

THE ALLIANCE.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING.

ALLIANCE PUBLISHING CO.

BOHANNAN BLOCK,
Lincoln, - - - Nebraska.

J. BURROWS, Editor.
J. M. THOMPSON, Associate Editor.

All communications for the paper should be addressed to THE ALLIANCE PUBLISHING CO., and all matters pertaining to the Farmers Alliance, including subscriptions to the paper, to the Secretary.

Notice to Subscribers.

EXPIRATIONS.

As the easiest and cheapest means of notifying subscribers of the date of their expiration, we will mark this notice with a blue or red pencil, on the date at which their subscription expires. We will send the paper two weeks after expiration. If not renewed by that time it will be discontinued.

EDITORIAL.

THE ELECTION.

Elections were held Tuesday in nine states, Virginia, New Jersey, Ohio, Iowa, Mississippi and Massachusetts to elect governors, while minor offices were to be filled in New York, Nebraska and Maryland.

Of these Ohio, Iowa, New York, New Jersey and Virginia, have gone Democratic, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and Nebraska have gone republican, but by greatly reduced majorities.

This remarkable result will be explained in a very different manner by the partisan press according to the partisan bias of the writer. The loss of Iowa, a great republican stronghold, will be attributed to prohibition; that of Virginia to Mahonism; that of New York to the personal influence of Gov. Hill.

The general fact that the republican promises of last year have not been fulfilled, that hard times remain and are intensified, and that the people see no prospect of relief through republican rule, will account largely for the stampede. The growing conviction that protection protects only capital and not labor, may be another reason.

But to fly from republicanism to democracy in the hope of relief is to avoid Chryseis to be wrecked on Scylla.—With no change on financial policy offered, and only 8 per cent relief on tariff, would seem to be too thin bait even for gudgeons.

The loss of Iowa shows a continued objection of the farmers of that state to corporation rule. The railroaders proposed to regain through Hutchinson what they had lost through Larrabee. To the Alliance belongs the honor of their checkmate.

The result in Nebraska is a surprise to no one. There was no organized opposition to the railroad crowd. If the honest element that was outraged by the purchase of the votes that nominated Reese, would have been defeated. But the depth of infamy a Nebraska republican convention will submit to is beyond human ken. The dissatisfied element had nowhere to go, and simply reduced the vote by staying at home, without changing the result. We have now an ex-L. & M. attorney for one of our Supreme Judges.

In the second district of course the result is not a surprise. As in the state, there was no organized opposition by the disaffected republican element. It would not rally to the democrats, and could not rally anywhere else. So the B. & M. sends another corporation caper to congress, and the people and farmers of that district go unrepresented. VIVE LA PEUPLE! VIVE LA REPUBLIC!

As we close our forms a dispatch reaches us saying that the entire people's ticket of Custer Co. is elected.

"FAKE STATISTICS."

That monopoly organ the Lincoln Journal, in its issue of October 31, dons a Bon's skin, and with all its brags except its ears hidden, makes a brave assault upon the far-famed Alliance memorial—or rather upon that single allusion in it to the mortgage debt of Nebraska. No paper that has been issued in many years has created so much of a stir as this memorial; but it is noticeable that the monopoly press, while trying to throw discredit upon it by denying its statements about farm mortgages, have uniformly failed to publish it, and have failed to combat any economic proposition contained in it. The Journal article contains almost as many misstatements as it does sentences. It says: "That memorial represented that Nebraska farms were mortgaged to the extent of \$150,000,000." The fact is, the memorial alluded to the "farm mortgages," as amounting to \$150,000,000; and the memorialists included mortgages on farmers' chattels as farm mortgages, as they properly are. Now it has not been shown, and cannot be, that this is a high figure, even for the land mortgages. The Bee, in trying to figure these mortgages down, admitted the existence of \$90,000,000 of land mortgages. The amount of chattel mortgages must remain unknown; but the fact of chattel mortgage sales taking place weekly in nearly every county seat is patent to every man who knows anything.

The Journal says, "similar memorials were prepared in several other states," and all were characterized by similar "statements relative to farm mortgages."

