

# Johnstown Weekly Democrat.

VOL. XXVII.

JOHNSTOWN, CAMBRIA COUNTY, PA., FRIDAY, JANUARY 10, 1890.

NO 38

## "THE LAND FOR THE PEOPLE."

MR. A. J. MOXHAM'S LECTURE BEFORE THE HENRY GEORGE CLUB ON MONDAY NIGHT.

Wages Not Paid by Capital, but From the Produce of Labor—A Lengthy Argument Setting Forth Some of the Main Points in Henry George's Theory.

The lecture of A. J. Moxham, Esq., delivered at the rooms of the Henry George Club on Monday night was, excepting the extracts read from "Progress and Poverty," substantially as follows:

Mr. Moxham began his lecture by reading an extract from Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," on "why in spite of increase in productive power do not wages advance in proportion?" The accepted political economy answers: because wages are fixed by the ratio between the number of laborers and the amount of capital. It says that capital pays labor; therefore the more laborers there are for a given amount of capital the less per man is the result. This has been taught universally and believed universally. This belief has prompted men who suffer to imagine that if they could get all capital and distribute it, all could be rich. Anarchists, socialists, and many other "ists" have been tempted by this "will of the wisp," and not unnaturally. If it is true that capital is the means by which labor is paid, then it is but a step further to believe as there are millions of laborers in this world and all paid by it, capital must be a thing well worth having—nay, it must be well nigh inexhaustible.

In 1889 the total wealth of this country was 61,450 millions. Of this amount what is termed capital, or wealth used for productive purposes only, could only be a small proportion, let us put it at 40,000 millions (perhaps that is too high), and let us take this capital and divide it among the sixty-five millions of people of this country. They get less than \$700 each. All the capital accumulated during the whole existence of America as a nation would not keep the wolf from the door for a year, if there were no other source of wealth and no other means of recuperation. This analysis would indicate that instead of capital being the source of our wealth, something else bigger than capital must be the source of its wealth. Again, if it is true that capital pays labor, the more capital, the more the laborers get. Those countries which are richest would be the countries which would pay the highest rates of wages; i.e., those countries which were the oldest in civilization. Is it so? No; wages are universally higher in new countries than in old, and in new countries capital is always scarce; in old countries always plentiful. If capital pays labor, then high wages and low interest go together, because high wages must mean more capital, and plenty of capital always means low interest. Is this true? No; on every side you find one law as absolute as that of the Medes and Persians; viz., wages and interest go both down and up together.

During times of great depression, when wages are at the lowest point and men are begging for work, what is capital doing? Why its wages (which is interest) are at the lowest point, and like labor it also is begging for work. During the depression that followed the panic of 1873 I knew of capitalists who could not get one per cent for their capital, and I knew of men who could not get seventy-five cents a day for their labor. Nay more, I knew of capital and men that could get no work at all, therefore could get nothing for their labor. Thus under conditions which admit of no explanation consistent with the theory that capital pays labor, do we find high interest coinciding with high labor, and low interest with low wages—capital seeming scarce when labor is scarce, and abundant when labor is plentiful. All these facts point to a relation between labor and capital, and—note you well—it is a relation of mutual harmony and not one of opposition. As we go on with our investigation we will learn that capital is just as helpless as labor in its future struggle with a power that is an enemy to both. What that power is our later lectures will prove.

If labor is not paid by capital, what is it paid by? We hope this evening to answer that query by proving that labor is paid by itself.

Because labor is paid in money and generally paid before the product of labor has been turned into money, it is inferred that wages are drawn from pre-existing capital, and therefore labor can not be employed till capital has been accumulated, and yet the very same school teaches that capital is nothing but "store-up, or accumulated labor." Is it not a little inconsistent to couple the two statements? First grasp and hold on to one truth—"Society in its most complicated form is but an elaboration of society in its modest beginnings. The man comes from the baby. Principles, evident in the simplest state of society, are merely disguised, not changed, by an advancing and complicated civilization, and when looking for real the pure truth, go to the baby, leave the man

alone. The baby does not lie, it has not learned to. The man cannot help it; he has become "civilized," according to Ingersoll's story.

