

CHURCH AND STATE.

In response to a request that he would give the readers of THE STANDARD some information with regard to the interview in the New York Sun of April 20, 1870, which was republished in THE STANDARD of July 23, Dr. McGlynn writes:

You will see from that interview, now seventeen years old, that the liberal and so-called radical views which I am supposed to entertain, and recent utterances of which by me have been charged to a feeling of irritation because of my suspension and excommunication, have in reality been fully entertained by me, I may say, from the beginning of my priestly ministry. I may add that in private conversations and in discussions at conferences of the clergy I have not only not made any concealment of these views, but have very fully declared them and vigorously maintained them. I have also, as in the instance of the Sun interview, made known my views on more than one public occasion. I confess that I have been in great measure restrained from public utterance on these questions by prudential considerations, while my convictions were extremely clear and settled on them. I could not forget that I was a priest, and that my chief duty was to preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments and to exemplify the charity of Christ.

As I have often since had occasion to say, questions of politics, political economy, of science and art—in fact, all questions that can be of interest to men, are only worthy so far as they have a moral and religious side, as can be deduced from a religious ideal, and co-ordinated toward a religious end. This is but another way of saying that a man is not a mineral, a vegetable, or a mere brute animal, but that he has a moral, mental, aesthetic and spiritual side that requires for its existence and for its satisfaction a supreme spiritual and eternal ideal, utterly distinct from the vicissitudes of time and sense, and from which, and in subordination to which, the things of time and sense can have their only explanation and reason of being. My interest, therefore, in questions of education, of politics and political economy, such as it has been, has always been with a clear vision, and because of a clear vision, of this spiritual and moral side of things; and my action outside of the pulpit or sanctuary, so far from being in any sense at variance with or alien to my vocation and work as a clergyman, was always prompted by an eager desire to help those spiritual and moral interests which it is the essential vocation of the priesthood to promote. It is a poor business for a man to be very eager to move perfect consistency in his views and acts throughout life. It was a true maxim of the ancient Romans: "Sapientis est mutare consilium."—It is the part of a wise man to change his mind. But in this matter I am very glad to be able to show that I have not been inconsistent, lest such weight as recent utterances of mine might have—and as I wish they could have—should be in any degree impaired by the allegation or supposition that they are made now for the first time and largely from resentment. Again, if it be worth while to defend one's consistency, I would say that while at any time I would have suffered whatsoever loss rather than deny or retract my convictions, yet so precious were to me the graces and opportunities of the Christian ministry to speak and labor for the highest ends, that I felt justified in repressing myself, and in not speaking too loudly or too often my convictions on certain subjects. I knew too well the narrowness, ignorance and obstinacy of what I have called the "ecclesiastical machine," with reference to questions of education, political economy and politics, and that what may be called the archiepiscopal ring here and the papal ring in Rome would not long tolerate such freedom of speech and independence on the part of a mere priest as might seem to be guaranteed to him, not only by his rights as an American citizen, but by right reason, Catholic theology and canon law.

It may be as well to state here that the sanctions and guarantees of canon law as against papal abuse are to a great extent but little more than a fiction, since it is the teaching of the canonists that in canon law the pope can do all things (*papa omnia potest*). How idle then to quote canon law against the pope, who can make or unmake, suspend or amend the canons at will! I therefore did suppress myself not a little, and in the whole of my ecclesiastical career but some half dozen times did I make strong public utterances that I knew must be distasteful to the machine, and these only when I felt that the best interests of humanity and of the church itself demanded that prudential considerations should be thrown to the winds. One of the first of these occasions was that which led to the interview published in the Sun. I shall give you a little chapter of unpublished history. A priest, Edward J. O'Reilly, pastor of St. Mary's church in Grand street, this city, a man of ability and culture, had shortly before the date of that interview been promoted from the parish of Newburgh, where he had begun to agitate in writing the so-called "school question," which largely consisted of the demand for public moneys for Catholic parochial schools. When he came to St. Mary's parish in New York he found himself burdened with two parochial

school buildings which he found it almost impossible to support, even with the aid of fairs, and raffles (in violation of law), and picnics and excursions, the chief profits of which would come from the sale of beer and intoxicating drinks. He said to me one day, "I can't support my schools." "Well, then," said I, "don't support them." "But," said he, "I must support them." "Well," said I, "support them then." I simply meant to say that if he and his people wanted private, religious, parochial schools nobody should deny them the right of enjoying that luxury, but that reasonable beings would suppose that he and his people should also enjoy the privilege of paying for the luxury. But the fact is that the Catholic people as a rule are not very eager for parochial schools, which are forced upon them by the fanaticism of bishops and priests, so that the support of the schools has to be extorted from the people by never-ending scoldings from the altar and pulpit, by choking people at church doors to sell them excursion tickets, and by other similar un-Christlike arts. In the conversation referred to Father O'Reilly quickly made known his view on the subject. He said, "We are paying our share of the taxes. We are therefore entitled to our share of the public school fund. We have the votes and the political influence, and we must demand, and shall obtain, our rights." I answered that he might have a majority of the voters in some of the wards in New York city, but that he should not forget the bitter hostility of the great majority of the people of the state and country to such demands, and that the pressing of such demands by him and his friends would provoke bitter denunciation and caricatures from pulpit and press, and would do irreparable injury to the Catholic church throughout the United States. He replied: "What have I to do with the Catholic church in the United States? My mission is to my own church and to the children of my own people"—a sentiment which I thought very uncanonical, and one that was rebuked by the action of children in his own Sunday school, who showed that they were concerned not merely for the interests of religion in the United States, but in far away China and Japan, for the spiritual help of which they were collecting and contributing their pence.

This Father O'Reilly, determined to carry out his views, associated with himself a number of priests, among whom were Fathers Cloury of St. Gabriel's, Treanor of the Transfiguration church, and McKenna of St. Rose's. They formed what may be called an offensive and defensive alliance with the Tammany ring, of which at that time the chief ornaments were Tweed, Sweeney, Connolly and Oakley Hall. It was a matter of life and death for the ring at that time, already deep in its unparalleled thievery and general rascality, to secure the re-election of Oakley Hall as mayor. It was like a goad to the desperate ring to be permitted to hope that they could buy the "Catholic vote" and the support of the Catholic ecclesiastical machine, at so cheap a price as that of a few hundred thousand dollars a year for Catholic schools, which sum they could easily procure by legislative trick and fraud. To give to the alliance more surety and dignity it was desired by the ring, and the desire was gratified, that Archbishop McCloskey should have a conference on the subject with Peter B. Sweeney, who was known as the "brains" of the ring. This conference was held on a Sunday evening, in a room in the old episcopal, now pastoral, residence of St. Patrick's church in Mulberry street. In due time the ring maintained its part of the bargain by passing through the legislature an appropriation which granted to the Catholic parochial schools of New York city an amount somewhere between two hundred and three hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Sweeney got great credit for his cleverness in so managing that the appropriation was tacked on to a bill on, I believe, the last night of the session, and in such shape and language that but few of the legislators could have known or guessed the real intent of the appropriation or the amount appropriated. The appropriation awarded "a sum equivalent to twenty per cent of the excise money in New York county for the years 1868 to such free schools as are not already in receipt of any share of the public school fund." A commissioner was by the act itself to be appointed for the distribution of the fund. Mr. Nathaniel Jarvis, Jr., was appointed such commissioner, and even he, who is somewhat known as a practical politician, was shocked at the cupidity and unscrupulousness of Catholic clergymen in their unseemly scramble to get more than their share of the appropriation. One worthy pastor had the coolness to ask for a share, although he had no school, on the ground that, if he could get a liberal slice of the fund, he would start a school. The parochial schools enjoyed this gift of the ring for a year or two, and clergymen privy to the bargain did what they could to keep their part of the pact by doing their best to re-elect Mayor Hall, and therefore to oppose the rival candidate, Judge Ledwith, who was himself a Catholic, and for whom personally some of the clergy referred to had the kindest feeling. More than one priest recommended the Tammany party from the altar the Sunday before election, and Mr. John Mullaly, a well known Catholic journalist and poli-

tician, recently a tax commissioner, went about to priests the Saturday evening before with what was equivalent to a message from Vicar General Starrs, with whom he had just been in conference, to the effect that the Tammany party were willing to do the best they could for the Catholic schools, and it was but fair that the Catholics and the clergy should do the best they could for Tammany hall.

Sweeney's legislative trick and the unparalleled robberies of the Tammany ring began to be understood by the public about the same time. The newspaper press and the pulpits of the whole state thundered against the iniquitous alliance of the priests and the Tammany ring. *Harper's Weekly* for a year or so, week after week, caricatured bishops, priests and nuns, representing them as robbing the public treasury and destroying our American institutions, and doing both of these things by the aid of the Tammany ring. The storm of public indignation compelled the speedy repeal of the legislative clause enacting the appropriation, but the bad passions and theological hatreds evoked by the storm have not yet been laid. It was because of the injury that all this was doing to the true spiritual interests of the Catholic religion that I, overcoming a good deal of reluctance, consented to speak as I did in the Sun interview of April, 1870, to show that all priests and Catholics were not in sympathy with the unhallowed alliance with Tammany, nor did they share the spirit of hostility to the public schools, and the fanaticism of those who, to promote parochial schools, would sacrifice the best interests of religion and charity, neglecting in great measure those religious teachings and ministrations and those charitable works which are peculiarly of the office of the church, sacrificing everything to a mere fetish of so-called Catholic education, in which system very often in practice there is but very little religion, and still less of any kind of education.

The publication of the interview in the Sun, happening about the time of the repeal of the appropriation, infuriated Tammany's clerical allies, and Fathers O'Reilly, Cloury, Treanor and McKenna having persuaded the venerable Jesuit Father Thebaud, then temporarily in charge of St. James's church, to join them, called a meeting of pastors at Father O'Reilly's house to take action in regard to the publication of what the New York Sun then called my "truly American views." The meeting adopted a remonstrance against me, to be signed by pastors, and to be sent through Father Preston, chancellor of the diocese, who presided at the meeting, to Archbishop McCloskey, then attending the Vatican council.