We quote the above to show just the reliability of the Journal's statements. The fact is, no similar memorial was adopted in any other state; and we defy the editor of the Journal to produce one.

The Journal says, "where the figures

came from was not at first known." No. And it does not appear to be known now to the erudite editor of the Journal. We will enlighten him. The estimates were first made up from the records of the great loan and insurance companies of Hartford. The name of the gentleman who compiled them can be found by the editor by referring to the Cong. Record for May 8th, 1888. A short time previous to that date Senator Reagan of Texas embodied them in a speech in the U. S. Senate, and a week or so later Senator Stewart, of Nevada, did the same thing. The figures had been twice printed in the Record, and were common property of the public before the Alliance alluded to them. But not until they were published by the Alliance, and had been sent to congress by a fool committee of the Nebraska legislature, and presented to the senate by Senator Manderson, in a speech alluding to the memorial as "a very important subject," did the brass-collared brigade, headed by the Journal, say anything about them; and then only to abuse the Alliance, and slobber their filth all over Mr. Burrows for presuming to publish such a slanderous statement about Nebraska, thinking as they did in their ignorance that the Alliance and Mr. B. had originated the figures.

After trying to show that the stated mortgage debt corresponded with the assessed valuation of the farms, the Journal says: "In other words it was made to appear that financiers had loaned more money upon farms than the amount of their assessed valuation." Well! If ignorance by the editor of a would-be great paper can be any denser than this, we would like to know it. The editor can step over to the court house and find the assessment rolls and the mortgage records side by side; and we will wager a new hat that he can find farms in every precinct in Lancaster county mortgaged for more than their assessed valuation; and we will make the same wager for every county in the state. The fact is, this editor is so absorbed in obeying the orders of his corporation task-masters that he has no time to learn anything about the condition of the farmers of this state.

The Journal says: "Commissioner Jenkins declares that 'time and again he has asked the members of the Farmers' Alliance to furnish the source from which those figures were taken, but in each case his request has been refused.'" This is another sample of loose statement. We do not believe Mr. Jenkins ever made such a declaration; though how many "members" of the Alliance he knows we are unable to say. Mr. Jenkins has never asked the officers of the Alliance for any information about the memorial. He applied for lists of secretaries of the subordinate Alliances, and for nothing else.

Again it says: "Further than this Mr. Jenkins says that not more than one sixth of the mortgages recorded are genuine—that 'as are an incumbrance upon the farms.'" We are not prepared to deny that Mr. Jenkins said that; but if he did—well, we have no quarrel with Mr. Jenkins. He is one of our subscribers. But is any sane man prepared to believe that five-sixths of the men who have put mortgages upon their farms are such silly fools as to pay them off and not record a release, thus leaving a clouded title? No answer needed. Again—

"Another class of mortgages is entitled to careful consideration. A man may save a small sum of money, purchase a farm, make a payment and give a mortgage to secure the balance. Mr. Jenkins thinks such a step is not an indication of distress but of thrift."

The above is altogether a matter of opinion—except to the man who gives the mortgage. With him it is a stern fact. It is something new in the ethics of finance, however, that compulsory debt is an evidence of thrift. The complaint of the Alliance memorial was that "the volume of the currency furnished by the government is insufficient to transact the business of the country upon a cash basis, and the people are therefore forced to do it upon a credit basis." This is the primary fact which places the farmers and laborers of this country at the mercy of the money lenders—and not the farmers and laborers alone, but all business men who are forced to borrow money. The system is an "evidence of thrift"—on the part of those who uphold it and profit by it. That some men, by energy, perseverance, industry and frugality, sometimes succeed in spite of the system, and under the load it imposes, illustrates the capacity of human nature; but does not furnish an argument for a financial system that is in the last degree oppressive and tyrannical.