Here Mr. Moxham again read several pages from Progress and Poverty and then continued: Before proceeding further let us give our terms a meaning. There are three elements that enter into the production of wealth in to-day's civilization, viz., Man, Land and Capital. All wealth is produced by labor. When man-kind was in its infancy there was no capital except that provided by the Godhead, in the thing called life, and that he gives us yet. Man we define as that creature or animal, made in the image of the Godhead—less than this we can not say, more we dare not. Land we define as including everything existing not made by man—not merely the surface of the earth, but the whole material universe, its forces, and opportunities, and everything supplied by Nature.

Starting with these two we produce by man's labor, Wealth, which means all natural products obtained by the exercise of man's labor on land, that tend to the gratification of man's desires, but we find that if man is not debarred from the natural opportunities that exist in land, he can make more wealth than he need use. We, the followers of Henry George, believe he can make more than he can use. As man does not want nothing but labor, he saves part of this wealth, so that when he wants to rest he can, and puts it by for further use and expediency, and out of part of the wealth so stored up comes Capital; viz., that part of a man's stock of wealth, which he expects to use for the purpose of getting out of it some return or revenue. We must exclude from capital everything that is included in land or labor, and we will call it "wealth in course of exchange."

As men multiply it is found that instead of isolation, each from his fellow, and living and laboring as units, it is better to work together. It is found that 100 men, each taking the special work he is fitted for, can produce more than 100 times as much as one man. As each does all he can in his own line and then exchanges the surplus of his particular products above his individual wants with those who have a similar surplus of their own and different products. The fisherman gives more to the man who makes shoes by exchange, each get what he wants, and so on. In this general exchange, we want a name that will explain what part of the general distribution goes to the different elements of wealth. So we say that the proportion done by land is paid for by rent. The proportion done by man is paid for by wages, and capital is paid by interest. We must now define the three. Rent, the return received for the use of land, means that share of wealth which measures natural products and opportunities. Wages means that part of wealth which gives us a return for labor as distinguished from the return received for the use of land and the return for the use of capital. We include in this the labor of all who work—not the day laborers alone, but all men who work, whether as bankers, doctors, authors or day laborers. Interest is the return for the use of capital. To continue we will first consider man as his own employer, and bear in mind that if not debarred from natural opportunities, every man who so desires could to-day be his own employer. Remember that we are dealing particularly with the returns of wages and capital. Say I devote my labor to gathering bird's eggs as food, or picking berries. Are not the eggs or berries I get my wages? There is no capital in this case, or if I take a piece of leather and make it into shoes, the shoes are my wages. Are they drawn from capital, either mine or anybody else's? If you choose to call the leather my capital, have I taken any value from it? No; I have added value to it, and if this be your argument what is left is the capital plus my wages—the additional value being my wages. We will go further and take agriculture. Since the days of the Roman Empire large districts in Europe have been worked by what is called the "Metayer System"—a system similar to the practice of farming on shares, where the landowner and capitalist, generally combined in one, gets his return from the resulting produce. Does the capitalist pay the laborer? It seems to me in this case the laborer pays the capitalist.

The next step in advance brings us to the case where the laborer, though working for another or with another's capital, receives his wages in kind, or a step further, though estimated in kind, is paid in money. For example, on American whaling ship the custom is to pay a fixed portion of the catch, say from one-twelfth to the captain to one three-hundredth to the cabin boy. Can anything be clearer than that these wages—this oil and bone, which the whaler has taken—have not been drawn from capital? The principle with whalers is, no catch, no wages. Take again the admiralty law under which sailors work. One maxim is that freight is the mother of wages, and any disaster which prevents the ship from earning freight deprives the

seamen of his claim for wages. Production is always the mother of wages, and invariably when the truth is reached does labor precede wages.

