

## SLAVERY THEN AND NOW.

A broad-minded and warm hearted lady, the daughter of a man who did good service in the anti-slavery cause, at a time when to stand up against slavery was to incur obloquy and reproach, takes exception to some expressions she has met with in THE STANDARD, in which the results of that system of industrial slavery which comes from making private property of land are spoken of as in some respects even worse than that system of chattel slavery which prevailed in our southern states. She says:

In one particular only was the condition of the chattel slave better than that of the most degraded of the wage workers of to-day—he had fresh air, but that was owing to the fact that he was an agricultural laborer, and worked neither in mines nor in factories. In every other respect his state was worse. That it was not utterly intolerable was owing to individual benevolence; to the fact that men are often better than their class. The alleviations of industrial slavery are owing to the same cause. Witness the hospitals, asylums, reformatories, schools and charitable societies of all kinds, besides the private help which all but a selfish few of the rich extend to their poorer neighbors. The fact that much, perhaps most, of this aid comes originally from the pockets of the beneficiaries is true of both systems of slavery, and the fact that justice is preferable to charity is as true in the case of the black man as in the case of the white.

But let us put aside for a few moments the question of the material surroundings and physical condition of the two classes of slaves; let us think of them as human beings, not as animals; let us compare their mental and moral status, the chances for growth of their minds and souls. You yourself, advocating a higher standard of living for the wage worker, remind us that we "do not live by bread alone." The law provides for the education of the industrial slave; the law provided for the ignorance of the chattel slave; the law encourages religious societies for the one, forbade them for the other; the law protects the domestic rights of the first, denied that the second had any. Industrial slaves may associate, they may travel, they may agitate for their betterment. You will see from the extracts I will give later how impossible this was for the black slave of the south.

Then my correspondent goes on to recall that the experience of sugar and cotton planters proved it more profitable to use up a gang of negroes every seven or eight years than to work them moderately, and to quote the colonial laws of South Carolina which prohibited the working of slaves for more than fifteen hours a day, from the 25th of March to the 25th of September, or for more than fourteen hours a day for the rest of the year. She quotes the law of Louisiana, which declared that the master must give the slave one linen shirt and a pair of pantaloons a summer, and one linen shirt, a woolen shirt and a pair of pantaloons in winter, and for food a bag of salt and a barrel of Indian corn, rice or beans every month, while the law of North Carolina provided that a slave should have a quart of corn every day. She also quotes the law of Georgia, which gave the county courts authority to provide for infirm slaves suffering from neglect of their owners and to recover costs from the owners, calling attention to the fact that information had to be given by a white man and evidence taken of white men, and that if the judges granted relief that they could not prove was absolutely needed they had to pay it themselves. She quotes other laws of various states which show: That in some of them for some time only a pecuniary fine was inflicted for the killing of a slave; and that where the killing of a slave was made murder, exemption was made in the case of a slave dying under "moderate correction," (which was defined to be "whipping or beating with a horsewhip, switch or small stick, or by putting irons on or confining such slave;") or in case of any slave resisting his lawful owner or master, or of any outlawed slave. That a slave could be outlawed for running away and concealing himself, or for "killing a hog or other animal of the cattle kind" in order to sustain life. That for striking any white man, except in defence of his master or overseer or their property, a slave could be punished at the discretion of the justice for the first offense, and in some states for the second offense, and in others for the third offense, he could be condemned to death. That if a slave was found beyond his master's plantation without a written permission any one might inflict twenty lashes on him, and if he resisted, kill him. The same punishment might be inflicted if seven slaves were found walking or standing together in a road without a white man. That the punishment of whipping was prescribed if a slave was found carrying a weapon, hunting with dogs, harboring a runaway, loosening a boat or selling any article without a specific ticket from his master. She points out that no colored man could give evidence against a white man, so that any barbarity could be safely inflicted upon a slave if white men were not present. That except in Louisiana, where, under the civil law there was some small restriction upon the separation of families, husband could be torn from wife, and child from mother. That laws were enacted in many of the states to discourage the manumission of slaves, and that the most savage penalties were pronounced against the publishing or circulating of anything having a tendency of exciting slaves or free persons of color to insurrection or resistance.

In Georgia a law forbade any congregation or company of negroes to assemble themselves contrary to the law regulating patrols. And every slave taken at such meetings, by order of the justice, without trial, receive on the bare back twenty-five stripes

with switch, whip, or cowskin. In South Carolina the police were forbidden to break into any place of religious meeting before nine o'clock, provided a majority of the assembly were white persons; if not, every slave present was liable to twenty-five lashes of the cowskin. A planter of San Domingo objected that the belief in a future state should be taught the negroes, as "such knowledge is apt to render them intractable, averse to labor, and induces them to commit suicide on themselves and their children, of which the colony, the state and commerce have equal need." The legislature of Virginia passed a law in 1831, by which any free colored person undertaking to preach or conduct any religious meeting, by day or night, might be whipped not exceeding thirty-nine lashes, at the discretion of any justice of the peace. The same penalty fell upon any slave or free colored person who attended such meetings; and any slave who listened to any white preacher in the night time received the same punishment. The same law prevailed in Georgia and Mississippi. A master might permit a slave to preach on his own plantation, but only to his own slaves. North Carolina in 1831 passed a law which began: "Whereas, teaching slaves to read and write has a tendency to excite dissatisfaction in their minds and to produce insurrection and rebellion," therefore, etc., "teaching a slave to read or write, or giving or selling to a slave any book or pamphlet shall be punished by thirty-nine lashes if the offender be a free black, or by imprisonment, at the discretion of the court; if a slave, the offense is punishable with thirty-nine lashes on his or her bare back on conviction before a justice of the peace." Georgia and Louisiana had similar laws. In Virginia, Georgia and North Carolina white persons teaching any colored persons to read or write, gratis or for pay, were to be punished by imprisonment or by fine of ten to five hundred dollars.

My correspondent concludes by saying: The question of the abolition of property in man and private property in land are one, but in the condition of society the grosser form of evil is first swept away. Never, had chattel slavery remained in force, could the wage slave of to-day have drawn the attention of the world to his wrongs? And it behooves him to remember this, for he was not always and everywhere in favor of freeing his black brother from bondage.

With this I heartily agree. So long as the monstrous wrong which permitted one man to treat the person of another as his property was sanctioned by law and public opinion, it was hardly to be expected that public attention could be called to the monstrous wrong which permits one man to treat as his exclusive property the element on which and from which other men must live, if they are to live at all. The abolition of chattel slavery was not only a necessary preliminary to the abolition of industrial slavery, but by calling attention to first principles and stimulating the sense of natural rights, it gave an impulse which is now beginning to take shape in the anti-poverty movement—a movement which has for its aim the equal freedom of all men. And in these days when ignorance and selfishness so bitterly oppose the further advance of the spirit of liberty, despite the wrongs and horrors of negro slavery, it is well to remember that it not long since had not only the passionate support of the people of the south, but was acquiesced in by the great majority of the people of the north as well.

The coarse, brutal form of slavery which makes labor itself a subject of property is only advantageous to the owner where population is sparse and land is open. Where the available land is all "fenced in," where there is a body of disinherited men, who, though their right to their own power of labor is legally acknowledged, have no right to anything upon which that power of labor can be exerted—have no right, in fact, to as much of the earth as they may stand on or lie down upon, save as they buy from week to week or month to month permission to use it—then the possession of the passive factor of production, land, gives as efficient and much more economical a command of the active factor, labor, as the actual legal ownership of men, with all its incidental powers of restraint and punishment. Thirty years ago the owner of a thousand slaves in Georgia or Mississippi would be at this time of the year enjoying himself in a northern watering place or in Europe, living in luxurious idleness upon the difference between what the labor of his slaves produced and what he was obliged to return to them in the way of food, clothing, shelter, medical attendance, overseers to keep them at work, and expenses of recapture if they ran away. Chattel slavery has now been abolished in the United States, but men of the same kind are living in luxury at watering places or in Europe, without doing any work themselves, by virtue of the ownership of city lots, agricultural lands or mineral resources, for the use of which they levy toll upon the produce of labor. In the one case as in the other products and services are obtained without the giving of products or services in return. To extort the labor for which he gave no return and which enabled him to live luxuriously without doing any work, the slave owner of 1857 had the power to flog, to iron and to pursue with bloodhounds. The land owner of 1887 has no need of these powers, for he has all that is necessary in the power of eviction, and how sufficient is that power, where population becomes somewhat dense and land is all "fenced in," we may see from what it means in such countries as Ireland, where a sentence of eviction has, with little exaggeration, been said to mean a sentence of death.

The laws to which my correspondent refers as recorded evidence, direct or inferential, of the atrocities of chattel slavery, were necessary parts of the system which

gave to one man a right to compel another man to work for his benefit. The slave had to be kept in ignorance, had to be restrained in his liberty of association and movement, had to be denied the right to resist or to testify against a white man, and the master had to be given powers of coercion, whose abuse was testified to rather than prevented by provisions against manning, etc., in order to enable the owner of his power to labor (for it was this, and not the person, that the apologists of slavery declared to be the essential subject of ownership), to keep and utilize his property.

But in the form of slavery which results from the monopolization of land no such laws are needed. It is not necessary that the master should compel the slave to work for him, for the slave is driven by his own necessities to sue for permission to work. It is not necessary to provide precautions against his running away, and to make provision for his capture and return, any more than it is to stimulate his industry by the lash, when what the slave most fears is that he may be discharged. The difference between the two systems is precisely that between the method of highwaymen who should compel travelers at the pistol's mouth, or by personal violence, to give up all they had, and the gentler, but quite as efficacious method which might be adopted on a desert road of taking possession of the only well, and leaving the travelers when they came up, the liberty either to die of thirst or to give up all they had for access to water.

If the degradation and cruelty inseparable from the system of chattel slavery seem more striking, it is because the connection between wronger and wronged is closer and more easily recognized. In the master overworking or underfeeding the slave, whipping, chaining or chasing him with bloodhounds; in the slave trader separating husband or wife, or tearing child from mother, or in the slave girl compelled to yield to brutal lust, we recognize the suffering of one individual as the direct result of the wicked greed or passion of another individual, but the degradation and suffering which result from the system of appropriating labor by making property of the passive instead of the active factor of production, seem at first sight to be due, either to the faults of the sufferers themselves, or of their class, or to general causes which we no more associate with conscious human action than we do earthquakes, storms or droughts.

But whoever will trace effect to cause will see in prison and almshouse and brothel and lunatic asylum, in drunkenness and wife beating and baby farming; in the squalor of city slums and the dreary life of the struggling farmer and of the laborer who half the year is a tramp, in low wages and fierce competition for employment; in children forced to work in factory or coal breaker when they ought to be at play, and in all the vice and crime and bitter suffering that flow from poverty and the dread of poverty, the results of the wrong which makes that element on which and from which all must live the private property of some.

So far as the satisfaction of material needs go, the ordinary condition of the chattel slave of the south was better than that of large classes of so-called free laborers. The power of the owner to overwork, underfeed or maltreat the slave was modified not only by individual benevolence, but by selfish concern for the maintenance in good condition of a piece of valuable property, and by the sense of responsibility and proprietorship, and, in many cases, of attachment, which resulted from the directness of the relation. The chattel slave was lodged more wholesomely than are large numbers of free people in New York; he was not habitually underfed as are large classes of free people in European countries; the mortality returns of the south did not contain a column for deaths by sheer starvation as do those of the richest city of the world.

If the fact that there were on the statute books of some of the slave states laws prescribing a minimum ration shows at least the recognition of a danger that the chattel slave might not get enough to eat, what do the poor laws of Great Britain and the public and private provision that is made in our free states to keep people from starving indicate?

If the fixing in slave codes of a legal maximum for the day's work of the chattel slave indicated a danger that the cupidity of the master might overwork him, what do the laws in restraint of the labor of freeborn women and children indicate in regard to the tendencies of industrial slavery? Is it not a fact that free farm-laborers and even free farmers work, when the season permits, as long, and even longer, than the maximum allowed by these slave laws, and that for a bare living? Is it not a fact that in our cities and manufacturing districts men and women can be hired for the bare living which constituted the wages of the slave to work to the extreme limit of human endurance? Do not our various inspection laws testify to the notorious fact that the employers of free labor find it cheaper to use it up and hire fresh labor than to go to the expense of making sanitary provisions and guarding against accidents to life and limb? Is there an occupation so deadly or so dangerous that free laborers cannot

be found to engage in it for wages that give only a bare living? If laborers had been worth twelve or fifteen hundred dollars apiece the building of our new aqueduct would hardly have cost so many lives.

The worst atrocities of southern slavery are matched not only by the horrors of the penal contract system which has grown up since emancipation in many of the southern states, but by the revelations that now and again are made of the conduct of prisons and asylums in other states. And in brief chronicles of destitution, suicide, degradation and crime the newspapers of our great cities daily record the bitterest tragedies.

The very fact that the chattel slaves of the south belonged to a distinctly marked and, as they themselves were accustomed to think, an inferior race, and that they were denied education, made them less sensitive to the evils of their lot. Accustomed to live for the day, and without forethought for the morrow, they were exempt from that racking anxiety to keep "the wolf from the door," that horrible fear of losing a foothold and falling to a lower depth that tortures so many in the fierce struggle of what is misnamed free competition.

No one who has experienced, or who will take the trouble to imagine, the awful sense of hopeless desolation that overpowers the man or woman out of work, with no money, with no friends to help, and with no prospect of securing employment, can hesitate to admit that the physical torture which the slave owner had in his power to inflict was as a means of coercion hardly more effective than the mental agony to which the industrial slave can be subjected. Consider the oppressions practiced on women who work for a living, and consider why those oppressions are practiced and endured. On the one hand the employer is driven, by the fierce competition of his business rivals, to seek constantly to secure more work for less wages; on the other, the workwoman is whipped into submission by the stinging lash of fear, wielded by the specter of helpless want which constantly pursues her. It may well be questioned if southern slavery has any darker pictures than those drawn by Helen Campbell in her "Prisoners of Poverty."