After all is said, we could concede what we do not, that the current statement as to Nebraska mortgages is some millions too high, and the money-monopoly tools would gain nothing. The object of money is to effect the exchange of commodities, not to compel the people to sacrifice nine-tenths of the net fruits of their industry to pay for its use. The result of an "insufficient volume of money" named by the memorial may be illustrated by two facts. In 1865 we paid 139 millions of interest, but it only took 58 million bushels of wheat, or 80 million bushels of corn to pay it. In 1880 we paid only 87 millions of interest, but it took 87 million bushels of wheat, or 261 million bushels of corn to pay it. Connect this with the pregnant sentence in the memorial: "The power to fix values, and the power to accumulate by interest, are the qualities which give money control over labor and production, and enable the money-lenders to accumulate in their hands the greatest share of produced wealth."

The Omaha Real Estate Exchange is rejuvenated. A great fall of real estate has taken place. Inside property ten miles from city hall can now be had as low as fifteen thousand dollars a front foot.

WHO OWN THE UNITED STATES.

The Limitation of Wealth.

In the November Forum is an article by Thos. G. Shearman, entitled, "The Owners of the Country," which seems to be an elaboration of an article on the same subject in the Forum for September, an extract from which we published some weeks ago.

The statistics of wealth presented by the last article are quite interesting. It gives seventy names which represent an aggregate wealth of \$2,700,000,000. The writer says he has information of thirty other persons worth \$450,000,000, making one hundred persons worth over \$3,000,000,000. Comparisons are made between the individual wealth of this country and England, which show that the accumulation in this country has been much more rapid than in that, and that the contraction of wealth in few hands is much greater here than there. Calculated on the basis of the Boston tax returns, it is shown that 40,000 persons own half of the wealth of the country. Deductions made from these and English statistics, show that 200,000 persons own 70 per cent of our total wealth, while 250,000 persons own 80 per cent of the whole.

The writer concludes that without any doubt there has been a vastly greater accumulation of wealth in few hands in this country in the past twenty-five years, than in any other. He says "in no other country, and least of all in England, during the last thirty years, has the burden of taxation been cast so exclusively upon the working class, or the machinery of taxation been used so unscrupulously for private profit."

Mr. Shearman confines his article to a review of the facts, and does not attempt to present a remedy; but he expressly states that he is "opposed, on principle, to all schemes for arbitrary limitations of individual wealth, whether by a graduated income tax, a heavy succession tax, or otherwise."

We have given this brief review of the facts and conclusions of Mr. Shearman's article to reach the point which he may consider hereafter, viz: the remedy. We stand on the same ground as Mr. Shearman as to schemes for the limitation of individual wealth, with some reservations as to the character of the wealth, and the means for its accumulation. If any general logical deduction can be made from Mr. Shearman's facts, it is that this concentration of wealth must be stopped, "or within thirty years the United States will be owned by less than 50,000 persons." The first question, is how is it to be stopped? In answering this the next query which arises is, of what do the accumulations consist, and how are they made? Do they consist of wealth created by labor, or wealth created by law? It is necessary to a correct understanding of this subject to keep this question down to its simplest terms. It is certain that there should be no limitation put upon wealth which results from human industry, while it is equally certain that there may properly be put a sharp limitation upon wealth which is the result of indirect taxation imposed through privileges and franchises granted by law. The least reflection will show that these accumulations are not the fruits of legitimate industry. Such enormous aggregations could not be possessed, or held, or stored, in any form of wealth created by labor. They exist only in representative forms which enable their possessors to exercise the power of indirect taxation, and thus continually absorb the fruit of labor as it is created, which they immediately transform into some of those representative forms endowed with the same taxing power.

What are those forms which are so potentely endowed—who created and endowed them—and may their creator and bestower resume them? In the correct answer to these questions will be found the correct solution of the problem.

The forms are franchises for banks, railroads of all kinds, gas companies, electric light companies, express and telegraph companies, water companies and privileges, bonds, U. S. state and municipal, and every form of franchise and privilege which is created by the community, defined by law, and by law granted to individuals or corporations. These franchises all carry with them the power to tax. In granting them the community has alienated the immense wealth which was alone created by itself, and has at the same time shared its right of eminent domain, as expressed in the taxing power, with the grantees, who have thus acquired by all odds the lion's share of that power. Added to the grants of franchises is the right to monopolize land for speculative purposes, and ultimately for rent, and the control of mines.