It was the expectation of at least some of the clergy that my removal would be the result of the remonstrance, but the good sense of Archbishop McCloskey prevented such a scandal, as it did again five years ago when he failed to carry out the command of the pope, sent through Cardinal Smeoni, ordering my suspension for my land league speeches. The fanatical McMaster, of the *Freeman's Journal*, gave cry, and the whole pack of editors of so-called Catholic journals all over the country swelled the chorus of vituperation from their organs great and small. But Archbishop McCloskey treated the remonstrance of the officious priests with scant courtesy. He sent them no formal answer, and the nearest approach to an answer was in a little speech at a collation after his return, in which, with what might have seemed ironical words, he congratulated the clergy upon their "harmony" and hoped it would continue, and then added that of course there would be difference of opinion in practical matters, but that when a course of action should be decided upon by the diocese it was to be hoped that there would be unity of action, although of course he could not pretend to claim interior assent or unqualified approval of courses to be decided upon in practical things. The latter words of the archbishop were borrowed almost literally from a suggestion of mine in a conversation of a day or two before.

For the prudential considerations already mentioned I forbore to say anything more in public on the subject. But some three or four years afterward, as if to force me into the unpleasant alternative of either avowing or retracting my supposed reprehensible opinions on the school question, I was appointed, nominally by the archbishop, but I believe in reality by a kind of plot on the part of Father Preston, who issued the notifications, and of the Jesuit Father Daubresse, the moderator of the conference, to be one of those who should have to discuss the school question in all its bearings at the semi-annual conference on moral theology. At the conference I discussed the question with the greatest freedom for over an hour, as it was my right to do, having been appointed, and as it was a duty of conscience to do, since I could not say aught else than what I believed. I am glad to be able to say that my utterances more than once elicited applause from a considerable number of the clergy present at the conference. I have never hitherto made any public statement concerning that conference, yet I believe that charges made within the last few months in the newspapers by officious clergymen, seeking to please the authorities, were made with reference to my utterances on that occasion. I have been charged with in-

sulting Cardinal McCloskey and with holding unorthodox opinions on Christian education simply because I believed and said in his presence that it is not necessary that secular instruction should be imparted by the same person, in the same room, or on the same day of the week as religious instruction, and that priests were sent by their Master to preach the gospel, to administer the sacraments, and to do charity, rather than to play the pedagogue for secular instruction, and that I, who had never been requested to build a parochial school, would probably if so requested avail myself of my clear right to ask a still higher authority to send me to China or Japan or to any other place where I might continue to be the priest without having to be the secular schoolmaster or school builder. And it would have been as discreditable to Cardinal McCloskey's judgment as it is to that of the officious newspaper informants to think that it was an insult to him that I discussed with perfect freedom once I was ordered to discuss at all.

You may observe in the suggestions republished in your paper from the Sun of 1870, that I was very anxious to take the wretched theological hatreds and squabbles out of politics, as far as possible, once and forever. I can assure you that in these suggestions for legislation or an amendment to the constitution—as you may readily see for yourself—I was by no means exclusively thinking of alleged abuses by Catholics, cleric or lay. I am aware that there have been and are grave abuses and violations of liberty of conscience on the other side. Inmates of institutions—protective, reformatory and penal—committed by the strong arm of the law, have been and are coerced into attending religious services, and thus deprived of that essential liberty of conscience before which even the strongest arm of the law should fall powerless.

The reading of the Bible in the public schools is maintained as a kind of fetish, not so much because of any great religious value it can, under the circumstances, have for anybody, as because it gratifies a certain pharisaic sense of religiosity, or, worse, the wretched ascendancy of one set of religionists over another, or, still worse, of religionists over non-religionists, in schools that by their very name of "public" and "common" proclaim the essential injustice of any such ascendancy, and of introducing into the schools anything that is not, or cannot be, common to all the people. You may remember the vigorous articles some years ago in the New York Herald because of the violation of liberty of conscience in the House of Refuge, an institution ruled by a close corporation, yet largely supported by funds raised by authority of law. The complaints of Catholics concerning that institution, and the frequent attempts to compel by law the granting of liberty of conscience in it, no less than the efforts of the managers and friends of the management to prevent such legislation, and their refusal without legislation to grant liberty of conscience, have been a constant cause of irritation, and have presented a distressing dilemma to the politicians for years past. Is it not high time to have done with this wretched business once for all by such legislation, or rather amendment of the constitution, as was suggested by me seventeen years ago? I am happy to have reason to believe that even gentlemen prominently connected with the House of Refuge are beginning to see this matter in the same light as I do, and that they will be willing to co-operate with citizens of all denominations and of no denomination in procuring through the constitutional convention, which is to be held in spite of the efforts of Archbishop Corrigan to prevent it, such provisions as will make such irritation and scandal impossible in future.

My reason for saying this is that some of these gentlemen are, I believe, actively interested in the work of a committee that has for one of its objects the procuring of some such provision or amendment in the constitution of this state. I will give you, as entirely pertinent to this subject, the text of a correspondence which I had some three months ago with the acting secretary of that committee, the Rev. Mr. Baker. But first I should like to say that some suggestions in my part of the correspondence were deliberately intended to make impossible in the future the miserable evasions that have been common in the past, by which, under the pretense of non-sectarianism, people have been deprived of the reasonable enjoyment of such religious ministrations as they preferred, and, on the other hand, have been coerced into attending religious service and instruction which were utterly distasteful to them, and at which very often they felt that they could not voluntarily be present without grievously sinning against conscience. Surely it is the rational doctrine of the soundest Christian philosophy, as it is a cherished American principle, that liberty of conscience shall be inviolate. The correspondence is as follows:

ST. LUKE'S HOSPITAL,
540 STREET AND 5TH AVENUE,
NEW YORK, April 29, 1887.

Rev. Edward McGlynn, D.D.—Rev. and Dear Sir: A conference of the executive and finance committee of "the central committee for protecting and perpetuating the separation of church and state" will be held at this hospital on Tuesday evening, May 3, at 8 o'clock, at which the following proposed amendment to the state constitution will be discussed:

"No moneys from the public treasury, state, county or municipal, or moneys raised by tax-

ation, shall be given, paid or loaned to any sectarian institution, or any institution under sectarian teaching or control."

I have been specially requested to ask you and the following gentlemen to be with us on that occasion: Rev. Joshua Strong, D.D., Mr. Henry George, Mr. Henry A. Cram.

I sincerely trust that it will be in your power to be present. Yours truly,

GEORGE S. BAKER,

Acting Secretary.

Executive Committee—E. M. Kingsley, S. Hastings Grant, Churchill H. Cutting, Andrew Fowler. Finance Committee—H. A. Oakley, Hugh N. Camp, William Alexander Smith.

NEW YORK, May 3, 1887.

Mr. George S. Baker, Acting Secretary of Committee for Protecting and Perpetuating the Separation of Church and State, St. Luke's Hospital, New York city:

Sir—I have received your favor inviting me to take part in a conference of the executive and finance committees of your committee to be held this evening, to which conference you inform me that you were requested to invite also Rev. Joshua Strong, D.D., Mr. Henry George and Mr. Henry A. Cram. I thank you for the courteous invitation, and regret that another engagement will not permit me to be present.

I am glad to be able to express my sincere concurrence in the general proposition which, as I understand it, underlies the purpose of your committee and the amendment to the state constitution it proposes as follows: "No moneys from the public treasury—state, county or municipal—or moneys raised by taxation, shall be given, paid or loaned to any sectarian institution, or any institution under sectarian teaching or control."

I am convinced from my reading of history that too often the liberty of religion has suffered by the so-called protection of the state, and its purity has been corrupted by state endowments, while, on the other hand, the liberties of the people and the rights of the state as representative of these liberties, have been time and again encroached upon by churchmen grown rich and powerful by the endowments of the state. I could not, however, with perfect satisfaction to myself approve the proposed amendment unless I were permitted to amend the amendment by making it broader and more radical, and so clear in its provision as to render impossible all quibbling and evasion. I would therefore suggest the insertion after the word "taxation" of the following words: *From licenses, excises, or in any other way, by authority of law.* Again, after the word "control" I would suggest the addition of the following words: *Or to any private institutions, or to any institution that shall not be the property of the people in their political capacity, and entirely controlled by officers elected or appointed by the people.*

I hope that these suggestions will meet with acceptance from the conference, in which case I shall cheerfully and earnestly defend the proposed amendment with voice and pen, and use what influence I may have in the matter of the election of delegates to the constitutional convention, and with the members of the convention in behalf of the amendment.

With best wishes for the committee and yourself, I am, sir, yours sincerely,

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

I received another letter from Rev. Mr. Baker, telling me that my suggestions had been submitted to the conference and were referred to a legal committee, from which, no doubt, we shall hear in good time a favorable report.

What I say in my letter to Rev. Mr. Baker is what I said in the Sun in 1870, and I am glad to know that what was said so long ago is in substance and spirit and largely in phrasing the same as the Nine Demands of the American Secular Union. I can cordially and unreservedly subscribe to these demands, and I should be glad to see them granted by appropriate changes in our constitutions, state and federal.

Narrow and bigoted people on the one hand, and malevolent people on the other hand, will fear, or make believe that they think that all this shows in me an indifference or hostility to religion, and they will persist in saying that it is the result of bitterness and irritation consequent upon recent events. Yet you have proved, by your publication of what I wrote for the Sun seventeen years ago, that these views are not new to me, that they were entertained while I was devoting myself exclusively to the work of my ministry, and that I avowed then that my object was, as I do now, that it is to promote the best interests of religion by taking theological squabbles and hatreds out of politics once and forever. These people should give me credit for honesty in the frequent assertion that no cause is fully worthy of human interest except by reason of its moral and religious bearings; and that the sanctions of morality are essentially religious. I have such perfect faith in the divine efficacy of the gospel, the sacraments and the charity of Christ, that I have but little patience with those clergymen who have so lost faith in the efficacy of their own ministry that they seem to place their chief trust in legislative help and in parochial schools. They seem to think that God has not a proper resting place in His universe till they have placed Him in their written political constitutions and sandwiched Him in between spelling and arithmetic. They seem to have yet to learn that the deepest sentiments and convictions of the human heart and mind—the perennial sources of high endeavor, noble thinking and right doing—religion, justice, love—are above and before all civil laws and constitutions and are the creators and never the creatures of whatever in the law is highest and best.

EDWARD MCGLYNN.

A Protestant's Outspoken Utterance.

NEW YORK CITY.—I am one of the last men to interfere in other people's business; but when the heaven of sympathy is working in the whole community, it affects me with others. I am not a Catholic, but this I will say, without fear or favor, that no man, Catholic or Protestant, ever lived more worthy than the spotless and saint-like Dr. McGlynn of the confidence of his fellowmen.

