

One Million Copies During the Next Twelve Months.

This is our aim for this thought-stirring summons.
Have we set our mark too high?

You alone can answer.

You—Single Taxer, Socialist, Citizen Interested in
a Better Order of Things—are the one to make this
shot a bull's-eye.

Every Opponent of Single Tax, every Conservative,
every Upholder of Things as They Are should have
one of these "sticks of dynamite" put in his hand. It
will wake him up or—he'll drop it before it explodes
and does.

You must get it to him.

Will you do it?

5 cents	buys	2 copies
25 cents	"	12 "
\$1.00	"	50 "
\$1.50	"	100 "
\$6.25	"	500 "
\$10.00	"	1000 "

Send orders to

THE JOSEPH FELS FUND OF AMERICA,

DANIEL KIEFER, Chairman,

Blymyer Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Other addresses by Mr. Bigelow can be had at five
cents each by addressing the above.

What Shall We Do With Our Millionaires?

— BY —

HERBERT S. BIGELOW



Delivered before The People's Church, Grand Opera House,
Cincinnati, Sunday, January 23, 1916.

What Shall We Do With Our Millionaires?

BY HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

"Thus saith the Lord my God: Feed the flock of slaughter; whose possessors slay them, and hold themselves not guilty; and they that sell them say, Blessed be Jehovah, for I am rich; and their own shepherds pity them not."
—Zechariah.

THERE are two precautions which should not be overlooked by those who are preparing for "preparedness."

In making ready to resist foreign invasion, they should take good care to place their arsenals, not at the points where the invaders would be likely to come, but in close proximity to the great industrial centers, where laborers may grow mutinous. This, it is said, is now being done.

A Dangerous Book.

The other precaution is even more important. The Bible should be suppressed. This is the most inflammatory book that has ever been written. If it were not for the circulation of this book among the poor, we would not need so many arsenals shrewdly located in inland cities where workingmen live. Much of the need for national preparedness is due to the pernicious influence of the Bible upon that underhalf of our population which is drudging away on an annual income of five or six hundred dollars. Isaiah said to the rich men of his time: *The spoil of the poor is in your houses.* What sort of talk is that to be drilled into the minds of our children in the Sunday school? What is more natural than that

people, in their loose thinking, should apply these words to the rich of our own day. If they are inflamed by these Bible agitators to think that the swollen fortunes of our day are in reality the spoil of the poor, what is to stop them from concluding that it would be a patriotic and religious act to despoil the rich?

Indeed, according to the account, it was Jehovah himself who commanded the children of Israel to spoil the Egyptians. Jehovah had no proper sense of property rights. There should be a preparedness commission to censor the Bible. The words of Jehovah, especially, should be blue penciled. Take, for example, the 11th Chapter of Zachariah, which is quoted above. It is Jehovah himself who is represented in this chapter as not only declaring that he is going to confiscate the property of the rich, but as glorying in it, and jeering at the rich in their discomfiture and abasement.

"Howl," he cried, "because the mighty are fallen." In this unseemly language he derides the defenders of property rights. It is said that there are in America 65% of the population who own but 5% of the wealth, and that there are 2% of the population who own 60% of the wealth. Manifestly, if this is the case, the Bible is no fit book to be circulating among our great property-less majority.

There are, of course, some safe things in the Bible. For instance, the people are commanded not to covet their neighbors' houses and fields. All safe preachers will try to center the attention of the people on such texts as these. But many will point to the so-called loot of the Rock Island or the New Haven, or to a thousand other illustrations of what they wildly call unearned wealth, and they will declare that in wanting this wealth they are not coveting what belongs to another, but are merely demanding back what has been stolen from them. The

preachers will have to do the best they can to combat such heresies, and statesmen should talk loudly of foreign enemies and judiciously distribute the arsenals. But if only some way could be found to get the Bible out of the hands of the people, it would probably mean a big saving in ammunition.

Under the Constitution of the United States, as interpreted by such decisions as that of the Dartmouth College Case, property has become more secure and absolute than in any European country. But it is certainly disquieting that the heads of people should be turned by such leveling words as those which the Bible puts into the mouth of Mary, the mother of Jesus, who sang:

"He hath put down the mighty from their seats, and exalted them of low degree.