The greatest of the powers thus granted by law, in its control over created wealth, is expressed by interest, the next greatest by rent. These two factors absorb the largest part of created wealth. Few people realize the accumulative power of interest. We give below a table from the Mercantile Journal of the accumulation of \$1 for 100 years, compounded annually, at different rates:

\$1 at 3 per cent.	\$ 19 76
1 at 6 "	300 00
1 at 9 "	5,581 00
1 at 12 "	84,475 00
1 at 15 "	1,374,405 00
1 at 18 "	15,145,007 00
1 at 24 "	2,551,599,404 00

Taking the total debt of the country at \$30,000,000,000, at 6 per cent interest, which is far below the average, in twenty years the accumulation would amount to \$128,214,080,000. Add to this the net income from all kinds of franchises, from mines and from rents, which can only be imagined, as statistics are unobtainable, and some idea may be formed of the rapidity of the transfer of created wealth to the possession of those who control the franchises which have been granted by the government, and the taxing power arising from them.

Money being the comprehensive form of wealth, or a representative of all wealth, interest becomes the controlling factor of distribution; that is, interest fixes the ratio of the other factors. Therefore if the people can control this factor they can control all. Can they control it? We unhesitatingly answer yes. If money was composed only of the precious metals, and coinage was not limited by law, money would be a natural product. The natural law of interest would then be operative. Interest would be determined by the volume of money as compared with products. But many kinds of money are issued by governments besides the precious metals, and the coinage of these are restricted. So it comes about that interest is determined by municipal instead of natural law, as municipal law determines the volume of coin and other money, and fixes legal limitations upon interest. Volume determines purchasing power, or price; purchasing power determines accumulating power, or the proportion of product which money will command. So in the laws which determine the volume of money the people have the power of redress from the evil of this rapid accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few people.

While space does not permit us now to consider the other factors of distribution, our argument thus far answers the questions we have asked, and offers a logical solution of the problem presented by Mr. Shearman. The power to issue money is an inherent sovereign power, and embraces the power to regulate its volume and fix its value. The value of franchises is a value created by the community collectively, and their revenues may be held and used by the community. The land and all mines belong to the community, and possession of them for public uses may be resumed at any time. So the natural and only remedy for the dangerous condition portrayed by Mr. Shearman lies in the resumption by the people of the special privileges and franchises which give to their possessors the power to tax. A relief from taxation, as well as an equalization of its burdens, will come from the use of the proper revenue of franchises for public purposes.

of wealth, or a representative of all wealth, interest becomes the controlling factor of distribution; that is, interest fixes the ratio of the other factors. Therefore if the people can control this factor they can control all. Can they control it? We unhesitatingly answer yes. If money was composed only of the precious metals, and coinage was not limited by law, money would be a natural product. The natural law of interest would then be operative. Interest would be determined by the volume of money as compared with products. But many kinds of money are issued by governments besides the precious metals, and the coinage of these are restricted. So it comes about that interest is determined by municipal instead of natural law, as municipal law determines the volume of coin and other money, and fixes legal limitations upon interest. Volume determines purchasing power, or price; purchasing power determines accumulating power, or the proportion of product which money will command. So in the laws which determine the volume of money the people have the power of redress from the evil of this rapid accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few people.

While space does not permit us now to consider the other factors of distribution, our argument thus far answers the questions we have asked, and offers a logical solution of the problem presented by Mr. Shearman. The power to issue money is an inherent sovereign power, and embraces the power to regulate its volume and fix its value. The value of franchises is a value created by the community collectively, and their revenues may be held and used by the community. The land and all mines belong to the community, and possession of them for public uses may be resumed at any time. So the natural and only remedy for the dangerous condition portrayed by Mr. Shearman lies in the resumption by the people of the special privileges and franchises which give to their possessors the power to tax. A relief from taxation, as well as an equalization of its burdens, will come from the use of the proper revenue of franchises for public purposes.

Decrease of Population in Kansas.

The report of the Kansas state board of agriculture for the months of August and September, 1889, contains the following remarkable statement:

"The population of Kansas, as returned by the assessors one year ago, was 1,518,552; for this year the same returns make the population of the state 1,434,014, a loss of 84,538, or 5 1/2 per cent."

