

GAINING GROUND.

It is something that our friends should never forget, that what we are doing is not shown by the vote we can poll, by the membership of our societies, by the attendance at our meetings, nor by the number of those who publicly or privately avow themselves as believers in the single tax. Beyond all these, our work is producing its effect in modifying public opinion insensibly in our direction. The majority of men are too careless and too timid for logical thought, and the best we can hope for them is that they will approach the truth by degrees—that our advocacy of the single tax will bring them in some measure to see the absurdity and injustice of present methods of taxation. When they begin doing this they are not, it is true, with us, but they are on the road to our position.

Evidence of how we are in this way affecting even those who denounce us may be seen in such utterances as that in which the *Evening Post* recently declared that the notion of making personal property pay as much taxes as real estate is "a chimerical idea against which the experience of the civilized world is everywhere running." Another evidence is given in a privately printed circular which is being sent by mail to New York business men. In this it is shown by the census of 1880 that the personal property of the country is only one-third the value of the real estate, while (the national taxes, falling on personal property) the aggregate taxation on real estate is \$234,563,041, and on personal property \$712,730,721. Therefore, the writer concludes, the owners of personal property are paying nearly two and three-quarter times as much as their proportion. He asks:

Can there be any sound public policy, wisdom or justice in our present system of taxation? Is there any reason for the demagogue cry for greater taxation of personal property? It is a fact that where taxation of personal property is nearer to nothing in the states, there is the greater prosperity. Without paying any state, county, city or other taxation the entire expenditures of the United States would still fall on owners of personal property. Being \$400,000,000 it would still be twice their share of the public burdens. Is this not a strong argument for abolishing state taxes on personal property owners while the United States so taxes them for the general welfare? Can any one point to other nations which pay over seven hundred and twelve millions of dollars taxes? Do we wish to drive out personal property owners, and thus reduce the values of real estate, or to pay such high rates of interest and profits to owners of personal property that they will say because of the high interest and profits and pay the taxes? We must suffer as a nation or change our policy.

Such an argument shows at least a glimmering of light on the true principles of taxation. This protest against the disproportionate taxation of personal property would doubtless disclaim any connection with us. Yet he has been affected by our thought and is doing our work. When a man becomes conscious of the injustice and inexpediency of taxing personal property he has only to go a little further to see the inexpediency and injustice of taxing the improvements that are now taxed as real estate. And when he once realizes the propriety of looking to land values as the only source of revenue, he is a good enough single tax man for practical purposes. For when we get so far as to put taxes on land values in lieu of other subjects of taxation, the taking of the whole "unearned value" for public uses will be a certain consequence.

And now, to give greater point to what I have just written, comes Mayor Hewitt.

What a terrible bugbear the idea of abolishing all taxes save upon land values was to Mayor Hewitt fifteen months ago, every one who remembers his speeches and letters in the campaign which put him in the mayor's chair well knows. But the agitation which we have carried on and the knowledge which he has gained while in the office of mayor have so far educated him that, in his message to the board of aldermen, just sent in, he unequivocally takes the ground that taxes on personal property ought to be abolished, and has to this extent at least become one of us. He says:

In view of recent utterances, it may be well to say that this city would largely gain by the abolition of all taxes upon personal property. The amount thus collected at this time is about one-sixth of the whole amount of taxation. If personal property, except bank shares, were relieved of taxation, it would not be necessary to add more than one-sixth to the rate upon real estate, which last year would have amounted to .30 of one per cent, thus raising the total taxation to 2.32 instead of 2.16, which was actually paid. There would be an apparent addition to the taxes of the holders of real estate, but as many of these are also tax payers upon personal property, the addition would be more nominal than substantial. But, in the case of those who do not pay taxes upon personal property, the advance in the value of real estate, which would inevitably follow the abolition of taxes upon personal property, would far more than compensate for any addition to the amount which would then be assessed upon real estate. The abolition of personal taxes in this city would attract to it the capital of the whole world. We are now the center of exchanges on the western continent, but in a few years we should be the clearing house for the commerce of the globe. If the city of New York, therefore, could make a bargain with the rest of the state, by which it might be agreed that in lieu of taxation upon personal property for state purposes there should be added one-sixth to the amount assessed upon real estate, the present embarrassment in regard to the assessment of personal property would be