But it is of little profit to compare the two systems of slavery, with any view of deciding which may be the worst. That which is gone was a rude system of robbing labor suited only to a sparse population and low stage of industry; that which is now developing with increase of population and improvements in the arts, is the system on whose overthrow depends the safety of modern civilization. And it is most instructive and encouraging to note that the same powers of press, pulpit, wealth and ignorance which are now arraying themselves against the abolition of industrial slavery arrayed themselves in the same way, and with the same arguments, against the abolition of chattel slavery.

As for the benevolence which alleviated the lot of chattel slaves, and sometimes made it a happy one, it is capable of doing harm as well as good in its efforts to merely ameliorate the conditions of those suffering under the present form of slavery. As Father Huntington says in his terrible article on tenement house morality, reprinted from the FORUM in THE STANDARD of July 2, "an increased number of the hardest workers in the cause of philanthropy are beginning to question whether all our charitable agencies and institutions, by making the lives of tenement house people just not intolerable, may not be actually increasing the evils they are organized to redress."

And it is certain that all forms of eleemosynary relief, even to the fresh air excursions which, originating here, are now being organized in other cities, are largely destructive of the sense of independence and self respect which the chattel slave did not possess, but which is the foundation of all the virtues of the free citizen.

In its society column the JOURNAL says: A new and most praiseworthy fad has seized upon fashionable society this summer, or at least the matron portion of it. This is to invite one, two or half a dozen children from the slums of the city to spend a time at their country houses.

The Newport villas are entertaining a number of these little Arabs at the present time, and there are many scattered about at the seats in Westchester and on Long Island. These children are rarely taken into the bosom of the family, as are the Fresh Air Fund excursionists, but are given over to the care of the gardener and his wife and provided liberally with good food, baths and fun.

The venerable John Jay has entertained a small army of these poor mites since spring. Mrs. Jacob Lorillard, who also has a place in Westchester, has opened her doors, and at Newport Mrs. Parson Stevens, Mrs. Frederic Vanderbilt and Mrs. Wilson are a few among the many who have shown their charity in so excellent a way. A groom is generally sent to entertain and watch the small boys, while a maid takes care of the feminine portion of the party. The fashion is a pretty one, not expensive to people of wealth, and commands itself highly to all those who have any idea of what the babies of the poor suffer during the warm weather.

This pleasant and fashionable "charity fad" may enable the rich to still their consciences by imagining that they are really doing something for the poor; but it may also have some other tendencies. It is like taking little chattel slaves out, giving them a taste of freedom, and then returning them to bondage. HENRY GEORGE.

## WHY THEY HATE HIM.

## A TRUE AMERICAN IN 1870 AS IN 1887.

What Dr. McGlynn Said to a "Sun" Reporter About Parochial and Public Schools—Mr. Preston as Poor an Exponent of True Catholicism Then as Milford True Catholicism Now.

New York Sun, April 30, 1870.

Dr. McGlynn is opposed to Catholics or anybody else making application for state aid to any separate school or charity. He is sure that the Rev. Mr. Preston did not express the Catholic view on this matter of state denational schools; and the Rev. Mr. Preston has since admitted in a public letter that his view on this matter is not necessarily the Catholic view. Dr. McGlynn did not mean to assert that Catholics do not wish to unite secular and religious education. On the contrary, he knows that all Catholics and all good men do wish to unite secular and religious education; but a great many Catholics, as well as the great majority of the people of this country, do not believe that religion and arithmetic must necessarily, under all circumstances, be taught in the same room and by the same person. He does believe that our public schools are one of the chief glories of America, and that they should be made institutions where Christians and infidels, Jews and Gentiles, may alike send their children without their being insulted by any book or prayer or hymn that is to them a badge of the ascendancy of a sect, and without fear of any sectarian bias whatever. He does believe that an infidel, a Jew or a Mohammedan has the same rights in our government as any one else has; and he deprecates the effort to keep the Bible and prayers and sectarian hymns in the schools, and the attempt to put Christianity and the Bible into the constitution of the United States as utterly un-American and fanatical, and as an attempt to unite church and state, which should be strenuously resisted by all lovers of pure religion, as well as all lovers of the country. He does believe that public education, paid for by public moneys, should be in the hands of seculars, and not intrusted to religious orders as such, for the reason that this, too, would be a union of church and state, and for the other very good reason that the state should exercise the right of strict examination, inspection and control, and the immediate supervision of all institutions which it pays for, and to this the religious orders would not submit. He does believe that the works that are most imperatively demanded of religious orders here are those works of spiritual and corporal mercy to which they are especially pledged by their vocation.

Dr. McGlynn did not particularly desire to have religious orders teaching in Sunday schools. As a matter of fact, while there are in his parish seven sisters of charity engaged exclusively in works of charity, they do not teach in the Sunday school, and have never been asked to do so.

Dr. McGlynn spoke of a bill which was passed in the assembly this year, but which met with opposition in the committee of the senate, the object of which bill was to protect the liberty of conscience of children in asylums, houses of refuge, etc. But a leading senator thought that there was no room for this act of justice, while they were so busy in granting or maintaining appropriations as favors. Dr. McGlynn said that it had been hoped that a leading member of this year's legislature would have introduced, and that members of both parties would have aided, the passage of a bill, the object of which would be to take the matter of sectarianism and its consequent theological bitterness and threatened dangers out of the field of politics, if possible, at once and forever. But legislators of both parties were probably too busy in buying, selling and bartering to find time or inclination for such an act of justice and statesmanship. In fact the putting of a stop to this matter of doing favors, in the shape of appropriations, would perhaps take away too much of their stock in trade. The intended measure had the cordial approval of influential Catholic clergymen and laymen, who would like to see some such measure incorporated into the constitution of every state of the union; and it is to be hoped that the people will demand from the politicians some such just and statesmanlike measure. It would be substantially as follows:

1. Forbidding appropriations of school funds to any but common schools.
2. Forbidding the reading of the Bible, or any other distinctively religious book, all praying, worship and singing of religious hymns, in common schools.
3. Forbidding magistrates to commit to any but public prisons, asylums, etc., any person who is charged with a crime.
4. Repealing all existing laws by which appropriations are made to any but public institutions, and forbidding legislature counties, cities, towns and villages, to donate any property or to sell or lease it at lower than market values, or to donate money for the payment of assessments, or for any other purpose, to any church or to any school, college, asylum, hospital, etc., or to any institution of charity, correction, or learning, which is not the property of the people and under the exclusive control of officers of the people.
5. Revoking existing appointments and forbidding future appointments of chaplains, whether salaried or not, in any public institution, and forbidding compulsory attendance at or joining in any prayer, worship or religious service or instruction in any public institution, and forbidding any insult to the faith or religious convictions of any inmates of public institutions or pupils in public schools.
6. Granting all reasonable facilities to citizens and clergymen of all denominations to visit public institutions of charity and correction to impart religious instruction or consolation or administer religious ordinances to those of their own faith or those who may freely desire it.

Reporter—Is it your intention to get up a parochial school in your parish?

Dr. McGlynn—No. It would be a sort of spiritual luxury, which I would think it absurd to attempt to supply while we are suffering so sadly from the want of necessities. Archbishop Hughes thought that 1,000 souls were enough for the care of one priest. Now, we have perhaps 25,000 souls in our parish. I should like first to get and support the 25 priests; then we should build some two or three more churches in our parish; next I would provide better than we are doing at present for the poor and suffering, particularly children, who are in the greatest danger of losing both faith and morals; and, last of all, if at all, would I provide for the schooling of children of parents who are able and willing to provide for them. I would rather business rather than mine to procure and pay schoolmasters.

Reporter—Are Catholics desirous of taking the Bible and all sectarianism out of the public schools?

Dr. McGlynn—Yes; the Catholic church, as a body, is committed by its highest authority in this country to that policy. It is sufficient to quote from the late council of Baltimore, signed by all our bishops, and approved by the pope, pp. 423, 424.

As often in books in use in the schools there are things which are hostile to our faith, and place our doctrines in a false light, and distort history, the welfare of religion, the right education of youth and the honor of our country demand a remedy to so great an evil. As it is certain that in most of the states public education is so conducted that it is made to serve the interests of the sects, so that the minds of Catholic children are gradually imbued with their principles, we admonish pastors that they should spare no pains in looking to the Christian and Catholic education of children, and should watch diligently to prevent their using the Protestant bibles and reciting and singing the prayers of the sects. Therefore they should be vigilant in guarding against the introduction of such books and exercises into the public schools. They should everywhere resist these sectarian efforts with constancy and moderation, and endeavor to obtain the necessary remedy from the authorities.

Reporter—Are priests in favor of taking children away from the common schools when they have no parochial schools in their own parish, or when the parochial school is inadequate to accommodate their children, or when they have no other school to go to?

Dr. McGlynn—I should hope that the priests, if any, who advocate so absurd a practice are very few indeed. At all events, it is quite sufficient to quote against them the preceding extracts from the council of Baltimore, which clearly imply that Catholic children are going and will go to public schools, and make it the duty of pastors to take an interest in the schools, and to secure in them the rights of conscience of Catholic children.

Reporter—Does the council of Baltimore commit the church to the state denominational system?

Dr. McGlynn—No. It requires priests to exhort the people to support them by generous private contributions.

Reporter—Do you intend to give a lecture on these subjects in your church?

Dr. McGlynn—No. I did have some intention, not of delivering a lecture in St. Stephen's church, but of simply instructing our people in an ordinary sermon upon what the council of Baltimore lays down in this matter, and upon our duty to protect the rights of conscience in public schools and public institutions. But this I think no longer necessary, and anything more than this that would touch upon politics, and upon points controverted among Catholics, would be out of place in the pulpit, which should be sacred to the preaching of the faith and charity of Christ.

## A Letter from the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost.

WATCH HILL, R. I.—I am on the shelf for a few weeks out of the fight—but oh how my blood boils at the damnable injustice done Dr. McGlynn by mock priests in the name of the sham of religion. Not that it will do him or our movement any harm, but oh, the atrocity of it! That men wearing the livery of the Judean carpenter should do in His name to another what was done to Him. Bah! How hard it is to keep one's religious balance. I do not know where real Christianity is preached except in the Anti-poverty society. The fight is on! Count on me through good fortune and ill. I should be ashamed to live and afraid to die if I did not fling all my little might into the conflict. O, but it is glorious to live and not be old in such a day as this. The Samter gun has been fired!

Yours faithfully, HUGH O. PENTECOST.

## Tax the Income Back.

ST. LOUIS, July 12.—We are a nation of freemen, and yet our laws vest in certain citizens the power to levy taxes on the whole community under the name of rent. These privileged citizens call this rent their income. It is not their income; it is the people's income. There is no sentimental "goodly goodly to the poor" enthusiasm in this language and none intended, and if the working classes or anybody else don't understand it it is because they are not as smart as landlords, who understand it only too well. That is why they "boom" real estate and western towns and cities. That is why they hire the daily press to "boom" their land, and that is why they don't boom the Anti-poverty society. Now, as a simple remedy for all this, let us turn round and tax our income back. C. E. TURNER.

## An Anti-Poverty Excursion.

The executive committee of the Anti-poverty society is arranging for a grove meeting, to be held at Oriental grove, Long Island, on Saturday, Aug. 13. A steamer, three tugs and four barges, with a carrying capacity of six thousand, have been engaged to transport the members of the society and their friends to the grove. Oriental grove is situated on the sound, about twenty miles from this city, and is a most beautiful place. About ten acres are thickly wooded, with a large open country back of it. There is a large dancing pavilion for the young people, a long line of beach for bathing, a ball playing ground and all facilities for thorough enjoyment. The committee proposes to have personal control of all the departments connected with the excursion, and they will see to it that all who attend will have an enjoyable day and at reasonable prices. Details will be printed hereafter.

## The Fourth in Kansas City.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—The trade and labor societies celebrated the Fourth of July with the largest parade held in this city for years. Appropriate literary exercises were held later in the day at a picnic, which about 5,000 persons attended. John S. Crosby, a well-known lawyer, was orator of the day. He spoke on "The Relation of the Government to the Labor Question." He showed that the solution of the land question would at the same time solve the labor question. The audience listened very attentively and the marked applause evidenced the deep hold which the land question has taken upon the working people of Kansas City. T. G. J.

## Delegates from the Seventeenth.

At a meeting of the Seventeenth assembly district association of the united labor party on July 14th, J. H. Magee, J. K. Sullivan and Robert Hamilton were elected delegates to the Syracuse convention, and Charles A. Young, Adolph Goetz and John Savage alternates.

## Organizing the Farmers.

CHICAGO, July 12.—I have been in the rural part of northern Illinois during the past few days and I find the farmers more dissatisfied with the present state of affairs and present taxes than any other class. I shall try and organize the farmers in some districts. E. F. BURROUGHS.



## ANTI-POVERTY.

## NOT WEATHER DOESN'T CHECK THE NEW CRUSADE.

An Enthusiastic Meeting, With Louis F. Post in the Chair—Father Huntington Declares the Causes of and the Remedy for Poverty—A Speech from Henry George.

Sunday, July 17, was one of the hottest days of the heated term. New York fairly sweltered, and the excursions to the country and the seashore were unprecedented. But the heat made small difference to the Anti-poverty society. The usual crowd was gathered in front of the Academy of Music before 7 o'clock, and the usual rush followed when the doors were opened. In the topmost gallery, where the heat was most intense, vacant seats were to be found; but elsewhere the house was crowded.

In opening the meeting, Chairman Louis F. Post said:

Father McGlynn—(great applause)—was to be here to night, but they sent such a pitiful call for him from Philadelphia that we had to let him go. And he is preaching anti-poverty there to-night to an audience that crowds the theater, I have no doubt. But we have left with us a real prophet (applause), and a real missionary has volunteered to speak to us also. (Applause.)