The board attributes this unusual falling off of population to an excessive accumulation of people in the cities and towns during the boom period. The booms having collapsed, the inference is that the people have returned whence they came, or sought new fields of speculation. The Omaha World-Herald attributes the loss to prohibition. Because the saloons are closed the people are leaving the state. The Bee attributes the bank failures to prohibition. If an epidemic of cholera or small-pox should break out in Kansas these papers would also attribute that to prohibition. It used to be traditional that the brain and muscle of the average Arkansian was developed on "pork, pone and whiskey," and that with him whiskey was an indispensable article of diet. But not so in Kansas. The infusion of puritan blood when that region was settled very sensibly tempered the whiskey appetite; and all the fits that may now or hereafter afflict that state are not to be laid to prohibition. While the board of agriculture may be partly right in its explanation, it is probably true that the greatest causes of the decrease of Kansas population are short crops and dear money. For several years previous to the present one the state has been afflicted with droughts which have greatly impoverished her producers. Debts and mortgages have been the legitimate result. Paralleling this, contraction of the currency has gone forward, continually lowering prices of products and property. Thus in both ways the farmers of Kansas have been scathed—their products lessened and their purchasing power diminished. This has paralyzed them, and of course the reflex effect is felt by the citizens of the towns. Without the country trade they must leave. Thousands of Kansas farmers have been abandoned, and of course the business that has no basis except the production of those farms must also be abandoned. In these causes may be found the decadence of Kansas population; and not in prohibition.

Chairman Cooley's Letter.

Chairman Cooley's letter, published in another column, is worthy of special attention. Its allusion to "the considerable number of persons improperly carried free" is peculiarly apt. The muzzling of the press through the agency of practically free transportation is not generally appreciated by the people as it should be. Every paper that carries railroad advertising is practically controlled in the interest of the railroads. The editor is a jumping-jack who performs his antics as the freight agent or president pulls the string. Look at the number of papers which carry railroad advertisements and the extent of this evil may be imagined. Three important facts bear upon this: 1st, the roads pay little or no money for advertising; 2nd, they gain little or no business by it, each road commanding the business that naturally belongs to it; 3rd, the contracts on which these advertisements are taken are terminable at the pleasure of the roads. This advertising business is used as a great engine for controlling the press of the country. The people who pay their fares see the liberty of their press destroyed, and at the same time pay the bill. Public opinion ought to make it irreputable to ride free on a railroad.

OVERPRODUCTION.

Superficial thinkers are apt to mistake symptoms of a disease for the disease. They attribute to an effect the potency of a cause, overlooking the cause itself. Thus in the regular recurring cycles of financial distress caused by the specie basis system of money the cry of overproduction is always raised. This cry is always accompanied by low prices all along the line, but especially low prices of farm products; and the unfolding condition precedent of this situation is a diminishing volume of money. The contraction of this volume produces low prices, and low prices produces the apparent overproduction. As an economic fact overproduction is not only a paradox, but it is impossible. Production is the constant effort of all mankind. It is the natural result of the human instinct of self-help—the one power which raises man pre-eminent over the brute creation. Its result is the accumulation of capital, and the increase of the power to gratify ever-increasing human desires. These desires always have, and always will, keep in advance of production. Overproduction means that all the desires of men have been gratified, and that there is a remaining surplus of the means to gratify them. This condition has never been reached, and never will be. But a condition resembling it in one feature is produced by a long continued shrinkage of values and falling prices. This condition is an apparent over-supply or unused product. The other indispensable feature of overproduction, viz: a condition in which all wants are gratified, is not only entirely lacking in such times, but the opposite condition is the existing one. In times of this apparent over-supply, accompanied by falling values and low prices, men's wants and needs are less supplied than in any other times. In such times want invades the thousands of homes, tramps multiply, business stagnates, debt accumulates, failures increase, insanity and suicide become common.