SAMUEL F. EVANS.

THE SYRACUSE CONVENTION.

Deputations Will Be Present from Every Section of the State.

Mr. John J. Bealin returned during the past week from a trip in the northern part of New York, taken in the interest of land and labor clubs. He visited Utica, Rochester, Medina, Oswego, Watertown, Clayton, Ogdensburg, Amsterdam, Schenectady, Cohoes, Watford and Lansingburg. All these places will send delegates to the Syracuse convention pledged to support the land doctrine as the primary principle for the platform. Mr. Bealin found a large part of the public ready to act with the new party, the movement being by no means confined to those usually denominated workingmen. In Cohoes he found professional and business men very active in forming branches of the party. Dr. J. W. Ross, Dr. J. Crane of Cohoes; Mr. Salsbery of Schenectady, a prominent dry goods merchant; J. Bartlett, editor of *Labor's Stage* of Amsterdam; P. H. Cummings and Harvey Book of the same place are working earnestly for the cause. A branch of the Anti-poverty society was organized there on last Sunday evening. The Rev. George Muller, pastor of the Baptist church at Schenectady, a believer in the anti-poverty doctrine and master workman of district assembly No. 65, is in full sympathy with the new party. Master Workman Alfred Murray of district assembly No. 104, is also an active supporter. In Oswego there is a great following. In Rochester, among the party leaders are Peter McKittick, Christian Drexler, William M. Shea, and D. C. Feeley, attorney-at-law. Rev. J. A. Copeland of Scottsville will be at Syracuse. W. C. Wood, M. D., of Gloversville has been elected a member of the convention. The attendance at Syracuse from all parts of the state will be large.

Mr. John McMackin has also returned from an extended trip in the interior of the state. He found the people in many districts ripe for a new party and states that he is positive that there will be a large representation at Syracuse.

THE ANTI-POVERTY EXCURSION.

Every Prospect of a Brilliant Success—A Large Number of Tickets Already Sold—Members Working Enthusiastically.

The first grove meeting and excursion of the Anti-poverty society, on Aug. 13, promises to be a thorough success in every way. Tickets have been distributed among the members for sale, and returns are already coming in, many members requesting a fresh supply of tickets.

The excursion barges will leave various points as follows: West Eleventh street, 8:30 a. m.; Broome street, E. R., 9 a. m.; Eighth street, E. R., 9:20 a. m.; Thirty second street, E. R., at 10 a. m. Departures will be made promptly on schedule time, to secure the advantages of the tides. Lunch will be served on the boats at city prices, under the charge of an experienced caterer; or dinner can be secured at the grove hotel for fifty cents.

Tickets for the excursion will be sold at the box office of the Academy of Music on Saturday and Sunday; or they can be purchased from any member of the society, or by mail from Henry George, 25 Ann street, or Rev. Dr. McGlynn, room 28, Cooper union. The grove meeting will be addressed by Dr. McGlynn, Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost and Henry George.

It Is the Gospel of the Golden Rule.

CHICAGO, Ill.—What a wonderful hold this doctrine of the land for the people takes upon a man! How the church-hardened Christian seems to freshen up under its influence. And, best of all, is the sight of thousands who, looking at Christianity, have said, "If this represents the teachings of Christ, then I am better off without it," now turn to that misunderstood and misrepresented Christ, and with open arms and swelling hearts call Him "brother." When I first read the speeches of Dr. McGlynn and Henry George, the allusions to a God in matters of political economy and the bringing of God into the discussion of the practical affairs of our life seemed like sacrilege; but I soon saw that it was the misconception of the character of God, and not God's indifference to the welfare of His children, that caused the feeling. And this proves the wonderful growth that takes place when this subject is thought upon. I feel that the power that is in this movement comes from the justice that it exhibits, and along with that comes naturally the power to bring back to God and His ways the men who have been driven from Him by the Christian churches.

R. H. COWDREY.

A Sunday Afternoon Address.

Dr. McGlynn will deliver his lecture, "The Cross of the New Crusade," at the Perine Mountain home, Baltus Roll hill, near Summit, N. J., on Sunday, the 7th inst., at 2 o'clock sharp. Rev. Chas. P. McCarthy will preside. After the discourse orderly questions will be answered. Conveyances will be in waiting at the railroad depot at Westfield on the arrival of the 9 o'clock a. m. train from the foot of Liberty street, New York, to convey passengers to the home, returning in the afternoon to meet the Westfield 5:27 train to New York city. Visitors are recommended to take their lunch with them, as the Perine home does not provide any supplies except for invited guests. The grounds are open to all, and tents are erected for the convenience of those who bring their own provisions. There is a plentiful supply of spring water. The round trip from Jersey City will cost about \$1.50, including the drive up the mountain, from the top of which the view is magnificent and the air invigorating.

American Citizenship is Going to Have a Meaning Soon.

NEW YORK.—I am a regular reader of THE STANDARD. Till now it seemed to me of no importance at all to meddle with American politics. But since your new party has sprung up I have come to the conviction that it is my duty to support it. So last week I filed my declaration of intention to become a citizen.

JOHN EISENSTEIN.

"Blessed Are Ye When Men Shall Cast Out Your Name as Evil."

May God bless the president of our anti-poverty society every hour of his holy life. And when he dies, may every hair of his head be a candle to light him to glory.

Anti-Poverty in Omaha.

OMAHA, Neb., July 29.—We have organized an anti-poverty society here to begin the missionary work, and hope to see an organization of the united labor party grow out of it.

F. S. LEWIS, Secretary A. P. S., 119 North Fifteenth street.

ANTI-POVERTY.

THE SOCIETY HOLDS ITS FOURTEENTH PUBLIC MEETING.

William T. Crossdale Reviews the History of the Excommunication—Louis F. Post—An Illustration of the Cause of Poverty and the Means by Which It Can Be Abolished—The Crowded World Will Be Speedily Uncrowded by the Imposition of a Tax on Land Values.

The Academy of Music, though less crowded last Sunday night than usual, was still fairly well filled with an attentive and enthusiastic audience, who showed their devotion to the anti-poverty cause by braving the extraordinary heat. The meeting was opened promptly at 8 o'clock, with William T. Crossdale in the chair.

After the singing of the "Anthem of Liberty" by Miss Munier's Concordia chorus, Mr. Crossdale said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: The presence here on such a torrid evening as this of an audience doubtless larger than could be attracted to any church in the city (applause) goes to show that our members are anxious at all times to testify before the presence of their zeal in the cause represented by this society. (Great applause.) It has been suggested to me that instead of attempting any formal speech this evening I shall briefly tell a story familiar to many of you and yet one that many need to have reiterated in order that they may understand exactly its full bearing.

A question was propounded two weeks ago by a gentleman in one of these seats to Mr. George (applause and cheers) why it was that the president of this society, the typical American priest (cheers) should not obey the summons to go across the seas to answer for his action in America on political economy. I make no claim to be able to answer that question from a theological standpoint, but I do claim to have studied that case from the beginning to the end and to be able to give you the absolute facts that give the lie to the statement that Dr. McGlynn (great applause) was summoned to Rome merely as a matter of church discipline and not on account of his opinions. I have studied that case from the beginning, and I do not hesitate to say here that anything that I lacked in the way of necessary information has been cheerfully furnished me by the good doctor himself. (Applause.) And I therefore think that I can speak with absolute accuracy when I give you an account of the chain of facts that go to form this history.

Possibly some of you have learned from recent publications when the first difficulty began. Seventeen years ago this native-born citizen of New York, this priest fresh from the teachings of the "propaganda" in Rome, found in this city an iniquitous conspiracy between a small group of the priesthood and the Tweed ring. He lifted his voice against it. He protested against it in private. He protested against it in public. He declared that the American common school system—"Hear! hear!" and applause—purified from all sectarian influence that over-zealous Protestants might inject into it, was good enough for Catholic and Protestant, for Jew and Gentile. (Applause.) From the time that he dared lift his voice in favor of that principle, from the time that as an American he stood by the very foundation stone of American liberty—(applause and cheers)—this man was persecuted. And there are men in this audience who know how he was persecuted by a small coterie who were determined, if possible, to effect his ruin. And you, gentlemen, particularly the Catholics in this audience, know that the sleuth hound who stood at the head of this party was this man Preston. (Grous and hisses.) From that time on, everything that human ingenuity and devilish malignity could suggest has been done to annihilate the standing of this man, who was the beloved pastor of the largest parish on earth. (Applause.)

But even the men who were conspiring for his ruin did not dare openly to lift their hands against this man who had the Cardinal McCloskey's cheers and applause, and the choir itself, disgraced by Corrigan. (Hisses.) Yet the attempt then was made. Four years before the beginning of these difficulties, when no man in New York, and particularly no Irishman in New York, believed that any such action could possibly be taken, there came from Rome, from the man you have since learned to know and to justly despise, Cardinal Simoni (hisses), a message addressed, not to the archbishop of this diocese, but to the coadjutor bishop who had been brought over from New Jersey through machinations in Rome, not through influence exerted in New York. There came a suggestion that Dr. McGlynn was using dangerous words in regard to the Irish cause; and before even an answer could be made, before time was given to send back an excuse, if excuse were needed on the part of a man whose father and mother were of Irish origin and who was a priest of that church which has received its most loyal support from the Irish people, there came again from this cardinal prefect of the propaganda another order to the cardinal archbishop himself to suspend the priest McGlynn unless in his judgment it ought not to be done. It is needless to tell a New York audience that in the judgment of Cardinal McCloskey it was not to be done. (Applause.)

But nevertheless the pressure brought to bear was such that this priest, without blame, this man who had taught the doctrine that the land of every country belongs to the people thereof (applause), this man who had merely said to a New York audience what Bishop Nulty had said to the Irish people in general (applause), was so persecuted, so nagged at from across the sea by inspiration from this side that he had to promote the benevolent archbishop of this diocese that he would refrain from making any more Irish land league speeches in order that this archbishop should not be persecuted by this pressure from Rome, stimulated from this side. Ladies and gentlemen, was there any matter of discipline there? (Cries of "No.") Was this priest unfaithful to any of the duties of the priesthood? ("No; no.") Was he disobedient to the honored archbishop? ("No; no.") No; he was none of these. But because he taught, not in the pulpit, but on public platforms, a doctrine that was offensive to Errington, the conspirator (hisses) who professed to represent the English cabinet at the Vatican, the conspirator who came well nigh turning the same Vatican against the Irish people—a doctrine offensive to Simoni (hisses), who was then in alliance with Errington; because in the exercise of his right as an American citizen he had taught a doctrine true, good and wholesome, the only doctrine that can ever relieve Ireland from the tyranny under which she has so long suffered, (great cheering and applause), he was persecuted until he agreed, for the sake of peace, to make no more land league speeches at all. Surely, up to that point no man can pretend that there was on his part any matter of discipline. He was persecuted for opinion's sake from Rome.