A short time ago I heard a young man say that honest poverty is a good thing. He was just out of college. I suppose he had heard some one say that; some professor must have told him. However he got the idea, he had it—that poverty was a good thing. There are some people—and young men just out of college often belong to that class—who believe everything they are told. (Laughter.) You have even heard old men in the country, who, when anything they say is challenged, retort that "they seen it in print." (Laughter.) There are many people who always believe what they see in print; and many young men who believe just what every old fogey of a college professor may say. There was an old Dutchman on the witness stand once. He was told to go on and tell his story. After he talked a little while, the lawyer on the other side—the wrong side, of course, (laughter)—thought the witness was saying something he did not know. "How do you know that?" he asked. "My wife told me." "We don't want to know what your wife told you; tell what you know yourself." The witness went ahead, and after a while he was in the middle of a story he couldn't possibly have known anything about. "How do you know that?" asked the lawyer again. "My wife told me." He was set right and went on again and again was interrupted with, "How do you know that?" "My wife told me." "Now look here, Mr. Witness," said the judge, "suppose your wife told you the heavens had fallen, what would you think?" "Well, I think they was down." (Laughter.) That is the way with young college men sometimes.

The man that sits back in his easy chair on the front porch and looks out on the men at work and thinks of the teeming millions struggling day after day to keep the world going undoubtedly has good reason to believe that poverty is a good thing—a lever of civilization. (Laughter.) Old John Randolph of Roanoke used to describe a patriarchal picture. It was a beautiful picture of a patriarch surrounded by dependent relatives and slaves, but the criticism that was made of this picture of John Randolph's was that he always pictured John Randolph as the patriarch. (Laughter.) Young men who think that honest poverty is a good thing never picture themselves as the honest poor. (Applause.) They never themselves want to be that kind of a lever of civilization. I remember an old story of slavery times. A colored man had run away from Kentucky to Ohio. We had a beneficent law in those days that picked up a piece of property that had run away and ran him back. (Hisses.) Well, this piece of property was brought before a judge, who investigated the case before a judge, and he said to the man, "Now look here, why did you run away?" "Well, massa, kase I want to be free." "Bad master, I suppose?" "No, massa mighty good ole man." "Didn't you have good clothes?" "As good clothes as any nigger down there." "Didn't have a good house?" "As nice a cabin as you ever see." "Not enough to eat?" "Not enough to eat in old Kentucky! I reckon I had enough to eat." "I don't understand it. You had a good master, a good house, good clothes and plenty to eat. Why in the world did you run away?" "Well, massa, I done felt that situation open. I reckon you can get it if you want it." (Laughter.)

If rich people like poverty, let them try it and give the other fellows a rest. (Applause.) We do not think it necessary to have poverty in the world. We don't think it is a good thing. But anybody who thinks it is a good thing is at perfect liberty to indulge his taste. We are not trying to snake one man out of the slough of poverty under our institutions. As soon as you get one man out a dozen others will fall in. We propose to dry up the slough so that nobody can tumble into it. (Great applause.) We propose to do it by making men free and letting them get rid of poverty themselves.

We have no use for anti-poverty societies of one. A good recipe for success in business under the pro-poverty system—under the system of anti-poverty societies of one—is this: In the first place, you want to keep your family in a good moral atmosphere. Let them go to church and observe all the proprieties. Be careful of that. Then be true to your friends. Then, in the third place, keep out of the penitentiary. After that you can do what you please. Once in a while an anti-poverty society of one slips up on the third principle. One did the other day. (Laughter.)

When I was out in Pennsylvania last week my attention was called to a peculiar fact there. They have got the whole earth under a great big hole, as large as this building, will go down forty or fifty feet. Well, this happened, in many instances, where I was and the rain fell into the holes and then froze. Some of the miners thought they would like to abolish their poverty, so far as ice was concerned, and they determined to gather that ice. But the man who owned the hole that the ice was in (great laughter)—mind you, he had never seen the hole, didn't make it himself, didn't make the earth around it, didn't put the water in, and didn't freeze it when it got there, although he owned it all the same—he sent word to these men—he never had seen them, never does see them—that they must pay so much for every ton of ice they took out of the hole. Consequently they are in a state of poverty in the matter of ice. The ice was there last winter. They would have saved it up. They had all the means, but they couldn't get the permission of the man who owned the hole. (Laughter.) The ice wasn't worth anything to him. It remained there, and as summer came it rotted and melted away. The ice wasn't of any benefit to anybody, simply because the man who owned the hole wouldn't allow it to be taken out. That is a perfect illustration of our industrial system. (Applause.) As the ice was, or

would have been, of use to the men in the coal regions, so are all the bounties of God withheld to all men. (Applause.) Those men wouldn't have been in poverty in the matter of ice this summer if they had not been prohibited from taking the ice and melting it; any man willing to work he is in poverty to-day in the matter of any form of wealth if he had the opportunity of going to the earth to take its fruits. (Applause.)

We are going to put an end to all this. (Great applause.) We are going to put a tax on the value of ice in holes. (Laughter.) The tax assessor will say, "You are going to charge men so much a ton for the privilege of taking ice! Well, as soon as you get it, we are going to take it away." Anybody can then go and take ice, and nobody will be poor in the matter of ice. And wherever there are places where ice is valuable, where people will pay for the privilege of taking ice, they will pay it over to somebody, and that somebody will have to pay it over to us. That is our plan, a perfectly simple one. It is so simple they all see it, and naturally enough pro-poverty people don't want it.

In that region of Pennsylvania, men who are living in poverty to-day could build themselves houses, could dig coal, could absolutely live in comfort if they did not have to pay for the privilege of working. They dig forty, fifty, and sometimes a hundred tons of coal a day for less than the value of a single ton. (Applause.)

Now, I am going to read a set of resolutions that were adopted by the Progress and Poverty club here:

Whereas, The Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn—(applause)—has been excommunicated for teaching a doctrine which the illustrious Thomas Malthus, bishop of Meath, has without doubt, disapproved, advocated, namely, that "the land of a country belongs to all the people of that country"; and that involuntary poverty in the midst of plenty is not the intention of the Creator, but is entirely the result of human enactments; therefore,

Resolved, That we will strenuously oppose him in his effort to elevate humanity, and to give to every man his equal right in the bounties of nature, by preaching and working for "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." (Applause.)

The chairman then introduced the Rev. Father Huntington as one whom the Anti-poverty society had already learned to esteem and love. The tempest of applause that greeted the reverend gentleman's appearance showed how lively was the sense of his services to humanity. Father Huntington said:

Mr. Chairman, Brothers and Sisters—I remember when I was a very little boy in my father's house, seeing an old colored man sitting one evening on the stairs of the entry. His name was Joshua Hanson. He was a well known character. During the latter part of his life he was engaged in running off troops of slaves across the border. He had been a slave once himself. Being a hard working man and unusually quick, he had made various gains with his masters that he should be allowed to earn something over and above his usual services, and he had earned enough to pay for himself and to buy his liberty under three different masters, and then he was taken back into slavery again. (Laughter.) He used to say that after he had bought himself three times he thought he belonged to himself as much as he did to any other man. (Laughter and applause.)

My friends, there are workmen in this country who have paid for themselves not three times but thirty times, and they do not belong to themselves yet. (Great applause.) Why?

Let us go over the principles once more. We can not go over them too often. We have got to give them to every day to people that are so far behind the times that they still think the doctrine of Henry George is that all the land should be divided into little pieces, and each one should take a slice.

In order to have the things we need for our life and comfort we must have two elements, the land and the labor to put on the land. Look around this hall. What is there in this hall or the stores along Broadway, what of the things you see, that hasn't come out of the land one way or another? There isn't a single article here, not one, not even the clothes you have on, that has not come from the land. If you are going to live on fish you have got to have the land to grow the trees to build the ships with which to go out and catch the fish. (Applause.)

The land is the great reservoir of the things we need for the development of the body and mind. No one but believes there is enough there to supply more than the whole population of the world to-day wants, and yet beyond this in the earth lie unknown, unimagined treasures ready to be brought forth at the touch of labor for generations yet to come. All that is necessary is the talismanic touch of labor and the earth will yield her best, her richest gifts. (Applause.)

God could have put us in a world so small and overworked that it would have been just a terrible scramble with one another to see which would get the little there was, and then it would indeed have been "the devil take the hindmost." No! God could not have done so, because He is God, and He has not done it. (Great applause.) There is plenty to eat and drink and wear, and plenty to cover us from cold and shade us from the heat, and it is all in the earth.

The other element is labor. God has so ordered things in our present life that in the sweat of our brows we shall eat our bread; but that labor need not be exhausting or degrading; it need not leave us after a few years warped and bent, and awkward with the powers of mind and body God has given the reward of the labor of all would be a sufficiency for all. There is plenty of land, there is plenty of power to labor. Put the two together, and the result will be what God intended, abundance for all needs of our complex nature that can be met by material goods.

But that result can be hindered in one of two ways. God has made us beings with free will and power of choice to settle in some measure our own destinies in this world. If we choose to defeat His purpose and thwart His goodness, we can do so and ruin the harvest we have sown; if we choose to do His will, we can be free and strong and holy.

Now, with that power of free will men can hinder the purpose of God in fitting labor and land to one another in two ways.

A number of men may get hold of labor by declaring that they have a right to the bodies of men; that they have a right to make other men use their powers to minister to their own advantage and comfort. Then you have slavery. Certain men have taken that element of labor in their own hands, and they are defeating the purpose of God just as far as they are choosing. They do no labor, and they misuse and misapply the labor of others. Slave labor is indefinitely less productive than free men's labor.

There is another way in which the same evil can be wrought; it is going on now. This way is by getting hold of the other element land, so that men can not reach it and bring forth from it what God meant should be brought forth from it. I ask you if that system is not defeating the purpose of God to day as truly as slavery defeated the purpose of God thirty years ago. Is not that the rea-

son why working men have to buy themselves over and over again? and after all they are industrial slaves at the end. (Applause.)

Take any number of men in the world, put them on the land—put them there with their bare hands, without tools or machinery; let that land be fruitful of grain and all manner of herbs, and contain iron and other metals beneath the soil; let there be an abundance of water and showers in due season—then those men, a hundred or a thousand or many thousands, can work and get possession of the things that God has put in the earth for them, and live and grow in the image of God. But either hold men in slavery or hold the land from them by ownership, and those men can be starved to death, no matter what they may do. (Applause.)

Now then, what do we propose? What is the simple, evident way to set both these elements free, so that the result God intended may be brought about? Make men free and the land free, and then you have what God intended should be. (Applause.) And to do that you have not to go and do anything so foolish as to try to chop up the land into pieces. All that you have to do is to take the value of the land and apply it for the use of the community. Then the land is not the property of owners who can shut it out from labor, or hold labor back from it; but then land is free—open for labor to do its work upon. That is the simple way—a tax upon the value of land, according as the value is made by the community—a tax laid upon the value according to the full rental value of the land.

You can hold your titles to the land, you can call it yours if you like, but as long as the community gets the worth of it, the worth that has been created by the labor of the community, and not by the individual living on the land; as long as the community is drawing its revenue from the land for its own purposes, that land is to all purposes free for man to work upon and to draw forth the things that God has placed there. (Applause.)

And how plainly this shows that this is no gospel of idleness, no scheme for one man to get the fruit of another's toil! Remember land is not actually useful when labor, toil, is applied to it. Men cannot live on dirt. And if the earth is to furnish them with food, they must plow and harrow, and sow and reap. Men are not made to live in caves; and if the earth is to furnish them with habitations, they must dig foundations, and build, and frame and join. Trees do not cut themselves down, iron does not smelt itself, coal does not rise to the surface or break itself for use; these operations are left for the hands of man, and the forces of nature he has harnessed for his service.

I want thus simply to state what it is we are aiming at, so that not only here, but in stores, and offices, and counting rooms, and in the streets, we can have it clearly before us ready for discussion. We must look this great fact in the face, that land is not free because it is held in ownership by those who shut it out from the labor of mankind. That is all plain. We all understand that; but the question that comes, not here when we are all alive with enthusiasm, and when the electric current is flowing from heart to heart, but when we go home and have a fit of the blues or meet some one cleverer than ourselves, whose sophistries we don't see how to answer—the question that rises then is, "Will it ever be that land will be the property of the people and labor can be laid upon it so that the land will yield her increase and the seed will bear its fruits for human needs?" "Can it be done in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

Bear with me, my friends, those of you, my brothers, who hold not the faith that I do, who perhaps have been driven from that faith by the persecutions and errors of those who have claimed to teach it, bear with me if I say that the reason why we shall succeed is because the principles we set forth are only a fresh enunciation of the gospel of Jesus Christ. (Great applause.) Remember, Christianity was not always what it seems to many of you to-day. If it had been, it would never have conquered the world; it never would have won its way against ten persecutions until it reached the throne of the Caesars. Christianity once was the clear declaration by one ringing voice in Galilee, in Judea, in Jerusalem, the ringing declaration of two great principles—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. (Tumultuous applause.) The message that was carried from the lips of the living Teacher, the message that went forth far and wide as the apostles took their journey east and west and north and south, was simply those two principles preached by working people, preached by ignorant people, preached by people who had none of this world's power or wealth to push their way, but who went about just to talk to others. That is all. What a foolish thing to do when the heathen world was gathered under one firm hand! What a foolish thing to think that that heathen power could be beaten down; that those heathen religions could be crushed and pulverized! What a strange thing to believe that those warring elements, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, ever could be brought to believe in the brotherhood of man! (Great applause.) Whoever could think that the professors of all those warring beliefs, with their countless gods and goddesses and deities and divinities, could be brought into one fellowship, acknowledging one God as the father of us all! But it was done! (Great applause.)