If we take the statist's relating to agricultural products, says the Economist, and consider them simply as statistics, the results seem to prove an overproduction, but the moment we consider them in the light of an under-consumption the true condition is discovered at once. In 1867, 65,636,000 acres in cultivation produced 1,329,720,000 bushels of all kinds of grain, which sold for \$1,284,000,000; while in 1887, twenty years subsequent, 141,821,000 acres produced 2,690,457,000 bushels, which sold for only \$1,204,289,000. That is, the products of 1887 from less than one-half as many acres and half the amount, brought the farmer \$79,711,000 more. It is impossible to charge this wholesale destruction of values to overproduction. It was a want of ability to purchase, caused by a shrinking volume of currency, and nothing else. In 1887 we had \$52 per capita of money and in 1887 we had less than \$7.

Let us go to the figures and amounts themselves and ascertain how much this alleged overproduction was. Working from the rule that this surplus is sent abroad, we find that in 1888 we exported in all, beef, pork, and dairy products, 1,132,000,000 pounds (120,000,000 bushels of wheat and flour (produced to bushels), and that our whole exports amounted to \$688,000,000. Had the 65,000,000 of our people consumed each day that year more than they did consume, one ounce of meat, it would have taken 1,470,000,000 pounds, 338,000,000 pounds more than was exported.

If they had consumed four ounces of flour each day it would have required 148,280,000 bushels of wheat, 28,280,000 bushels more than was exported. If they had expended 3 cents each day for products in excess of what they did expend, they would have bought \$711,750,000, or nearly \$29,000,000 more than was expended. Does any one doubt that our people could have consumed one ounce of meat or four ounces of flour each day more than they did? Go among the alleys, the by-ways, and almshouses, and be taught better.—Could we not have expended three cents each day for the comforts or necessities of life more than we did? Stand on the street corner and notice the crowds as they pass by, and receive the answer. Where there is a demand there is no overproduction. And the fact that the ability to supply that demand does not exist does not alter the case. If overproduction existed its only cure would be to cease labor, cease production. The cure for inability to supply demand lies in another direction. If contraction of money volume depresses prices, expansion of money volume will increase prices. In the application of this economic law will be found not only the cure for so-called overproduction, but for the hard times that now beset us as well.

Conquest by Free Trade.

Conquest by Free Trade.

We are sapiently told by one of Sir John's [protectionist premier] city organs that the establishment of continental free trade would be equivalent to the conquest of Canada by the states. Why not to the conquest of the states by Canada? The whole republic world, in fact, become ours by unrestricted reciprocity just as much as though we had killed all Uncle Sam's forces, and put garrisons in New York, Boston, Chicago, Detroit, Buffalo, Ogdensburg, Charleston, Philadelphia, and every other city or town of note. Nay, it would be more truly ours by free trade than by conquest. Did we overrun the republic with the governor general's body guards our neighbors would be as much annoyed as surprised.

They would not then buy freely from us. Their guerrillas would try to capture without paying for those immense herds of Canadian cattle, horses and sheep that American consumers will buy, when we have free trade with them, at prices twenty per cent higher than our people get now. Surely all rational beings must perceive that a

Canadian conquest of the states would not give Canadians one particle more profit than continental free trade, but would put them to huge expenses in maintaining their position. On the whole we had better not subjugate our neighbors by superior strength when it is so plain that we can gain all the advantages of subjugating them, and a great many more, by an untaxed exchange of commodities.