relieved. This tax is notoriously impossible of collection in this city. It is doubtful whether one-fifth of the total amount which ought to be collected if the law could be enforced actually reaches the treasury. Those who ought to pay the most part of it pay the least, while the humble citizen, who is unable to "fix up" his statements, is subjected to the full amount of lawful taxation. The estates of widows and orphans and wards in chancery pay the full amount of taxation required by law, although in most cases it can be least afforded, while "bloated" capitalists either entirely escape taxation or compromise for a very inadequate sum. This condition of affairs is scandalous. It cannot be continued without subjecting property to attacks which seem to be founded in justice, and which produce very great dissatisfaction in the public mind.

Just think of it! It is not two years since Louis F. Post and I were discussing—as one of the things that might be done by and by—the possibility of getting a bill introduced in the legislature to permit New York city to exempt from taxation personal property and improvements, or even personal property alone, the city to pay a quota to the state by way of equivalent for the reduction in its revenues. We were thinking and talking about this, because we well knew that the agitation that would follow the introduction of such a bill, with a fair chance of passing, would have a very great effect in opening men's minds to the advantages of the single tax, and that its adoption would prove so beneficial that the people of this city, and the people of other cities, seeing how much had been gained by going a little way on our road, would be disposed to go further. And now comes Mayor Hewitt, one of our bitterest opponents, to propose, with a much better chance of public hearing than we could have got then, or could get now, this thin-end-of-the-wedge measure.

Mayor Hewitt goes on to follow what I have quoted with some disquisitions upon the general subject of taxation which show the regrettable weakness of his political economy, and lays down the astounding proposition that "the income tax, with proper exemptions of small incomes, is the most just mode of raising revenue, although it ought not to be the only kind of taxation levied," as well as the proposition that "in whatever form taxes may be imposed, so long as the total income of the community exceeds its expenditure, the incidence of taxation will be necessarily upon production."

But why the most just mode of raising revenue ought not to be the only way of raising revenue, and how the relation between the income and expenditure of a community affects the incidence of taxation, are questions that we need not at present raise with Mr. Hewitt. He is evidently trying to save himself from going too far, and does not wish, after taking one step in our direction, to be forced to take another. But, nevertheless, he does propose to take one step in our direction, and that the all-important first step. And we can only expect progress one step at a time.

As showing the utter impossibility of fairly collecting taxes on personal property Mayor Hewitt states that formal charges were preferred to him against two of the commissioners of taxation, who it was alleged had taxed the personal property of certain individuals and corporations far below its real value. He says that an investigation of these charges satisfied him that they were correct and that the plain injunction of the law had been violated by the commissioners. He thus continues:

Under ordinary circumstances it would have been my duty, on being satisfied of these facts, to have removed the commissioners complained of from office. But I could not shut my eyes to the fact that the existing laws never had been executed, and there was no difference of opinion among those who had studied the question that they never can be executed, as they stand, in this city. The commissioners, therefore, are confronted with a legal duty impossible of performance. If I had removed them from office I could only have appointed other persons who would have been confronted with precisely the same obstacle. Inasmuch as the good faith and sound judgment of the commissioners now in office had not been impugned there was no reason, therefore, why I should simply shift the responsibility from one set of officers to another, who could not possibly be more successful in the enforcement of the law. When we are brought face to face with an embarrassment of this kind, the conclusion is obvious that the law ought to be so amended as to enable it to be executed by conscientious and faithful officers.

The mayor's conclusion as to the law is indeed obvious; but it is far from being so obvious that he was justified in not removing officers who had deliberately violated the plain injunctions of the law. He is certainly not consistent. The position that he took in the spasmodic attempt to enforce to the very letter the Sunday law, and in preventing raffling at fairs (when the fair in question was the anti-poverty fair) was, that it was his business to enforce the law as far as he was able, and that if this brought out defects in the law it would more quickly lead to its modification or repeal. If, acting on this principle, Mayor Hewitt had removed these two commissioners, and then removed the next two, and so on, it would have had the effect of calling public attention to the injustice and absurdity of attempting to tax personal property far more forcibly than could be done in any other way.