He hath filled the hungry with good things, and the rich he hath sent empty away."

That sort of doctrine is unconstitutional in America. Congress ought to bar from the mails, and exclude from interstate commerce, Bibles which have not been purged of these inflammatory passages.

If it is found impossible to carry out this program, another measure may be suggested as a means of averting revolution. This is that the rich consent to a confiscation of a part of their fortunes, or that they offer no stubborn resistance to drastic income and inheritance taxes, by which a substantial portion of their wealth may be taken to lessen the evils of poverty.

There is no doubt about it, there is an increasing number of people, now a great multitude, with votes in their hands, who take the Bible seriously, who make a present-day application of these Bible tirades against the rich. Something must be done; the rich, who now control the United States government, may stand on their

constitutional rights and refuse to yield an inch. But would that be wise? Might they not in the end lose more than by making really generous concessions?

A Program of Restitution.

However that may be, I think that there is truth in these Bible passages, and that the people are not altogether wrong in drawing present-day inferences from them. Therefore, as a means of doing substantial justice to rich and poor alike, and of averting revolution, I urge the following:

(1). Make the big rich pay an income tax which shall be as large a proportion of their incomes as is now taken from the poor man in the form of indirect taxes which increase the cost of his living.

(2). Do not let a man bequeath more than \$25,000 without the payment of an inheritance tax. Charge him five per cent on the second \$25,000, charge him ten per cent on the next, and so on up, so that from an estate of a million dollars, at least half shall be taken for the public. Practically all, perhaps ninety per cent any way, should be taken from all estates of over a million dollars.

(3). With these funds pay a pension of a dollar a day to all mothers who have been bereft of their bread winner and who have dependent children to support, and also pay twenty-five or thirty dollars a month to all people who have not that much income and who have reached the age of 65 years.

I urge these measures as a means of national security. Why raise armies to defend swollen fortunes? It is safer to have the rich discontented than to have the poor discontented. If we took these swollen fortunes to pay old age and mothers' pensions, we might have to keep an arsenal at Tarrytown and another at Newport. But it would take only a few pinches of powder and a small

measure of preparedness to keep the rich quiet. Surely that would be easier than preparing to cow the sullen millions who toil and to build frowning arsenals to command the factories where labor is exploited. Some people's idea of preparedness is to curry favor with the rich and overawe the poor. My idea is to win the loyalty of the poor and command the obedience of the rich. Germany, with her pension funds, won the hearts of her people, and their loyalty has been the amazement of the world.

We must stamp out poverty, and the bill for it should be sent to our over-rich. That is the best investment in preparedness that the nation can make.

The very size of these great fortunes is prima facie evidence that they have not been honestly earned and that therefore they can be honestly taken.

Owners of America.

The tax receipts of the Federal Government are \$700,000,000 a year. This covers the cost of the United States army and navy. It includes the \$165,000,000 for pensions. This sum takes care of the Department of Justice, with all the judges and district attorneys; it takes care of the State Department with ambassadors to all the nations and consuls to all the great cities of the world; it takes care of the Department of Agriculture with its various and vast activities; and out of this sum is maintained the Department of the Interior, the story of the achievements of which, reads like a romance. It is difficult for the imagination to grasp the huge undertaking, the ubiquitous services, of a mighty government like ours. It can mean little to say that this government costs \$700,000,000 a year. But it may perhaps mean something to say that there are 7,509 individuals in this country whose combined annual income is greater by

\$150,000,000 than the total tax receipts of the United States government.

That is to say, these seven thousand, five hundred and nine persons could keep back \$20,000 a year each for their living expenses, and they would have enough left out of their princely incomes to run the United States government.

It is not necessary to inquire how these people got such incomes. The size of them is enough to condemn them. Such incomes could not have been rightfully earned. If they could not have been rightfully earned they must belong to somebody else. Therefore we do not need to apologize for taking these incomes. It is these millionaires who should apologize for having them.

