to themselves?

The belief that labor-saving machinery injures workers by depriving them of the opportunity to work, is in itself as absurd as the idea that a protective tariff benefits labor.

An examination shows that machinery enormously increases the production of wealth and that this increase inures primarily to labor and is diffused by exchange through all other branches of labor.

It can be proved that labor-saving inventions tend to benefit labor, but that this tendency is aborted is even clearer today than when John Stuart Mill doubted that mechanical inventions had lightened the day's toil of any human being. It is trades unions and not machinery which, in many occupations in Great Britain, have reduced hours and increased wages.

It is legislation which has stopped the harnessing of women in mines and the working of little children in mills and brickyards.

To decide why free trade or labor-saving invention fail to produce the benefits we naturally expect, we must examine into the distribution of wealth. When increased production fails to benefit labor it must be due to increased inequality of distribution.

Suppose Robinson Crusoe's island to be visited at frequent intervals by ships. His wants could not only be satisfied by less exertion, but his wealth would be increased by the ready market this would afford for his produce.

But this increase would all go to Robinson Crusoe as owner of the island. Friday, a slave, would still get only a slave's wages, just enough food and lodging to maintain his working efficiency. And if there were one or one hundred free men on the island, but owning no land, their share would be no greater.

Let the island pass to Crusoe's heir and though wealth production be multiplied the lot of both slave and free men might become not only relatively but actually harder.

And, though statisticians might set forth, in "figures which cannot lie," how their condition had improved, better housed, better fed, freed from fear of cannibals; yet condemned to a round of dreary toil, unlightened by variety, undignified by responsibility, they would be less men, more machines than Friday. Men whose freedom does not include free access to the earth, to the raw materials necessary to make labor productive, do not and cannot share the increased wealth due to improvements in production or exchange. Those who want them to work give them enough to live on and maintain their strength, but if they find no one who wants them to work they are free only to beg, to freeze or to starve.

The prodigious forces man has harnessed by invention and discovery are good or evil according to our use of them. They become our slaves or our masters as we use them wisely or not.

Where the planet is held to be private property and children born upon it are denied the right to use its opportunities save by paying rent to the heirs of some dead man, improvement in production, increase in wealth makes their lot harder and harder.

#### THE ROBBER THAT TAKES ALL THAT IS LEFT

To abolish protection is to drive off one robber of labor. That will help but little if we leave a stronger and more rapacious one to plunder him.

The robbers which plunder labor by diverting earnings from producers to non-producers include monopolies of machinery and of transportation and exchange, protective tariffs, bad systems of currency and of finance, corrupt government, public debts, standing armies, war and preparations for war. But these are the lesser robbers and to abolish them all would not really benefit labor so long as land remains private property, for increased rent swallows up all we thus save.

Land in itself has no value. It is only when the ownership of land becomes equivalent to the ownership of laborers that value attaches to it. Where population is sparse and vacant land plentiful, labor can obtain the use of land on nominal terms. It is only when all accessible land has been appropriated that the robbery of labor by the private ownership of land becomes increasingly apparent and life harder and more hopeless for those who own only their labor.

*The power which the ownership of valuable land gives is that of getting human service without giving human service, which is, in essence, the same as the ownership of slaves.*

Land and Labor are the primary factors in production. Capital is their product and is, in itself, powerless to oppress or harm labor.

It is not as a capitalist but only as a land owner that wealth has power to harm.

No matter how simple or how complex civilization may be, wherever land is all privately owned there is always a class who can never hope to get more than a bare living by hard and unremitting toil, and whose constant anxiety is that even this bare living may fail them.

#### TRUE FREE TRADE

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"Come with me," said Richard Cobden, as John Bright turned heart-stricken from a new-made grave. "There are in England women and children dying with hunger—hunger made by the laws. Come with me, and we will not rest until we repeat those laws."

In this spirit the free trade movement waxed and grew, arousing an enthusiasm that no mere fiscal reform could have aroused and, entrenched though it was by restricted suffrage and rotten boroughs and aristocratic privilege, protection was overthrown in Great Britain.

And—there is hunger in Great Britain still, and women and children yet die of it.