However, let us not look a gift horse too

closely in the mouth. If Mayor Hewitt has not done all that he might have done, his present position with regard to taxation is certainly a great advance upon his previous position—an advance on which we single tax men may congratulate both Mayor Hewitt and ourselves. And so long and so far as he will use his large influence and his great talents in urging the abolition of taxes on personal property let us give him all the support we can. He, to be sure, only proposes to go a little way in our direction. But we need not concern ourselves with how far any one proposes to go. The all important thing is to get people started.

How true it is that our progress must be by steps, and how true it is that in accomplishing these steps we must rely upon the aid of those who are not with us in ultimate aim, but are for the moment, at least, only willing to take the immediate step, are matters that I would commend to the consideration of those friends of the good cause who think that not to run a presidential candidate would be to abandon the cause itself, and who imagine that with the issue likely to be joined between the two great parties in the coming national election we have no concern. The truth is that great reforms of this kind are not usually accomplished by parties formed for the purpose, and that the decisive political battles which secure them are generally fought on what are nominally minor issues. Thus the abolition of slavery in the United States was not accomplished by an abolition party, but by a party which distinctly and most emphatically disavowed any intention of disturbing slavery where it already existed; which denounced abolitionists without stint, and proposed merely to prevent the extension of slavery to the territories.

But the moment this extremely moderate measure became an issue of practical politics, upon which two great parties struggled for political power and spoils, more was accomplished for the anti-slavery cause than could have been accomplished by any amount of "standing up to be counted" on the part of thorough going anti-slavery men. For the men who fell into line for this moderate measure soon found themselves driven further and further by the impulse of movement and the reaction of opposition. In arguing against the extension of slavery to the territories they were compelled to argue against slavery itself, just as in advocating the reduction of protective duties, President Cleveland's supporters will, in the face of republican opposition, be compelled to deny the claims of protection, and though, perhaps unconsciously in many cases, to really advance free trade principles, and thus, as Mayor Hewitt is doing, prepare the public mind for the abolition of all taxes upon labor or its products.

For our purpose it matters very little whom or what men vote for, as compared with what they think about, and our main concern should be to stimulate thought. President Cleveland's message, Mayor Hewitt's utterance, Senator Sherman's proposition to substitute a bounty on home grown sugar for a tax on the foreign product, to say nothing of the numberless magazine and newspaper articles on similar subjects, all show that, thanks in large measure to our efforts, political discussion is rapidly drifting in the direction of our principles. Let us do what we can to encourage this drift.

In another column will be found an article from Daniel R. Goodloe of Washington, entitled, "Low Land Monopoly Locks Up Capital." The assumption made in it, that what is generally called the "investment of capital in land" diminishes by that much the amount of capital that can be used for other purposes, is one sometimes made by our friends, but it will not stand analysis. The mere buying of land or renting of land within a community in no way diminishes the amount of capital that can be used for productive purposes; it merely transfers capital from the hands of one set of people to those of another set of people. And when people outside of the community buy land from members of the community, as when English investors buy land in America, the effect of the transaction is really to increase for the time the available capital of the community. Capital can really only be "locked up in land" when it is actually buried or expended upon it in unproductive improvements. If the buyer or the renter pays money, or produces, or any other thing of value, for the privilege of owning or using land, what he thus parts with some other man gets, and the wealth or the capital of the country is not thereby lessened.

But what does occur in large numbers of these cases is that wealth that would be used as capital by the purchaser or renter, and which would in his hands constitute a most effective aid to production, is transferred into the hands of men who apply it to unproductive uses and thus withdraw it from the active capital of the country. This is one of the great evils of our system of treating land as though the rights of individual ownership which justly attach to things produced by human labor also attached to it. And in addition to this, there is an actual loss of capital and of labor in useless expenditures made for the sake of monopolizing land in order to compel those who will afterward need it to pay a tribute for its use. This monopolization again compels men who would gladly be at work, and for whom there are abundant opportunities of work, to stand idle and to waste capital that they might otherwise employ in increasing production, thus bringing about the state of things which we see to-day—hundreds of thousands of idle hands and millions of unused acres.