No one will soberly contend that these fortunes have been rightfully earned. The Standard Oil Company was prosecuted, and the trust was dissolved, because it was found to be guilty of illegal acts. This prosecution was inspired by the general belief that the company had become a monopoly and was exacting extortionate prices and was accumulating inordinate profits. At the time of the dissolution of the trust, its stock was worth less than \$700 a share. Now it is worth \$1,700 a share. Since the dissolution one individual shareholder of the company has realized \$26,000,000 a year in dividends, and besides that, the value of his stock has appreciated \$85,000,000 a year. If the prosecution of the trust was justified on the ground that it was taking too much from the American people, who will say that it is not now taking too much, since the value of its privilege to tax the American people is almost three times greater than when it was prosecuted.

If Judas had not hung himself, and if all twelve of the apostles had started to work at the dawn of Egyptian civilization seven thousand years ago, and if from that

time until the present day they had each made and saved the wages of an American workingman they would have accumulated by the present time less, by many millions, than this one shareholder has received in a single year by reason of the increase in the value of his stock.

It is not necessary to cite the fortunes which have been accumulated in violation of law. The greater part of the concentration of unearned wealth is due to processes which are entirely legal.

Manhattan Island is thirteen miles long and one and a half miles across at the widest point. On this portion of New York City there are over three millions of people and the value of the land alone is over three billion dollars.

The average size of farms in the United States is one hundred and thirty-one acres and the average value is \$32.00 per acre. There is room on Manhattan Island for one hundred such farms, which, at the average value, would be worth \$4,500 each.

Suppose that there were no city on Manhattan Island, but that the land were divided equally between one hundred farmers. Now suppose that three million people, traveling in airships, should suddenly alight on these farms, like a swarm of locusts. Would they, like locusts, ruin the farmers? Suppose that these farmers should get up some morning to milk their cows and find, to their astonishment, a city of three million souls, with buildings sky high, with trains overhead and tunnels underground, with mighty bridges and miles of palaces, and bustling factories, and magic stores. Suppose that all this should happen to these farmers over night. Well, in that case, the farmers who had gone to bed worth \$4,500 each would have gotten up in the morning, worth on the average, thirty millions apiece.

Inevitably, every city, by reason of its growth,

creates land values, and if these values are not taken for public purposes, they become the foundations of great and altogether gratuitous private fortunes.

There is a law which brings the cream to the top of a pan of milk. There is also a law which draws the greatest land values into the centers of the cities. Those, therefore, who hold these central locations, become, not by their industry, but by the operation of this law, the wealthiest people of the city.

At the corner of Nassau and Wall Streets on Manhattan Island, land has sold for \$655.00 a square foot. This is at the rate of over twenty-eight million dollars an acre. The owner of an acre of land like that could let others use his acre and he could sit down and do nothing and a stream of gold of over a million dollars a year would pour into his lap.

An Idaho man won a prize making an acre of ground produce 647 bushels of potatoes. But if he had had six acres of land like that at Nassau and Wall Streets, he could have raised 389,000,000 bushels. That is to say, he could have sold his six acres and bought the entire potato crop of the United States.

New York's Five Billion Dollar Debt.

Manhattan Island is but one of the boroughs of New York City. The total population of New York City is over five millions. The land value of the entire city is over five billions.

We may get some comprehension of this huge figure if we express these New York land values in terms of farm values. Here is a city of 1,066,000 families. There are only 44,000 of these families who own any of the land. Over a million of the families are renters. Forty-four thousand families own all of the five billions of land values. This is equivalent to a row of United States

farms one-quarter of a mile wide and reaching nine times around the globe. These 44,000 families in New York City own land values which are equivalent to the combined value of all the farms in the states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin.

The ownership of the land of New York City means economic power. That five billions of land value is just the same to 96% of the people as five billions of public debt. The money spent for ground rent is like interest paid on public debts, except that interest on public debts is paid by producers for values which individuals have conferred upon government, while the rent of ground is interest paid by producers for values which government has conferred upon individuals. The ownership of the ground of New York City means the economic power of four per cent of the people to get five billions worth of real wealth, labor-produced wealth, without rendering the slightest service in return.

