

Collect the rent of all land and use the fund to pay for public services, and the natural resources will be restored to the people. The wealth-producer will retain the whole fish as his wage, less a small slice paid as rent for the use of natural resources; but this will return to him in public services, provided free of taxes and tariffs or other forms of plunder. Thus will wages rise to, and remain at, their natural level.

London, England.

—J. W. GRAHAM PEACE.

Herbert Quick's Last Article

WE have the melancholy duty of presenting here the last article written by the late Herbert Quick. It will appear as a chapter in a work shortly to be issued by Will Atkinson, under the title of "The Henry George We Knew." To this work many hands will contribute, and the chapters will include not only articles from those who knew "The Prophet of San Francisco" personally but who sat at his spiritual feet and learned from the writings of the master the lesson of industrial emancipation. Herbert Quick was one of these and tells in the following of the debt he owed to Henry George.—EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM.]

My meeting with Henry George was in the spirit only; but I think it was as complete and intimate as it could have been had we met in the flesh. I was a young man, teaching school and studying law, I had lost all my real hope of any redemptive force in society which could abolish poverty and give all men equal chances according to their ability, and assure even the one most poverty-stricken in efficiency a certainty of necessities of life, given the possession of industry. In other words, I had adopted the gospel of economic gloom.

The reading of *Progress and Poverty* had a marvelous effect upon me. I passed through a phase somewhat like that described in old-fashioned revivals as "experiencing religion;" only my exaltation was based on a hope founded on logic. It changed my whole life. It was a barrier to advancement to the best places in my profession of the law, but it made my life richer in every other respect.

For forty years I have been searching for an answer to the social message of Henry George. I have made up my mind that only in his principles of population was he mistaken, but that he was even at that nearer right than the old Malthusians whom he so brilliantly attacked. I have grown to believe that with the economic perfection of our institutions which his programme would bring, an intelligence would surely be built up which would result in a balance between births and deaths, but that with the increase of poverty with the growth of society under our present system all the calamities which Malthus predicted will come upon us. So that George gives us the remedy or cure for the evil which he denied. The economic system George laid before the world has never been refuted, and is irrefutable.

Moreover, in spite of the fact that the first fervor of the

'80's has cooled, my conviction remains that the system must win eventually if civilization is to be saved. Socialism of the governmental sort is a dream as wild as it would be for a man to seek to control all his vital processes by his brain. The involuntary nervous system of society must control its activities in the main; and these could work under the Single Tax. We should obtain reform without revolution. It is this high faith in the slow perfectibility of society to the end that we shall win eternal social life, and not come to one of the smashes of civilization with the wrecks of which history is strewn; that I owe to Henry George.

—HERBERT QUICK.

A Parable on Economics

TWO honest men cooperated to produce food for themselves and their families;—for food is the fundamental necessity of life. One of these men did the work, and the other furnished the capital. The workman had to have strength, knowledge and skill to do his part. The capitalist was required to furnish materials, implements and tools which were needed. Operating thus together there was ample food produced for them and their families.

But there was a curious law in the strange country in which they lived. In producing their food they naturally had to have a place on which to stand and to operate; and under this curious law a third man was permitted to take from them one-third of the food which they produced, leaving the laborer and the capitalist only one-third each, instead of one-half, which they should have had. As a result they often quarreled over their shares; for neither had quite enough, especially when the processes of production were slow, as they were at times; and each thought he should have a little more.

But neither the laborer nor the capitalist was very bright, except in his own field of activity. They did not see that this third man was not needed; that he aided them in no way, that he furnished nothing and produced nothing, and was a mere parasite living upon them, and taking the food from them and their families. To be sure he used to say that he furnished them with the place on which to stand and operate; but that could not be true; for the place was always there from the beginning of the world.

Another strange fact was that the laborer and capitalist could have abolished the curious law referred to, and deprived the third man of his privilege, and thus could have secured to themselves and their families each one-half of their joint production of food. But they have not yet reached that plane of intelligence, although there is some evidence that their children or grandchildren will do so.

—JOHN HARRINGTON.

DOUGLAS JERROLD listening to the interminable argument from a clergyman about the great evil of the time being the surplus population, exclaimed impatiently, "Yes, the *surplice* population."