Our treatment of land has, in short, the effect of taking capital from those who would most profitably use it and putting it in the hands of those who cannot so profitably use it and who even largely waste it; and also of preventing labor and capital from applying themselves to land in the production of more wealth. It thus not only greatly reduces the aggregate amount of capital in the community, but unjustly and unnaturally distributes that amount, stripping a large class of our people of the capital that they ought to have, and gathering it in enormous aggregations in the hands of a few. But we can more effectively point this out if we always keep in mind the real nature of capital, and remember that the mere transfer from hand to hand does not of itself lock anything up.

We present to the readers of THE STANDARD to-day a verbatim report of Dr. McGlynn's address before the Anti-poverty society last Sunday night. This magnificent vindication of Catholic faith against the stigma of slavish sycophancy and man worship which so many of its officials put upon it, will be read with pleasure by all lovers of freedom, but with especial pleasure by Catholics. Instead of a diatribe of the coarse "No Popery" order which the garbled extracts so widely spread by the press would make it seem, it will be found to be a masterly statement of historical truth—the manly protest of a deeply religious spirit against the degradation of the forms and authority of religion. Its flashes of humor and invective only the better point its moral.

The influence of an address like this cannot be confined to this country. Such of our readers as have friends in Ireland would do well to send THE STANDARD there, where the attempt to use the ecclesiastical authority in the support of political and social injustice is producing a quiet yet strong reaction. It is evident, as Dr. McGlynn says, that the resistance to the monstrous doctrine that Catholics must be bound in politics by ecclesiastical authority will find its quickest and strongest resistance among Catholics of Irish blood. Nor is it unfortunate that the revolt against it should be unhampered by outside interference, and that even such anti-Catholic papers as the *Times* of this city should belittle and misrepresent it.

HENRY GEORGE.

The pressure upon the columns of THE STANDARD has made it impossible to publish all the communications that have been received on the subject of a presidential nomination. We have tried to give representation to all sides, and propose in a future issue to give a resume of those unpublished.

A Good Suggestion.

NEW YORK CITY.—Sitting in front of an open fire the other night, a friend and I were discussing the coal miners' strikes—their causes, chances of success, and so forth. Among other matters we spoke of the tediousness of prolonged idleness to men accustomed to daily work.

"By Jove!" said my friend, suddenly, "what a chance those fellows have for reading!"

It was a half idle remark, but it set us both to thinking. The miners have a chance for reading, such as they never had before, and let us hope may never again. Why shouldn't we give them something to read? Why not supply them with anti-poverty literature and take advantage of their enforced idleness to teach them the cause and cure of their present distress?

My friend and myself—we are both single tax men—have become infatuated with this idea, and with your permission would like to suggest it to the other readers of THE STANDARD. To show that we are in earnest we enclose \$2-\$1 from each of us. If enough other STANDARD readers will "chip in" we can not only arrange to send one or two copies to the mining regions to make a systematic distribution of tracts, books and STANDARDS! EDWARD GRIFFITHS.

Think We Should Keep Out of National Politics.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—It seems to me that the united labor party will grow faster the nearer the members see some chance of its principles being put into practice. The contention that free trade leads toward free land is sound enough, no doubt; but a dreary outlook is the prospect that we shall have to wait till tariff reformers (and united labor party free traders) succeed in reducing the tariff revenue to the actual needs of the government, and then, I suppose gradually, be led to the idea that they might go further and confiscate a little more economic rent.

Is not there a shorter way? Have we to overturn the lusty giant protection before we can attack private appropriation of rent? Is it not possible for one of the states, by enforcing a tax on land values and diminishing the weight of its taxes on capital and labor, to so far demonstrate the value of the single tax as to make it sure that others will follow its example? Everybody but the mere landholders would be interested in this effort—the business man as well as the artisan, the farmer as well as the hired man, whether free traders from conviction or protectionists from habit or training.