The novel doctrine that free trade between two countries is equivalent to conquest of one by the other tends to some curious conclusions. For instance, Ontario has conquered Quebec, and Quebec has conquered Ontario. Manitoba has conquered Nova Scotia, and British Columbia has conquered the whole confederation. Were an imperial zolverin established, Canada would have conquered Great Britain, Australia and all the other parties to the compact. Again, the doctrine that free trade in all things is equivalent to conquest has this corollary: Free trade in some things is equivalent to partial conquest. We have therefore obtained a considerable victory and an undivided interest in the whole territory of the whole United States people by selling untaxed eggs. They have conquered us, and we have conquered them. The states' conquest of Canada, and the states' conquest of the values of the international exchanges of free and dutiable goods. If this be not incorrect, we have been almost half conquered by our neighbors, for they send us annually about \$21,384,188 of goods which we do not tax, and about \$27,097,080 worth of goods which we do tax. Equally, of course, we have about half conquered them by sending them free and dutiable goods in a certificate that we have acquired them. Just here the important consideration comes in that our conquerors, who thus appear to own an undivided half interest in Canada, have no representative either in Dominion or provincial. Nor have we, after half conquering them, any representative in their congress. Isn't this very remarkable? Doesn't it point straight to the conclusion that if we wholly subjugate our continental free traders, and they wholly subjugate us—thus absorbing each other as the two snakes did that swallowed one another from the tails—we need not have a common legislature, and therefore, each country would retain as much independence as it has now? This seems at first a queer conclusion from the acceptance of our tory contemporary's novel doctrine, but we are sure it is a correct one, and we hope, at least, that all logicians will combine in a certificate that we have reasoned as soundly as possible upon this very intricate, strange and perplexing subject.

Consolidation of Wealth in the U. S. and in England.

From Mr. Shearman's article in the Forum entitled "Who owns this Country?" we make the following significant extracts:

In Great Britain, although indirect taxation constitutes the greatest part of the public revenue, a large share of direct taxation has been maintained, and as far as possible, all tribute levied by the rich upon the poor, under the pretense of taxation, has been abolished. The natural consequence is that the disparity between the rich and the poor in Great Britain is less to-day than it was forty years ago; that wealth is more widely distributed; that the middle class is much more numerous, and that the masses are rapidly gaining in power and influence.

In America the deficit has been in necessity the opposite direction. Federal taxation has increased six fold since 1860, and the whole of this increase has been taken out of the relatively poorer classes. At the same time, the profit which is secured to the wealthier classes by the adjustment of indirect taxation, and their interest has been increased not less than ten fold.

Mr. Shearman is an enthusiastic advocate of the single tax. With Mr. George he probably attributes the great irregularity of wealth in this country to the monopoly of land, or the natural opportunity to labor. How he can reconcile this view with the conditions he describes as existing in this country and England, it is difficult to conceive. Here land has been comparatively free. Until within a few years a fertile homestead of 160 acres could be had for the taking. In England, on the contrary, land has been monopolized for several hundred years to an extent unknown in any other country. And yet "the disparity between the rich and the poor in Great Britain is less to-day than it was forty years ago," etc. We should like to hear from Mr. Shearman.

The Independent Voter.

Independence is simply the attitude of a voter who uses parties instead of suffering them to use him. He is so far from denying their value or their necessity in a free government that he makes the utmost use of them at every election. But he does not admit that, in order to use a party effectively, a voter must become its slave. That, indeed, is the spirit of party which honorable and self-respecting men who use all parties will constantly withstand. Undoubtedly surrender of independence is the condition of official honors from government or some other person some men may prefer not to pay that price. Party requires unwavering obedience to all its behests. Its candidates must be always supported. Its measures must always be advanced. The conduct of its chosen representatives must be extenuated, upon the ground that every man is fallible and no party is perfect, but that, on the whole, the party of the partisan who pleads is very much better than the other. It is political independence, the action of voters who have no other object than honest and able government, and the enforcement of certain policies, which restrains parties from dangerous excess. Mr. Conkling used to say that he despised those who belonged to a party a little. But it is such independent Americans who make parties useful public agencies.

An effort is to be made on Nov. 13th at Chicago to make a new platform and name for the Union Labor party. We warn these people that the public is ready for only three great planks, namely: Land, Money and Transportation, and any movement which undertakes more is foredoomed to defeat and derision. Let us have no more "lumber yard" platforms.

WANTED--A MAN!