But this is not the failure of free trade. When protection had been abolished and a revenue tariff substituted for a protective tariff, free trade had only won an outpost. That women and children still die of hunger in Great Britain arises from the failure of the reformers to go on. Free trade has not yet been tried in Great Britain. Free trade in its fullness and entirety would indeed abolish hunger.

This we may now see.

Our inquiry has shown that the reason why the abolition of protection, greatly as it would increase the production of wealth, can accomplish no permanent benefit for the laboring class, is, that so long as the land on which all must live is made the property of some, increase of productive power can only increase the tribute which those who own the land can demand for its use. So long as land is held to be the individual property of but a portion of its inhabitants no possible increase of productive power, even if it went to the length of abolishing the necessity of labor, and no imaginable increase of wealth, even though it poured down from heaven or gushed up from the bowels of the earth, could improve the condition of those who possess only the power to labor. The greatest imaginable increase of wealth could only intensify in the greatest imaginable degree the phenomena which we are familiar with as "over-production"—could only reduce the laboring class to universal pauperism.

Thus it is that to make either the abolition of protection or any other reform beneficial to the working class we must abolish the inequality of legal rights to land, and restore to all their natural and equal rights in the common heritage.

How can this be done?

Consider for a moment precisely what it is that needs to be done, for it is here that confusion sometimes arises.

Here are two simple principles, both of which are self-evident:

I.—That all men have equal rights to the use and enjoyment of the elements provided by nature.

II.—That each man has an exclusive right to the use and enjoyment of what is produced by his own labor.

There is no conflict between these principles. On the contrary, they are correlative. To fully secure the individual right of property in the produce of labor we *must* treat the elements of nature as common property. If anyone could claim the sunlight as his property and could compel me to pay him for the agency of the sun in the growth of crops I had planted, it would necessarily lessen my right of property in the produce of my labor. And, conversely, where everyone is secured the full right of property in the produce of his labor, no one can have any right of property in what is not the produce of labor.

No matter how complex the industrial organization, nor how highly developed the civilization, there is no real difficulty in carrying out these principles. All we have to do is to treat the land as the joint property of the whole people, just as a railway is treated as the joint property of many shareholders, or as a ship is treated as the joint property of several owners.

To make land virtually the common property of the whole people, and to appropriate ground rent for public use, there is a way that involves no shock, that will conform to present customs, and that, instead of requiring a great increase of governmental machinery, will permit of a great simplification of governmental machinery.

In every well-developed community large sums are needed for common purposes, and the sums thus needed increase with social growth, not merely in amount, but proportionately, since progress tends steadily to devolve on the community as a whole functions which in a ruder stage are discharged by individuals. Now, while people are not used to paying rent to government, they are used to paying taxes to government. Some of these taxes are levied upon personal or movable property; some upon occupations or businesses or persons (as in the case of income taxes, which are in reality taxes on persons according to income); some upon the transportation or exchange of commodities, in which last category fall the taxes imposed by tariffs; and some, in the United States at least, on real estate—that is to say, on the value of land and of the improvements upon it, taken together. That part of the tax on real estate which is assessed on the value of land irrespective of improvements is, in its nature, not a tax, but a rent—a taking for the common use of the community of a part of the income that properly belongs to the community by reason of the equal right of all to the use of land.

It is only necessary to abolish, one after another, all other taxes now levied, and to increase the tax on land values till it reaches, as near as may be, the full annual value of the land.

Whenever this point of theoretical perfection is reached, the selling value of land will entirely disappear, and the charge made to the individual by the community for the use of the common property will become in form what it is in fact—a rent. But until that point is reached, this rent may be collected by the simple increase of a tax upon the selling value of land irrespective of improvements—a value that can be ascertained more easily and more accurately than any other value.

For a full exposition of the effects of this change in the method of raising public revenues, I must refer the reader to the works in which I have treated this branch of the subject at greater length than is here possible. Briefly, they would be threefold:

In the first place, all taxes that now fall upon the exertion of labor or use of capital would be abolished. No one would be taxed for building a house or improving a farm or opening a mine, for

bringing things in from foreign countries, or for adding in any way to the stock of things that satisfy human wants and constitute national wealth. Everyone would be free to make and save wealth; to buy, sell, give or exchange, without let or hindrance, any article of human production the use of which did not involve any public injury. All those taxes which increase prices as things pass from hand to hand, falling finally upon the consumer, would disappear.

