

we at once see that nothing properly included under either one of these terms can be properly classed as capital. The term land necessarily includes, not merely the surface of the earth as distinguished from the water and the air, but the whole material universe outside of man himself, for it is only by having access to land, from which his very body is drawn, that man can come in contact with or use nature.

"The term land embraces, in short, all natural materials, forces, and opportunities, and, therefore, nothing that is freely supplied by nature can be properly classed as capital. A fertile field, a rich vein of ore, a falling stream which supplies power, may give to the possessor advantages equivalent to the possession of capital, but to class such things as capital would be to put an end to the distinction between land and capital, and, so far as they relate to each other, to make the two terms meaningless.

"The term labour, in like manner, includes all human exertion, and hence human powers whether natural or acquired can never properly be classed as capital. In common parlance we often speak of a man's knowledge, skill, or industry as constituting his capital; but this is evidently a metaphorical use of language that must be eschewed in reasoning that aims at exactness. Superiority in such qualities may augment the income of an individual just as capital would, and an increase in the knowledge, skill, or industry of a community may have the same effect in increasing its production as would an increase of capital; but this effect is due to the increased power of labour and not to capital. Increased velocity may give to the impact of a cannon ball the same effect as increased weight, yet, nevertheless, weight is one thing and velocity another."

What Wealth Consists of.—In the same chapter of PROGRESS AND POVERTY the author continues:—

"When we speak of a community increasing in wealth—as when we say that England has increased in wealth since the accession of Victoria, or that California is a wealthier country than when it was a Mexican territory—we do not mean to say that there is more land, or that the natural powers of the land are greater, or that there are more people (for when we wish to express that idea we speak of increase of population) or that the debts or dues owing by some of these people to others of their number have increased; but we mean that there is an increase of certain tangible things, having an actual and not merely a relative value—such as buildings, cattle, tools, machinery, agricultural and mineral products, manufactured goods, ships, wagons, furniture and the like. The increase of such things constitutes an increase of wealth; their decrease is a lessening of wealth; and the community that, in proportion to its numbers, has most of such things is the wealthiest community. The common character of these things is that they consist of natural substances or products which have been adapted by human labour to human use or gratification, their value depending on the amount of labour which upon the average would be required to produce things of like kind.

"Thus wealth, as alone the term can be used in political economy, consists of natural products that have been secured, moved, combined, separated, or in other ways modified by human exertion, so as to fit them for the gratification of human desires. It is, in other words, labour impressed upon matter in such a way as to store up, as the heat of the sun is stored up in coal, the power of human labour to minister to human desires. Wealth is not the sole object of labour, for labour is also expended in ministering directly to desire; but it is the object and result of what we call productive labour—that is, labour which gives value to material things. Nothing which nature supplies to man without

his labour is wealth, nor yet does the expenditure of labour result in wealth unless there is a tangible product which has and retains the power of ministering to desire."

Worker and Loafer.—She only knew of two classes, worker and loafer, and they would find those in every walk and in every sphere of life until the world ended. There would always be a certain section of the community which would take everything it could get out of life without putting anything in.—*Mrs. Stanley Baldwin, at the Women's Branch of the City of London Conservative and Unionist Association, 22nd January.*

If Mrs. Baldwin will translate this conviction into terms of political economy, she will speedily enough get alongside the "section of the community" who take everything and give nothing. The ground rents and land values of the City are not an unknown quantity to the local Conservatives. The sharp line of demarcation here between the "loafer and the worker" provides an outstanding illustration of the case that is worth eighty years of argument or prayer.

WHY THE PARSON WAS NOT DISMISSED

By Mark Twain

To the Editor, LAND & LIBERTY

SIR,

Here is the bit from Mark Twain's Autobiography. He is reflecting on the "lie" that a man can be independent. We are all slaves, however much we may think the contrary. The Rev. W. Twitchell, Mark's old and valued friend, is taken as a case in point. The Presidential election was on, and despite the fact that his congregation favoured Blaine, the Rev. Twitchell, thinking he was independent, cast his vote for Cleveland. This was a distinct disaster for him, because at the first annual meeting of his congregation it was moved that the connection between the church and Twitchell be dissolved. The motion was seconded, and would certainly have been carried, had not an incident occurred. To quote Mark Twain: "Mr. Hubberd, a middle-aged man, a wise and a calm and a collected man, rose in his place and proposed to discuss the motion before rushing it to a vote. The substance of his remarks was this: 'Mr. Twitchell is the first pastor you have ever had. You never wanted another till two months ago. You have had no fault to find with his ministrations as your pastor, but he has suddenly become unfit to continue them because he is unorthodox in his politics, according to our views. Very well, he *was* fit; he has become unfit. He *was* valuable; his value has passed away, apparently—but only apparently. His highest value remains—if I know this congregation. When he assumed this pastorate this region was an outlying district, thinly populated, its real estate worth next to nothing. Mr. Twitchell's personality was a magnet which immediately began to draw population in this direction. It has continued to draw it from that day to this. As a result, your real estate, almost valueless at the beginning, ranges now at very high prices. Reflect before you vote on this resolution. The church in West Hartford is waiting on this vote with deep solicitude. That congregation's real estate stands at a low figure. What they are anxious to have now above everything else under God, is a price-raiser. Dismiss Mr. Twitchell to-night and *they* will hire him to-morrow. Prices there will go up; prices here will go down. That is all. I move the vote.'"

Twitchell was not dismissed, but he never made any political mistakes again.

Yours, etc.,
W. R. LESTER.