

one, as well as that of the Populist who clamors for more money, for they stand upon the same basis in this respect, and that is the idea of the necessity of a fictitious stimulation of human industry. Most Populists say it is useless to think of all the idle men being employed without more money to furnish them employment and pay them. And McKinley shouts that unless we pay a big bonus to make up the difference between our own and foreign labor many of our people must go unemployed. As if the Almighty had made mankind's happiness depend upon tariff and fiscal legislation. In determining the political economy of the world He never provided for \$50 per capita nor an *ad valorem* duty. The world was fashioned with simply two conditions necessary—one, the land to work upon, and man with the ability and willingness to work upon it. All this anxiety to furnish people employment presupposes a condition which does not exist, and if the mass of men were restored to the state intended at the first, to wit, the right to apply their labor to land without hindrance, there would be no need of furnishing anyone employment, and the labor, the land, the tariff and the money problems would all be solved.

Take the case of the millions of the unemployed spoken of by Mr. Ingalls. They see around them on all sides great quantities of everything to eat, to wear, to enjoy and to fashion into houses for shelter. Of the amount of grains it is almost beyond calculation; of fruit there is enough to tempt the desire of everyone; of the meats the supply has never been exhausted; of all the things which make life possible and pleasurable they exist in such profusion that some even claim that there is an overproduction. And yet all these came from the soil simply as the result of man's labor applied to it.

A tariff does not cause the earth to produce any more bountifully, nor does it give men any greater disposition or ability to apply their labor to the earth. Nor does the volume of money in circulation have any such effect. These millions of unemployed people, notwithstanding the great abundance of everything good for human use, are ready and able to produce more, and even anxious to do so. And the soil of our country has not as yet begun to show what it can do in the way of production. It has been estimated that our country can sustain a population seven or eight times as great as we now have.

What, then, let me ask, stands between these vast numbers of would-be producers and the enjoyment of the fruits of honest toil? There is no escape from the fact that there is something that intervenes, something that says to these non-workers, "It is true that the earth could produce more with your labor, and that you are crying out in despair for the want of what you might produce." But this cry has always been heard, and the world is used to it.

Taxing Improvements.
BY QUINCY A. GLASS.

In the *ADVOCATE* of November 7, P. C. Branch, of Sterling, Kas., offers some remarks upon the land question, and calls upon Brother Saediker for answers to certain questions which he asks. I have no doubt that Mr. Branch will get a very prompt answer from Brother Saediker, because, like all earnest single-taxers, he is built that way, and I am not going to spoil Brother Saediker's pleasure by undertaking the work he has been asked to do, and is abundantly able to do. But I am going to take up this question of the difference between

rent for improvements and ground rents or economic rents as individual property and the question of moral right that underlies it.

Let me quote from Mr. Branch: "Land value and the value of improvements under existing laws are both taxable, the owner paying the taxes out of the rent received from the tenant."

This statement of Mr. Branch's is axiomatic in its correctness. As to the saving to the tenant in case the taxes were entirely collected from the ground rent, there would be exemption from personal property taxes, from any and all occupation taxes and from all indirect taxes which he now pays under internal revenue and tariff laws.

"I assert that land value should be exempt from taxation because land value is a product of labor." Land value is not a product of individual labor but is due to the growth of the community, or if the term pleases Mr. Branch better, the collective labor of the community. It is just and right that this value should go to the community as a whole and not be diverted to individuals.

Now take Mr. Branch's own town of Sterling. Let him go out two or five miles in the country and commence laboring on a piece of ground 25x140. How long will he labor upon it to give it the same value as a lot 25x140 in the central business portion of Sterling?

As to the question of a man having a moral right to individual ownership in rent from improvements upon ground and none in the ground rent, we hold that every man, woman or child born upon the earth has the same equal right in the ownership of the earth that has every other person; that it is the common heritage and that the way to bring about the realization of this right is for each and every one to pay into the public treasury by taxation, the rental value of that part of the earth's surface which he uses. We also believe that this fund is amply sufficient for all public needs and that there is no reason for taxing anything else.

We also believe that a man has as much right to loan or sell improvements upon land as he has to loan or sell any movable piece of personal property which he may own or produce, and that a man produces a house just as much when he hires labor to build it as if he drove every nail in the boards and shingles himself.

We believe that all taxes upon personal property, upon improvements, and upon occupations, hinder business, or in other words, hinder production and exchange of commodities, and that whatever hinders in any way the freest exchange between men of things needed, is an economic evil to be corrected.

I wish to ask Mr. Branch a few questions which I hope he will answer through the *ADVOCATE*: Please sir, will you tell us what callings and professions separate men from actual interest in and contact with land?

Can the right to produce things from land be attained without possession of land?

How would you restrict land ownership?

What do you mean by use and occupancy as applied to city and country?

On what grounds would you compensate land-owners?

Mr. Branch says he has more to say, and has certainly cast a stone into deep waters. I hope the *ADVOCATE*'s new rule on single-tax discussion will not shut him out.

The *Kansas Farmer* and the *ADVOCATE* can both be had till a year from next January for \$1.50.

ALARMING PATERNALISM.

A Note of Warning to the Incoming Senators of Kansas.