The crying need of the hour is more personal integrity, more honor, more manhood, more principle. It is a fact that in this day of grand material progress—in this day of churches, and schools, and steam and electricity—no business is done upon honor. Business is done upon a contract. A man is only trusted upon a contract if he is "good" or offers "good" security. "Good" means that he has collectible assets that can be reached by law. Speak of this to a business man, and he will reply, "O, that's all very well, but business is business." "Business" in general estimation, is something separate and distinct from ordinary manhood—something to which a code not founded upon honor, but solely on assets, is applicable. The underlying principle of this code is based on money—is greed. The possession of wealth has become the touchstone of modern life. It has become the open sesame to the cavern where lie hidden all treasures—respect, honor, position, political power, love—all these and more await the man who can command the magic talisman. So, men destitute of all of them, and who could command none of them in any other way, seek them through wealth—and wealth alone. The demoralization resulting from this condition is incalculable, unnamable. The thief who steals a horse we send to the penitentiary or hang; the thief who by the practices of so-called "business," by stock-jobbing or corners, steals a million, we land as a Napoleon of finance. The doors of society are closed against the honest man with a threadbare coat; the doors of our aristocratic churches swing on silver hinges to the banker prince whose board comes from usury and oppression. Education, pure morals, a noble life spent in aiding fellow-men, high scientific attainments, are no keys to good society. Its doors are only open to the successful accumulator of wealth—and no questions asked. An age of gold, of great material progress; but alas, also an age of the decadence of morals, of honor, of statesmanship, of poetry, of art. This is the record we are making for history. Wanted, a Man!

"A man who the truth will speak,
Shorn of all doubts;
"Who, when justice the truth would seek,
Dares to speak out;
A man who with purpose grand,
Strong in his right;
Will always for honor stand,
And die for the right."

IN PRINT AT LAST.

New York, Nov. 2.—The agreement between the Union Pacific and Chicago & Northwestern railroads, signed by Presidents Adams and Hughtill October 18, has been put in print at last. It provides that a joint through line for passengers and freight shall be established between all stations on their respective lines, and that the point through which the same shall pass shall be Council Bluffs. It is to be advertised and known as the Chicago, Union Pacific & Northwestern.

A joint through passenger service is to be undertaken as soon as either party gives notice of its readiness to establish the service, and each party to be furnished its proper proportion of equipment. The Northwestern is to make rates on all joint business west-bound, and the Union Pacific is to make east-bound rates, but the rates are not to be reduced unless such action is found necessary in order to meet the competition of other lines.

All questions arising out of the operation of this contract are to be settled by an arbitration committee made up of the two presidents, one director from each of the two boards, and a fifth person to be selected by the directors.

At points competitive between the Union Pacific and Northwestern lines, the traffic is to be divided as nearly as possible in proportion to the earnings. Any changes that may be made in the division of rates, either by agreement or by arbitration, are to continue in force for six months from the time the change is made.

The agreement took effect yesterday and is to continue for ten years. Similar contracts are being made between the Omaha & Republican Valley, Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha and the Union Pacific, the connecting point to be Sioux City, and the joint lines to be known as the Lake Superior, St. Paul & Union Pacific line.

If an agreement by which two separate roads each agree to be bound by rates made by the other, and to equally divide earnings at competitive points, is not a pool within the inter-state law, we would like to know what it is, law.

Tribute to a Leading Democrat.

Eloquent as the Hon. William Scott has been as the champion of people ground down by monopolies, robbed and oppressed by corporate avarice, he was far more eloquent, truthful when he wrote to the president of the New York Central railroad: "Send me a free pass to help me out my district. I am a democrat and not a republican, but we are both of us first of all for the corporations. If you get back to congress you will know where my heart really is; and be sure that on any question affecting your corporation my vote will go where it should do the most good." The Hon. William L. Scott may not be liable to conviction under Section 5,500 of the Revised Statutes, but we fear much that he will be liable to conviction as an unwelcome lumber-jack.—New York Sun.

Words of Sympathy.

Bro. John A. Hogg, of Shelton, organizer for Buffalo county, lost his eye last night, with molasses house and fixtures, and fifteen barrels of molasses one night last week. Loss \$600, and insurance. The fire is thought to be the work of an incendiary; but we hope this is a mistake.

We trust arrangements will soon be made by which every brother on joining the Alliance, may if he so chooses, receive at least \$500, or perhaps \$1,000, worth of insurance on the mutual plan. We believe this is entirely practicable.

In answering advertisements always mention THE ALLIANCE.