And if it was done in the first century of the Christian era, it can be done in the nineteenth too. (Applause.) Will you tell me that the truths we are now setting forth of Christianity are not a fresh setting forth of Christianity? If you do, I believe that those warring elements, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, ever could be brought to believe in the brotherhood of man! (Great applause.) Whoever could think that the professors of all those warring beliefs, with their countless gods and goddesses and deities and divinities, could be brought into one fellowship, acknowledging one God as the father of us all! But it was done! (Great applause.)

And if it was done in the first century of the Christian era, it can be done in the nineteenth too. (Applause.) Will you tell me that the truths we are now setting forth of Christianity are not a fresh setting forth of Christianity? If you do, I believe that those warring elements, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, ever could be brought to believe in the brotherhood of man! (Great applause.) Whoever could think that the professors of all those warring beliefs, with their countless gods and goddesses and deities and divinities, could be brought into one fellowship, acknowledging one God as the father of us all! But it was done! (Great applause.)

And if it was done in the first century of the Christian era, it can be done in the nineteenth too. (Applause.) Will you tell me that the truths we are now setting forth of Christianity are not a fresh setting forth of Christianity? If you do, I believe that those warring elements, Jew and Gentile, Greek and barbarian, ever could be brought to believe in the brotherhood of man! (Great applause.) Whoever could think that the professors of all those warring beliefs, with their countless gods and goddesses and deities and divinities, could be brought into one fellowship, acknowledging one God as the father of us all! But it was done! (Great applause.)

And, my friends, when you remember what has passed in these last three weeks, do you not feel the full force of the words, "Blessed are ye when men shall persecute you and revile you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, and cast out your name as evil and separate you from their company, for the Son of Man's sake, for yours is the kingdom of heaven." (Great applause.)

Of course that is very different from what the pro-poverty press says; but in the progress of every truth there are three stages. The first says "it is absurd." The next says "it is impious." The third says "everybody knows that." (Applause and laughter.) We have got to the second stage now. By and by you will see the papers say of the tax on the value

of land to the full extent of the rental value, "everybody knows that." (Applause and laughter.)

Now, we have only got to the point where they say "it is impious." It is against the Christian religion, "it is dead against the Bible." "And it is against the Catholic church." They do not say it is absurd now. They have got through with that. (Applause.) We are on the right road. What we have to do is to hold fast to our fundamental principles, which are the principles of the only true Christianity the world has ever seen or ever will see. Take one of them—the brotherhood of man. We believe in it so thoroughly that much as we have to say against the misused power of wealth, yet we declare that these rich men are our brothers, and we mean to treat them as such. We believe in the brotherhood of man. We are not against the rich, though they do not believe it, you know. (Laughter.) They may not care to own the relationship, or even shake hands with us as we come from our work; yet they are our brothers. We will own them if they disown us. I do not think there is much reason for us to envy these rich brothers of ours. Who here, for example, who in this Anti-poverty society, who would be a boodle alderman? (Applause and laughter.) I think we ought to exercise a great pity for them, poor, idle people, as many of them are, narrowed by their riches, cramped and held down by their gold and silver chains, struggling in the net of business competitions, prisoners of wealth, not daring to look truth in the face or speak it to their fellows, uneasy defenders of an effete and crumbling system. I do not think we need feel any envy of them at all.

If they were using their faculties as God made them to use them, they would be a great deal happier. And it is to give them a chance to do that—to realize something of the joy of the honest worker, the free man, cringing to none, condescending to none—that we carry on this movement. (Applause.) Some day perhaps they will see that, and bless where now they curse. And, after all, you know, the rich—a good many of them—are just as poor as paupers. (Laughter.) A while ago, if a man had a hundred thousand dollars he was a rich man. He is not now. He has to work like sixty for fear he will go to a poor house (laughter), unless, indeed, his property is on Manhattan island, and then he needn't work at all. The rich are grinding under a sense of the possibility of want. A boy said to me the other day, "It makes me shiver all over when I see the poor, wretched tramps in the street, and feel that I might become like them." And what will that boy do with the fear of want haunting him? He will say: "Come what will, I must secure myself; I must make money." Then will come the struggle for wealth, and then the love of it, and at last the frugal boy will be the fevered man, burning with the greed for gold, clutching at it with his dying hands and gloating over it with his dying eyes. That is the result of the present system on the rich. (Applause.) Are we not owning the brotherhood of man when we strive to save our brothers from that doom? Are we not acting in the spirit of the Master's words, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that "enthusiasm of humanity" that has won its way in the face of this tremendous power of wealth and oppression, in the face of all this organized greed and corruption; can we possibly gain our point?" And now, in answer to that, I say we have all history to tell us that it can be done and shall be done. (Great applause.)

church. And once more will shine forth the power of Christianity, the power of unselfishness, the triumph and victory of the cross. (Applause.)

It is coming! Old men who can read the signs of the times tell you it is coming. Men come up to me in the street and grasp my hand and say, "It is coming," and hurry on about their work. The bells are pealing out in great meetings like this and far over the land—

"Ring out the old, ring in the new,  
Ring in the loyal man and free,  
The larger heart, the kinder hand;  
Ring out the darkness of the land,  
Ring in the Christ that is to be."

If you are faint-hearted, if you go back on what you know to be the truth, you will have no comfort or peace. But if you are patient in bearing your witness to the truth, if you get hold of these principles and tell them again and again wherever you go, you will have the triumphant reward. Why couldn't you talk to nine people and get them to see a little daylight on this subject? Suppose those nine go each one to nine more, and so on, how long will it take before we get the whole country? Just four times. You have got forty thousand, then four hundred thousand, then four millions, then forty millions, (great applause) "and all the boundless continent is ours." That is the way it was done in the beginning. Three thousand one day, five thousand a few weeks after, and so on. That is the way it will go on now, through the lips, and words, and lives of every one of you that chooses to stand up for what you know to be the truth, and know to be the truth that has conquered once and will conquer again, and will conquer finally and forever at the last. (Applause.)

The day of the Lord is at hand, at hand,  
The clouds roll up the sky,  
A nation sleeps starving on heaps of gold,  
All dreamers toss and sigh.

When the pain is sorest the child is born,  
And the night is darkest before the morn  
Of the day of the Lord at hand!

Gather you, gather you, angels of God,  
Chivalry, Justice and Truth,  
Come, come for the world has grown coward  
and old;

Come down and renew us, ye Youth,  
Freedom, Self-sacrifice, Mercy and Love.  
Stoop to the battle field, haste from above  
To the day of the Lord at hand!

Gather you, gather you, hounds of hell,  
Famine and Plague and War,  
Idleness, Bigotry, Cant, Misrule,  
Gains and fall in the snare.

Hirelings and mammonites, pedants and  
knaves,  
Crawl to the battle or sneak to your  
graves.

In the day of the Lord at hand!  
Who would sit down and whine for a lost age  
of gold,  
With the Lord of all ages at hand?  
True hearts will leap up at the trumpet of  
God.

And there who can suffer, can dare!  
Each past of age of gold was an iron age,  
Too,  
And the meekest of saints may find stern  
work to do.

In the day of the Lord at hand!

But remember that the stern work must be  
giving with yourself, in honest self-sacrifice  
and suffering for the cause of the truth, for  
the cause of your brothers, for the cause  
of the cross of the new crusade. (Tumultuous  
and deafening applause.)

Miss Munier then sang Edward Mortimer's  
song, "Soggarth Aroon," which was received  
with enthusiastic applause, the audience re-  
fusing to be satisfied until Miss Munier had  
favoured them with "We Want the Earth,"  
and also with a repetition of the first verse of  
"Soggarth Aroon."

Mr. Post then announced that the Anti-poverty  
society would hold a business meeting at  
Irving Hall on Thursday evening, July 21. The  
president of the society (applause) will preside,  
and a full report of the work of the society  
will be made to its members. "On the 13th of  
August," he said, "this society is going out  
into the country; it is going on an excursion  
to Oriental grove. Full particulars will be  
given next Sunday night; but I can tell you  
in advance that the price will be fifty cents.  
So we will not only have a good time, but  
something over for the work of the society."

"And now, having appealed to your intellects  
and your hearts, we propose to appeal to  
your pockets. The proprietors of the pro-  
poverty press think we ought to carry on this  
crusade with nothing; but the proprietor of  
this hall does not think so. (Laughter.) He  
comes down regularly for his money. It  
costs over \$2 to hold this meeting. So you  
see, if the collection amounts to less than \$200,  
the outside work of the society is retarded to  
that extent. It is a great work that these  
meetings are doing right here in this hall. If  
we only paid expenses we would be doing a  
great work; but we ought to pay for work  
outside. This outside work is carried on with  
the surplus of our collections here, to a  
greater or less extent, according to that sur-  
plus. Be as liberal as you feel you can be in  
your contributions to-night. Bear in mind  
that you want to pay not only the expense of  
this meeting, but a little more to carry the  
gospel to the heathen. (Applause.)

"Bear in mind that every cent is expended  
in the most economical way. As a result of  
our work, we find anti-poverty societies  
springing up all over, not only in cities like  
Philadelphia, but in small hamlets, where  
they form anti-poverty societies, not of one,  
but of four or five or more."

The following telegram was submitted to  
the audience, and received hearty assent:

To the Chairman Anti-poverty Society Meeting,  
McCullough's Opera House, Philadelphia, Pa.:  
Our thousands here send you greeting.  
On with the new crusade!

The chairman then said: "We have now to  
listen to the 'Prophet of San Francisco,' as  
he has been called. (Great applause and  
cheers.) We do not need any introduction,  
and you know, after he is through, he will  
answer any questions that may be asked."

Mr. George, who was received with deafening  
applause, said:

My friends, I sat here last Sunday night at  
that great meeting with a feeling of solemnity.  
It seemed to me a most important and signifi-  
cant occasion. At last the issue had been  
made. At last the line had been drawn. At  
last the heaviest condemnation in the power  
of the ecclesiastical authorities (hisses, groans  
and howlings) had been thundered, not merely  
at the priest of the people, but at the cause of  
the people. (Great applause.)

There was in that great meeting a fitting  
response to it. The issue was met; the chal-  
lenge was accepted. From that time dates  
the beginning of our victory. (Uproarious  
applause.) The mightiest force in the world  
is now clearly and fully arrayed upon our  
side. As Father Huntington (applause) has  
said here to-night (applause), it is indeed  
the hour of Christianity against the perversion  
of Christianity. (Applause.) And I know,  
that this movement is taking clearly and decisively  
a religious phase that is bringing to some of  
us who have lost our faith a new and a firm  
consciousness of divine truth; a feeling that  
in this struggle we are on the side of all that  
is good and true, and that we are working in

our little way with a power that is mightier  
than that of man. (Applause.)

I was asked some years ago to address a  
congress of the Episcopal church upon the  
question, "Why workingmen do not go to  
church?" and I told them it was because the  
church had turned its back upon the working  
men. (Great applause.) It was because the  
church in all its branches and all its denom-  
inations, discarding the teachings of its  
founder, had become a mere prop for tyranny,  
had become a defense for all wrong and mo-  
nopoly (a voice: "That is as true as you live");  
had become a barrier of conscience, a justifier  
of wrong and a barrier against the realization  
of the God-given aspirations of men. (Ap-  
plause.)

That eighteen centuries after Christ died  
the so-called Christian world is full of misery  
and suffering and death, that the so-called  
Christian world the God that is really most  
worshipped is mammon; that the nations of  
so-called Christendom, armed, most of  
them, to the teeth, are maintaining even in  
what they call peace an industrial war  
against each other; that the hand of individ-  
ual is against individual, as that of nation  
is against nation, is due to nothing else than  
the failure of those who have called them-  
selves the ministers of Christ to teach Christ's  
truths. (Great applause.)

And as I listened here last Sunday night to  
that grand enunciation of the primary truths  
of Christianity—to that declaration of Dr.  
McGlynn—(deafening applause)—that man,  
whether he be high priest, archbishop—(hisses  
and groans)—or pope—(hisses and groans)—  
could cut him off from the church of God—  
(Great applause). A voice: "They can't do  
it." That declaration that the highest and  
most binding authority is the authority of  
conscience; that promise to hold to his faith,  
to go forward, whatever might come, unfail-  
ingly; and as I heard the response that  
went up from this vast audience, I believed,  
indeed, that a revival of true Christianity had  
come. (Great applause.)

Man needs a religion. But to-day that, all  
over the civilized world, so many men have  
turned away from the forms of religion, that  
so many men, in the bitterness of their hearts,  
have even made warfare against the most  
consoling of truths—the truth that there is  
above us a benevolent Creator, the truth that  
there is beyond us another life—is due to  
nothing else than what we see in this case,  
that the power of the ecclesiastical machine  
—(hisses and groans)—the power of church  
organization, has been turned







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 post office in the United States, to whom liberal terms will be given.

THE STANDARD is for sale by newsdealers throughout the United States. Persons who may be unable to obtain it for a favor, please publisher by notifying him promptly.

Sample copies sent free on application.

SATURDAY, JULY 23, 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.

STONES FOR BREAD.

A correspondent forwards us a communication on the social situation recently sent by him to the *Congregationalist*, together with a letter from the Rev. Dr. H. M. Dexter, giving the reasons which induce him, as editor of the *Congregationalist*, to decline publishing the communication.

Dr. Dexter's letter is interesting, as defining tersely the views, not only of the manager of a prominent religious journal, but of the vast majority of the Christian clergymen, on a question which he and they acknowledge to be of surpassing interest to humanity.