Let us keep out of politics. Let the wisest and ablest thought of the party leaders be bent on discovering means by which a state can be gained in which to practice our prin-

ciples. The full measure of prosperity might not be possible to the inhabitants of a state while national revenues continued to be raised by tariff duties and internal revenue taxes; but something would be gained, and a partial demonstration of the good effect of discouraging land speculation and increasing the opportunities for labor would bring recruits to the ranks of the party by the thousand.

The belief in protection may be an error, but it is hard to overcome it. "It benefits some people," says a friend of mine, "for there would not be so much money ready to defend it; and whether it benefits the folks who hire men to work for them or folks who monopolize natural opportunities, yet the land value tax would help the hired men get a bigger share of the proceeds in the first case, and in the latter case help men to work who now can't find any one to hire them steadily."

The policy for the party is the one that will enable its members to most readily unite in work, and which will make proselytizing easy. Give us something more practical than a plan to reach free land after the whole United States agrees on free trade.

GEORGE WHITE.

A Convention of Kansas Sympathizers. The following "call for a state convention of single tax delegates from Kansas" has been issued by land and labor club No. 1 of Kansas City, Kas.:

The citizens of the state of Kansas in favor of the Syracuse platform, adopted by the united labor party of New York, are requested to meet in mass convention at Topeka on February 9, 1888, at 10 o'clock a. m., to elect a state central committee and take such measures as in their judgment may seem best calculated to secure the success of the united labor party in the near future. Any person that is opposed to the single tax on land values will not be permitted to participate in the deliberations of the convention.

By order of the united land and labor club No. 1 of Kansas City, Kan.

DR. C. H. BLAKESLEE, President.

F. M. P. DONNELLY, Sec.

In commenting on this call the Topeka Labor Chieftain says: "The men and what they wish to accomplish is set forth unequivocally. There is no need for hesitation or timidity on the part of any. The advocates of the single land tax in Kansas are many and as a whole will constitute a factor capable of giving prominence to any right principle which they desire to promulgate."

It is to be hoped that the convention will be a large one and of great service to the movement.

Will Continue to Discuss the Question.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—The Fifteenth ward association of the united labor party in this city have taken up the discussion of the advisability of entering actively into the national campaign.

The predominant sentiment seems to be that we could go into the national campaign, agitate the land value tax and not be forced to take any stand on the tariff question positive enough to produce lukewarmness in those of our number who are not willing under present conditions to accept the so-called "free trade" ideas of the "revenue reformers."

Still there are a few who do not agree with this view, and the association intends keeping up the discussion at its meetings, on the first and third Friday of each month, at 268 Grand street, and invite the attendance of any one interested. EDWARD CROW, Secretary Fifteenth Ward Assn.

Thinks the Tariff Question Will be the All-Absorbing Issue.

CHICAGO, Ill.—Mr. Wilder takes a sound position in your issue of January 7. To go into the national contest this year would be to make the united labor party a laughing stock. The tariff question will be the all-absorbing issue, and, notwithstanding your opinion to the contrary, I do not believe that the great bulk of our party are free traders. For one, while I am a believer in the single tax, an emphatically for protection until a single tax at least becomes an accomplished fact. Besides, where would the machinery and funds come from to run a candidate for the presidency? Education in our doctrines is an essential preliminary before the united labor party could even hope for a corporate guard outside of the state of New York. Sentiment must yield to common sense.

J. B. CARROLL.

To the Treasurer of the Anti-Poverty Society.

—Enclosed find slip filled out, in which I agree to send the society \$6 during the year 1888. I will send it all at one time, and should you not hear from me by the time you need the money just drop me a line. I am busy and may overlook it. I must insist that my name be kept out of THE STANDARD. I can't stand it. It is not necessary for me to explain my position. God speed the time when a man will not be obliged to conceal his sentiments on political economy. I am striving hard to abolish my own poverty so that I may be able to do more in assisting others to do the same. I have lately converted a real estate dealer and deacon of the Congregational church to the cause of matters. If you use any of this letter in print do not give the locality.

Louis F. Post on "The Duties of Citizenship."