Anyone taking a train from Youngstown to Pittsburgh through the Mahoning valley, and seeing the tremendous steel works that line that trail of coal and iron, will get an impressive picture of the wealth of this one American industry. If he could bring Gary from Indiana and put that in the picture, if he could add Bethlehem to the picture and bring Cambria from Johnstown, and if to all these he could add all the other steel mills in the country, if he could assemble them all into one hissing, roaring inferno, and if to this city of Titans he could add all the other manufacturing industries of the whole nation, if he could add the packing houses of Chicago and Kansas City and Omaha, if he could add the flour mills of Duluth and Minneapolis, if he could add the lumber mills of all the north, and south, east and west, if he could bring into the picture the textile mills of Lynn and Lowell, and all the others from Massachu-

setts to Georgia and the Carolinas, if to these he could add all the paper mills and the machine shops and the shoe factories and the oil refineries and the railroad and automobile shops and the smelters and the electrical plants, and all the distilleries of Cincinnati, if he could bring into one massed picture all the manufacturing plants of every description in the whole country, so that as his train moved along he could see the countless smokestacks like the charred trunks of a forest, it would be a staggering picture, would it not? The human brain would reel with the vision of such might of wealth and industry. Yet, the land values of New York City, held by 44,000 families, equal nearly a third of all the capital invested in the combined two hundred and seventy thousand industrial plants reported by the United States census.

Everyone can understand, if he gives the subject a moment's reflection that there must be a certain relation between land values and population. There are five millions of people in New York City, and there are five billions of land values. The ratio in New York is a thousand dollars of land value for each man, woman and child in the city. In seven years' time, from 1906 to 1913, the population of New York increased, on the average, 189,000 a year. In that same period the assessed value of the land of New York went up, on the average, a hundred and seventy-five millions a year. That is to say, the land value kept pace with the growth of population at the rate of just about a thousand dollars worth of land value for each additional unit that was added to the population.

Thus, by the growth of the city, the total increase of land value in these seven years, was \$1,323,000,000. To whom did that stupendous sum go? To the 44,000 families, and to no one else.

In seven years, over a million more people crowded on to the land of these families, and this increased pressure of population increased the value of their holdings over a billion dollars. That much more wealth came under the control of these few families. It did not come to them in return for their industry. Just as a sponge absorbs water, so by a kind of economic capillary attraction, the owners of the land of growing cities suck up the wealth of other people. It was as though these forty-four thousand families owned certain numbers on a wheel of fortune, and this extra million of population came from the four quarters of the globe and stopped at their numbers, and that made them a billion dollars richer than they were before.

We abolished the Louisiana lottery, but we retain a lottery that is nation-wide, that sends its fever into every hamlet in the land, a lottery that half the nation is playing all the time, a lottery that lures men from legitimate fields of production and seduces them with dreams of unearned wealth. As long as we allow the individual to keep the increased value which comes to his land by reason of the growth of population, so long will men be tempted to gamble in the earth, holding portions of it, not for use, but for speculation. This practice is vicious for two reasons: it gives to men wealth which they have not earned, wealth which is the measure, not of their usefulness but of their neighbor's poverty; and what is worse, the practice results in the locking up of the earth's resources, and in the restriction of production and opportunity.

Freeing the Land.

Tax burdens should be shifted from improvements upon land to land values irrespective of improvements, if, for no other reason, to prevent the holding of land out

of use. No owner should be permitted to hold land out of use. The right to use land is a natural right and should be protected by law. If that is so, then no man can have a right to hold land out of use which another man needs. The legal right of one man to hold land out of use is necessarily an infringement upon the natural right of others to make use of the land.

Suppose the American continent were owned by one man, and suppose that the whim should strike him to refuse to let anybody use it? If the legal right to hold land out of use were pushed to that extreme, it would destroy the American nation and compel our hundred millions of people to move or die of hunger.

That illustration is not as extravagant as it may seem. More than one-half of the American continent is now held idle. The Secretary of the Interior testifies to this fact in the following language:

"We haven't touched the resources of more than one-third of the continent, and that one-third is producing not more than one-third of its possible yield. East of the Mississippi one-half of the arable land is absolutely uncultivated today, and the other half produces only about 50% of what ought to be its normal yield."