Then, the next year, another letter came over from Cardinal Simoni (hisses) saying

that the priest McGlynn had been violating his understanding with his archbishop by talking on the Irish question, and complaining that, though his words were less violent than the year before, there still was dangerous evidence in them that he was disposed to favor "the Irish revolution." What do Irish-Americans think of the power that will reach three thousand miles to check a man because it fears that he may be favoring the Irish revolution? God bless the Irish revolution! (Great applause and renewed cheers.) It will be accomplished at a certain time, and that time will be when the doctrine preached by Bishop Nulty and Dr. McGlynn shall have entered into the hearts (applause) and inspired the brains and minds of the Irish people, and brought them to stand hand to hand and shoulder to shoulder with the English and Scotch democracy for the overthrow of the whole system. (Wild applause and cheering, lasting nearly two minutes.) It is not my purpose to go into that, but as an American, looking at this matter from afar, I tell you I have no hope of Irish success through any alliance with weak-kneed English liberals. It must be the democracy on both sides of the channel (applause) that will tear from vested privilege, from landlords and from lords of all kinds, the right of the people to the soil of the country that they own in common. (Applause.)

But in the case that I have alluded to, the doctor was able to give a very quick and prompt explanation. He said to the archbishop—remember that I am speaking of the cardinal archbishop, not this effigy that is there now (great laughter)—I am not a Catholic, and I have a perfect right to say that he is a kind of a little man-milliner, all dressed up, and if you should take the dresses off there would not be enough left of him to scare a school boy—he said to the cardinal archbishop of New York: "I did not speak at any land league meeting. I kept my word. But I did go to the Cooper union and there made a speech at the request of Irishmen, without regard to the land league, in order to raise money for the starving poor in certain famine districts in Ireland." (Applause.) But out of his love for his church, he said: "I will not again speak for Ireland, even for charity." And that was accepted as something satisfactory to the power that ruled the Irish people. (Hisses.)

Well, gentlemen, in the course of time the good cardinal passed away, and his coadjutor (hisses and hisses) took the complete title of the office. Then the men who had for seventeen long years watched for their chance redoubled their watching. In the summer of 1886—that is, last summer, it began to be rumored through this town that the working people of New York, weary of acting as the supporters of people who had all the use imaginable for them for two months before election and none the day after (hisses and laughter) were going to throw aside all the factional fights and feelings that had hitherto divided them and go into politics in one solid phalanx for their own account. Do you think that news was heard with pleasure? Do you think they liked it back here? (Here the speaker pointed to the rear wall of the Academy of Music, which divides it from Tammany hall.) Tammany hall is on the other side of that wall (hisses), and I tell you the trembling alarm of that organization must have shaken that dividing wall when they really saw and felt that the working people of New York meant business at last. (Applause.) Quick upon the rumor came another, that these men proposed to put aside their attitude of humble supplicants, and that they proposed to make a man their candidate who was truly the friend of the American people. Then came a time when it was clearly and surely seen that they would nominate Henry George. (Great applause and repeated cheering.)

Before that nomination was made, there went through this town another rumor. Men learned with surprise—and many of them with great pleasure—that the beloved pastor of St. Stephen's, and a number of other priests, I think thirteen in all, would be present. Instantly, on this same 23rd day of September, there went forth a letter, which did not arrive till the next day, the 30th, to every one of these priests, commanding them not to go. All but one of them obeyed. But one man said to this archbishop: "I have promised to go. I have allowed myself to be announced to speak at this meeting, and it will be a greater scandal to the church should I now publicly withdraw than it will be for me to go (applause), therefore I shall go. (Applause.) But in order that I may not have even the appearance of disobedience to my ecclesiastical superior, I hereby agree not to make any promise to address any more political meetings during this campaign." Was there any spirit of insubordination, was there any spirit of disobedience there? (Cries of "No; no.") A man has his self-respect to maintain, it seems to me, from the mere fact that he stands before the community as a priest of God. (Applause.) Dr. McGlynn had his self-respect to maintain and he maintained it. But he did yield to discipline in this matter.

Now, what was the next step? On the 1st of October he spoke, and on the 2nd of October came the mandate suspending him from the priesthood for two weeks. This was the first beginning of discipline. So far as that is concerned there is a reasonable excuse for those people who say that the suspension was because of a matter of discipline, because there was disobedience to a command which the archbishop had no right to issue, but which he nevertheless did issue. But that suspension never took effect in two weeks, and Dr. McGlynn resumed his ministrations.

What was the next step? Because of a newspaper interview, without any inquiry, without even sending to ask whether it was true, without even sending for the reporter to ask whether it was a verbatim report, on its mere appearance, on the inference that something in it was disrespectful to Pope Leo XIII, this archbishop instantly suspended Dr. McGlynn again "for the balance of the year," as he says in exceedingly elegant language. Now, then, at once, as you have heard here on this platform, word was sent by Dr. McGlynn that he had not been his intention to say anything disrespectful of the pope, and he said so in the columns of the newspaper itself. But in that same paper he said: "I reaffirm the doctrine that the land of every country belongs to the people thereof." And in his own statement of this whole case over his own signature Archbishop Corrigan speaks of this as a quasi-retraction. "But," he says, "he never retracted the main statement that private ownership in land was against natural justice," and because of that he was again suspended. There you have the whole case in a nutshell. It is not necessary to review a step by step. The signature of the archbishop stands before the people of New York the statement that Dr. McGlynn, after he had completed the penance, if you choose to call it such, imposed for his first act of disobedience, was again suspended because he refused to withdraw his doctrine in regard to the land question. Thus the suspension was because of a political opinion. And all the newspapers and all the Prestons who may choose to lie about it cannot alter that fact unless they prove that the archbishop himself lied when he put his signature to this paper.

You know the rest of the story, how the doctor was clubbed out of his pulpit and his home at St. Stephen's; how he was evicted, like any cottier in Ireland, by the man who attempted to succeed him, and whom, thank God, the women of St. Stephen's forced to run away (laughter); and the man, suffering under this cruelty, and in all serious earnestness, ill with a disease known as enlargement of the heart, was by the evil consent and the ignominious driving out of an attack, which was serious indeed. Then he went away, driven from his home, finding shelter in the home of his dead sister, and finding responsibilities there which he has since well earned to carry. He, a sick man, was then ordered to come to Rome. And, ladies and gentlemen, I defy you to find in the whole record a single word to show that he ever refused to obey that order. He found good reasons, sufficient reasons, which any gentleman, any archbishop, should have been glad to accept as sufficient. And yet, while no refusal had been made, there came again from this same Simoni, of whom we have heard a few years before, a cable order to Dr. McGlynn to first retract his doctrines and then come to Rome. And from that moment until the present hour there never has been one single moment that that order did not stand. And, as Dr. McGlynn himself has said, it would have been a fool's errand for him to have gone to Rome without first retracting the doctrine. (A voice: "Let Rome come to him.")

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have gone over this matter simply because it was suggested to me that there were some who might forget the consecutive order of events. Doubtless all have read the story, but it has not been presented to them frequently in consecutive order; and the absence of our presi-

dent to-night seemed to give an occasion of presenting it to this audience. But all of this was apparently dropped, and a new, perfect, fresh order came, not saying anything about what preceded it, but saying, "Come to Rome within forty days." But the old order stood, and there never has been one single moment when it was possible for Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome with any hope of accomplishing anything whatever save to be insulted anew, unless he retracted the truth which he has again and again preached so eloquently from this platform. (Applause.) That, it is unnecessary to say to this, or to any audience that knows him, he did not do, and he will not do it. (Applause.) As Father Huntington—(applause)—himself said, he is not that kind of a priest. He is rather the kind of a priest that the church which he loves and honors had in the early days when men and women lived in caves, when they became blazing torches for the amusement of a Roman populace, when they were thrown to beasts in the arena to make a Roman holiday. He is the stuff of which martyrs are made (applause), and all the powers of men cannot bend such a man to take back, to retract, to lay down what he believes to be the truth living truth of God, to his children. Had he been that kind of a man this great hall would not have been filled night after night to listen to him. Had he been the kind of a man who would retract the truth for the sake of convenience, or for the sake of anything else, the people who have so nobly, so honorably, followed him in his misfortune would not be to-day the firm supporters of him that they are. It is not merely as a beloved priest that he is supported by Catholic people, it is because he is a great man. And, furthermore and above all, it is because, as priest and man, he typifies a great and good man, who is not a machine, whose enemies will utterly fail to rot beneath their feet. And the action of the men who have sought to destroy him has, as has been well said, deprived him of a parish and given him a continent. (Great applause.)

Mr. Crossdale then reminded the audience of the intended grove meeting and excursion of the Anti-poverty society at Oriental Grove, on August 13, particulars of which have already been given in THE STANDARD. The Concordia chorus then sang the new crusaders' battle hymn while the collection was taken up, after which Mr. Crossdale announced that soon as they may be received with prolonged applause. Mr. Post spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: We have had this meeting on almost every occasion of a public meeting of this society a gentleman who is known by reputation to you all, personally to many, but who has not yet addressed the society. I refer to Mr. James Redpath. (Applause.) James Redpath was an old-time abolitionist. (Applause.) He was in that movement at its inception. He was a crank abolitionist, if you will, and when that fight was over and the slave was freed, a man whom he had incensed said to him: "Well, now you have abolished slavery, what are you going to abolish next?" "Poverty," said Redpath. That was twenty-five years ago. I suppose the man he spoke to thought that that was about as impossible a thing as could be undertaken. I doubt if Mr. Redpath himself had any very clear idea of how poverty could be abolished, or whether it could be abolished, and think that he replied on the spur of the moment. But since then he has been convinced that there is a way to abolish poverty, and it is only on account of his ill health that we have not heard from him yet. But before the year is through, we may expect to listen to his ringing voice from this platform in behalf of this new crusade. (Applause.)