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—Louis F. Post delivered a lecture in Liberty hall, corner of Nostrand and Gates avenue, Brooklyn, on Monday evening under the auspices of the Twenty-third ward association, united labor party. Major Alfred R. Calhoun presided and introduced the speaker. Many of the members of the association attended and there were several ladies present. The subject of the lecture was "Duties of Citizenship." Mr. Post showed how those duties could only be fulfilled by helping all men to a larger fuller liberty, and that this was only possible through the principle of taxing land to its full rental value, as advocated by the united labor party.

To "Standard" Readers in New Haven. NEW HAVEN, Conn.—At a special meeting of the land and labor club of New Haven the following resolutions were adopted and the secretary was instructed to send a copy to THE STANDARD for publication:

Resolved, That the land and labor club No. 3 of New Haven extend a cordial invitation to all readers of THE STANDARD in this city to join our organization and take an active part in the much needed and neglected work of propaganda in this vicinity.

Resolved, That it is the unanimous opinion of this club that a national convention should be held at the earliest possible date, a presidential ticket nominated and a national campaign inaugurated. ALFRED SMITH, Sec.

ANTI-POVERTY.

DR. M'GLYNN'S DISCOURSE ON "THE POPE IN POLITICS."

St. Peter and St. Peter's Successor—The Growth and Abuse of the Temporal Power—The Catholic Machine in Politics—Selling Out Poor Ireland—The Future of the Papacy.

Sylvester L. Malone, the nephew of the well known patriot priest of Brooklyn, presided at the thirty-seventh public meeting of the Anti-poverty society at the Academy of music, last Sunday night, and introduced the Rev. Dr. McGlynn, who spoke on "The Pope in Politics." His remarks were listened to with the most intense interest by the thousands of ladies and gentlemen who packed the academy from pit to dome. A number of priests were scattered throughout the audience, and evidently in hearty sympathy with the speaker. Dr. McGlynn said:

The pope in politics! What business has the pope to be in politics? (Cries of "None!" and applause.) What has the pope to do with politics, and what has politics to do with the pope? (Applause.) And what have the pope's men, as pope's men, to do with politics, and what has politics to do with them as pope's men? Who is the pope?

A great many years ago there stood upon the earth a man who alone of all men dared to say of himself: "I am the way, the truth and the life," who alone of all the men that breathed the air of heaven ever dared to say what in any one else had been a horrible blasphemy: "The Father and I are one." But that man, of all men, that Son of God, said: "Learn of me because I am meek and humble of heart." That man said: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." That man said: "My kingdom is not of this world." When men, ravished by the heavenly beauty of his doctrines, fascinated by the music of his voice, enchanted by the radiance of his countenance, were eager to follow him, he bade them to feel health and strength flow out therefrom—when in their passionate enthusiasm they would seize him and make him king, he fled from their hands into the mountain alone and spent the night in prayer.

He had nowhere to lay his head, and yet the gold and the power of earth could not tempt him to swerve from the simple path of preaching the truth of God, of ministering God's consolations to the afflicted and refusing to have any part or parcel in the mere temporal kingdoms of the world. (Applause.) We read in the gospel how the subtle spirit of evil brought him up to a high place, showing him all the kingdoms of this world and the glory thereof, and the lying spirit offered to give him what it was not in his power to give if he would but swerve from perfect fidelity to the truth, if he would but worship him who is called the prince of this world.

This man, the gentlest, the lowliest, the humblest of men, who explicitly tells us that his kingdom is not of this world is the only possible source, as author and founder claimed by the papacy. This man as he walked one day on the sands of the sea of Galilee, otherwise known as the lake of Genesareth, saw a fisherman mending his nets and called him to be a follower. He said to him that he would make him a fisher of men, and told him that he would give him a new name that should signify unshaken fidelity in adhesion to the truth. And later on he said to this man: "Simon, Simon, dost thou love me?" and he repeated the interrogation, and a third time he proposed the question. That loving disciple, taught by and experienced how unwise it was to boast of his greater love, of his greater fidelity, since on the bitter night of agony, after his vain boasting and cursing and swearing that he would do no such thing, at the mere word of a maid-servant he cursed and swore that he knew not the man, now humble in all his own conceit said: "Lord, thou knowest all things—thou knowest that I love thee;" and in answer to the modest pretension of love for the master, he heard the command: "Thou art Peter; thou art rock; feed thou my lambs; feed thou my sheep." All the ministrations and the examples of the master, all his teaching, all the words of the shepherd's commission given to that man, teach simply that he should excel the brethren in love for the master, and show his greater love for the master by his modesty, by his humility, by his long-suffering, by his forbearance, by his tenderness for the least of the sheep, and not by his solicitude for the vaunts of his disciples. (Applause.)