It is urged that labor cannot exercise its productive power unless supplied by capital with maintenance. The laborer must have food, clothing, etc., before he can work. True, but is this food and clothing truly capital? Is it "wealth devoted to exchange," and can you measure its return by the interest at so much per cent paid to it? No; this confusion results from a misconception—intentional or otherwise—of what capital is. The payment of wages always supplies the precious rendering of labor, and so far as the employe is concerned it is but a receipt of a portion of the capital which his labor has previously produced. In the exchange of labor for wages the employer always gets the capital created by the laborer before he pays out any capital in wages. At what point is his capital lessened, even temporarily?

The laborer who works for his employer does not get his wages till he has performed the work. He is exactly like a depositor in a bank. He can not draw money out till he has put money in. In paying wages the capitalist only exchanges capital of the one form for capital of another form. The payment of wages, no matter how long the process, never involves any advance of capital. It may take two years to build a steel works, but the creation of value of which the steel works will be the sum goes on day by day from the hour the foundation is dug till the works are finished.

In agriculture the creation of value does not take place at once but by degrees—step by step from the sowing of the seed till the crop is gathered, and that no payment of wages in the interval lessens the farmer's capital is proved when the land is sold or rented during the growth of a crop. A plowed field will bring more than one not plowed, or a sowed field more again than a plowed field. Nor is the maintenance of labor drawn from capital. Food, clothing, and all articles of wealth are only capital so long as the owners propose not to consume but to exchange them for other commodities as a means of getting a return or increase of wealth. Keep clear the line between wealth that is capital and wealth that is not capital. All capital is wealth, but not all wealth is capital. Men do not consume clothes and food according to whether the doing of it is going to lead to a return by their going to work. They put on clothes because they want comfort; they eat because they are hungry.

London has plenty of capital, and if maintenance were drawn from capital this would suffice, yet if productive labor in London were to cease, within a few hours men and women would die like sheep.

The series of exchanges is like curved pipe filled with water. If more water is poured in one end, the same comes out the other, not identically the same water but its equivalent. Those who do the work of production put in as they take out—generally putting in a little more than they take out. They receive in subsistence and wages but the products of their labor.

We do not urge that capital is not useful. It is very useful, but we do urge that labor can get along without capital far better than capital without labor. All the capital of London would not do the African savage much good, yet such capital as he wants he manages to acquire, and it is as civilization advances—as more capital is needed—that it is produced, and that easily by united labor, just as the human organism secretes what blood it needs. The purpose of capital is not to advance wages or subsidize laborers, it is to assist labor in production with tools, soil, etc., and with the wealth required to carry on exchanges. If therefore we are right in these conclusions, all schemes looking to the alleviation of poverty by increasing capital or by restricting the number of laborers, must be condemned. If each laborer in performing labor really creates the fund from which his labor is drawn as we hold he does, then wages cannot be diminished by increase of laborers, but, on the contrary, the more laborers the greater the fund and the higher should wages be. We know that at present this is not so, and we believe we know why it is not so. This, among other lessons, will be taken up in our subsequent lectures. To-night we want only to consider wages and capital. We urge, as we believe has been clearly proved, that capital does not pay wages.

There is one capitalist who pays wages, and that is the Godhead, and He gives to man in advance the capital from which he draws those wages. When He puts him on this earth He puts into him life, and puts before him opportunity, and that life lasts long enough for man to turn his opportunity to account. Imagine the creation according to the old school of Political Economy. Picture the Godhead creating man and putting him naked into Eden only—man and land—and then creating a Rothschild and drawing on him for funds to keep his universe going. After thinking this out make up your mind whether wages are drawn from capital or capital from wages.

## LETTER FROM SOMERSET.

County Institute—Fatality Among Physicians—The Nicelys. SOMERSET, Pa., January 3, 1890. To the Editor of the Johnstown Democrat.

As a looker on here in Somerset, I have been impressed with the bustle and stir to be witnessed on every hand. Streets are thronged with men, women and children from all parts of the county, and from adjoining counties. Hotels, boarding houses and private dwellings are all packed with guests. Stores, offices and shops are filled from early morning until late hours in the night with buyers and goers.