We have a state of society that might well arouse anyone to the idea of abolishing poverty if it can be abolished. There is scarcely a vice and scarcely a crime that cannot be traced to the poverty of our time—poverty in the midst of plenty. Greed and idleness on the one hand, and poverty and toil on the other. A day or two ago I read in a newspaper how some charitable people in Chicago had made a discovery. A remarkable discovery they had made of a young girl who worked in a store there for three dollars a week and who had to pay three dollars a week for rent. They were philanthropic people and they immediately set about to find some relief. And what relief do you suppose they found? Why, they have started a boarding house for working girls where they can get board for a little less than three dollars a week. Well, now, can't they see—that girl can see if they can't; the working girls and working men can see if they can't—that when they have succeeded in giving her board for a little less than three dollars a week the boss will succeed in getting her work for a little less than three dollars a week? (Applause.) That is the only way these people can get their heads together. Think of it, gentlemen, that they have done. They have given this girl a place to board for a little less than three dollars a week and they have helped to drive the boarding house keeper out of business. She has been boarding girls for three dollars a week. Now she has lost her job. Well, that seems to be the result of most of our advances. Somebody loses a job whenever we make an improvement.

Do you remember that little boy who made one of the most remarkable inventions connected with the steam engine? They used to have a boy pull a string in the olden times, on steam engines, so as to open and close the valves, to let the steam come in at one end and then let it go out at the other. Well, this boy, this particular boy, liked to have a good time. He wanted to play ball. One day the thought struck him that he could attach that string to the machinery so it would work itself. He did so, and went off to play, and when he came back the old machine was working away just as well as if he had stayed there. He did that several days in succession. But one day the boss came and found him playing ball. "Why are you not tending to that engine?" said the man. "Because the engine is tending to itself," said the boy. They went there, and sure enough, the engine was tending to itself. The boy had made a great invention. Well, what happened? The boy lost his job. That particular boy did get some compensation for his ingenuity and his laziness. He got a reward from the man that appropriated the invention. But, then, all the other boys that pulled strings on other engines, they lost their jobs, too—(laughter.)—and they did not get any reward. And so it is with all the inventions and all the advances we make.

Well, now, what the Anti-poverty society wants to do is to make inexhaustible opportunities for work. The Anti-poverty society is not a creator. It did not make the universe, and it cannot make inexhaustible opportunities for work; but I will tell you what it can do and what it is going to do. It is going to brush away all the obstructions to the inexhaustible opportunities for work that the Almighty has made for men. (Applause.) When we started out on this crusade we had a right to expect the sympathy and assistance of organized religion because the religious sentiment, the religious spirit, was in our movement; and if the religious sentiment, the religious spirit, was in the organized religious movements, then we had a right to expect their assistance and their aid. (Applause.)

But organized religion has not been entirely sterile in this movement. We have our McGlynn (applause), we have our Pentecost (applause), we have our Huntington. (Applause.) These three we have already before the people, and there is many another man in the pulpit to-day whose heart is with us (applause), whose voice has already spoken, and who has many and many another voice with us before this year is out, with us before the people, and, I hope and believe, on this very platform and before this very society. (Applause.) You see the fact of it, that most men who go into the ministry go there with a pure spirit, pure motives, honest purposes, and when the scoundrels that get into the profession put the handcuffs on them they can't stand it long. They have in good faith offered up their lives for a sacrifice to God, and when they find their superiors would lead in the other direction they are willing to sacrifice their lives. "Get thee behind me, Satan." (Applause.)

Speaking of Dr. McGlynn (applause), I want to tell you something about a friend of mine, an Irish Catholic who thinks a great deal of Dr. McGlynn. I notice that there are a good many Irish Catholics that think a good deal of Dr. McGlynn. (Applause.) There are a good many people who are neither Irish nor Catholics who think a good deal of Dr. McGlynn. (Applause.) And this Irish Catholic friend of mine thinks so much of the doctor that he has his portrait framed and hung up in his shop right where he works. Another man works in that shop who is not an Irishman, and not a Catholic and who thinks a very great deal of Dr. McGlynn, but who does belong to Tammany hall. Well, this man came over to my friend and he said: "Pat, there's a companion piece to that picture you ought to have put alongside of it." "What's that?" says Pat. "You ought to have the portrait of the devil hanging there," said he. "No, sir," replied Pat, "ye've heard 'em communicate him." (Laughter, cheers and applause.)

We are all learning in this movement what we hope that even the churches may learn before long, that religion means something more than constantly asking the Almighty to "save my soul." (Applause.) I was walking in a country churchyard last week in the village near which I was born, and on the tombstone of a woman who died at the age of eighty-five I saw this epitaph: "In that she lived for others she lived for God." It was a true epitaph. I knew that woman when she lived and she deserved it. That epitaph indicated what true religion is. It indicated what organized religion has yet to learn. In that we live for others we live for God. (Applause.) In that we live for others, and to the extent that we live for others, we are truly religious. There was no anti-poverty society of one proposed in that epitaph. (Applause.) And she whose body lay there when she was alive would have scorned the idea of constituting herself an anti-poverty society of one.

James Russell Lowell, before he was converted, told us what true religion is: He's true to God who's true to man. Where'er a wrong is done To the humblest or the weakest, 'neath the all-beholding sun,

That wrong is also done to us; and they are slaves most base Whose love of right is for themselves, and not for all the race. (Applause.)

But, coming back to what James Redpath said, "Why should we not abolish poverty? What is poverty that it cannot be abolished? On this platform a few nights ago I took occasion to tell you of those holes in the mining regions of Pennsylvania where the rain had collected and frozen, and for the sake of the illustration I will mention it again. In the winter months the rain had frozen in these holes and those men, who earned on an average of seven dollars a week and a half a week during the year, thought that they might alter their work so they went into the holes and gathered that ice and put it away to save it for summer. Why did they want to do that? Because they wanted to abolish their poverty in the matter of ice. During the summer months, not having ice, they suffered; and if they could have ice during these hot summer months their poverty would be abolished as to that. Now, here was plenty of ice for them. All it required was a little labor to take it out from the ground and put it away in caves until the summer should come. But the men that owned the holes in which the ice had accumulated told them they could not take it from there unless they would pay so much a ton. They were not capitalists. Out of their seven dollars and a half a week they hadn't any money left for ice. The owner could have allowed them to go in and get it. That they could do and wanted to do. But they could not, in addition to that, go down into their pockets and pull out money and pay for going into those holes. The consequence was that the ice stayed till nature took it away. It melted, and their poverty in ice was not abolished because some one stood between them and the Creator who had furnished the means with which to abolish their poverty in the matter of ice.

I mention that again, because it is such a perfect illustration of the whole social system. Everything that we see, everything that we enjoy, is taken from the earth by labor just as that ice might have been taken. And the possibilities of producing from the earth by labor are unlimited. A man, if he has access to the earth, can produce all that is necessary to satisfy his wants; and given six millions of people with free access to the earth, there would never be any poverty. Take it one thing at a time. Would there be any poverty as to ice if men could go where ice has accumulated by nature and take it out? Would there be any poverty as to any other of the things which we enjoy that are taken from the earth just as that ice might

have been taken? But here stands the middle man, here stands the man that owns the hole, as it were, here stands the man that owns the globe, who says: "You shall not take anything unless you pay me for the opportunity." Sometimes they want a good deal more than the opportunity is worth and more than anybody can afford to pay, and the result is that we cannot bring labor in contact with land. The labor of man cannot be brought in contact with the materials that the Almighty has furnished, and this middle man is all that stands in the way. If we could get him out of the way, labor and land could freely come together, and poverty would be abolished. It would be abolished in the coal regions in the matter of ice, and it would be abolished in everything else that we take from the earth, just as it would be in the matter of that ice.

It may be a pretty big job that we have undertaken to get rid of this middle man, but I guess we shall do it before we get through. I think that the means that have been proposed will dispose of him; and I think that this society, with other societies that are spreading the movement over the country now, will do it. The movement is running on in a way and with a speed that before long will make these men come to terms and get out of the way from between the men who want to produce, the men who want to abolish their poverty, and the natural means with which they might abolish it. (Applause.)

During our parade on the 18th of June, as we came down Broadway, where that magic lantern performance is, on Twenty-third street, some men who did not belong to an anti-poverty society, unless it was an anti-poverty society of one, had hired this institution to throw remarks at the procession as it passed by. One of these remarks that appeared as I was passing was this: "To abolish poverty." Well, I understood that that meant, and so I waited to see what would come next, and presently down came a flap—"Work." To abolish poverty—work! That is true. You can't abolish poverty without work—your own work or some other man's. (Applause.) You can't abolish poverty without work, neither can you go to Europe without going there. Now, suppose somebody should say: "To go to Europe—go there." That is all right. You have got to go if you want to get there. But suppose you haven't the means to go? There is something more than work necessary to abolish poverty. It is the natural material to which to apply the work.

It is well enough for the men who have cornered the raw material to say: "Abolish your poverty by work." We say: "Yes, we will abolish our poverty by work, but we want that material that you have stolen. When we get that, poverty will be abolished by work. (Applause.)

I am going to illustrate to you as briefly as I can, this system that we have, this system of rent. I have done it once or twice before on a blackboard, but we can't use a blackboard here; some of you are too far off. So I am going to suppose that people must come into this building for the purpose of procuring some necessary of life; that they must have a location in this building in order to get some necessary of life. There is nothing violent about that supposition, because this building then would simply represent the earth, and we must get all the necessities of life from the earth. Now I am going to suppose that that box, the one nearest the stage on this floor, and that one opposite, are equally desirable for the purpose of getting this necessary of life. So as to give exactness to it, I will suppose that each of these boxes will produce six—six dollars, six anything you please—and that the next box will produce five; that is, they who have got in there would be able to get five with the same amount of labor that would produce six in either of the first two boxes. The upper box near the stage I represent by four, and the next two by three, and these seats here by two, and those seats beyond in the circle by one, and the rest of the seats by nothing—that is, by a bare living, just enough of the things needed to sustain life, nothing more. So you see, here are the grades: six, five, four, three, two, one and a bare living. Now we have got a representation of the earth, with varying degrees of fertility, its varying advantages, some places, some soils, being better than others, and grading on down to a point where a man by his labor can produce for himself but a bare living.