All this would show that the disciple who had denied his master three times, having learned greater humility from his own downfall, should seek to atone for the blasphemous apostasy by being a more loving and kinder and more intelligent and self-sacrificing shepherd of the fold. He was taught with singular emphasis the truth that the master had taught in general to all, that the disciple is not above his master. And in no age of the world, in no land, should the disciple who inherits the office of Peter be above the master. (Great applause.)

The office of Peter is salutary in the world only in proportion as it is exercised in full conformity with the spirit of him who would have no earthly kingdom, whose crown was a crown of thorns, a diadem emblematic of his sufferings, of his agony; who was to be exalted not upon the shoulders of men but upon the horrid, ignominious gibbet, that, with outstretched arms strained to dislocation, he might symbolize his all embracing love for all the human race. (Applause.) The pope is, if he is anything, simply the successor of that man Simon Peter, of that man who was told that he knew not of what spirit he was when he dared to draw his sword and in his hasty, ill considered zeal, to cut off the ear of one of those who came to capture Christ in the garden of agony. He was told to put up his sword. He was told by the master with stern rebuke that if that master needed aid he could call upon his Father to send him legions of angels to fight his battles. But his battles were not to be fought with the arm of the flesh. He was to conquer the world by dying for the world. And the spirit that was his, the spirit of which Peter should be the example and which as yet he ignored, was the spirit that should teach him that the kingdom of Christ is not of this world and that the power of Christ's kingdom is in inverse proportion to the temporal and earthly power that it may sway over unwilling subjects.

The office of Peter was to confirm his brethren in the faith, in their adherence to the teachings of Christ, in the spirit of fortitude with which they should go out into the whole world and preach the pure and sweet doctrines of the gospel to every creature. He was, if you choose, to establish a see on earth

that should inherit the apostolic tradition of the Christ, should be the depository of the teaching of Christ and his apostles in matters of faith. It was his office to be the high priest of the Christian altar, and a bishop of his church, to consecrate other bishops and to ordain other priests who might perpetuate the priesthood of Christ, the ministry of his altar and the preaching of his word.

All this was the office, not merely of Peter, but of all the apostles. He sent them out to teach the whole world to look up to heaven and to acknowledge but one Father in heaven and one brotherhood on earth. (Applause.) This was the office of Peter, and Peter fulfilled the office. He went out into the world, he preached the gospel, he baptized the nations, he and his successors. He taught by example rather than by word that meekness which the master says should be characteristic of him and of all who should learn of him. And if the pope is successor of Peter, who, rather than the pope, should surpass all other men in meekness, in lowliness, in humility and poverty of spirit? (Applause.)

Peter and his successors for three centuries practiced what they preached. They were good shepherds. They loved the sheep for their own sake and not for the sake of the flock. They endured that which the master had chosen as the test of perfect love: "A greater love no man showeth than that he should give his life for his friend." "I am the good shepherd, and I lay down my life for the sheep." Nearly every man of them who was elected to that charge for three centuries—elected, forced, driven into it by the suffrages, the entreaties, the coercion almost, of the clergy and the people (applause)—nearly every man of them made good in reality, as every one of them was prepared to make good in spirit, the shepherd of his flock. (Applause.)

We hear, during these centuries, of no concordats between the pope and the emperor. (Applause, renewed several times.) We hear of no ambassadors, official or semi-official, of no unofficious, going to back doors or to kitchen stairways, whether of the palace or of the catacombs, where the popes had their palaces, to negotiate understandings and compromises between the pope and the civil power. (Applause.) The word "pope" had not yet come into existence. (Applause.) The bishop of Rome was acknowledged by the Christian church to be the successor in the see of Rome of blessed Peter. The see of Rome was acknowledged to be by excellence the apostolic see—to be, beyond all other sees, the depository of Christian traditions. The bishop of Rome was acknowledged to have the leadership in the church of Christ—to be the chief bishop of the church.