In the second place, a large and constantly increasing fund would be provided for common uses, without any tax on the earnings of labor or on the returns of capital—a fund which in well-settled countries would not only suffice for all of what are now considered necessary expenses of government, but would leave a large surplus to be devoted to purposes of general benefit.

In the third place, and most important of all, the monopoly of land would be abolished, and land would be thrown open and kept open to the use of labor, since it would be unprofitable for anyone to hold land without putting it to its full use, and both the temptation and the power to speculate in natural opportunities would be gone. The speculative value of land would be destroyed as soon as it was known that, no matter whether land was used or not, the tax would increase as fast as the value increased; and no one would want to hold land that he did not use. With the disappearance of the capitalized or selling value of land, the premium which must now be paid as purchase money by those who wish to use land would disappear, differences in the value of land being measured by what would have to be paid for it to the community, nominally in taxes, but really in rent. So long as any unused land remained, those who wished to use it could obtain it, not only without the payment of any purchase price, but without the payment of any tax or rent. Nothing would be required for the use of land till less advantageous land came into use, and possession thus gave an advantage over and above the return to the labor and capital expended upon it. And no matter how much the growth of population and the progress of society increased the value of land, this increase would go to the whole community, swelling that general fund in which the poorest would be an equal sharer with the richest.

Thus the great cause of the present unequal distribution of wealth would be destroyed, and that one-sided competition would cease which now deprives men who possess nothing but power to labor of the benefits of advancing civilization, and forces wages to a minimum no matter what the increase of wealth. Labor, free to the natural elements of production, would no longer be incapable of employing itself, and competition, acting as fully and freely between employers as between employed, would carry wages up to what is truly their natural rate—the full value of the produce of labor—and keep them there.

*"A tax on land values is of all taxes that which best fulfills every*

requirement of a perfect tax. As land cannot be hidden or carried off, a tax on land values can be assessed with more certainty and can be collected with greater ease and less expense than any other tax, while it does not in the slightest degree check production or lessen its incentive. It is, in fact, a tax only in form, being in nature a rent—a taking for the use of the community of a value that arises not from individual exertion but from the growth of the community. For it is not anything that the individual owner or user does that gives value to land. The value that he creates is a value that attaches to improvements. This, being the result of individual exertion, properly belongs to the individual, and cannot be taxed without lessening the incentive to production. But the value that attaches to land itself is a value arising from the growth of the community and increasing with social growth. It, therefore, properly belongs to the community, and can be taken to the last penny without in the slightest degree lessening the incentive to production.

Taxes on land values are thus the only taxes from which, in accordance with the principle of free trade, any considerable amount of revenue can be raised, and it is evident that to carry out the free-trade principle to the point of abolishing all taxes that hamper or lessen production would of itself involve very nearly the same measures which we have seen are required to assert the common right to land and place all citizens upon an equal footing.

To make these measures identically the same, it is only necessary that the taxation of land values, to which true free trade compels us to resort for public revenues, should be carried far enough to take, as near as might practically be, the whole of the income arising from the value given to land by the growth of the community.

But we have only to go one step farther to see that free trade does indeed require this, and that the two reforms are thus absolutely identical.

Free trade means free production. Now fully to free production it is necessary not only to remove all taxes on production, but also to remove all other restrictions on production. True free trade, in short, requires that the active factor of production, labor, shall have free access to the passive factor of production, land. To secure this, all monopoly of land must be broken up, and the equal right of all to the use of the natural elements must be secured by the treatment of the land as the common property in usufruct of the whole people.

Thus it is that free trade brings us to the same simple measure as that which we have seen is necessary to emancipate labor from its thralldom and to secure that justice in the distribution of wealth which will make every improvement or reform beneficial to all classes.