The Secretary of Agriculture, in his 1913 report, says:

"According to the best statistics, the total arable land in the Union is approximately, 930,000,000 acres, but only about 400,000,000 acres of this is included in farms and improved land. It appears that less than 40% of the improved land is reasonably well cultivated, and less than 12% is yielding fairly full returns."

These two cabinet officers agree then that over half of the American continent is now being held out of use. If to hold all the continent out of use would starve the nation to death, is it possible that half of it can be held

out of use without producing grave problems of unemployment and poverty?

Commissioner Davies, of the Bureau of Corporations, has reported to President Wilson that 1,694 timber owners hold in fee at the present time 105,600,000 acres, or one-twentieth of the entire area of the United States.

If a humble American citizen went out on one of those acres and put up a home worth a thousand dollars, the government would put an annual tax upon his home, the government would tax him \$10.00 a year, for using that acre in that way. Which is better for a country, that humble people should use these acres or that rich men should hold them out of use? It is the used acres of honest working people that feed the nation's armies, is it not? It is not the idle acres of the rich that contribute to the national defense. Yet the government makes the poor man pay \$10.00 a year for using that acre. Suppose the government were to charge the poor man about \$2.00 a year, not for using his acre, but for the privilege of holding it, and suppose it should treat the rich in exactly the same way, charge them nothing for using their land, but make them pay \$2.00 a year for holding it. Then these 1,694 rich owners would have to pay an annual tax of \$211,000,000 a year, they would have to pay that or let go of it. Of course they would let go, and the people who are now trying to make a living at a great disadvantage because they had been pushed up against the cactus or against the ice, would get access to these millions of acres, and the wilderness would soon be full of granaries to feed armies in case of need, and sturdy husbandmen would take the place of idle landlords, and the nation would grow in economic power, and from these regions, now as silent as death, mighty armies would respond to a call to fight, as only men can fight who have homes and freedom to defend.

This country needs a new abolition movement. We must abolish the legal right to hold land out of use and when we have done that, the doors of opportunity will swing open to the unemployed, the earth will cry for men and poverty will be abolished.

Testimony was given before the Commission on Industrial Relations concerning the size of land holdings in Texas and Oklahoma. A man named Waggoner of Ft. Worth was mentioned as owning 800,000 acres. The late Mr. Post, of breakfast food fame, was mentioned as the owner of 200,000 acres. A man by the name of Jones was said to own another 200,000 acre tract. A Dallas man was said to own 400,000 acres. One corporation in eastern Texas was credited with an 800,000-acre holding, the Adair ranch was credited with 600,000 acres, and the King estate with a million acres. Yes, and I should not forget the Taft ranch with between two and three hundred thousand acres, mostly idle, and on the rest of which Mexicans, not Americans, are employed at 80 cents a day.

Think of giving over a State like that to the rapacity of speculators. When a few men are permitted to have such vast holdings, the bulk of the population must of necessity be reduced to serfdom. In some counties of Texas and Oklahoma, from 60 to almost 70% of the farmers are tenants, and one witness described them as the "sorriest lot of men you ever saw."

This, however, is not a condition peculiar to the southwest. The census says that 20% of Ohio's farm land is unused, and I am told that in some of the richest farming communities of Ohio, half the farmers are tenants.

On the train recently I fell into conversation with an elderly lady, a widow, who owns a \$15,000 farm in Licking County. She said she belonged to a ladies'

guild and that she distributed over 200 Christmas baskets, many of them to farm tenants, whose crops had failed on account of the heavy rains. I inquired what her own tenant made, how much on the average he could hope to lay by in a year. She did not think the amount should be put above \$300.00. Then I remarked that it would take 50 years' labor to buy that farm. She admitted this to be the case and acknowledged that it was not the brightest prospect in the world. The land value had doubled since her husband bought the farm, and he died at 44 as she said, having worked himself to death to free the farm of mortgages.

Room for All.