To the Newly-Elected Members of the Legislature of Kansas:

GENTLEMEN:—In a few weeks you will take the seats to which you have been chosen, and will begin to promote the general welfare by passing bills.

In the meritorious work of enacting laws, you will do well to bear in mind certain well defined principles of contemporary "free" government. Among these are some relating to the functions of government. A few of them will be enumerated:

(1) Governments are instituted among men for the purpose of aiding the rich in their efforts to gain more wealth, and incidentally to discourage honest effort on the part of the poor to obtain the fruits of their own labor.

(2) Wealth belongs to him who can get possession of it by any means, "machination, incantation or device, honest or otherwise."

(3) The man who fails to obtain wealth because of qualms of conscience becomes the jest and derision of his fellows.

(4) Public credit belongs exclusively to the rich and cannot be pledged in behalf of the poor.

(5) The state must never make a profit on anything, but must raise all money by taxation of those who have little.

(6) The state must never do anything for a poor individual which he can do for himself, or which a corporation will do for him at an exorbitant price.

(7) Nothing may be done to check competition or promote co-operation. The waste resulting from competition increases demand, and hence raises prices to the benefit of the toiler.

(8) "A public office is a private snap." Close adherence to these rules, and enactments in consonance therewith will soon lay low the monster of paternalism now stalking in our midst, laying his blighting hand on industry, stifling competition, palsying effort and enervating our youths. No den must be left into which this octopus can retire. No spark of life must be left in the creature whose tentacles have encompassed the land and taken hold in every part.

O, legislators, for the sake of the upper ten, the blue blooded, the aristocratic of the state, leave no vestige remaining of those old fashioned plebeian laws which attempt to place all on an equal footing.

Attend to our school system. The rank growth of socialistic paternalism therein bids fair to have absolute sway. Instead of letting each pupil pay for his own tuition, he is taught with the others though he be as poor as Lazarus. Even text books are furnished free in some places, as well as teachers, school house, desks, etc. This is encouraging shiftlessness. What inducement is there for a man to work if his children are to be schooled anyhow?

But not only are common schools infected with this disease of paternalism. It goes farther. It is the same in the high school, and in the State Agricultural college and State Normal school.

Worse than that! The highest institution, the State University at Lawrence, is steeped in paternalism.

The poorest tatterdemalion, if he simply has brains and can gain his board somehow, may go there and be admitted. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been expended to put up buildings for common use. Professors by dozens are employed. A library of 25,000 volumes is for general use. And when the rogues try to charge a library fee of \$5

the students object. Of course no other citizen of the state need pay anything, however much he uses the books.

Then a gymnasium has been provided for students, and instead of developing their own muscles, that job is in the hands of a paid instructor. Worse than that the state undertakes to keep the students clean, and has provided basins, basins, towels, soap, etc. Next thing it will hire someone to wash them, if this tendency is not checked.

Librarians pick up and replace the books which students have taken out of the shelves. The rooms are heated, lighted and swept by the state.

All of this should have a speedy end. The majority of your honorable body are anti-paternalists. In our school system you will find an opportunity to knock this evil between the eyes. This ought to and must be done. You can't root out paternalism under a paternal school system. Begin at once on the schools and let the State University be the first awful example. LEX L. LEONIS.
State University, Nov. 19 1894.

Loss of the Chicago Times.

The virtual loss to the People's party of the Chicago Times through the sale of the controlling interest in that paper to Adolph Kraus, a rich lawyer and veteran democratic politician, is a serious blow to the cause of the people. Though the Times has not been avowedly a People's party paper, its course during the last six months has been such as to greatly advance the interests of that party. This has been due to the influence and the work of Willis J. Abbott, the principal editor, who, though not owner of the paper, was able, by his earnestness and enthusiasm, to convince the then proprietors, Messrs. C. H. and W. P. Harrison, that their interests no less than justice and right were on the side of the People's party. Mr. Abbott was in sole charge of the paper when the American Railway union strike broke out, the Harrisons being out of town, and upon his own responsibility arrayed the paper on the side of the men in that struggle. The editorials he wrote at that time, the courage and force with which he combated the aggressions of the corporations and scored the servile Cleveland administration gave needed encouragement to the workingmen's cause. Mr. Abbott is by conviction and by open avowal a Populist. Though not a public speaker, he attends the People's party meetings and does what he can by quiet words to help along the cause. He is enlisted for good in the service of the people, and when the time comes, as it will come, that Chicago has a great Populist newspaper, he will be active in its establishment and direction. At present, he remains with the Times as editorial writer, though in a great measure gagged. Yet there are signs that his influence is still great enough to prevent that paper, while he is of its staff, from being positively antagonistic to Populism, and his articles in it give the People's party the best representation it now has in the Chicago press—all insufficient as that representation is.

Don't fail to look over our book list under the head of premiums. Our books are few but they are the best going, for educational purposes.

Those who want to learn about the "Initiative and Referendum" should see Sullivan's "Direct Legislation." See premium list.

The *Kansas Farmer* and the *ADVOCATE* can both be had till a year from next January for \$1.50.

When writing to our advertisers always mention the *ADVOCATE*.