The partial reform miscalled free trade, which consists in the mere abolition of protection—the mere substitution of a revenue

tariff for a protective tariff—cannot help the laboring classes, because it does not touch the fundamental cause of that unjust and unequal distribution which, as we see today, makes "labor a drug and population a nuisance" in the midst of such a plethora of wealth that we talk of over-production. True free trade, on the contrary, leads not only to the largest production of wealth but to the fairest distribution. It is the easy and obvious way of bringing about that change by which alone justice in distribution can be secured, and the great inventions and discoveries which the human mind is now grasping can be converted into agencies for the elevation of society from its very foundations."

#### FREE TRADE AND SOCIALISM

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"Individualism and socialism are in truth not antagonistic but correlative. Where the domain of the one principle ends that of the other begins. And although the motto *Laissez faire* has been taken as the watchword of an individualism that tends to anarchism, and so-called free traders have made 'the law of supply and demand' a stench in the nostrils of men alive to social injustice, there is in free trade nothing that conflicts with a rational socialism. On the contrary, we have but to carry out the free-trade principle to its logical conclusions to see that it brings us to such socialism.

Whether businesses in their nature monopolies should be regulated by law or should be carried on by the community, is a question of method. It seems to me, however, that experience goes to show that better results can be secured, with less risk of governmental corruption, by state management than by state regulation. But the great simplification of government which would result from the abolition of the present complex and demoralizing modes of taxation would vastly increase the ease and safety with which either of these methods could be applied. The assumption by the state of all those social functions in which competition will not operate would involve nothing like the strain upon governmental powers, and would be nothing like as provocative of corruption and dishonesty as our present method of collecting taxes. The more equal distribution of wealth that would ensue from the reform which thus simplified government, would, moreover, increase public intelligence and purify public morals, and enable us to bring a higher standard of honesty and ability to the management of public affairs.

There is another way, moreover, in which true free trade tends strongly to socialism, in the highest and best sense of the term. The taking for the use of the community of that value of privilege which attaches to the possession of land, would, wherever social development has advanced beyond a certain stage, yield revenues even larger than those now raised by taxation, while there would be an enormous reduction in public expenses consequent, directly



and indirectly, upon the abolition of present modes of taxation. Thus would be provided a fund, increasing steadily with social growth, that could be applied to social purposes now neglected. And among the purposes which will suggest themselves to the ready by which the surplus income of the community could be used to increase the sum of human knowledge, the diffusion of elevating tastes, and the gratification of healthy desires, there is none more worthy than that of making honorable provision for those deprived of their natural protectors, or through no fault of their own incapacitated for the struggle of life."

#### PRACTICAL POLITICS

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"Free trade, narrowed to a mere fiscal reform, can only appeal to the lower and weaker motives—to motives that are inadequate to move men in masses. Take the current free-trade literature—its aim is to show the impolicy of protection rather than its injustice; its appeal is to the pocket, not to the sympathies. Yet to begin and maintain great popular movements it is the moral sense rather than the intellect that must be appealed to, sympathy rather than self-interest. For however it may be with any individual, the sense of justice is with the masses of men keener and truer than intellectual perception, and unless a question can assume the form of right and wrong it cannot provoke general discussion and excite the many to action. And while material gain or loss impresses us less vividly the greater the number of those we share it with, the power of sympathy increases as it spreads from man to man—becomes cumulative and contagious.

But he who follows the principle of free trade to its logical conclusion can strike at the very root of protection; can answer every question, and meet every objection, and appeal to the surest of instincts and the strongest of motives. He will see in free trade not a mere fiscal reform, but a movement which has for its aim and end nothing less than the abolition of property, and of the vice and crime and degradation that flow from it, by the restoration to the disinherited of their natural rights and the establishment of society upon the basis of justice. He will catch the inspiration of a cause great enough to live for and to die for, and be moved by an enthusiasm that he can evoke in others.

It is true that to advocate free trade in its fullness would excite the opposition of interests far stronger than those concerned in maintaining protective tariffs. But on the other hand it would bring to the standard of free trade forces without which it cannot succeed. And what those who would arouse thought have to fear is not so much opposition as indifference. Without opposition that attention

cannot be excited, that energy evoked, that are necessary to overcome the inertia that is the strongest bulwark of existing abuses. A party can no more be rallied on a question that no one disputes than steam can be raised to working pressure in an open vessel.