Well, now, Adam and Eve drop in. Adam comes into this box here because he recognizes it is the best, a sort of Garden of Eden, and he takes his seat there. There are eight seats in the box, but he only uses two. And, after he is comfortably seated, Cain comes along with his wife. Cain had a wife, you know. (Laughter.) Cain comes in with his wife. He comes in there and wants a seat in Adam's box, where they produce six. "But," Adam says, "you had better pay me something for this seat." "Why not?" says Cain. "I won't pay you anything for your seat. There are six other seats in this box just as good as yours have and there is another box just as good with eight seats. I won't pay you anything." And then more would come. And so it would go on until those two boxes were filled. There would not be any such thing as rent up to that time. Nobody that came in would pay for the privilege of a seat in any of those two boxes so long as unoccupied seats there could be had just as good as the seats in the boxes were filled. Now we would have to have two "number six" boxes, as I will call them. A man would not want to go into the "five" boxes if he could get into the "six" boxes. Then a little bargaining would ensue between these new comers and the old comers, and the most that the new comers would give for the privilege of being in the better box would be "one." That is, they would say: "It is immaterial to us whether we work for 'five' and keep it all, or work for 'six' and give 'one' to the others." So they would be willing to pay as high or nearly as high, but no higher than "one." Then when the number five boxes were filled people would have to go into number four. And then the rent would be higher. For the "five" box it would be one and for the six box two. Then, don't you see, Mr. and Mrs. Adam or Mr. and Mrs. Cain would have the best of the bargain, because they got there first. And so it would go on until finally we would find people down in the seats which produced only "one," and then they would be driven over into the circle where they would get just a bare living. Meantime rent would be going up all the time, and people were driven to the center where they were just enough to sustain life that would be the working people could get anywhere, because Adam and Cain and the rest would take the difference as rent. Wages would be the same all the way up, but there would be a gradation of the rent from "six" down to "one." All you have got to do to prove this to your satisfaction is to look about you and see how all the better places in the community command a higher ground rent according to their location.

But that is not all, and that is not the worst of it. You can very well see how the landlords of the first comers, who got the best places and kept them, and that after a while there comes a time when they can lay back and do nothing, and all that is produced by others above a living will be turned over to these people whose merit is that their grea-

dered the earth just as that ice might

have been taken? But here stands the middle man, here stands the man that owns the hole, as it were, here stands the man that owns the globe, who says: "You shall not take anything unless you pay me for the opportunity." Sometimes they want a good deal more than the opportunity is worth and more than anybody can afford to pay, and the result is that we cannot bring labor in contact with land. The labor of man cannot be brought in contact with the materials that the Almighty has furnished, and this middle man is all that stands in the way. If we could get him out of the way, labor and land could freely come together, and poverty would be abolished. It would be abolished in the coal regions in the matter of ice, and it would be abolished in everything else that we take from the earth, just as it would be in the matter of that ice.

It may be a pretty big job that we have undertaken to get rid of this middle man, but I guess we shall do it before we get through. I think that the means that have been proposed will dispose of him; and I think that this society, with other societies that are spreading the movement over the country now, will do it. The movement is running on in a way and with a speed that before long will make these men come to terms and get out of the way from between the men who want to produce, the men who want to abolish their poverty, and the natural means with which they might abolish it. (Applause.)

During our parade on the 18th of June, as we came down Broadway, where that magic lantern performance is, on Twenty-third street, some men who did not belong to an anti-poverty society, unless it was an anti-poverty society of one, had hired this institution to throw remarks at the procession as it passed by. One of these remarks that appeared as I was passing was this: "To abolish poverty." Well, I understood that that meant, and so I waited to see what would come next, and presently down came a flap—"Work." To abolish poverty—work! That is true. You can't abolish poverty without work—your own work or some other man's. (Applause.) You can't abolish poverty without work, neither can you go to Europe without going there. Now, suppose somebody should say: "To go to Europe—go there." That is all right. You have got to go if you want to get there. But suppose you haven't the means to go? There is something more than work necessary to abolish poverty. It is the natural material to which to apply the work.

It is well enough for the men who have cornered the raw material to say: "Abolish your poverty by work." We say: "Yes, we will abolish our poverty by work, but we want that material that you have stolen. When we get that, poverty will be abolished by work. (Applause.)

I am going to illustrate to you as briefly as I can, this system that we have, this system of rent. I have done it once or twice before on a blackboard, but we can't use a blackboard here; some of you are too far off. So I am going to suppose that people must come into this building for the purpose of procuring some necessary of life; that they must have a location in this building in order to get some necessary of life. There is nothing violent about that supposition, because this building then would simply represent the earth, and we must get all the necessities of life from the earth. Now I am going to suppose that that box, the one nearest the stage on this floor, and that one opposite, are equally desirable for the purpose of getting this necessary of life. So as to give exactness to it, I will suppose that each of these boxes will produce six—six dollars, six anything you please—and that the next box will produce five; that is, they who have got in there would be able to get five with the same amount of labor that would produce six in either of the first two boxes. The upper box near the stage I represent by four, and the next two by three, and these seats here by two, and those seats beyond in the circle by one, and the rest of the seats by nothing—that is, by a bare living, just enough of the things needed to sustain life, nothing more. So you see, here are the grades: six, five, four, three, two, one and a bare living. Now we have got a representation of the earth, with varying degrees of fertility, its varying advantages, some places, some soils, being better than others, and grading on down to a point where a man by his labor can produce for himself but a bare living.

THE STANDARD.

HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.

Published weekly at
25 ANN STREET, NEW YORK.TERMS, POSTAGE FREE.
One year, \$2.50; six months, \$1.25; single copies, 5 cents.
Entered at the postoffice, New York, as second class matter.

Communications and contributions are invited, and will be attentively considered. Manuscripts not found suitable for publication will be returned if sufficient stamps are sent for return postage. No notice will be taken of anonymous communications.

Contributions and letters on editorial matters should be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD, and all communications on business to the PUBLISHER OF THE STANDARD.

THE STANDARD wants an agent to secure subscribers at every postoffice in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newspapers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it will confer a favor on the publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY AUGUST 6, 1887.

THE STANDARD is forwarded to subscribers by the early morning mails each Friday. Subscribers who do not receive the paper promptly will confer a favor by communicating with the publisher.

SOCIALISM AND THE NEW PARTY.

It is necessary that the platform to be adopted by the united labor party convention which is to meet at Syracuse on the 17th should firmly and clearly define the position of the party with relation to socialism. This is rendered necessary by the organized endeavor of the State or German socialists to impress their peculiar views upon the party—an endeavor that has become so notorious that any disposition to evade the issue whether or not the united labor party indorses these views, would give its enemies a specious pretext to make the charge that it does.

Stimulated, perhaps, by the imitation produced by what in socialistic parlance might be called the attempt of the socialists to "exploit" the united labor party, there is a strong disposition to rule out of the convention three prominent socialists who have been elected as delegates, but who are not voters of New York—one, Mr. Schevich, having his legal residence in New Jersey, and the other two, Messrs. Gronlund and Vrooman, having been in the state only a few months.

But though such a proceeding might be in conformity with the usage requiring that the members of a state convention should be voters of the state, the fact that these gentlemen are prominent socialists, and elected for that reason, furnishes an argument for the most liberal recognition of the right of the district to send such representatives as will best express the opinions of its members. Since the relations of the united labor party with socialism have been brought into such prominence and will enter into the most important part of the proceedings of the convention, it is all the better that socialism should be represented there by its ablest exponents, and it would be a pity to rule out of the convention on technical grounds three such men as Messrs. Schevich, Gronlund and Vrooman—the first a well-known socialistic editor, the second a well-known socialistic writer, and the third an accredited missionary and orator of the socialistic labor party. The question between State or German socialism and the ideas of that great party of equal rights and individual freedom which is now beginning to rise all over the land, may as well, since the socialists have raised it, be settled now as at any other time, and ought to be settled frankly and openly, and on its merits, and with the best representation of socialistic ideas that the members of the party who hold to these ideas can select.

There are a large number of us who are not socialists, do not propose to become socialists, and are not willing to be used as a stalking horse for socialism; and if the socialists of the German school, who have hitherto acted with the united labor party, propose to use the socialistic organization as a party within a party, and making up in discipline what they lack in numbers, to insist upon any indorsement, expressed or implied, of their peculiar theories as a condition of continuing to act with the party, then the quicker the two bodies separate, each to go its own way, the better it will be.

And this is not merely as a matter of principle but as a matter of policy—if any distinction can be made between the two things in the minds of men who have no policy except to advance principle. For any disadvantage that might result from being called socialists we care nothing. But to permit the simple and obviously just principles of securing equal rights in natural opportunities by taking land values for public uses and of bringing businesses in their nature monopolies under the control or management of the state, to be confounded with schemes for abolishing industrial liberty and making the state the sole landholder as well as the sole landowner, the sole capitalist, the sole employer and the sole director of production and exchange, would be to greatly retard the work we have in hand. Such confused theories and wild schemes as those of the doctrinaires of the German socialistic school can never stand the test of intelligent discussion or make headway among a people with whom the instinct of individual freedom is so strong as with ours.

German socialism is so confused and confusing in its terminology, so illogical in its methods, it contains such a mixture of important truths with superficial generalizations and unwarranted assumptions, that it is difficult—at least for people of English speech—to readily understand its

real meaning and purpose. Let me endeavor to give such a brief account of it as will at least serve to show the differences between it and the theories advanced in THE STANDARD and held by the great bulk of the men who are now united in the formation of a new party.

In the theories of Marxian or German socialism—or socialism as we might as well call it to avoid repetition—the central point is the employer or capitalist. In that form of production which the socialistic writers denominate the capitalistic, and which they assume to be that of all production in the grade of civilization to which the most advanced modern nations have already attained, or, at least, in that to which they are advancing, this employer provides site, building, tools and materials, and buys labor, paying for it wages. He does not, however, pay in wages the whole value which the labor he buys adds to his material, but only a part of it, which the socialistic writers put at from one-quarter to one-half. The rest he keeps for himself. He, in short, buys labor as he buys commodities, and the price that he must pay and that labor can demand is, in the socialistic theory, fixed by the same law that governs the price of other commodities; that is to say, the minimum on which, in the existing state of society, laborers will consent to maintain themselves and reproduce. The tendency of competition for employment among laborers to reduce wages to this minimum and keep them there is assumed, in the socialistic theory, to be the general law, and is styled by them the "iron law of wages." That part of the value created by the laborers, which the employer does not return to them in wages, but keeps for himself, and which is generally assumed by socialistic writers to be from three-quarters to one-half of the whole produce, they style "surplus value." Gronlund, however, in his book, "The Co-operative Commonwealth," which is probably the best popular rendering into English of the socialistic theory, gives to this "surplus value" of Marx the much more intelligible name of "feecings." It is from this "surplus value," or "feecings," that profits, rent, and interest are assumed to come, and from it the employers or capitalists maintain and augment their capital. This, in fact, the socialistic writers generally speak of as, and even more commonly assume to be, the source of capital, and from this idea is derived the assertion they frequently make that capital consists of unpaid labor.

