

We all live now in a world of concrete manifestations, of which our physical bodies are to each of us the most vital examples. But we also live now in a world of abstract realities, which our consciousness stubbornly refuses to ignore. How, then, can we rationally say that when our bodies disintegrate we ourselves dissolve into nothingness? Because we are dead to the physical world when our physical forms no longer serve us? That is no reason for assuming that we are non-existent in a spiritual world to which from infancy we have been growing accustomed.

The more reasonable inference is that with the loss of the physical body we become, not less spiritual to the point of non-existence, but inexplicably more spiritual—more truly and completely ourselves.

"Life absolutely and inevitably bounded by death" seemed intelligible to the author of *PROGRESS AND POVERTY* only "as the avenue and vestibule to another life." So it is coming more and more to seem to the most of us—not mystically but rationally. In the death of the human body we do not believe that we witness the death of a soul over which there were rejoicings at its birth. We believe that we witness the coming of a soul to maturity. May we not as rationally rejoice over this as over its birth—even though we grieve as we return its physical embodiment to the earth from which it came?

At all events it seems to me unreasonable to think of my friend as having literally died. I think of him as having come more intimately into communion and useful co-operation than ever before with all who have lived for what he has lived for. I picture him as continuing his work with his father, to whose cause he was consecrated from boyhood. I picture him as working with Tolstoy, whose spirituality attracted him in his later years as it had his father before, and under whose influence he remained while his rational consciousness found physical expression.

Call it hope or call it superstition, the fact remains that he has had a spiritual as well as a physical life. And the inference arises which will not be denied, that only his physical life is at an end. It must be that in a larger and freer environment his spiritual life goes on developing that unity of love and effort for just things which has formed the character that we identify as the man we knew.

LOUIS F. POST.

AUTHOR AND CONGRESSMAN

As intimated in our December issue, the death occurred at his home in Washington on November 14th of former Congressman Henry George, Jr., son of the author of *PROGRESS AND POVERTY*. Mr. George had been in ill-health for several years. During recent months his condition had grown worse; and he had been confined to his room since the middle of September.

A funeral service was held at the house by the Rev. Dr. John C. Palmer and Assistant Secretary of Labour, Louis F. Post, a life-long friend of Mr. George and of his father. The body was taken to New York to be laid in Greenwood Cemetery beside his father and other members of the family.

Mr. George is survived by his wife and three children. He was born in Sacramento on the 3rd of November, 1862. Owing to delicate health when a boy he had very little schooling, but he had a great advantage in the intimate companionship of his father and the intellectual stimulus of his father's method of encouraging his children to question all things rationally. Throughout his life he was an indefatigable reader over a wide range of subjects and books, but of political economy and political history and science, particularly.

When less than seventeen he left school for good and, teaching himself shorthand, became his father's secretary, in which service he continued until the early nineties,

except for a few breaks at intervals. When his father came first to Britain in the Land League days, as special correspondent to *THE IRISH WORLD*, young Henry George worked as a reporter on the staff of the *BROOKLYN EAGLE*.

After some experience at reporting he again acted as his father's secretary, accompanying him on his cyclonic lecturing tour through the British Isles in 1884. He was present at the Glasgow City Hall in that year when his father spoke there to the historic Scottish meeting, out of which has sprung the present movement in Great Britain from which may be traced the current of agitation that led up to the famous Budget of 1909.

On his return to the United States in 1885, he undertook more reporting, and rendered his father some further service as secretary during the production of *PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE*. Later he had secretarial experience with the managing editor of the *NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, and did some supplementary work at writing fictitiously signed articles for that magazine. After a round of campaign speeches in his father's contest for Mayor of New York in 1886, and some miscellaneous service on *THE STANDARD*, which his father started in 1887, Henry George, Jr., became the managing editor of that paper. He served as such with skill and fidelity through trying experiences during his father's long absence in Australasia and on his trip round the world in 1889.