The working classes have been awakened to the fact that there is some deep wrong in the constitution of society, although they may not see clearly what that wrong is; they have been gradually coming to feel that to emancipate labor radical measures are needed, although they may not know what those measures are.

And scattered through the great body thus beginning to stir and grope are rapidly increasing number of men who do know what this primary wrong is—men who see that in the recognition of the equal right of all to the element necessary to life and labor is the hope, and the only hope, of curing social injustice.

It is to men of this kind that I would particularly speak. They are the leaven which has in its power to leaven the whole lump.

To abolish private property in land is an undertaking so great that it may at first seem impracticable.

But this seeming impracticability consists merely in the fact that the public mind is not yet sufficiently awakened to the justice and necessity of this great change. To bring it about is simply a work of arousing thought. How men vote is something we need not much concern ourselves with. The important thing is how they think.

Now the chief agency in promoting thought is discussion. And to secure the most general and most effective discussion of a principle it must be embodied in concrete form and presented in practical politics, so that men, being called to vote on it, shall be forced to think and talk about it.

The advocates of a great principle should know no thought of compromise. They should proclaim it in its fullness, and point to its complete attainment as their goal. But the zeal of the propagandist needs to be supplemented by the skill of the politician. While the one need not fear to arouse opposition, the other should seek to minimize resistance. The political art, like the military art, consists in massing the greatest force against the point of least resistance; and to bring a principle most quickly and effectively into practical politics, the measure which presents it should be so moderate as (while involving the principle) to secure the largest support and excite the least resistance. For whether the first step be long or short is of little consequence. When a start is once made in a right direction, progress is a mere matter of keeping on.

It is in this way that great questions always enter the phase of political action. Important political battles begin with affairs of outposts, in themselves of little moment, and are generally decided



upon issue joined not on the main question, but on some minor or collateral question. Thus the slavery question in the United States came into practical politics upon the issue of the extension of slavery to new territory, and was decisively settled upon the issue of secession. Regarded as an end, the abolitionist might well have looked with contempt on the proposals of the Republicans, but these proposals were the means of bringing to realization what the abolitionists would in vain have sought to accomplish directly.

To secure equal rights to land there is in this stage of civilization but one way. Such measures as peasant proprietary, or "land limitation," or the reservation to actual settlers of what is left of the public domain, do not tend toward it; they lead away from it.

The only way to abolish private property in land is by the way of taxation. That way is clear and straightforward. It consists simply in abolishing, one after another, all imposts that are in their nature really taxes, and resorting for public revenues to economic rent, or ground value. To the full freeing of land, and the complete emancipation of labor, it is, of course, necessary that the whole of this value should be taken for the common benefit; but that will inevitably follow the decision to collect from this source the revenues now needed, or even any considerable part of them, just as the entrance of a victorious army into a city follows the rout of the army that defended it.

Thus it is that when men take up the principle of freedom they are led on and on, and that the hearty advocacy of freedom to trade becomes at length the advocacy of freedom to labor. Once the tariff question becomes a national issue, and in the struggle against protection, free traders will be forced to attack indirect taxation; while before the abolition of indirect taxation is reached, the incidence of taxation and the nature and effect of private property in land will have been so well discussed that the rest will be but a matter of time.

Property in land is as indefensible as property in man. It is so absurdly impolitic, so outrageously unjust, so flagrantly subversive of the true right of property, that it can only be instituted by force and maintained by confounding in the popular mind the distinction between property in land and property in things that are the result of labor. Once that distinction is made clear—and a thorough discussion of the tariff question must now make it clear—private property in land is doomed."

#### A NOBLER CAREER

(The following is quoted verbatim from "Protection or Free Trade"):

"That which is good harmonizes with all things good; and that which is evil tends to other evil things. Properly does Buckle, in

his 'History of Civilization,' apply the term 'Protective' not merely to the system of robbery by tariffs, but to the spirit that teaches that many are born to serve and the few to rule; that props thrones with bayonets, substitutes small vanities and petty jealousies for high-minded patriotism, and converts the flower of European youth into uniformed slaves, trained to kill each other at the word of command. Fortifications and navies and standing armies not merely suit the protectionist purpose in requiring a constant expenditure, and developing a class who look on warlike expenditures as conducive to their own profit and importance, but they are of a piece with a theory that teaches us that our interests are antagonistic to those of other nations.