The total population of the United States, together with the population of Norway, Sweden and Switzerland, can be put into our two States of Oregon and Washington without crowding people more than they are crowded in Belgium. If the entire population of the globe were moved into the territory of the United States, there would still be room for three times our present population, before we would be as crowded as they are in Belgium.

There are six hundred and twenty-two people to the square mile in Belgium. Multiply that number by the number of square miles in Texas and the result shows that there is room in Texas for the total population of the United States together with all the people of France, Prussia, Austro-Hungary and England.

Germany maintains a population of 67,000,000 on a territory three-fourths the size of Texas.

There are 508 to the square mile in Rhode Island. We have seven western States in which we could put all our own population and all of China's 400,000,000 without crowding people more than in Rhode Island.

There are 419 people to the square mile in Massachusetts. At that rate California alone could hold seven times the population of the United States.

So there is room enough in America. There is land enough to absorb all our idle and half-used labor, if there were no artificial barriers. The problem of national prosperity is in part, one of education. England built two battle ships to Germany's one, but Germany built two schools to England's one. The thorough education of the nation's working force, a scientific and technical training to teach the nation to use its labor power most productively, this is an imperative need. But it is folly to increase the supply of intelligent labor if nothing is done to open up opportunities for this labor. The way to open up opportunities is to tax idle land into use.

There is no power in a gas engine unless there is a proper mixture of gasoline and air. There is no power in industry unless there is a proper mixture of land and labor. As, in a gas engine, the carburetor is the instrument by which the mixture of gasoline and air is determined, so, in industry, the system of taxation is the carburetor by which can be determined the mixture of land and labor.

Our Untitled Aristocracy.

There might be some advantage to us if the owners of America had titles of aristocracy, and belonged to a distinct social caste. We have in this country a growing economic inequality which is the more dangerous because it is shielded by the mask of democracy. We are so much enamored by the symbols of our democracy, we are so lulled by the names of freedom, we are so content with our one great adventure in political equality, that we do

not seem to understand that a new industrial feudalism has arisen to challenge the republic of the fathers.

When the ownership of a country is concentrated in the hands of a titled aristocracy, the evil is dramatized. The aristocracy stands out with stars and garters, inviting attack. We take no alarm because we do not see the gilt and the fringe.

We ridicule the bespangled lords of Europe. We throw stones just as though we had no glass in our own houses. We Americans go up to the temple every day and thank the Lord that we are not as Europeans, and we have abundant reason for that. But a humble and a contrite heart is good for anyone, and we can see many things about us which should reduce somewhat our bump of bumpiousness.

For instance, let us consider the Astor fortune. It is estimated at \$400,000,000, but we know that on Manhattan Island alone the bare land value of this estate is on the tax books for \$71,000,000. That may not be more than one-fifth of the family fortune, and this family is far from being the richest one in America. But let us consider this one item of this one family fortune; \$71,000,000 of land values. That is a rather lordly estate, is it not? If you had a row of 160-acre farms, a row long enough to reach from New York to San Francisco, you would feel like a lord, wouldn't you, whether you had the title or not? The Astors could sell their land holdings on Manhattan Island alone and buy a row of these farms from New York to San Francisco. Was there ever an English lord who could boast a baronial estate like that? But the head of this house not only has a lord's estate in America, he has the title of lord in England. England has given him the empty honor, and we have given him the solid substance of ducal power. Which of us is the more ridiculous?

This expatriated American English lord recently made his son a \$7,000,000 present. What did he give him? He gave him title to \$7,000,000 worth of this New York land. Where did this English lord get the right to bequeath \$7,000,000 worth of the land of America? He got it from the American government. What makes this land worth \$7,000,000? Because the laws of America which Americans themselves make, compel Americans to pay rent for this land. And who is the son who got this land, and to whom American citizens must pay rent? He is a captain in the English army. On whom is the laugh, on lord-loving England, or on democratic America? By our own laws we bind our own people to pay rent to support an English lord and a captain in the English army. Nor is that all. From this Astor estate, England is drawing an income tax, so I am informed, of over a million dollars a year. By act of Parliament, over a million dollars of New York rents are going to help Britannia rule the seas. These annual ground rents of New York City should be the revenue of New York. They should not go to the support of a titled or untitled aristocracy either in England or America.