THE STANDARD passing into different ownership, Henry George, Jr., became a Washington correspondent. In 1891 he transferred the seat of his activities as newspaper correspondent to London. Here he made the acquaintance of Joseph Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, William Stead, Helen Taylor (step-daughter of John Stuart Mill), and Cardinal Manning. Of this democratic Cardinal he speaks and writes as he does of Tolstoy—"a great spirit no less than a great mind."

Further newspaper work succeeded Mr. George's return to the United States; editorial writing for a Washington paper, and a period of two years in Florida, first as news editor and then as managing editor of a Jacksonville daily paper. After a business venture in Cleveland in 1895 and 1896, Mr. George again joined his father, this time to assist in the preparation of *THE SCIENCE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY*.

In 1897 his father was drawn into the campaign for the Mayoral seat for Greater New York as the candidate of the Jeffersonian Democracy. He died just before its close, and Henry George, Jr., succeeded him in the candidacy.

In later years and since his marriage in 1898, Mr. George travelled extensively—as an observer, writer, and lecturer—in the United States, Canada and Japan, and in a trip round the world in which he visited Tolstoy. An account of his visit to Tolstoy reprinted from *THE WORLD'S WORK*, appeared in the March, 1910, issue of *LAND VALUES*. In 1900 he was a candidate for Presidential elector on the Bryan ticket in New York. In intervening times he published in magazines and newspapers many articles and investigations concerning monopolies. He was the author of *THE MENACE OF PRIVILEGE* and *THE ROMANCE OF JOHN BAINBRIDGE*, both published by Macmillan, his investigations furnishing the material for the warnings of the former and the romance of the latter. Mr. George did much lecturing since his father's death, on subjects principally within his own wide experience and observation.

Early in October, 1910, he was adopted as candidate by the Democratic Party and the Independence League for the seventeenth Congressional district of New York. He made a splendid uphill fight, and was returned by a majority of 1,721. Writing just after the close of the contest, he said:—

"We have had a royal fight in a Republican 'silk-stocking' district. It contains nearly a quarter of a million inhabitants, and at this election had more than 50,000 voters registered. The incumbent, Mr. W. S. Bennet, was standing for his fourth term and was quite

confident of re-election for several reasons. The district was regarded as 'safe' for a Republican. The boundaries had been so arranged as to make it a pocket borough for Republicanism. Two years ago Mr. Bennet carried the seat by a majority of over 8,000. He was a favourite with the New York City delegates for Legislative honours. He had a very extended personal following on account of his interesting personality and his willingness to do personal service for both Democrats and Republicans. Against this, I was little known in the district up to the time of my nomination. We put into the field the finest body of speakers in this city and went along on radical lines appealing to progressive Republicans as well as to Democrats and Independence Leaguers.

"The thing that most amazed my opponents and continues to amaze them was the strength we developed by our avowal of the whole free trade and Single Tax faith."

Joseph Dana Miller wrote at the time the following interesting account of the contest:—

Henry George, Jr., won his fight for a seat in Congress from the seventeenth Congressional district of New York after a spirited campaign in which he gained the good-will of the voters of his district. In a district normally 6,000 to 8,000 Republican he won by a majority of 1,721 over William S. Bennet. Mr. Bennet has represented the district for three terms. He is popular as a handshaker and vote-getter; he is a "stand-patter," and voted for every increase of duties in the Payne-Aldrich tariff. He stood upon his record as a high tariff man and belittled the arguments of his opponent that the high cost of living was due chiefly to the tariff.

It was one of the few Congressional districts in which the tariff was directly and persistently assailed. It was the only one in which free trade was openly and boldly preached without equivocation. The candidate frankly announced himself as a free trader, and went even further than his enthusiastic speakers in the clear-cut radicalism of his utterances.

Many votes, it is safe to say, were cast by Republican Free Traders, of whom there are many in this district where the Single Tax and abolition of all tariffs have been preached by the adherents of Henry George for many years at the corner of Seventh Avenue and 125th Street. This was one of the causes which helped.