Unembarrassed by hostile neighbors; unentangled in European quarrels; already the most powerful nation on earth, and rapidly rising to a position that will dwarf the greatest empires, the American Republic can afford to laugh to scorn any suggestion that she should ape the armaments of Old-World monarchies, as she should laugh to scorn the parallel suggestion that her industries could be ruined by throwing open her ports to the commerce of the world.

The giant of the nations does not depend for her safety upon steel-clad fortresses and armor-plated ships which the march of invention must within a few years make, even in wartime, mere useless rubbish; but in her population, in her wealth, in the intelligence and inventiveness and spirit of her people, she has all that would be really useful in time of need. No nation on earth would venture wantonly to attack her, and none could do so with impunity. If we ever have a foreign war it will be of our making. And too strong to fear aggression, we ought to be too just to commit it.

In throwing open our ports to the commerce of the world we shall far better secure their safety than by fortifying them with all the "protected" plates that our steel ring could make. For not merely would free trade give us again that mastery of the ocean which protection has deprived us of, and stimulate the productive power in which real fighting strength lies; but while steel-clad forts could afford no defense against the dynamite-dropping balloons and death-dealing air-ships which will be the next product of destructive invention, free trade would prevent their ever being sent against us. The spirit of protectionism, which is the real thing that it is sought to defend by steel-plating, is that of national enmity and strife. The spirit of free trade is that of fraternity and peace.

A nobler career is open to the American Republic than the servile imitation of European follies and vices. Instead of following in what is mean and low, she may lead toward what is grand and high. This league of sovereign States, settling their differences by a com-

mon tribunal and opposing no impediments to trade and travel, has in it possibilities of giving to the world a more than Roman peace.

What are the real, substantial advantages of this Union of ours? Are they not summed up in the absolute freedom of trade which it secures, and the community of interests that grows out of this freedom? If our States were fighting each other with hostile tariffs, and a citizen could not cross a State boundary-line without having his baggage searched, or a book printed in New York could not be sent across the river to Jersey City without being held in the post-office until duty was paid, how long would our Union last, or what would it be worth? The true benefits of our Union, the true basis of the interstate peace it secures, is that it has prevented the establishment of State tariffs and given us free trade over the better part of a continent.

We may "extend the area of freedom" whenever we choose to—whenever we apply to our intercourse with other nations the same principle that we apply to intercourse between our States. We may annex Canada to all intents and purposes whenever we throw down the tariff wall we have built around ourselves. We need not ask for any reciprocity; if we abolish our custom-houses and call off our baggage searchers and Bible confiscators, Canada would not and could not maintain hers. This would make the two countries practically one. Whether the Canadians chose to maintain a separate Parliament and pay a British lordling for keeping up a mock court at Rideau Hall, need not in the slightest concern us. The intimate relations that would come of unrestricted commerce would soon obliterate the boundary-line; and mutual interest and mutual convenience would speedily induce the extension over both countries of the same general laws and institutions.

And so would it be with our kindred over the sea. With the abolition of our custom-houses and the opening of our ports to the free entry of all good things, the trade between the British Islands and the United States would become so immense, the intercourse so intimate, that we should become one people, and would inevitably so conform currency and postal system and general laws that Englishman and American would feel themselves as much citizens of a common country as do New Yorker and Californian. Three thousand miles of water are no more of an impediment to this than are three thousand miles of land. And with relations so close, ties of blood and language would assert their power, and mutual interest, general convenience, and fraternal feeling might soon lead to a pact, which, in the words of our own, would unite all the English-speaking peoples in a league "to establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty."

Thus would free trade unite what a century ago protectionism sev-

ered, and in a federation of the nations of English speech—the world-tongue of the future—takes the first step to a federation of mankind.