Why all this life? The answer is, that it is the annual gathering of the hundreds engaged in the laudable work of "teaching the young idea how to shoot;" in other words, it is the week of the County Institute. More spruce young men with white silk mufflers, and prettier young women never graced any Pennsylvania town, than those to be seen in the streets, in the Court House in day time and in the Opera House in the evening, than are visiting this county seat. And if one were to believe half of what Professor Brooks, of Philadelphia, one of the instructors, says, a better equipped corps of teachers is not to be found in any other county than those now representing the schools of this county.

The day sessions of the Institute are held in the Court House, and the evening lectures are delivered in the Opera House, both places being filled to overflowing with enthusiastic audiences. Of the proceedings of the Institute proper, it can be said they have been of a very interesting and instructive character from first to last. As to the lectures, it may be said some were good and others indifferently so. The notorious Sam Smedley's harangue, "From the Bar-room to the Pulpit" was in keeping with the man—coarse, abusive, sarcastic, funny and unconstructive to many of his audience, but highly entertaining to others. Professor Brooks' lecture was a little too profound to be popular in the eyes and ears of a mixed crowd. Will E. Carlton, measured up to the expectations of everybody, in talking about home. While he cannot render some of the tony things he has written with as good effect as Riley or Bill Nye can most of their productions, he is a popular lecturer, and always gives satisfaction. Artistically considered the Boston Stars, in their performances, were a success; their only failure was along the line of what is regarded as popular music. The Hub culture is a notch or two too high for general appreciation.

This town has been sorely visited with in the past four weeks. The well-known and popular physician, Dr. Brubaker, whose sudden death cast a gloom on the whole county, had scarcely been laid away in his grave, until the people were called upon to mourn the loss of Dr. Biesedker, whose good qualities as a young man, and whose skill as a physician, had given him prominence in the eyes of all. And now the sad announcement is made of the sudden death of Dr. Miller, a well rounded and accomplished physician, who came here from Berlin to take the place of Dr. Brubaker. Wednesday morning at nine o'clock, he left home to visit patients in the county, and at three o'clock p. m., he was found dead in his buggy—the horse having picked his own way for two or three miles along the road. His death is attributed to lung and heart complication. The doctor was a son-in-law of Hon. A. J. Colburn, at whose house the lifeless body will remain until Saturday, when it will be taken to Berlin for interment. The shock to his wife has been so great that much anxiety is felt as to the result.

A strange fatality seemingly has lighted upon the medical profession in the county. Within the past four weeks Dr. Blough, a young man with fine prospects, located at Meyersdale, and who had just returned from his wedding trip, took suddenly sick and died in a very short time afterward. Up to date only a few cases of influenza are reported, all being of a comparatively mild type. Upon inquiry I find the Nicely boys, convicted and sentenced to be hung for the murder of Farmer Umberger, are still in the old insecure jail. As the Governor has not set the day for their execution, and as no time has been fixed for a hearing before the Parole Board, one never hears a word said about them, unless elicited by an inquiry. A LOOKER ON.

## At Their Final Resting Place.

The remains of Rev. Alonza P. Diller, who prior to the flood was pastor of St. Mark's Episcopal Church, were on Saturday together with those of his wife and child, exhumed in Prospect and taken to the morgue. Yesterday afternoon, after funeral services, the remains of the three were finally interred in Grand View.

A lady tells us that she heard a colored preacher say: "De fo' part of de house will please sit down; fo' de hind part cannot see de fo' part if de fo' part persist in standing befo' de hind part, to de utter obfuscation of de hind part by de fo' part."—Christian Advocate.

## TWO MORE DEATHS ON THE RAIL.

Mail West Yesterday Evening Dashes Upon Two Men at Benscreek and Kills Them Both.