Mr. Bennet's failure to accept Mr. George's challenge to debate the causes of the high cost of living was made much of by the George speakers, and undoubtedly influenced many voters.

One of the chief causes of success was the candidate himself. His speeches were strong appeals, manly, dignified and free from the arts of the politician. Something of the loving simplicity of heart and mind that come to him from his great father were manifest to the voters of his district, and drew to him the support of independents. In the high-minded and honourable treatment he accorded to his opponent, refusing to take advantage of certain openings which a less punctilious swordsman might have eagerly availed himself of, he took to himself the high knightly counsel:—

'Tis not in mortals to command success,
But we'll do more, Sempronius; we'll deserve it.

In all his efforts for the Commonwealth, Henry George has the loyal and enthusiastic support of his wife, and readily acknowledges how much this means to him at all times.

SPEECH IN CONGRESS

(The following is extracted from the Free Trade speech made by Henry George, Jr., in Congress on June 10th, 1911. The occasion of the debate was the Bill to reduce the tariff on wool and manufactures of wool.)

To him that produceth, to him should go the fruits thereof. This is getting to be the current of thought. Consequently I believe that just so surely as this country shall establish an income tax that surely will the mass of those who pay it become active in quest of some substitute tax. They will be far more active against an income tax than they may now be against a tariff tax, because an income tax is direct in its incidence. It can be seen plainly by the man who pays it. Therefore income-tax payers will rebel against this tax upon their industry. They will look for a tax that will raise revenue, but not tax thrift.

What tax will do that? A tax on land values will do it; do it absolutely. It will fall on privilege, and not any part of it on toil.

This brings us to a consideration of the single-tax philosophy. I am a single taxer. I do not believe in taxes upon any kind of industry, or upon anything that comes from industry. I believe the whole burden of taxation—Federal, State, and municipal—should fall upon monopoly. I believe it should fall upon the mother of all monopolies; upon the earth; upon that value which comes to any piece of land not by reason of the toil of its owner—for all improvements should be exempted—but from the development of the community; from social growth and social improvement.

That part of New York City known as Manhattan Borough, Manhattan Island, comprises land officially valued at more than three thousand million dollars. The island was bought from the Indians by Dutch traders in the seventeenth century for \$24 worth of calico and glass beads. Yet now that same piece of land stands on the tax books at three thousand millions. That is the official value of the ground alone. It does not include the value of buildings or other improvements of any kind. Who made the increase in value from \$24 to three thousand million dollars—who but all the people? The coming of population did part; the birth of babies did part; the laying out of streets, the making of great public improvements, the general toil, the building this island into a great centre of production, of manufacturing and trade made parts. Social growth and social improvement brought the value to that piece of land. Why should it not be taken into the Public Treasury for social uses? Why not abolish all other taxes and take by taxation this publicly-made value for the uses of government—municipal, State, and Federal?

To tax land values, ground values, alone is not a mere dream. It is not the utterance of a man so far in the advance of practical affairs as just to be listened to for a brief hour and then be dismissed. My colleagues, it is a principle that is now and here. It is claiming the grave attention, shaping the legislation, of the advanced nations of the earth. It is in the Orient; it is in the Occident; it is in the Antipodes; it is amongst the progressive people to the north of us with whom we are seeking closer ties; it has made a momentous, convulsive drive forward in Great Britain.

Now I believe that this single tax would meet better than any other form of taxation the four canons of taxation. It is the most equal tax. It falls upon men according to the natural bounties they have in their possession. The man who has little pays little. The man who has much pays much, so that it is the most equal kind of a tax.

Then it is certain. It is not intermittent and wavering. It falls regularly, so that all dependent matters can be arranged accordingly.

In the next place, it is direct. It can not be shifted. It stays where it falls. There can be no addition of this tax to the value of the land. The landowners are getting as much as they can get now. They are not waiting for taxation to put up the price of their land. On the contrary, any proposal to put a tax on values immediately causes a discouragement on the part of some owners who have idle lands, and the tendency is for the price of land to go down.