And upon our relations with all other nations our repudiation of protection would have a similar tendency. The sending of delegations to ask the trade of our sister republics of Spanish America avails nothing so long as we maintain a tariff which repels their trade. We have but to open our ports to draw their trade to us and avail ourselves of all their natural advantages. And more potent than anything else would be the moral influence of our action. The spectacle of a continental republic such as ours really putting her faith in the principle of freedom, would revolutionize the civilized world.

For, as I have shown that violation of natural rights which imposes tariff duties is inseparably linked with the violation of natural rights which compels the masses to pay tribute for the privilege of living. The one cannot be abolished without the other. And a republic wherein the free-trade principle was thus carried to its conclusion, wherein the equal and unalienable rights of men were thus acknowledged, would indeed be as a city set on a hill.

The dangers to the Republic come not from without but from within. What menaces her safety is no armada launched from European shores, but the gathering cloud of tramps in her own highways. That Krupp is casting monstrous cannon, and that in Cherbourg and Woolwich projectiles of unheard-of destructiveness are being stored, need not alarm her, but there is black omen in the fact that Pennsylvania miners are working for 65 cents a day. No triumphant invader can tread our soil till the blight of "great estates" has brought "failure of the crop of men"; if there be danger that our cities blaze it is from torches lit in faction fight, not from foreign shells.

Against such dangers forts will not guard us, ironclads protect us, or standing armies prove of any avail. They are not to be avoided by any aping of European protectionism; they come from our failure to be true to that spirit of liberty which was invoked at the formation of the Republic. They are only to be avoided by conforming our institutions to the principle of freedom.

For it is true, as was declared by the first National Assembly of France, that "*ignorance, neglect or contempt of human rights are the sole causes of public misfortunes and corruptions of government.*"

Here is the conclusion of the whole matter: That we should do unto others as we would have them do to us—that we should respect the rights of others as scrupulously as we would have our own rights respected, is not a mere counsel of perfection to individuals, but it is the law to which we must conform social institutions and national policy if we would secure the blessings of abundance and peace."

Capon Healing Water is ranked above any other spring in the world by high authority. Its reputation for amazing cures was so well established before the Revolution that Virginia refused to sell it and state ownership continued for 130 years.

You need not diet, exercise or leave home or work to be benefited.

Its strongest endorsements come from those who tested it longest, as three Presidents of the Medical Society of Virginia. Dr. Wm. P. McGuire after fifty years use, Dr. Bedford Brown after forty years use, and Dr. A. M. Fauntleroy after twenty-five years use.

"The Capon Springs Water is tonic, diuretic, alterative and aperient. I have known of no case of renal calculi or gravel which has not been cured by an intelligent and sufficiently long use of this water. Gout and rheumatism and their dependent conditions are always benefited or cured. Liver and stomach ailments are much benefited and I have seen supposed incurable liver disease entirely and permanently cured. In catarrhal affections of the uterus, lungs, bladder and intestines, the effects are always beneficial and often wonderful."—DR. ALFRED WHELEN, of Philadelphia.

"Useful in catarrhal conditions or various organs—pleuritic exhalations, dyspepsia, diseases of the liver, kidneys and bladder, scrofula, rheumatism, gout and diabetes melitus." "A Reference Hand Book of Medical Sciences" edited by Dr. T. L. Stedman, Editor "N. Y. Medical Record."

"Beneficial in diseases of the urinary, digestive and reproductive organs."—DR. S. T. ARMSTRONG in "Practical Therapeutics," 1899, edited by Dr. Frank P. Foster, Editor "N. Y. Medical Journal."

"Unquestionably good results have been wrought by these waters."—ROBERTS BARTHOLOW, M. D., M. A., LL.D., in "Materia Medica and Therapeutics," formerly Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in the Jefferson Medical College of Philadelphia.

"It has no equal as a corrector of hyperacidity."—DR. WM. H. MERCUR, of Pittsburgh.

Capapoon (Healing Water) is shipped anywhere direct from Capon Springs, W. Va., by parcel post, in cans \$5.00 for 5 gallons and \$6.00 for 5 gallon bottle in handy tilting crate, postage or express extra. All prices are F. O. B. Capon Springs, W. Va. Also via freight or express in cases of 12 half-gallon bottles for \$12.00 and in galvanized iron 30 gallon barrels for \$30.00, and 55 gallon barrels for \$40.00. Carriage extra.