"We have again and again," says Dr. Dexter, "argued for the righting of the wrongs of labor; we have many and many times rebuked the rapacity of the rich. You say that we have never had any remedy to propose—except by safely dealing in abstractions—for the poor man's hard lot, when we have habitually insisted that the one only sufficient remedy for all social evils is the application to all the affairs of life of the golden rule. You say we have uniformly condemned strikes; the fact is we have uniformly declared that the laborer has a perfect right to strike so far as to withhold his labor for a given party for given wages. What we have condemned has been his assumption by violence to prevent other persons who are willing to work for the wages he rejects for doing so. You say we have indiscriminately condemned trades unions, laborers of labor, and the like; the fact being that we have affirmed the perfect right of laborers to combine in that manner so long as they confine themselves to peaceful and proper behavior, without undertaking to compel other workers to hold the views and practice the measures which they hold and practice. Whoever lives long enough will see the history of the Knights of Labor and of similar organizations now existing written with the honest confession that they have harmed the cause they were intended to benefit more than all the oppression of the capitalist."

Dr. Dexter's letter brings to mind a cartoon published some years ago by an English comic paper. This cartoon represented a poorly dressed and faded looking woman calling upon a prosperous, fashionable physician. Accompanying the woman was a young girl whose pinched and drawn face showed that she was not long for this world. The physician was saying: "My good woman, I have examined your daughter carefully, and find that while she is in no immediate danger, there is decided need of care and caution. I advise a generous diet, with three glasses of old port daily. Take her to the seaside for the summer, and by all means let her spend the winter in Italy or Madeira."

The humor of that cartoon lay in the prosperous doctor's evident ignorance of the fact that for the vast majority of his fellow creatures a generous diet, a summer at the seaside, and a winter in Italy were as much out of the question as a voyage to the moon. Dr. Dexter reminds us of that physician because he proposes a remedy for social evils which, under existing social conditions, is absolutely impossible of application. And it is precisely this attitude of the clergy that renders modern Christianity the lifeless, sapless thing it is; that has replaced the eager multitudes who listened to the teachings of the founder of Christianity with the slender congregations who observe the outward forms of religion at stated times, and banish all thoughts of religion from their daily lives.

The golden rule! The precept that bids each man love his neighbor as himself and do unto others as he would they should do unto him! Let Dr. Dexter look around him and see for himself what chance men have to follow it. Let him descend from platitudinous generalities and tell how the golden rule shall be enforced in individual cases.

Pick up the first newspaper that comes to hand. Here in a daily paper of July 14 is the story of a lawsuit for \$8.34 brought by a woman whose business is to make button holes at eighty cents a hundred. Wretched pay, isn't it, Dr. Dexter? Softly though, the story isn't told yet. The woman is described as comfortably dressed, with gold earrings and massive rings. She doesn't make the button holes herself at eighty cents a hundred. She hires other women to do the work and pays them so much less than eighty cents a hundred as to make a handsome profit. Talk of the golden rule, Dr. Dexter, to the man who pays eighty cents a hundred for making button holes; or to the woman who hires other women to make button holes for less than eighty cents a hundred; or to the women who by actually making button holes for starvation wages keep other women out of work and force them to choose between starvation and sin; or to the people who buy the garments whose button holes are made at eighty cents a hundred. Talk to these people, Dr. Dexter, and learn how little influence the platitudinous papping of the pulpit has upon every day life and

action. The woman who buys those garments will tell you that love for her neighbor is all very well, but she owes a duty of economy to her husband and her children; the man who sells the garments will tell you he might as well go out of business and lie down and starve as to pay higher prices for work than his competitors are paying; the middle-woman will wonder from what asylum you have escaped; the poor, starving wretches who do the actual work of button hole making will ask you if you want them to face the alternative of starvation or sin, that their sister-women may be relieved from it.

Do you know, Dr. Dexter, that there are at this moment in this city of New York thousands of women, many of them perilously young and attractive, who have been "laid off" for the dull season by the great bazar stores, and left to get through the summer as best they can? Do you know what "as best they can" means to many of these women? Do you know that they were worked hard through the winter and spring, spurred to greater zeal by the hope of steady employment, and then thrown into the street without a day's notice? Do you think, Mr. Dexter, that the employers of those girls have treated them as they themselves would wish to be treated? Do you not know that they can't treat them as they themselves would wish to be treated without the risk of business disaster? Do you mean to say that when the Christ whom you preach formulated the golden rule he meant that it should be impossible for men to observe it?

Look at the coal mines of Pennsylvania, Dr. Dexter. Read in the New York *World* of July 15 this terse summary of the situation, written by a *World* reporter on the spot after full investigation:

The barons are now complete masters of the situation. The men are slaves. Every form of extortion is practiced with impunity. The laws are defied. Fenry and squalor reign triumphant.

Did Christ die for these miners over whom "penury and squalor reign triumphant," Dr. Dexter? Are they men toward whom all other men should practice the golden rule? Doubtless you will say so. And yet the coal barons who were rich at the cost of these poor miners' penury are, many of them, subscribers to your paper, and have read your exhortations to observe the golden rule without the faintest idea that what you said had any application to them, save as urging them to subscribe to a mission fund, or donate money to a charity. Did you mean those exhortations to have any effect on the treatment of miners by coal mine owners? Have you ever gone to an individual coal mine owner and told him: "These miners are your brothers, and unless you treat them as you would like to be treated yourself, you will surely be damned?" That would be insisting, in your own words, "that the one only sufficient remedy for all social evils is the application to all the affairs of life of the golden rule." But were you to talk in that fashion to a coal mine owner, he would, if he condescended to answer you at all, point out to you that a strict following of the golden rule would result in anarchy and chaos; that he paid these poverty stricken miners wages at which he could secure plenty of men to take their places; that to pay them more would only be to enable competing coal mine owners to drive him out of business; that supply and demand must regulate the price of labor as of everything else; finally, that the duty of a Christian minister is to preach religion and not interfere in secular affairs, and please stop his paper. And you would find it mighty hard work to answer him.

Look around you, Dr. Dexter, and consider the case of the men and women, your brothers and sisters, for whom, you tell us, Christ died on Calvary, and whom—if indeed the golden rule is a living precept to you—you love as you love yourself. Do you see the tenement houses? do you see the hovels? do you see the liquor saloons? do you see the brothels? do you see the prisons? do you see the little children's graves? Tenement houses, and hovels, and saloons, and brothels, and prisons, and children's graves are growing more numerous year by year, and they must be filled to overflowing; it is only the churches that go empty. Our social system will not be denied; the poverty monster must and will have his victims. As in some devilish lottery, every man and woman that comes into the world must draw the bean and abide the chance. Think you that under such circumstances man can love his neighbor as himself? can risk misery for himself and his family by doing unto others as he would they should do unto him? Dare you say, Dr. Dexter, that you yourself can do it? Dare you tell any individual man what the golden rule really means and threaten him with eternal damnation if he, individually, fail to observe it? If you saw impending over some woman near and dear to you the awful doom that today impends over tens of thousands of women, your neighbors, whom God made and Christ died for, would you content yourself with babbling platitudes, with urging Christian fortitude and tame resignation? If you would, truly your soul must be in evil case.

Dr. Dexter, to men circumstanced as we are in this nineteenth century of Christianity, such preaching as yours is but the crackling of thorns under a pot. You bid us apply the law of Christ to our lives, and when we point out to you that our whole social system is founded on a denial of that law; when we urge on you that the law which society repudiates, the individual cannot possibly observe; when we entreat you, in the name of the Master whom

you are vowed to serve, to aid us in righting the monstrous wrong which has brought poverty into the world and compels men to damn their souls that their bodies may live, you turn contemptuously aside and are as one that mocketh.

What would you think, Dr. Dexter, of an earthly father who, leaving his children for a time, should make piteous provision for their comfort, and then give to one or two among them the right to claim that provision as their own exclusive property, to be doled out or withheld from the others, as the favored ones might see fit? Could such a father observe the golden rule? Would not the disinherited ones become the slaves of the more fortunate, and the fortunate become the tyrants of the slaves? Would not lying and stealing and evil speaking and envy and hatred abound? Yet such an earthly father would be but an antitype of the heavenly Father in whom modern Christianity asks us to believe. Is it any wonder that churches should be empty?

God has made marvelous provision for the comfort of his children during their sojourn upon this earth. Soil, and air, and sunshine, and water, are ever ready, needing but the combining touch of man's hand to be quickened into fruitfulness. Coal and oil and metals without stint are buried in the bowels of the earth, waiting but the hand of man to pluck them forth and convert them into things of use and beauty. Giant forces of incalculable power stand ready to be harnessed for the service of mankind. Unnumbered millions of men might dwell here happy and contented, without strife or hatred or aught but loving kindness each for the other; and passing away, leave undiminished means of enjoyment for their successors. But on every field, on every mine, on forest plain and tumbling cataract, some individual man has laid his clutch, impudently claiming that God made that land for him, and that his fellow men have no share in the bounty of the Creator, save only as he may choose to give it them. And, therefore it is that men stand idle in the market place, and women seek for bread in brothels, and little children perish from the earth like flies uncounted and uncared for, and every man's hand is raised for himself and against his neighbor, and the devil of poverty takes the hindmost, and the golden law of Christ is but a pretty saying, to be devotionally spoken on Sunday, and laughed to scorn on Monday, and Christianity is dying at the root.

A priest, whom a prelate is beseeching God to damn, and whom thousands of the plundered poor pray night and morning that God will preserve and bless, has said of the anti-poverty movement that it is the gospel of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We earnestly entreat the Rev. Dr. Dexter and all other clergymen to ponder the meaning of these words; to consider whether such a brotherhood of man as Christ had in mind when he laid down the golden rule is possible so long as men are taught to regard God as a partial stepfather; and we warn them that, if they neglect to do so, whoever lives long enough will see the history of their churchy organizations "written with the honest confession that they have harmed the cause they were intended to benefit."

OUT OF THE MOUTH OF AN ENEMY.

The *World* has investigated the labor movement in politics for the benefit of its constituency of politicians. Its investigation consisted of interviews with men of prominence in the labor movement, each of whom was requested to answer a series of questions. To the first question, "Do you and organized labor in your section favor independent political action at the fall elections this year?" fifty-nine replies were in the affirmative, four in the negative and five non-committal. To the second question, "Would you hold a national convention for the purpose of thoroughly organizing your party? If so, before or after the elections this year?" twenty-four replies favored the holding of such a convention before the elections this year, twenty-three after, and three opposed a national convention until the states were organized. To the third question, "Do you favor a labor nominee for the presidency in 1888?" sixty-six replies were in the affirmative, three opposed and four non-committal. The opinions as to which of the two old parties the strength of the new movement will be derived from indicate a general belief that about seventy per cent will come from the democrats and thirty per cent from the republicans.

The most important question was: "What, in your judgment, are the great issues which demand a new party?" To this the replies were various in form, but significantly uniform in substance. Said one, "The great issues are land, labor, money and transportation;" said another, "The great issue underlying all others is the moral right of the whole people to the use of the land, upon which and out of which they must live;" another writes, "The Clarendon hall platform is the best;" and another, "The great issue demanding a new party is the land question." Of 68 persons interviewed, 51 declare for the doctrine of the land for the people. Of these 51, only 9 are from New York and Brooklyn; from Albany, Troy, Middletown, Binghamton and Auburn, there are 1 each; and from Buffalo, 2; from Newark and Trenton, N. J., 1 each; from Altoona, Erie, Mauch Chunk, Johnstown, Harrisburg and Pittsburg, Pa., 1 each; from New Haven, Danbury and New London, Conn., 1 each; from Providence, R. I., 1; from Manchester, N. H., 1; from Cincinnati, O., 1; from Vincennes and Elkhart, Ind., 1 each; from Chicago, Springfield, Peoria and Jacksonville, Ill., 1 each; from St.

Louis, Mo., 1; from Parsons, Kan., 1; from Denver, Col., 1; from Des Moines, Creston, Grand Rapids and Burlington, Iowa, 1 each; from Holland and Battle Creek, Mich., 1 each; from Minneapolis, Minn., 1; from San Francisco, Cal., 1; from Portland, Ore., 1; from Covington, Ky., 1; from Baltimore, Md., 1; from Charleston, S. C., 1, and from Houston and Galveston, Tex., 1 each.

When it is remembered that these opinions come from all sections of the Union, and that the persons interviewed were picked out by a newspaper that hates the land movement as "the devil hates holy water," these figures are wonderfully significant and encouraging.

THE TARIFF AND LAND MONOPOLY.

Edward J. Shriver contributes to the June number of the *Political Science Quarterly* an interesting and valuable article entitled "How Customs Duties Work." He reviews the promises made by the advocates of protection, and shows that they have not been kept. He says:

America is no longer the promised land for the laborer; for of the swarms of immigrants we have attracted many cannot find work. Meanwhile stocks of unsalable goods accumulate until the pressure forces out enough establishments to check the supply. Not one of these things should have happened under a system of protection, according to its friends, and at least one would not have been prophesied by its enemies—that manufacturers' profits should have decreased, although the prices of their goods are only slightly reduced.

That the protective system has not benefited labor has for some time been growing more and more apparent to workingmen. It does not keep up wages nor assure steadiness of employment. It plays no part whatever in that lowering of the price of food which is the only advantage enjoyed by the workingmen as an offset to the reduction of their wages. So far as the products of the protected industries themselves are concerned, it has, Mr. Shriver shows, done but little to reduce prices, and yet he insists that the profits of the manufacturers, who have used their united influence to maintain the system, have steadily fallen. Here, then, is a demonstration that neither capital nor labor profit by the tariff to an extent at all comparable with the burden that customs taxes impose on consumers, and the question naturally arises, who does get this great sum drawn from the pockets of the whole people?

Mr. Shriver answers this question conclusively. He shows that while home competition prevents either labor or capital from securing any extravagant returns from the various processes by which crude materials are adapted to human use, that the extra price caused by the tariff runs back by a kind of economic law of gravitation to the starting point—that is, the earth—and there remains. It is the mine owner who reaps the benefit of the higher price of iron and coal, and, by a similar process, the possessor of the forest enjoys the final advantage of the tariff on lumber.