The present generation of Astors will pass away. But by our laws of inheritance, the present holders of the property will have the entire say as to who shall reign in their stead. And what will be their inheritance? They will inherit the legal power to charge the coming generation a rent for land which Peter Minuit bought from the Indians at the rate of two-tenths of one cent an acre. By the will of an English lord, these few darlings of fortune will be selected from among all the five millions of New Yorkers, and on their heads will be placed a crown of economic power over their fellows.

We laugh at the docile Germans who permit their Kaiser to keep fifty-six palaces. It appears that he has

almost as great a variety of palaces as we have of pickles. We cannot get over our amazement that in this Twentieth Century an enlightened people should let anybody strut around in gold lace and talk of "My subjects."

We did a big thing, no doubt, when we kicked out the king. But this is the essence of kingship that one man should have command over the property of another. In England, as Thackeray said, there is nothing left of the king but a suit of clothes. They allow a certain family to amuse themselves with the royal duds, and that is all. In America we do not tolerate the duds, but here as in England, men still inherit the right to live wastefully and insolently on the fruits of other men's labor. We have American families who enjoy the imperial power to impose taxes for their private benefit upon the masses of the American people.

The Impending Crisis.

The contest is between the ideals of political equality and absolutism of property, which, strange to say, has become even more absolute in America than in Europe.

The heart of America is loyal to the ideals of 1776. But we need to understand that we have economic institutions at war with our political institutions, and we must choose between them. There is no doubt about the choice America will make when she understands the issue.

For instance, here is a man who toils six days a week at exhausting labor, and has to support his family of five on a wage of \$2.00 a day. He is one of our sovereign citizens and there are several millions in precisely that condition.

Here is another man who has inherited from his father a landed estate, which, after the taxes are paid, nets him a million dollars a year. He is another of our

citizens. We put a vote in each man's hand and we say: "You are political equals." Is it not evident that they are not and cannot be political equals as long as there is so great a difference in their economic condition?

The labor of one of these men is exhausting to the body and mind. The needs of his family consume all of his resources. He has no margin left of money or strength. He is a thrall of circumstance. A slave is a slave because he has to spend himself utterly, merely for his keep. The freedom that any of us have is measured by the amount of money and strength we can spare after our keep has been secured. If that is a fair definition of freedom then there are millions of Americans who have precious little of it.

But consider the case of a man who inherits an income of a million dollars a year. With one year's income he can buy 1,600 years of the other man's labor. One can buy 1,600 more times of anything than the other man can buy, and that means, that even in this republic of political equals he can buy 1,600 times as much political influence as the other can ever hope to have.

The rich man can buy newspapers and politicians, he can hypnotize Governors and Senators, he can purchase the nominations of Conventions, he can smother the freedom of universities with his largesses, he can becloud the civic vision with his calculating charities, he can patronize militias, subsidize orchestras, wheedle legislatures, rule rulers.

Mommsen, the great German historian, says, "Riches and misery in close league, drove the Italians out of Italy and filled the peninsula, partly with swarms of slaves, partly with awful silence." He predicts that the dragon's seed of North America will one day ripen with similar fruit. We hope to falsify that prediction. We mean to overthrow the present structure of economic in-

equality and build our fortress of political freedom on the enduring rock of economic justice. Is there enough vitality in our political institutions to establish economic justice before it is too late? The patriotism of America answers, "Yes," and men who are born of the spirit of the fathers set themselves with confidence to the task.

There are two Americas. There is the America of the Murphys and the Morgans and the Astors. There is also the America of Jefferson and Lincoln and Altgeld and Henry George and Tom Johnson. To one America I am a traitor, to the other I am loyal. I do not want my son shot down fighting for Morgan and his munition factories. But if I had twenty boys I would give them all to fight the battles of our true America, for this true America of ours is the greatest country in the world, and the living hope of mankind. I would give my voice, my pen, I would shoulder a rifle and give my life to defend this America from all her foes without or within the republic.