CAPON SPRINGS CO., CAPON SPRINGS, W. VA.

"For Kidney Troubles especially Capon Springs is the best in America."—DR. J. K. BARNES, former Surgeon General U. S. Army.

"For Uric Acid Troubles and diseases such as gout, rheumatism, kidney troubles, calculus, I think it is invaluable."—DR. WM. P. MCGUIRE, former President Medical Society of Virginia; President Farmers & Merchants' National Bank, Winchester, Virginia. (After fifty years use.)

"Very valuable, both as tonic and alterative."—DR. HUNTER MCGUIRE, former President American Medical Association.

"I have found none so good as Capapoon."—DR. JOS. M. MATHEWS, former President American Medical Association.

"Capon Springs and baths possess valuable medicinal properties."—DR. D. HAYES AGNEW, former Professor of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania.

"The estimate on their remedial power has been, not too high, but decidedly not high enough."—DR. JOHN H. JANEWAY, of New York.

"Capon is similar in its effects, though quicker and more positive in its action, than Vichy of France or Carlsbad of Germany."—DR. THOS. A. ASHBY, former Professor of Gynecology, University of Maryland.

"I know of no water comparable to Capon for kidney and bladder troubles, Vichy, of France, does not equal it."—DR. W. V. MARMION, Washington, D. C.

HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION OF AMERICA  
GEORGE E. EVANS, *Pres.* P. R. WILLIAMS, *Sec'y.*  
1306 Berger Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION OF AUSTRALIA  
W. H. RENWICK, *Pres.* P. J. MARKHAM, *Sec'y.*  
18 George Parade, Melbourne, Australia.

HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION OF GREAT BRITAIN  
United Committee for the "Taxation of Land Values" Trustees.  
11 Tothill St., London, S. W. 1.

ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION  
C. O'C. HENNESSY, *Pres.* WALTER FAIRCHILD, *Sec'y.*  
11 Park Place, New York.

HENRY GEORGE LECTURE BUREAU  
F. H. MONROE, *Pres.* 534 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

The burden of municipal taxation should be so shifted as to put the weight of land taxation upon the unearned rise in value of the land itself, rather than upon the improvements. —THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

I find it very difficult to disagree with the principle of Henry George. . . . I believe in the taxation of land values only. —LOUIS D. BRANDEIS.

Henry George was one of the great reformers of the world. His conscience was active, his sympathies broad, his purpose indomitable, his courage unflinching, his devotion to principle absolute. These qualities, though rare, are not exceptional, but with these were united the passion of a great idea, the perception of a primal truth unrecognized, and the genius of language to move mankind. —WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, 2d.

The most necessary reform that I know of is the exemption of improvements and the taxation of land values only. —GEORGE FOSTER PEABODY.

I am inclined to believe that no writer of our times has had a more profound influence upon the thinking of the world. I have read "Progress and Poverty" several times and have always felt that for beauty of style, elevation of spirit, and weight of argument, it is one of the great books written in my lifetime. —NEWTON D. BAKER.

All the country needs is a new and sincere thought in politics, coherently, distinctly, and boldly uttered by men who are sure of their ground. The power of men like Henry George seems to me to mean that. —WOODROW WILSON.

People do not argue with the teaching of George; they simply do not know it. He who becomes acquainted with it cannot but agree. —LEO TOLSTOY.

Your "Outline of Progress and Poverty" was of very great service in our study classes. The average workman has too little time for reading and is apt to be scared by "Progress and Poverty" itself. You are rendering a greater service to the cause than you realize. I wish you every possible success. —J. W. GRAHAM PEACE, Editor, "The Commonwealth," London, England.

We congratulate you on "Henry George's Land Question," abridged, and will be glad to have 10,000 copies. —A. W. MADSEN, Editor, "Land & Liberty," London, England.

Your "Henry George's Land Question," abridged, is a splendid piece of literature. We will be glad to have 10,000 copies. —HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION OF AMERICA, Pittsburgh, Pa.

You have been extraordinarily successful in condensing "Progress and Poverty." —BOLTON HALL.