Mr. Shriver says: When we compare the selling prices here and abroad of such highly finished goods as nails, stamped ware, elaborate castings, agricultural instruments and the like, we find but little difference, for in these the chief cost is labor, and this is cheap in America because daily wages are high. But the nearer we come to the ultimate raw material, the closer is the correspondence between the rate of duty and the higher range of domestic prices. Analyze the various items which go to make up a ton of pig iron—the first crude, unmanufactured stage—and the mystery is solved. The ore, the coal, the limestone, which are the only elements entering into the cost of a stove or a kettle that nature gives, and whose quantity cannot be increased or diminished by any fiscal policy, are sold to the furnace man, who smelts them into pig iron, for just as much more per ton of iron that they will produce, as he will receive for that same ton in comparison with his competitor abroad.

That is to say, the monopolizer of natural opportunities takes the lion's share of the taxes wrung from the people in the shape of increased prices. The competition between laborers prevents labor from getting it; the competition between manufacturers prevents them from retaining it; but in natural opportunities there is practically no such competition, and the land owner enjoys nearly the whole advantage.

This is no matter of mere theory. Its truth has been practically illustrated before the eyes of the existing generation in the United States. Within a few years great deposits of iron and coal have been developed in Alabama, Georgia and Tennessee and other southern states. The deposits are as rich as those of Pennsylvania, and it was gleefully announced by those engaged in "booming" the new region that labor was much cheaper there than in the north. What was the result? Did the general price of iron throughout the country suddenly fall? Did the price of labor in the southern mining regions suddenly rise? Were the profits of capital engaged in iron production in the south enormously augmented? No; none of these things happened. The only effect was a swooping down of land speculators on the favored region. The prices of land ran up as if by magic, and even non-mining land, destined, it is supposed, to be occupied for residential purposes by the throngs of expected operators, has gone up in value so that the increase in rents must shortly deprive the region of its boasted advantage of "cheap labor." Could there be a clearer demonstration of the truth that the private ownership of land concentrates not only all natural, but all artificial, advantages acquired by the people as a whole in the hands of a few?

That low paid labor is not necessarily cheap labor is now confessed by many of the most conservative political economists, but a practical illustration of the truth of the statement was recently given by a southern cotton manufacturer in a conversation with the writer of this article. The manufacturer said that he obtained nearly

all bosses and foremen from the northern states or Europe, and had, of course, to pay the northern scale of wages to induce them to come. The great body of the workers, however, are, he said, southern whites and their wages are lower than those paid in the north. "Does that not give you a great advantage in competing with northern mills?" he was asked. "Oh, no," the manufacturer replied, "Our people are not so skillful as the northern operatives and the latter really turn out more yarn or cloth for the money paid them than ours do."

But there is one class of Americans that ought to read Mr. Shriver's article with peculiar interest, and that is the farming class. No effort has been spared to delude these people into the belief that their interests are those of the land monopolists, and for years many of them have had dust thrown in their eyes to prevent them from seeing what the protective policy means for them. When they once comprehend that that policy has failed to increase the purchasing power of labor employed in manufactures; that it has failed to materially reduce the price of manufactured goods which they buy, and has lowered the price of food, the commodity that farmers sell, they will see plainly that the American farmer is the worst sufferer by the protective policy. Seeing this, and seeing at the same time that the mere monopolist of the land, as such, profits by this policy, the farmer will begin to comprehend that he has nothing in common with the land monopolists, but that his salvation lies in the rescue of labor and capital from the grasp of monopolies of all sorts. Having seen this, he cannot fail to see that the concentration of all taxation on land values must benefit the working farmer. So far as the mere total of taxation in dollars and cents is concerned it will not be increased for him. His house, his barn, his stock, his farming implements, and all that he buys for consumption are now taxed either directly or through the tariff, and the aggregate of such taxation is greater than the aggregate that would fall on the value of his bare land under the new system. On the other hand, the markets of the world, in which his selling prices are now fixed, would be open to him for purchase or barter, while the revived and permanent industry of the naturally rich regions of our own country—now paralyzed by the monopoly of natural advantages and of publicly created values—would give him such a home market for his products as he has never enjoyed. It matters nothing about prices, but he would be able to get more shoes, more hats, more clothing, more implements, and more luxuries for a given number of bushels of wheat than he now can get, and he could live a prosperous life and face death without fear that his children should not have an even better opportunity than he had himself enjoyed. He has often been told in the past that too much wheat has been raised, but there has never been a time when there were not hungry and unfilled mouths on the earth—mouths hungry and unfilled simply because the hands accompanying them could find nothing to do. The labor party, the land reform party, the anti-poverty party—call it what you may—proposes to put an end to this by putting an end to land and other monopoly, by taking for the whole people those taxes now levied by Pennsylvania coal mine owners on labor and capital and these enormous increases in land values, recently seen in the mining regions of the south, and always seen in great cities. This once accomplished the American farmer will be among the first to profit by a system that protects his interests as a laborer and a capitalist, even though it may dispel any dreams he may have that the lottery of fortune may some day place in his hands the price of a sudden increase in the value of his land.

OHIO WORKINGMEN AND MR. FORAN.

Press dispatches represent that the labor unions of Ohio are making a strenuous effort to induce the democratic state convention at Cleveland to nominate Congressman Foran for governor. What is thus represented as the action of the unions is doubtless only that of "labor politicians" who assume to speak for the unions. It will bother any man in or out of a union to point out the benefit that labor would derive from such a nomination. Mr. Foran is one of the men who have achieved political success by the mere expression of sympathy with workingmen. He is a member of one of the two old parties that are prone to express such sympathy, but to neither of which can the toiling masses reasonably look for any really wise legislation. It is said that this democratic convention at Cleveland will pass a resolution by which "the rights of the laboring classes to organize will be recognized, and their efforts to secure an amelioration of their condition by legislative enactments encouraged." Such talk is as cheap as it is meaningless. Parties must be judged by their acts, and the last act of the Ohio democracy was to send Mr. Payne, the Standard oil monopolist, to the United States senate. His colleague, John Sherman, equally illustrates the slavish devotion of the republican party of the state to the powers able to contribute money for purposes of political corruption.

Mr. Foran is a man who urges workingmen to remain in one of these two parties, and who opposes with bitterness any attempt on their part to organize a party that will represent the masses instead of the classes. There are, unfortunately, a good many workingmen who have fallen into the habit of looking at politics from the Foran standpoint, and they think that the end and aim of political activity by workingmen is to arrange a deal that will place a few "friends of labor" in office leaving untouched and uncared for the conditions that crush an ever-increasing number of laborers into hopeless industrial slavery. If the movement in behalf of Foran really has any support from inside labor unions, we may rest assured that it comes from this class of workingmen.

Such men have no lot or part in the real political labor movement of to-day, and the sooner this is made plain to such people and the politicians who dicker with them the better it will be for all concerned. Of course workingmen have a perfect right to hang on to these discredited methods if it pleases them to do so, but such people have no right to speak for the sincere and earnest men who believe that the time has come for forming a new political party which shall aim, not at merely ameliorating the condition of the wealth producers, but at so radical a change in the existing conditions that labor will be assured of the possession of the wealth that it produces, not as a matter of concession and favor, but as its absolute and undeniable right. Such a party has already been formed. It is no combination to secure fat offices for a few, but an organization to recover the rights of all. It will name its own candidates and try to elect them, and such arrangements as Ohio democrats are seeking to make in behalf of Mr. Foran will not have the slightest effect on the action of the new party. When the politicians of the old parties once learn this they will be relieved from much embarrassment and save considerable money.

Maurice J. Power is quite a philosopher. He tells a *Tribune* reporter that the labor party will die as the causes of the poor people's discontent are removed. "Their irritation," he says, "is the direct result of physical causes." What a power of wisdom is here! "They haven't enough room," continues the sage of the county democracy. "They never had!" he adds. There is something amazing in the faculty politicians sometimes display for going to the bottom of things. It would be difficult to state the anti-poverty platform more tersely and truly. "The irritation of the poor is the direct result of physical causes! They haven't enough room! They never had!" There you have the whole question in a nutshell. Well, if Power and Croker and Corrigan and the rest of them will continue in their present policy, it will not be long until the poor have all the room they want. There is plenty of it. All that is necessary is to tear down the parchment fences that crowd the poor into the slums while there are miles of open space even in so thickly populated a city as this.

A million soldiers fought in the rebellion for the land of their birth or adoption. How many soldiers can freely occupy any of the land they fought for?

To enable *Tribune* readers to keep abreast with the news of the day, it is necessary to state that a meeting of the New York Anti-poverty society was held at the Academy of Music last Sunday night, which was addressed by the Protestant monk, Father Huntington. The house was crowded, and the auditors were enthusiastic.

A rumor having got abroad in Berlin that an attempt on the life of the Emperor William would be made during his journey to Gastein, a fictitious imperial train was dispatched ahead of the emperor's train. This was after the plan of the potentate who made his slaves try all new food to see whether it was poisonous. Much of the same order was the testing of the public scaffolding in Westminster abbey before the "nobility and gentry" of Britain were allowed to risk their lives upon it. It is said that when the scaffolding was completed the workmen were assembled upon it, and at a given signal, made to execute a simultaneous jump. The scaffolding stood firm, and the safety of the peerage was assured. Had something given way, and the common fellows gone down in a mass, doubtless a special thanksgiving would have been intruded into the jubilee service for that God Almighty had so signally preserved the lives of the nobility.

"The masses rather than the classes," says the *Herald* in referring to our real estate boom, "are clearly bound to be the greedy purchasers of all the land they can acquire in the city of New York." Quite true. But the masses can't acquire any. The prices are too high.

A few weeks ago the pro-poverty press made a great ado over the refusal of the painters' union of this city to admit a man named Lang to membership. The ground of objection was Lang's bad character. A savior of society, with more of hatred for the union than of love for Lang, thereupon procured him a situation in a private house, where he promptly organized himself into an anti-poverty society of one, and proceeded to abolish his own poverty by impoverishing his employer. He tripped up, however, in one of the essentials of the lone-hand Anti-poverty society by getting found out, and now he is in Sing Sing.

Two or three anti-poverty societies of one pooled their issues in Bridgeport, Conn., last week at a joint business meeting held in a jewelry store. The meeting adjourned early in the morning, having reduced the poverty of the societies in attendance by the aggregate sum of \$15,000.

In a neatly bound and handsomely printed little volume, entitled "The Margin of Profits," issued by Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons, Mr. Edward Atkinson of Boston describes a novel style of cooking

stove, or, which he... The fe... is the su... a comple... material, every he... of cook... terior of the outsi... precise... atmosphe... Mr. A... tion the... of its ex... the follo... dinner ex... pendit... kerosene... Ten p... leg of m... grouse; f... pudding; customa... sundry v... cost for f... Mr. A... after dea... epitaph, p... how on the g... ing his s... statistics cookery... be a big... tion on l... deserved p... how field of v... The R... mail on... Francis... Satan's c... tion att... like a s... victim b... approach... his disgr... assumes... This is... rigan, b... Fact 1... Simeoni... tion of... Archbis... Give o... vited to... in writin... utteranc... been at... he disab... with him... Fact 2... New Yo... table di... The p... archbis... Dr. M... act con... was her... by not c... the sup... system, by slay... in. In o... gone to... have be... go to R... Supp... Francis... from t... bring d... on som... not, vl... Of th... remark... includi... facture... what l... in grov... among... wife's c... The l... strikes... of the... neers o... the str... railroad... enginee... been in... weakn... dealing... increas... be suc... large... lauded... other... any k... ing the... of the... can c... quiesce... this is... skill re... tive en... trades... wide o... bility t... on the... may be... The... ner mi... terest... worth... ing la... ments... "rules... is enfo... Penns... of a fa... ments... family... paid... ing f... to \$1... averag... all en... struck... vance... paid i... determi... and ti... only h... enoug... and fi... bundr...



stove, or, more properly, cooking oven, of which he is the inventor.

The feature of Mr. Atkinson's invention is the surrounding the cooking oven with a complete wall or box of non-conducting material, so that the utmost power of every heat wave is utilized for the processes of cookery. While the water in the interior of the oven may be at boiling point, the outside of the apparatus remains of the precise temperature of the surrounding atmosphere.

Mr. Atkinson has christened his invention the "Aladdin" cooker, and in evidence of its extraordinary economy, he submits the following list of viands, composing a dinner for sixteen persons, prepared at an expenditure of less than two quarts of kerosene:

Ten pounds of sirloin of beef; ten pounds of leg of mutton; four pounds of halibut; four grouse; four pounds of fish; a large apple pudding; three loaves of bread, full size—the customary family loaf; three loaves of cake; sundry vegetables, not measured; the whole cost for fuel being between five and six cents.

Mr. Atkinson expresses a desire that after death his monument should bear the epitaph, "He taught the American people how to stew." We congratulate him on the good sense he has shown in diverting his mind from the study of fanciful statistics to the practical problems of cookery. His "Aladdin" cooker ought to be a big success, and the proposed inscription on his tombstone will doubtless be well deserved. In teaching the American people how to stew, Mr. Atkinson has a wide field of usefulness before him.

The Rev. John B. Pendergast hit the nail on the head in the church of St. Francis Xavier last Sunday. He said that Satan goes about sometimes as a roaring lion attacking openly and at other times like a serpent in the grass, stinging his victim before he is aware of the enemy's approach. "But the most dangerous of his disguises," said the priest, "is when he assumes the form of a child of God." This is a serious reflection on Dr. Corrigan, but it is true.

Fact No. 1.—In January last, Cardinal Simeoni, prefect of the sacred congregation of the propaganda, telegraphed to Archbishop Corrigan:

Give orders to have Dr. McGlynn again invited to proceed to Rome, and also to condemn in writing the doctrines to which he has given utterance in public meetings or which have been attributed to him in the press. Should he disobey, use your own authority in dealing with him.