Monday afternoon about 4:25 o'clock, as the Mail Train west rounded the curve in the cut just east of Benscreek station, about twenty miles east of this place, it struck two men, knocking them off the track. The train was stopped as soon as possible, but the men were both dead when picked up. They were put in the baggage car and brought to this place and left in the baggage room at the station.

One of them had both legs broken and was bruised about the face and head. The other had the back of his head crushed and was otherwise mangled. The life must have been knocked out of both instantly.

Both were young men, apparently not twenty-five years of age, and wore working clothes. They had the appearance of foreigners, and are thought to be miners in the Benscreek collieries. The bodies were brought from the station to the morgue at a late hour last night. They will be buried at the county's expense.

The trainmen said that they had either stepped out of the way of a freight train which was moving on the other track, or had just got off of it. That locality is noted for the great amount of riding done on freight trains, and perhaps these poor fellows were doing as most of their associates were in the habit of doing. The grade at the place where the accident happened is very heavy, and it furnishes a good opportunity for persons to get off or on east-bound freight trains, which move quite slowly there.

## St. Paul's Ungallant Beau.

Last winter, so the story is whispered around the circles of upper-tendom, a reception was held at the home of one of society's local queens. When gentlemen in coats of steel pen cut and ladies clad in fashion's triumphs were curtsying and bowing to the well-marked measures of a quadrille, lo, a garter was seen lying upon the floor among the feet of the light-hearted dancers. Of course, some Cavalier Bayard of the ball room stooped and picked up the dainty cirelet, to keep until claimed by its fair owner, remembering how a king bent down to gain the Countess of Salisbury's garter and made it the badge of England's highest order. But no; they politely stared, while ladies blushed, until the hostess discovering the cause, sent a domestic who removed the shocking article upon a dustpan. Ye gods, such is the nineteenth century, that the young men would hold themselves polluted by the touch of a silken cirelet. Once men went forth to battle, trusting in the talisman of a little ribbon or a fragment of a maiden's samite dress.

We noticed Wednesday the finding of the body of a woman at Coopersdale on Monday. In removing the woman the body of a man was found under her. The morgue descriptions are as follows: No. 525, female, dark hair, calico dress, probably Mother Hubbard, white cotton undergarments. The body was fairly well preserved, but the clothing was nearly all gone. She was five feet three inches in height, had a full head of brown hair, and wore a switch. There was a small notched rubber hairpin and a long rubber hairpin broken in two, having a round top. The dress had a dash of red crossed with white, and polka dots on a brown ground.

No. 526, male, pants of figured woolen goods, red flannel drawers, white shirt with linen standing collar, gray flannel undershirt, gold separable collar button, white cotton socks, trunk or desk key in pocket, also a "surprise box." He was five feet eight inches in height, narrow, low forehead and wide jaws. The upper teeth gone, all the lower teeth small and irregular.

The County's New Officers. The new county officers will assume their duties to-day. They are all Democrats. Following is the list: Prothonotary, James C. Darby, of Conemaugh borough, who succeeds H. A. Shoemaker; Register and Recorder, Celestine J. Blair, of Ebensburg, who succeeds himself; District Attorney, Frank J. O'Connor, of Johnstown, who succeeds Hon. John Fenlon, appointed by the Court to fill the unexpired term of the late Harry G. Rose; Poor Director, Raphael Hite, who succeeds Jacob Shaffer, deceased, Coroner, Peter McGough, of Portage, who succeeds Dr. D. W. Evans, of Johnstown; Auditor, Joseph Hipps, who succeeds Louis Roland, of Johnstown, deceased; Surveyor, Henry Scanlan, of Carrolltown.

Thoughtful and Kind. Mr. Hughes, of Hoover, Hughes & Co., on Saturday, ordered his foreman in charge of the new Lincoln Bridge, to erect side walks on either side of the bridge at the expense of his firm. No provision was made in the contract with Hoover, Hughes & Co., for sidewalk, and Mr. Hughes will be entitled to the thanks of the whole community for his kind thoughtfulness in providing sidewalks for our people at this time.