Nothing could better show the incoherence of socialism than its failure to give any definite meaning to the term which it most frequently uses and lays the most stress upon. Capital, the socialists tell us, consists of "unpaid labor" or "surplus value," the "feecings" of what has been produced by labor. Capital, they again tell us, is "that part of wealth employed productively with a view to profit by the sale of the produce." Yet they not only class land as capital (thus confounding the essential distinction between primary and secondary factors of production), but when pressed for an explanation of what they mean when they talk of nationalizing capital they exclude from the definition such articles of wealth as the individual can employ productively with a view to profit, such as the ax of the woodsman, the sewing machine of the seamstress and the boat of the fisherman. The fact is that it is impossible to get in the socialistic literature any clear and consistent definition of capital. What they evidently have in mind in talking of capital is such capital as is used in the factory system, though they do not hesitate to include land with it and to speak of the landholder pure and simple as a capitalist.

The same indefiniteness and confusion of terminology, the same failure to subject to analysis the things and phenomena of which it treats, run through the whole socialistic theory. For instance, in the "Socialistic Catechism" of Dr. J. L. Joynes, which is circulated by the state socialists both in England and this country, the question is asked, "What is wealth?" The answer given is, "Everything that supplies the wants of man and ministers in any way to his comfort and enjoyment." Under this definition land, water, air and sunshine, to say nothing of intangible things, are clearly included as wealth, yet the very next question is, "Whence is wealth derived?" to which the answer is given, "From labor usefully employed upon natural objects." Yet the notion that labor usefully employed upon natural objects produces land is not more unintelligible than the notion that "surplus values" or "feecings" produces capital. As to the latter, it might as well be said that robbing orchards produces apples, and in fact considering that land is by Socialists included in capital, it might as well be said that robbing orchards produces apples and apple trees too.

This indisposition or inability to analyze, to trace things to their root, and distinguish between the primary and the secondary, the essential and the accidental, is the vice of the whole socialistic theory. The socialist sees that under the conditions that exist to-day in civilized societies, the laborer does not get the fair reward of his labor, and that the tendency of the competition between laborers is, despite the augmentation of productive power, to force wages to the minimum of a bare livelihood. But, instead of going further and asking the reason of this, he assumes it to be inherent in the "wage system," and the natural result of free competition. As the only remedy for these evils, he would put an end to the "wage system," and abolish compe-

tion by having the ownership of all capital (including land) assumed by the state; having all production and exchange directed by the state, and making all employed in production, or, at least, all employed in production for exchange, employees of the state, whose business it will then be to see that they do get a fair return for their labor. In the "co-operative commonwealth," as pictured by the socialistic writers, ownership and possession of all means of production, including both land and capital, would be held by the state. The various classes of producers would be organized in associations or guilds in the nature of government departments, whose members would settle their hours of work, the part each should assume, and the relative value of their labor, while the collectivity or general government would, in the words of Gronlund, "only have three functions, of being general manager, general statistician and general arbitrator. As statistician it will determine how much is to be produced; as manager distribute the work and see to it that it is properly performed; and as arbitrator it will see justice done between association and association and between each association and its members."

Only this, ought certainly to be enough even for a collectivity as big as the United States; but in thus minimizing the functions of the collectivity, Mr. Gronlund is evidently thinking merely of its relation with the various producing departments or associations. A still larger job would be that of exchanging things and parts of things after they had been produced by the various associations. To this end the socialistic scheme is that all produce for exchange is to be turned over to the general government, which is to give the producers, or rather the producing association, money or orders in the form of labor notes, upon its general stock of wealth, according to the amount of labor which has entered into the productions. The general government, in its capacity of general statistician, or general bureau of statistics, is not only to decide how much of each particular article is to be produced, but at what rates it is to be exchanged and how much of it is to be exported when it is deemed expedient to export. Even newspapers and books are to be produced and circulated in this fashion. If it is possible for anyone seriously to imagine such a scheme in actual operation in a country like the United States, it might be instructive for him to go on and speculate how long it would take it to break up in anarchy or pass into worse than the despotism of ancient Egypt.

The utter impracticability and essential childishness of such a scheme as this is largely disguised to the believers in socialism by a curious pretense of scientific research and generalization, and much reference to the doctrine of evolution. According to the socialistic writers all production up to quite recent times was for use, not for exchange, and they even gravely say that capital has only become an agent in production during the last two hundred years or so. Slavery, according to them, was the first method of organizing labor and securing the increased production that comes from it. From chattel slavery, by way of serfdom, the natural evolution has been into the industrial slavery of the wage system and "capitalistic production," in which modern civilization is now. And from this mankind are to pass by evolution into the socialistic organization of production and distribution in which all industry is to be intelligently ordered by the collective will. This evolution, they hold, will be accomplished anyhow by virtue of the natural forces, whatever they may be, which produce evolution, and the socialists who understand and hold to the Marxian theory do not so much hope to assist in hastening its advent as to put men in readiness to take advantage of the new order when in the fullness of evolution it shall come. Their notion sometimes seems to be that one branch of industry after another will pass under control of the state, until everything has been thus managed and directed. At other times it seems to be that the commercial crises or gluts (which they attribute to a tendency of capitalists to produce as much as possible in order to get the largest profits, while the laborers, not getting their fair share of the produce of their labor, are unable to buy what is thus produced) will finally culminate in a grand break-down of the present system, when all that socialists will have to do will be to step in and organize industry under governmental direction.

The simple truths which are the grains of wheat in all this mountainous chaff of grotesque exaggeration and assumption are that with the progress of civilization and the integration of society the division of labor becomes more minute and the methods of production require larger amounts of capital, and that certain functions are developed, such, for instance, as the maintenance of highways, the supplying of cities with water, etc., which can better be performed by the community or under the control of the community, than by leaving them to individual enterprise, and (when in their nature competition becomes impossible) to individual or corporate monopoly.

Ignoring the essential distinction between land and capital, regarding land as but one of the means of production, of no more importance than steam engines or power looms, and looking to the direction and employment of labor by the state as the only mode of securing an equitable distribution of wealth, socialists do not appreciate the wide and far-reaching con-

sequences which would flow from the simple reform that would put all men upon an equality with regard to natural opportunities, and which by appropriating its natural revenue for the support of the state would make possible the freeing of production from all the imposts and restrictions that now hamper it. The nationalization of land is included in their programme as is the nationalization of machinery, but while they do not attach any more importance to the nationalization of land than they do to that of any other "instrument of production," they also mean by it something essentially different from what is aimed at by the united labor party. Frederick Engels, the coadjutor of Marx in founding this German school of socialism, has recently written a tract on the labor movement in America as a preface to a new edition of his "Condition of the Working Classes in England in 1884," which has been translated from the German by Florence Kelley Wischniewetzky, who is, by the bye, a daughter of Congressman Kelley of Philadelphia, and who doubtless comes the more easily to the idea of full governmental regulation and direction of industry from her familiarity with the idea of the direction and regulation of industry by protective tariffs. In this pamphlet Herr Engels thus states the difference between the socialists of the German school and those who think as I do:

If Henry George declares land monopolization to be the sole cause of poverty and misery, he naturally finds the remedy in the resumption of land by society at large. Now, the socialists of the school of Marx, too, demand the resumption, by society, of the land, and not only of the land but of all other means of production likewise. But even if we leave these out of the question, there is another difference. What is to be done with the land? Modern socialists, as represented by Marx, demand that it should be held and worked in common and for common account, and the same with all other means of social production—mines, railways, factories, etc.; Henry George would confine himself to letting it out to individuals as at present, merely regulating its distribution and applying the rents for public, instead of, as at present, for private purposes. What the socialists demand implies a total revolution of the whole system of social production; what Henry George demands leaves the present mode of social production untouched, and has, in fact, been anticipated by the extreme section of Ricardian bourgeois economists who, too, demanded the socialization of the rent of land by the state.

The difference is, in fact, even greater than Herr Engels represents it. We do not propose any such violent and radical change as would be involved in the formal resumption of land by society at large, and the letting of it out to individuals. We propose to leave land in individual possession as now, merely taking, in the form of a tax, as nearly as may be, the equivalent of that value which attaches to land by reason of the growth and advance of society—and while thus appropriating for the use of the community a revenue which properly belongs to the community, to do away with the incentive given to the withholding of land from productive use by the individual expectation of profiting by its future increase in value.

This simple yet radical reform would do away with all the injustice which socialists see in the present conditions of society, and would open the way to all the real good that they can picture in their childish scheme of making the state the universal capitalist, employer, merchant, and shopkeeper.

For if the laborer does not now obtain his fair earnings; if, despite the improvements which increase productive power, wages still tend to a minimum that gives but a bare living; if it is not because of any inherent injustice in the "wage system," nor because of any "iron law of wages" which operates because it must. These things are simply the results of the fact that labor, deprived of its right of access to land, the natural and indispensable element of production and existence, and thus rendered helpless, must, as the only means of escaping starvation, sell itself to those who can employ it.

Make land free of access to labor and all else becomes possible. Land is not wealth or capital, but is, on the contrary, that original factor of production from which labor produces wealth and capital. Land is not a means of production, like a tool or a machine. It is the original means of production, without which no other means of production can be used, and from which labor can produce all other means of production. It is not true, as socialists say, that the mere laborer, in the present stage of civilization, could not avail himself of the access to land to get a living. The two essential and primary factors of production—labor and land, even in the absence of secondary factors obtained from their produce, have in their union, to-day, as they had in the beginning, the potentiality of all that man ever has brought, or ever can bring, into being. Nor is it true, as the socialists seem to assume, that the whole class of producers below that of the employing capitalist are so destitute of capital, so incapable of getting it if they have good opportunity to use it, that they could not find the means to make good use of land if the monopoly that now holds so much eligible land vacant were broken up. Here in New York we see the poorest class of laborers building themselves some sort of shanties wherever they are permitted to use convenient land even on sufferance. And if the valuable land in and around New York that is now held vacant at enormous prices were subject to a tax which destroyed the expectation of profiting by the future increase in land values and compelled its owners either to build, to sell, or to give it away, is there not a great body of wage workers who would hasten to build or to get themselves homes? And with agricul-

tural land, mining land, and, in short, all natural opportunities subjected to the same just system, is there not a great body of men now competing with each other in overstocked, unproductive vocations, or selling their labor for wages, who have or could find the needed capital to employ themselves to good advantage? With the glut in the labor market thus relieved, and the increased demand which would come from the relief of production both from the fines of present taxation and the blackmail of land speculation, would not wages rise quickly and high in all branches of industry?

