

The "Anti-Poverty Society"

THE tearing down of the old Academy of Music in New York City is a reminder of the time when, nearly forty years ago, that building echoed to denunciations of involuntary poverty as something wholly man-made, and demands for a radical change in the system of land ownership that is responsible for poverty.

Forty years have passed; Henry George, Father Edward McGlynn, and the others who assailed the innermost ramparts of the citadel of privilege, seem to be forgotten. The landlords still take their mighty toll of the product of industry and trade, and the evil newspapers point to increases of billions of dollars in land values as evidence of prosperity. So far as the great majority of the 6,000,000 dwellers in New York seem to know or care, there is no land question that affects their interests.

What kind of animal is man? To the people of New York came the "Prophet of San Francisco," to preach the ever-old and ever-new gospel of justice, freedom and human brotherhood. He lived, labored, and died working for these aims. He challenged the very basis of the social order that rests upon the assumption that the earth belongs to the favored few, to whom the many must pay ransom for the right to exist. He passed, and there has been no other to take up his work and carry it on to a triumphal conclusion.

Why is it that the question of man's right to the use of the earth is no longer discussed, or even mentioned? The press is silent. The so-called "liberal" journals prate of parlor socialism and paternalistic schemes, but refuse to print anything so radical as the simple truth that our present land system is a gigantic robbery of the many for the benefit of the few. Privilege is enthroned, and the horde of special-interest beneficiaries steadily increases. How long, Oh Lord! how long?

Some Mellon Economics

SECRETARY of the Treasury Mellon denounced the McNary-Haugen bill, designed to give the farmers some of the benefits of the protective tariff, on the ground that if enacted that measure would result in the sale of staple farm products to foreigners at lower prices than those paid by domestic consumers. That foreigners should profit by the aid of Government subsidies to our farmers was, to Mr. Mellon, an absurd proposition, that need only be stated to be condemned.

And Secretary Mellon is right. To tax the American people in order that surplus farm crops can be sold at low prices to European consumers, is manifestly unsound and unjust. The defeat of the bill, despite the political pressure brought to bear by the western farm states, shows that the Congress has more intelligence and courage than it is generally credited with.

So much for the farmer's side of the protective tariff scheme. How about our highly protected manufacturers, who are enabled to extort from the American farmers at least \$400,000,000, annually by reason of the high duties on imports? Do they sell to the foreigners at prices lower than the domestic consumer pays? Assuredly they do, in many cases the difference between the export and the domestic price being from 20 to 40 per cent. Mr. Mellon's Aluminum Company sells kitchenware to the benighted heathen much cheaper than to the American farmer. The United States Steel Corporation, that in the past twenty-five years has been enabled by the tariff to rob the people of the United States to the extent of at least \$1,000,000,000.00, in the shape of higher prices than would have prevailed under free trade, also sells its products for export at reduced prices. So with many other articles of general consumption. The farmer's housewife pays a heavy duty on her sewing machine. The same machine is sold at a substantially lower price to the women of South America, Africa or Asia.

What is Mr. Mellon kicking about? He has accumulated his immense fortune, estimated at \$200,000,000, largely through the operations of the tariff. Does he think it is all right for the wives and daughters of the farmers to pay a 70 per cent. tax on stockings, in order that America hosiery manufacturers can make exorbitant profits, while selling stockings cheaper in the British markets than at home? If the American people are to be robbed by high tariff taxes for the benefit of the manufacturers, why should not the system be applied for the benefit of the farmers as well?

After Forty Years

THE fortieth anniversary of Henry George's memorable campaign for Mayor of New York City will bring to the survivors of those stirring days mingled feelings of pleasure and disappointment. The first real protest against the fundamental injustice of the existing system of land ownership to be voiced in American politics, the candidacy of the San Francisco printer, who had in Progress and Poverty challenged the age-old theories of private property in land, was hailed as the beginning of a movement that would destroy vested privilege and establish economic justice. With burning enthusiasm those who had seen the light of the torch held high by the simple, sincere, earnest prophet of justice and brotherhood, threw themselves into the contest for Mayor with the hope that out of the discussion provoked by the introduction of fundamental principles of social organization might come enlightenment that would make real the vision of a better day. That Henry George was defeated by a narrow plurality did not matter. What was important was the forcing into the political arena of an issue that had hitherto been ignored. Surely, they thought, it cannot be long