## GLADSTONE ON CARNEGIE.

What the Grand Old Man Thinks of the Iron King's Views on the Duties of Wealth.

Mr. Gladstone has become deeply interested in Andrew Carnegie's ideas concerning the duties of wealth, as set forth in a recent article in the North American Review. Mr. Gladstone says he agrees with Carnegie in nearly everything that he affirms and recommends, and his (Gladstone's) main reservation is prompted by Carnegie's language respecting the Endowment of Stanford University. Gladstone says he has some doubts as to whether large endowments of places of learning do not raise the market price of the higher education, which they aim at lowering. "I must add," he says, "that the growing tendency to the dissociation of universities as such from religion does not abate but enhances the force of all such considerations as have suggested my language to reserve."

"I now come to an important addition which I should like to attach to the gospel of wealth. I see no reason why, in the list of admissible or desirable objects for the dedication of funds, we are not to include their direct dedication to the service and honor of God. The money spent in the erection of our cathedrals and our great churches, hardly inferior to cathedrals, has been large, and has in my judgment been very well laid out. What I have said as to the endowment of offices and places has some application to the great province of religion; but apart from this, and apart from the marvellous and noble works, such as cathedrals, the institutions of religion and the works of devotion, learning, mercy, and utility connected with it are numerous and diversified. Religion is a giant with a hundred hands, whose strength, however, is not for rapine, but for use. I should wish to bring its claim, proportionate, and therefore large, under the consideration of the open-handed and open-minded philanthropist."

## NOT ENOUGH THERE NOW.

Horace Greeley's Reasons for Declining to Take a Subscription. From the Buffalo Express.

To interrupt Horace Greeley when he was in the throes of bringing forth an editorial an editorial which has never been equaled in the journalism of America, an editorial which was a sledge for his party, a thunderbolt for his foes, was a danger which to friend, no enemy, none but a fool dared encounter. I was once in his editorial sanctum when the fool was there, said Chauncey Depew in a speech to the Buffalo Press Club. To relieve your apprehensions I was not the fool. But he was one of those itinerant and persistent gentlemen with a subscription book. He kept presenting it while old Horace was writing—as most of you remember, with his pen away up to his chin, like this, (illustrating)—and Horace had a habit when anyone would interfere of kicking and so he kicked at the subscription fiend. Finally, when he saw he could not get rid of the intruder by this means he stopped in the middle of a sentence, turned round and said raspingly in that shrill voice of his:

"What do you want? State it quick and state it in the fewest possible words." "Well," said the subscription fiend, "I want a subscription, Mr. Greeley, to prevent thousands of my fellow human beings from going to hell." Said Mr. Greeley: "I won't give you a cent. There don't half enough go there now."

## TO MAKE MERRY OVER.

She—Sir, what do you mean by putting your arm around my waist? He—Do you object? She—Mr. Arthur Gordon, I'll give you just five hours to remove your arm.—Beacon.

"What's the trouble here?" he said to a crowd assembled in front of a Third avenue table d'hote restaurant.

"An Italian Count has just died," volunteered one of the crowd. "While eating his macaroni he got some of it wound around his neck and strangled to death." —Epoch.

Miss X.—That Italian Count seems to lead a rather monotonous life.

Mrs. Y.—Yes; I notice he never has any change.—Life.

Fair Bostonian (to her Kansas cousin.)—Always sip soup from the side of the spoon.

Kansas Cousin (desperately.)—Yes; but I can't get it in sideways.—Puck.

"You ask for the hand of my daughter? What expectation have you?" "Why—none at all."

"Neither has my daughter. Take it and be happy.—Fliegende Blaetter.

Anxious Mamma (of six daughters, the eldest)—Ethel, you really must exert yourself more. Here it is the middle of your second season, and you haven't had a single good offer yet. You know I must bring Clara out next season and Maud the next, and there are three to come after them.

Ethel—Yes, mamma, I have been considering the matter, and I think the only way is to persuade papa, to buy us all a machine, and let us learn typewriting.—Puck.