With this liberty of labor to employ itself all the evils of "the wage system" would disappear, and free competition through the interplay of demand and supply would not only fix the returns of the various kinds and qualities of exertion with a justice and celerity to which the best efforts of any administrative bureau would be the clumsiest parody; but would determine the amounts and kinds of the various articles needed to satisfy the wants of society, and the relative values at which they should exchange, with a comprehensiveness, a nicety and a celerity which any general statistician or board of general statisticians, even though he or they possessed all human knowledge and all human virtue, could not hope to approach.

In concentrating effort on the recognition of equal rights to land, the new party is striking at the root of that unjust distribution of wealth which the socialists of the German school blame to the wage system, and of that tyranny which they mistakenly attribute to capital. But we do not propose to stop here. There are other monopolies than that of land, though they are less important, and we propose to break them all up. The kernel of truth in the socialistic demand that the state should manage and regulate all industry is that there are many things that already can be better managed or controlled by the community than by private individuals, and with the advance of society these are constantly increasing. While we aim at simplifying government by substituting a simple and efficient plan of raising revenue for the present costly, cumbersome, unjust and demoralizing method, and by cutting off functions for which there is no need, we propose at the same time to push forward in the direction of extending the co-operative functions of the state.

Let the socialists come with us, and they will go faster and further in this direction than they can go alone; and when we stop they can, if they choose, try to keep on.

But if they must persist in bringing to the front their schemes for making the state everything and the individual nothing, let them maintain their socialistic labor party and leave us to fight our own way.

The cross of the new crusade has been raised. No matter who may be for it or who may be against it, it will be carried on without faltering and without swerving.

HENRY GEORGE.

AN IMPORTANT DECISION.

The decision rendered by Justice Bradley of the United States supreme court, at Trenton, N. J., last Monday, is one of great importance to the advocates of the governmental ownership of railways. The case was one in which the state of New Jersey sought to prevent the Staten island rapid transit company from building a bridge across Arthur Kill, to connect Staten island with the main land in New Jersey. The work had been authorized by an act of congress, but the state of New Jersey insisted that this merely gave permission to cross the navigable water to be spanned by the bridge, and without the consent of the state the abutments could not be built on the New Jersey shore, or on the land under water belonging to the state.

Justice Bradley decides that the constitutional power of congress to regulate commerce is in no way dependent on the consent of the states, and he says:

We think that the power to regulate commerce between the states extends not only to the control of the navigable waters of the country and the lands under them for the purposes of navigation, but for the purpose of erecting piers, bridges and all other instrumentalities of commerce which in the judgment of congress may be necessary or expedient.

A railroad is certainly an "instrumentality of commerce," and if this decision of Justice Bradley, in which United States Judge Nixon concurred, shall be upheld by the supreme court, there can no longer be any constitutional question as to the right of the federal government to build, purchase or otherwise acquire the railroads.

Nor does this decision end here. The argument having been made that the state has the right of eminent domain while the United States have no such dominion over lands, the court declared that to admit such a contention would be to permit the states to frustrate the supremacy given by the constitution to the government of the United States, and it therefore gave the opinion that—

If it is necessary that the United States government shall have an eminent domain still higher than that of the states in order that it may fully carry out the objects and purposes of the constitution, then it has it.

This, if also sustained by the supreme court, completely equips the federal government with all the necessary power to build and operate a railroad from one end of the country to the other, and such power to build and operate a competing road is, of itself, sufficient to enable the government to secure any existing roads at a reasonable price without resort to drastic legislation or arbitrary power. This is the only solution of the railway problem, and the solution cannot long be delayed, if the

question, Shall the railways control the government or the government control the railways? is to receive an answer consonant with free institutions or the wishes of the people. The difficulties encountered in enforcing the inter-state commerce law already indicate that the powers conferred by the statute on the commissioners is insufficient, and this but prepares the way for going forward instead of turning back. In fact, as was remarked in THE STANDARD at the time of its passage, the chief value of that law was as a first step toward the ultimate governmental ownership of our railway system. Let no man be alarmed by the interested outcry that this would promote robbery and jobbery. No government officials will ever dare to steal such vast sums as have been taken from the American people by the irresponsible individuals who constitute the railway rings and syndicates that now control the system with an ever-increasing concentration of power in the hands of a few. The power to rob, to oppress and to cheat exists, and it is fully exercised. At the very worst, it can be no more outrageously used by government officials than it has been used by the men who now possess it.

The extracts that we print elsewhere, from a recent issue of the *Christian Advocate*, the leading Methodist paper of the United States, are significant, as indicating unmistakably the fast approaching turn in the tide of Christian sentiment regarding the anti-poverty reform. Christian teachers who but a few months since saw in the denouncing of private ownership in land nothing but an attack on the eighth commandment, are beginning to recognize the truth that the moral law which sanctions and protects the ownership of things in no way justifies the claim to monopolize the right to the use of that element from which alone things can be produced. The *Christian Advocate* still opposes the anti-poverty reform, but it does so on the ground of expediency only. It admits, impliedly, if not avowedly, that private land ownership is unjustifiable, but it is still unable to see how the abolition of that system would tend to the extirpation of poverty. It has abandoned positive opposition for negative. A little more study and observation will open its eyes to the truth.

At a recent meeting of the "Subway Board" Mayor Hewitt of this city proposed as an amendment to a pending motion, "that all men shall do unto others as they would that others should do unto them."

Such an utterance from a chief savior of society naturally created a sort of mild panic in the board, and President Hess asked the mayor "if he really wanted that put in." The mayor replied that he did; that the motion under consideration was a string of platitudes, and that he had added one more as an amendment.

A platitude is defined by Webster as "that which exhibits dullness; a weak or empty remark." It appears, therefore, that Mayor Hewitt considers that when Christ enunciated the golden rule He made a weak and empty remark, exhibiting flatness or dullness. Had Mayor Hewitt been present at the Sermon on the Mount he would probably have shouted "rats," or the equivalent Judaic expression, and gone home disgusted.

But the golden rule will yet become a living truth, the Hewitt anti-poverty society of one to the contrary notwithstanding.

The pro-poverty press gets off a good thing once in a while. Here is what a writer in the *Star* says about the federal government and the railways:

How absurd it is for sensible men in this country to urge that a federal government organized and equipped as ours is, and as Mr. George describes it in his united labor party platform, shall assume to manage the railways. For the men now, or likely to be, in the federal government to attempt to do that would be like the effort of the tail to wag the dog!

"True, 'tis pity; pity 'tis, 'tis true."

Something to Read and Preserve.

The *Independent* of this week publishes, under the title "The Story of Dr. McGlynn," a clear and succinct account of the persecution of the doctor from the beginning of the difficulties about his land league speeches up to the present time. It occupies nine columns. The account was prepared by W. T. Chesnut, and the *Independent* editorially publishes a note from Dr. McGlynn saying that he had gone over the article and that it faithfully follows the record and the documentary evidence, and brings out points that have been overlooked or forgotten. The author completely demonstrates that Dr. McGlynn was persecuted solely on account of his opinions on the land question.

The Eighteenth Assembly District Picnic.

The Eighteenth assembly district, united labor party, had a very enjoyable picnic at Brommer's union park, on Tuesday evening last. Among the guests were Dr. McGlynn and Dr. Curran, formerly of St. Stephen's and now of Saugerties. Dr. Curran made a few remarks, in the course of which he facetiously said that he appeared in place of Henry George, who was prevented from attending. Dr. McGlynn made an able address, and John McFadden and Frank Ferrall also spoke briefly.

The McGlynn Fund.

The publisher of THE STANDARD acknowledges the receipt of \$1 from John Gleason of Leadville, \$1 from George V. Williams of the same place, \$1 from Chas. O'Donnell of Freeland, Pa., \$1 from Martin Clance of Port Falls, Idaho, \$1 from Mrs. A. E. Bonn, 33 West Washington square, and 37 cents from J. A. H., contributions to the Dr. McGlynn fund.

Scattering the Good Seed.

NATIONAL HOME, Wis.—Package of papers, etc., arrived all right. I am scattering the good seed with calm trust that the life who numbers the very hairs of our heads will issue a good harvest.

A. D. CADY.

condense

In the
stitution
conceive
the inha
equality
ness such
There
racy than
and yet
Uti, Sch
the two
selves c
represent
citizens
in the op
the offic
This abs
the mos
unintern
Switzerl
luc aut
own regu
tion, so k
laws of t
dealing
churches,
poor. Th
local taxa
of indepe
its birth a
The lan
are call
that they
a restrict
situated
to a great
agricultu
of three
and culti
possess lan
and other
The comm
waste or
miserable
neglect a
managed
by the re
quire. All
in its man
great as o
land of t
fringes the
the comm
to the use
the first w
wood for
repairing
household
plements
summer p
which yiel
finally a
corn, pota
In many
land that
manured
is sufficien
table port
every soc
English ac
village of
excellent
and dip i
head of c
minal pri
port the
meet all
any tax.
Here has
ever been
not suffici
joyment c
from a f
frota time
bestuning
sary. Co
cession in
in a privi
share in t
It is the
original o
domain o
enjoy w
claves, in
side, wit
the comm
excluded
terially in
and there
commune
Reissens
called, ha
tion, betw
between
rights for
deavor to
be free, e
equal dem
established,
spirit of t
As there
results of
where the
have been
the simpl
firewood.
They may
some case
more, to
they pay
entirely e
ed to qua
the plots
Every
ancient tr
document
poration.
tion, while
the societ
deciding
with neig
parts of c
ambles c
for antic
streng, in
democrat
back into
nearly in
the age
They hav
novations
they hav
ing maint
of men
This leadi
form of
of human
The mo
their rich
in the sev
coring tr
not the se
turf and
group of
dark wa
to be a
ancient a
Be the
the pers
dustrial
cerves as
a hundr
The tow
occupier
varying
of beel
persons
usual la