Fact No. 2.—In its issue of July 15, the New York Herald publishes the following cable dispatch:

The pope, conversing with an American archbishop, said: Dr. McGlynn lost his best opportunity by not coming to Rome while Cardinal Gibbons was here. He would have seen that the church, by not condemning the Knights of Labor, was the supporter of the many against the feudal system, whether the feudality is represented by slavery, territorial right or modern capitalism.

In other words, if Dr. McGlynn had gone to Rome, land monopolization would have been a moral wrong; but as he didn't go to Rome, land monopoly is all right.

Suppose Dr. McGlynn should go to San Francisco, and thus double his distance from the sacred propaganda, would that bring down the divine sanction, via Rome, on some other form of robbery? And if not, why not?

Of the earl of Aberdeen's wife the *Sun* remarks that "every article of her dress, including the jewelry, was of Irish manufacture." How pleasant it is to know that what the earl filches from the Irish people in ground rents he graciously distributes among Irish tradesmen in payment for his wife's clothes.

The last of the long series of disastrous strikes that have occurred this year is that of the Brotherhood of locomotive engineers on the Brooklyn elevated road. Had the strike occurred on one of the great railroads requiring a large number of engineers the result would doubtless have been in favor of the brotherhood. But the weakness of this powerful organization in dealing with a small road shows how increasingly necessary it is that strikes, to be successful, should be conducted on a large scale. The methods of the much lauded brotherhood are simply those of other trades unions. If workmen of any kind can so prevent men from taking their places as to paralyze the business of the employers they strike against, they can compel, for a time at least, acquiescence in their demands; but this is more difficult the less the peculiar skill required for the trade. The locomotive engineers are one of the strongest of trades unions because of their close and wide organization and the great responsibility their calling involves. But the result on the Brooklyn road shows that even they may be beaten in detail.

The strike of the operatives of the Garner mills at Cohoes is also of peculiar interest. These mills, owned by two young ladies residing in this city, are said to be worth, including a great deal of surrounding land and some nine hundred tenements, at least \$5,000,000. One of the "rules of the estate" has been that which is enforced on some of the coal estates in Pennsylvania, that if one of the members of a family occupying one of these tenements takes work elsewhere the whole family has to remove. The wages paid have been extremely low, ranging from \$1 per day for a man to \$1.25 per week for a child and averaging, it is said, 62½ cents per day for all employed. Five thousand operatives struck a couple of weeks ago for an advance that would bring wages to the price paid in eastern mills; but in the face of the determined attitude of the mill managers, and their inability to hold out, about the only hope of crippling the mills is that enough of them should be able to remove and find work elsewhere. About eight hundred have already gone.

## WHAT THE TAX WOULD YIELD.

A Pennsylvania Editor Presents Startling Figures as to What Would be the Result in His Town.

Franklin, Pa., Penny Press.

At first the theory of land taxation, as advocated by Mr. Henry George and his followers, presented to our mind so many objections that we were afraid to apply the tests, and sacredly let it alone, brooding, however, all the time over our present system, unjust in theory and iniquitous practice, till we read Mr. William T. Crossdale's articles in *THE STANDARD* on the "Shoemaker's Field," the "Sailors' Snug Harbor" and the "Randall Farm," and then we began to think in earnest.

First, we made a rough estimate of the value of four squares of our city, those lying east and west of Thirteenth street and north and south of Liberty street, and from those estimates we found that a land assessment and taxation alone of those four squares, were every building and improvement removed from them, at our present rate of taxation, i. e., 27 mills, on a fair salable valuation, would yield a revenue of at least one-fifth of the whole taxes now received by the city from land, improvements, personal property and general and special taxes. With this startling result we began looking up facts and figures. To our surprise we found a lot on Liberty street assessed for taxation at \$841, while the owner wanted \$2,300, or the assessment was 33 per cent of its salable valuation on it, while the poor hovels, shanties and homes of the poor or humble are assessed at about 85 per cent of their real value. Worse ones than this met our view. But we were not looking up errors of judgment, mistakes by or frauds of officials. All we wanted and all we want to use are the naked facts, that we may apply the theory of land taxation in our city and see what the results will be, that we may pursue the course best for our city and citizens.

The first question that presents itself to fair-minded and conservative men is, can the taxes necessary for our affairs be raised by land taxation without injustice or an increase of the rate of taxes? And then which is the better system and what are the advantages of the one over the other? As to these let the official figures speak.

The square between Liberty and Elk and West Park and Thirteenth streets, with all its improvements, is now assessed for taxation purposes at \$98,539. When we made our first estimate, without knowing anything about the assessment, we valued the land of that square, without any buildings or improvements, at \$80,500. The competent men, at least, well-informed men, inform us that our estimate was too low and that \$100,000 was about right. The square of land, without the improvements, between Liberty and Elk and Twelfth and Thirteenth streets, is worth about \$125,000. These two squares, without the improvements, west of Thirteenth street and between Buffalo and Elk streets, may be valued respectively at \$40,000 south of Liberty and \$51,000 north of Liberty street. This would give a land valuation of these four squares at \$316,000. Our present rate of tax is twenty-seven mills, and at this rate these four squares of the naked land would yield a tax revenue of \$8,532, or almost one-third of the present tax, and that, too, without changing the rates of the levy.

Who, then, would object to a land tax as far as these city squares are concerned? Only those who have vacant lots who will neither sell, lease nor build, but dog-in-the-manger like sit down and expect to get rich by the increasing wants of an increasing people. Who want land taxation as far as these city squares are concerned? Every energetic business man who wants to build, every man who has good improvements on his land and every man who rents one of the rooms or buildings on one of those squares.

It is a notorious fact that the poorest buildings on Liberty and Thirteenth streets yield their owners the largest percentage of income. On the other hand, a gentleman who wants to build a fine building on Liberty street said in our presence a few days since that he could not afford to build a fine building, as his taxes would be so high, and also that a \$3,500 building would bring him in as much money as a \$10,000 building, and he would have only one-third as much tax to pay. If the vacant lots west of Snook & Co.'s block were taxed at the same rate per foot that the lot is on which the building is erected, how soon would that vacant place be built up with fine buildings? Other lots, for instance one whose owner valued it at \$2,000, when it was wanted to build a manufactory on it, at a rental of six per cent on the \$2,000 valuation, although really not worth more than two-thirds of that sum, would not be rented as a manufactory at all, which has been vacant almost unimproved since the war. The owner was cut off in the early part of this century, would have a fine house or a busy manufactory on it before the winter winds would blow. So with a hundred other vacant lots in this city.

This then would be the result. Now is it just? The lot 150x75 feet, Thirteenth and Liberty streets, on which the First National bank stands, in itself is no better than any other lot on any of the adjoining squares, only that the aggregation of people who want to do business in that neighborhood make it worth \$15,000. Who creates this value? The aggregation of people. Whose value is it? The people? Why then not tax it for the people? It is just, it is just.

The present real estate value of that square is \$100,000. The improvements are worth \$106,000. The present assessed valuation is \$98,539. The actual rate of assessment then is not more than forty-seven per cent on its present worth.

Not a lot on that square can be leased at a less rate than six per cent on the valuation we have placed on it. Why then not tax it all at that value and rate?

A land tax in the city of Franklin at the sale value of land, on the rental per centage, would yield a revenue of more than \$100,000, enough to bear all of our present municipal expenses and give us free water, and in a few years paved streets, would build up our waste place, transform gilded drones into active business men, make money and patriotism akin, take away the premium on drones, remove the onerous and unjust burdens on active capital and productive labor, place an indirect reward on him and his who do most for self and his community, would double our population within a few years, and put and keep every person who would work at employment till we would become a work shop, our city or county a wealth reproducing land, and our people freer from want, happier and more virtuous.

**Pauperism in England.**  
According to the London Times there are in England and Wales 729,005 paupers, being a proportion of 26.2 to each 1,000 of population. In London, with an estimated population of 4,149,533, the number of paupers at the end of April was 95,634, or 23.1 to each 1,000 of population.

In considering these figures, it must be borne in mind that the Times' statistics embrace only those who have actually given up the struggle for existence and thrown them-

selves on the community for support. No account is taken of the enormous mass—a majority of the English people, in fact—who are clinging desperately to the ragged edge of starvation, and preserving the last remnant of their self-respect by a mode of life which would disgust a decently bred hog. Nor is any enumeration made of that very large class to which the whole royal family, nearly all the nobility and most of the "gentry" belong, who drag out luxurious and useless lives at other people's expense.

## A Few Pertinent Conundrums.

If it is not dealing with too tender a question, I would like to ask a conundrum or two.

Should an issue arise, under the laws of our land, as to the real owners of the Roman Catholic cathedral in this city, what would be the most likely result of the inquiry in a legal as well as a national sense? The cathedral does not belong to the people who gave the money to build it, but the title, I believe, is vested in the archbishop. But is it so vested that if the archbishop chose to withdraw from the Roman Catholic church he could take that property with him and sell it at auction? If not, then the legal title must belong elsewhere. In that case, it is the property of his ecclesiastical superiors, Cardinal Simeoni, for example, or the pope? Or for whom does the archbishop hold it in trust? If it is for his ecclesiastical superiors, then it is the property of the Roman pontiff; if so, then his holiness owns property in the United States to the value of a thousand millions of dollars. In his recently published letter to Archbishop Corrigan he refers to the Roman Catholics of his diocese as "your subjects." It is therefore plain that he regards the Roman Catholic hierarchy as a monarchy, in which an archbishopric in this republic is the equivalent of a dukedom—that being the grade assigned to the title of archbishop in monarchical countries.

Gradually this Roman monarchy has been conferring aristocratic titles in this republic. We have now cardinal whose equivalent is prince, bishops as dukes, monsignors, my lord, and a few counts and chevaliers. Does not this constitute a monarchy within our republic, to which the "subjects" are held in fealty as in other monarchies? And would not the faithful "subjects" of this intermonarchy be the natural foes of the republic if an issue should occur that would place their monarchy in antagonism with it?

The treatment of Dr. McGlynn has clearly revealed to us the fact that this Roman duke is not only an interested worker in our politics, but that he arbitrarily dictates what the policies of his subjects must be also, under the penalty of excommunication or deprivation of other benefits of religion. If this is a monarchy and an aristocracy within our republic is it not well for us to know it as soon as possible? Is this powerful and secretive political organization, which has already begun to threaten the subversion of the republic, really Christianity, or, as Mr. Pentecost so aptly suggests, is it not some other deity?

## The Hebrew Jubilee.

The Halifax, N. S., *Critic* recently issued a jubilee number, in which appears an article by Mr. C. F. Fraser, the editor, entitled, "A Jubilee Reversion."

In this article a venerable Jew, with whom the writer was acquainted as a boy, gives the following lucid explanation of the theory of the Jewish jubilee:

"Through the institution of the jubilee, land monopoly was rendered impossible, and capital in land being available to all the people, industry reaped its full and just reward. Under such a law no family could remain for generations in abject poverty; for at the jubilee the lands with which they had parted, it may be from necessity, once again became their own property. Nor was this unfair to the persons who had become the temporary owners of the lands; for all purchases were made upon the law, and the law provided that in the jubilee year the land should revert to its original owners; and hence the prices paid by purchasers varied according to the nearness or remoteness of the ensuing jubilee."

Here the old man stopped, and after a prolonged silence, broken only by the unorthodox ticking of a dozen clocks, he continued slowly, as if in profound thought: "Our laws were indeed just; the people have an inalienable right to the land, and individual monopoly is at variance with the spirit of equity; but many generations will come and go before the justice of this claim shall be generally recognized among the Gentiles."

Commenting hereon Mr. Fraser says: "As I now ponder over the old man's words their full import and significance appear to me in a new and striking light, and I feel that for the first time, how closely his ideas agree with those of Mr. Henry George, and how strange it is that Mr. George's theory, that private property in land is prejudicial to the best interests of society, and utterly opposed to the fundamental principle of equity and justice, should have so startled the present generation, seeing that its truth had been acknowledged by the early writers of the holy scriptures and by the framers of the Hebrew law."

## How Small Competitors Are Crushed.

LYONS, Mass., July 6.—My father was an oil refiner and went in partnership with T— at Foxborough, Pa. They put their hard-earned money together and bought a ten-barrel still, the capacity of which they increased to forty barrels. The still, with other improvements, they then valued at \$3,000. They were making money and underselling the Standard oil company when one day a representative of that corporation appeared and offered them \$2,000 for their outfit, threatening if they would not sell to ship oil in and underbid them. Of course they sold. They went into the grocery business and after a year failed. My father moved to Salamanca, N. Y., and worked in the Erie car shops that winter for one dollar a day. Now, how can a man pay rent, buy fuel and support a family of five on a dollar a day? I think the strain he went through that winter was the cause of his death a few months later.

EMMETT T. SMITH.

## A Catholic Who Knows His Rights, and, Knowing, Dares Maintain.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—When Dr. McGlynn has been cut off from the church by a cruel and unjust sentence of excommunication, which, no matter what the pretext, was originally occasioned by his teaching the doctrine that the land of every country belongs to the people of that country, then it is time for Catholics who believe in this doctrine to stand shoulder to shoulder in solid phalanx, announcing their determination to uphold the doctrine in spite of the pretense that it is contrary to faith, as some of the Catholic church authorities are endeavoring so industriously to make people believe.

Let every Catholic believes in the land theory do all in his power to convince his fellow Catholics of the real nature of the doctrine, and then they cannot be fooled by misrepresentations. I do not for one moment admit that there is anything un-Catholic in the theory. I am a firm believer in every dogma of the Catholic church, which I con-

sider not a mere human institution, but of divine origin, speaking the words of eternal truth through its infallible head, the pope. Yet one cannot fail to recognize the miserable tendency to err in the human side of the church. In fact, this fallibility and weakness of its members is only a stronger proof of its divinity, for had it been only a human organization it would have been whelmed by its own corruption just about four hundred years ago.

The infallibility of the church and of the pope is limited to matters of faith and morals. Now neither the church nor any pope has ever pronounced against the theory that private ownership of land, including the unearned increment—those values which arise from the growth of the community—is unjust. And the proposition that the state should take the unearned increment for the common benefit of all because created by all is so clearly within the province of the state's right of taxation that no Catholic writer has dared to controvert it. And the talk of compensation is the veriest nonsense. People are not compensated for paying their taxes.

No one has dared interfere with learned Bishop Mulvey in teaching this same doctrine. He declares that "usufruct is the highest form of ownership which individuals can hold in land," and in his beautiful letter to the clergy and faithful of his diocese he expounds the great truths that God has made the earth for all his creatures, that all have an equal interest in it because all have an equal interest in life, and that if some monopolize more than their share they should be made to pay to the community in taxation the full value of that monopoly, so that the interests of all may be guarded.

As to Dr. McGlynn, his case seems more nearly to resemble that of the great patriot priest, Savonarola, than any other example yet adduced from history. The wrong monk preached to the poor of Florence the gospel of a new crucifixion. He denounced the nobles for their licentiousness, brought men back to true religion and devoted himself to the material and political welfare of his fellow citizens. He freed the city from its subjection to the Mediceis and started a model republic, placing a tax of ten per cent on all real property. The infamous pope, Alexander VI, could not stand the denunciations of the "Roman machine," and through various intrigues succeeded in finally having him condemned and burned, although he was never convicted of heresy.

As to the assertion of the New York *Sun* that Dr. McGlynn, when saying that "a man who sins against his conscience sins against the Holy Ghost" was uttering "unadulterated Protestantism," it is only necessary to quote from Adonis & Arnold's "Catholic Dictionary," approved by Cardinals Manning and McCloskey, and published in New York by the Catholic publication society company. It says under the word "conscience":

Two great principles concerning conscience are laid down by Catholic divines. First, a man is always bound to follow his conscience, even if false and erroneous. . . . Nor can any injunction of any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, make it lawful for a man to do that which his conscience unhesitatingly condemns as certainly wicked. God himself, Billuart says, cannot make it lawful for a man to act against his conscience, because to do so without sin is a contradiction in terms.

While not attempting to interfere with the conscientious beliefs of others, we have a right to maintain our own. The church authorities may oppose the land theory in their capacity of citizens, but when they attempt to use the machinery of the church to throw discredit on the objects of the Anti-poverty society or the united labor party they make an awful mistake, and it will take years of good behavior on the part of future successors to restore the church to the position of influence it has held.

Good Catholics should protest against the misuse of ecclesiastical authority now going on and the abusive misrepresentations of a great political doctrine by those now in power.

THOMAS B. PRESTON.

## Will Be Excommunicated With a Quiet Conscience.

MARATHON CITY, Wis.—Inclosed find remittance for renewal for *THE STANDARD*. I read in yesterday's papers that the order for the excommunication of that true and fearless friend of humanity, Dr. McGlynn, has arrived from Rome. As a Catholic and a citizen I greatly deplore that wealthy New Yorker, lay and ecclesiastical, should have gone so far in their efforts to crush the truth as to invade the well meaning but ill-advised Leo XIII. The willful and malicious misrepresentations of our cause by the wealthy American dailies are fair samples of the misrepresentations practiced at Rome. But if excommunication is to fall on all Catholics who uphold the land doctrine advocated by Dr. McGlynn, then will I also be excommunicated—and with a quiet conscience. Therefore, let us do all in our power to uphold the hands of the champion of truth, justice and humanity until the victory is won and the pope has seen his error, which, if we are up and doing, will be before long. Because, if the cause so near and dear to our hearts shall have once triumphed in one state, the tremendous advantage gained by that state will compel the other states to follow, and, once in operation in the whole United States, other nations must follow or be depopulated. The very thought almost makes me mad with delight.

M. LEMMER.

## Rome at the Helm.

LAKELAND, Fla., July 12.—So it has come to pass that in this "free" country of ours a very considerable class of citizens of the United States are to be restricted and even directed in their political opinions and acts by a royal ecclesiastical machine in Rome; that the archbishop of New York, the appointed representative of the Romish hierarchy, through the columns of the press, declares the right of the propaganda, through him, to say to the millions of Catholics of America what views they may or may not hold concerning the all important political question of taxation. The presumptuous interference of the Catholic church with our public school system, which kindled the fires of "know-nothingism" and fanned them to a heat that threatened the Catholic "church" (not the Catholic "religion") with extermination in the United States, was insignificant when compared with this issue of American citizenship.

P. V. JONES.

## Does Rome Claim Political Allegiance?

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., July 13.—A man has been excommunicated for obeying his conscience, his reason and his religion in a purely temporal matter. Are Catholics to infer from this that their political actions are to be governed by Rome? Are they to believe that the government of their country is subordinate to the demands of the church and that Rome claims a political allegiance more binding than their allegiance to their own country? If the Catholic church proposes to enforce these principles, then I say Catholicism is dangerous, and no government is safe where it exists. Supposing the pope issued a command for every true Catholic to refuse to pay civil taxes, or to refuse to vote, there he then between that and the command sent to Dr. McGlynn, "Don't attend certain political meetings?"

It is the duty of every true Catholic to oppose with all his might this movement of

Rome in politics. Otherwise the old prejudice which a century could scarcely overcome will revive in fresh vigor. "Catholic and traitor" will again be heard, and the cry of "no popery" ring throughout the land. A. K.

## The Pope He Is a Happy Man.

Jay Kaye in Toronto Grip.  
The pope he sat in the Vatican,  
In St. Peter's chair sat he;  
And he said, "Such a fix as I've got into,  
In my life I did see."

An' ay he as swiftly twirled each thumb,  
He sighed to himself, "Me miserrum!"  
"For the Irish priests all a-crying 'Woe!  
For the land is desolate?  
But the English bishops they say 'Not so,  
Pay no heed to their lying prate!'  
Eh? I can but twirl each thumb,  
And helplessly sigh, 'Me miserrum!'"

"I'll send two prelates over the sea,  
And try what Italian finesse  
Will do, to make matters more smooth for me,  
And help me out of this mess.

At present I can but twirl each thumb,  
And sigh to myself, 'Me miserrum!'"

"The nuncio, with Norfolk's duke hobnobs  
In honor of jubilee;  
But, then, there's these Irish evictions jobs,  
Demanding my sympathy—  
How to keep both parties under my thumb  
Is the bothering problem—'Me miserrum!'"

"So unfortunate! just when the swerving mind  
Of English society  
Is turning to Rome, in fact, going it blind  
With fashionable piety—  
Cries Ireland, 'Oh father, why are you  
dumb  
Over these our wrongs?'—'Me miserrum!'"

"If I say to Ireland, 'Submit to wrong,'  
Farnell will the Moses be,  
Who from bondage will lead them forth e'er  
long,  
But in that case—good by to me,  
They will say I just sat and twirled my  
thumb,

While poor Ireland wailed, 'Me miserrum!'  
If I say to those who believe in me,  
Who to faith and to church are true,  
'Bun courage, Belle Erin! I bless you, be free!  
Then, England, good bye to you,  
To the gods, to the lands, we had planned  
would come

To Mother Church, 'Me miserrum!'"

"Eh? I have fallen on an evil day,  
For the schoolmaster is abroad,  
And the demon of thought we no more can  
lay  
In the name of the church or of God.  
McGlynn I have bounced—but he'll make  
things hum

In the states, I suppose—'Me miserrum!'  
"Now, which shall I keep, and which let go?  
Poor Erin, or Albion rich?  
Could I soft savior both, how blest! but, no—  
There remains but the question—'which?'  
I dare not think. Go, bid Gounod come,  
Be music my solace—'Me miserrum!'"

## Are Catholics Rome's Subjects?

WISCONSIN, July 12.—The Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen* of July 2, anticipating the visit and speech of Dr. McGlynn on the 6th, had an article headed "The Archbishop's Wish," in which it said: "Archbishop Heiss, when spoken to on the matter, hoped that none of his Catholic people would countenance or encourage him by their presence."

The same paper of the 9th said:

So far as receiving any endorsement from the Catholics of this city, Dr. McGlynn's visit has been a complete failure. A *Sentinel* reporter says that Irishmen were as scarce as hen's teeth at the labor picnic.

Which, if true, shows conclusively what sequeous slaves "his Catholic people" or "subjects" are to the bishop. And it further demonstrates the need of Dr. McGlynn's work to show Catholics that they do not belong to the pope and his satellites.

How long will it be before American Catholics will become true and real American citizens by discarding the authority of, and allegiance to, all foreign potentates and acting upon their own judgments as patriotic Americans? The authority used to silence McGlynn may some day blot out our system of free government if it can exercise influence over a sufficient number of its "subjects."

W. S. W.

## A Presbyterian Clergman Spreading the Light Among the Miners.

SLATKINGTON, Pa., July 13.—I sent to the Anti-poverty society a few days ago \$1 as my initiation fee. I have also set aside a small sum to be used in this righteous cause, and have announced in the pulpit my conviction that the absorption of rent by private individuals is the monster evil of this age. For some time past I have been making use of the many opportunities that come in my way as preacher and pastor to show that our present land system stands squarely across the track of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and has got to go down.

My bible says, "The profit of the earth is for all." Whatever the wise writer of Ecclesiastes meant by the words he certainly got down to the truth when he said that. And it makes very little difference, to my mind, whether or not the writer of the 115th psalm believed in land taxation. His words, "The earth hath He made for the children of men," are as the blast of a trumpet to me.

JOHN F. SCOTT,

Pastor Presbyterian Church.

## Dr. McGlynn Doing God's Will.

LOWELL, Mass., July 12.—Chairman Gahan of the Anti-poverty society in New York last Sunday expressed my sentiments. Excommunicated or not, I am with Father McGlynn on the land question. He is doing God's will when he speaks what he thinks. A Roman Catholic cannot be a good citizen if denied this privilege.

SAMUEL QUINN.

## The Coming Demonstration at Wheeling.

Henry George will speak at a grand demonstration of the Knights of Labor to be held at Wheeling, Pa., on the 30th.

## It Will Be Submitted to Popular Vote.

West Virginia Democrat.  
As we understand the case, Dr. McGlynn was given the alternative either to renounce a political conviction or be excommunicated. He could not renounce his conviction, and Rome expelled him from her church. As we understand the case, it was this: The archbishop, exercising authority in this free country, claims a right to prohibit a priest from advocating a particular economic proposition; the archbishop claims a right to say that a priest shall not argue in favor of the George land theory. The question was not whether a priest may make political speeches, but whether he may advocate a doctrine which, in the opinion of the archbishop, is an unsound doctrine. If the church forbids her priests to make political speeches, so far so good; but if the priest may speak on public questions, then the church in Rome, three thousand miles distant, must not dictate the political opinions of an American citizen.

The question is not whether the George theory be correct; the precise question is whether Rome shall dictate the political opinions of a native born American priest. If this question be decided to a popular vote, it will be submitted against Rome by a thousand ballots to one. This is the view of every intelligent Catholic with whom we have consulted.

## ANTI-POVERTY IN PHILADELPHIA.

Dr. McGlynn Addresses an Immense Audience in McCaull's Opera House on Sunday Evening.

Dr. McGlynn lectured last Sunday evening at McCaull's opera house, in Philadelphia, at the meeting of the Anti-poverty society of that city. To say that the house was crowded would give but a faint idea of the extent of the vast audience that sweltered and panted within it. One of the side doors was opened at 7 o'clock for the admission of women. At 7:30 the main entrances were thrown open, and a tumultuous scramble for seats ensued, which continued until every part of the house, even to the top gallery, was packed with people. The heat was almost intolerable, the temperature during the two hours and a half occupied by the proceedings being close on 100 degrees. The audience was apparently made up mostly of working people, though there were many young men present whose appearance indicated that they were of the well-to-do classes. The audience was in thorough sympathy with Dr. McGlynn, and greeted every reference to the principles of radical land reform with loud and continued applause.

W. H. Johnson, chairman of the meeting, spoke for half an hour previous to the arrival of Dr. McGlynn. In reference to the excommunication of Dr. McGlynn, he denounced the usurpations of Rome, recalling the fate of the emperor, Henry IV of Germany and of Barbarossa a century later, and declaring that an American citizen in the person of Dr. McGlynn would overthrow the usurped powers of the papacy. He said that an "impolitic pedagogue of an archbishop" had renewed the pretensions of Rome, and that the anathema of the pope was only empty thunder when supporting them.

When Dr. McGlynn came upon the stage the audience greeted him with a storm of applause. It was nearly five minutes before the doctor was permitted to begin his address, the air being whited with waving handkerchiefs, and the cheering loud and continuous. The speech which followed lasted two hours, the audience listening with the closest attention and frequently interrupting the speaker with applause. In speaking of the right of all men to the natural bounties of the earth, the doctor said:

"The great doctrine of this natural religion by which men who have quarreled with the church from what they saw in it are being brought back to God, has for its central truth the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man. Might is no longer right. (Applause.) It is no longer natural that the big devour the little. The giant is bound to respect the helpless infant that bears God's image. All men are equally the children of God, and God is not the stepfather of any."

"God could not be a father that he is," said the speaker, if he gave to any class of men a special right in the bounties of nature. The Anti-poverty society were neither anarchists nor socialists. The highest judicial authority had decided that the common wealth had the right to tax land, and they wanted it taxed up to the value of the rental, but sought that end only by constitutional means.

"Compensation?" continued the doctor, "I believe in no compensation to the man who has stolen because he stops stealing. A man's title to a share in the bounties of nature consists in the fact that he has been born. It is the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. 'Liberty, equality and fraternity' is on a transcript of the gospel of Christianity. It is a part of every Christian church. It is a pity that the church is so conservative as to pester for vested rights what are only vested wrongs and to aid the aristocracy against the democracy."











1. U. S. 202, 203. 31 AND 32 1040, 1041, NEW YORK.