But the development of this papal power that has been going on for centuries was that undreamed of. You find little or nothing of it in the epistles of the man Peter, who nearly was as good a pope or almost as great a pope, as his holiness, Leo XII. (Great applause.) And you seek in vain in the epistles of the first pope for anything like the incredible self-assertions of the last pope. (Applause.) I should have said of the latest pope. (Laughter and applause.) Men in their enthusiastic reverence for the apostle never dreamed of carrying him upon their shoulders, but they carried him in their hearts. (Great applause.) And he never dreamed of attributing to himself, and no one else ever dreamed of attributing to him, all the wondrous conquests of the Christian church during his not brief apostolate. There were other apostles, there were bishops and priests by the scores and the hundreds who did the work. And it is only the fashion of comparatively modern adulation and pope worship and pope deification, to attribute to a poor old man already tottering on the brink of the grave, ignorant of the history and the geography of the world, all the triumphs of the church of Christ. Christ gave to this man, Simon Bar-Jona, the authority to be the shepherd over his flock. He did not give to him the appointment of other apostles. He, with the rest, permitted the choice of a new apostle to take the place of the apostate and traitor, Judas, to depend upon the cast of a die or the drawing of lots. And the successors of Peter for hundreds and hundreds of years, for very many hundreds of years, continued modest in their high office, eager everywhere to defend the purity of the faith, ready by their letters to rebuke any bishop, no matter how high placed, who should teach anything contrary to what had been taught by the apostolic church from the beginning. And he did not arrogate to himself the right to appoint bishops to rule, to dominate with minute inspection over the affairs of the clergy of the whole world. The bishops of the church everywhere for a thousand years were elected by the clergy and the people, and the very successors of Peter for these long centuries were elected by the clergy and the people of Rome. (Applause.)

This Christian society with its priests, its bishops, with the bishop of Rome acknowledged to be the senior bishop, the presiding bishop, the superior of the inferior, the chief officer, became, by its adherence to the spirit of the master, conqueror the whole civilized world. It was the spirit of Christ and not the sword of Peter. (Applause.)

After three centuries it unfortunately became good policy, as much as it was a matter of Christian conversion for the saving of his soul, or as it was the result of a miraculous cross in the heavens, for Constantine to become a Christian. And we, too, have seen the Christian emperor, that followed the time of Constantine, cause what a sad mistake it was, what a pitiable and unfortunate thing it was, that the church of Christ was befriended, protected, enriched, not merely with wealth, but with temporal power, by Constantine and his successors. Thence dates the beginning of the degeneration of the Christian church. The purple that symbolized, not the blood with which Christ empaneled his cross, but the power that Constantine gave to the church, is the imperial purple. The privilege of wearing it comes from Constantine and his successors.

The very virtues of the church unfortunately gave occasion to the wealth and the power that have corrupted the church. Christians were willing or even eager to bring their disputes about temporal matters to the arbitration of the bishop, who was their father and their friend. In his wisdom and impartiality the emperor gave the sanction to all the decisions of the bishops, that shall be merely the blunder but a crime if it is committed at all in this new virgin continent of that union of church and state, which means the injury and the corruption of both. Unfortunately the church is very human as well as divine. The lesson of Peter's life tells us how very human the papacy is. The fact is that Peter in his successors is still very human. He may be rash on

the one hand and he may be time-serving on the other. (Applause.) And certainly he was a very strange pope who should think himself greater, or better, or higher, or more of a pope, or a better man than Peter. And what we are safe to say of Peter surely we are safe to say of his successors. (Applause.)

The Roman empire, in spite of its conversion to Christianity, was doomed by its crimes, by its false policies, by its absolutism, which Christianity taught it little or nothing to mitigate. The Christian church came to teach certain general principles of religion and of morality; but somehow or other it was left to men, by sad and painful experience, by the oppressions and the robberies, the wars and the murders of long centuries, to find out for themselves the beauty of universal suffrage, the beauty of republicanism; to discover for themselves the rights of man, the rights of citizenship; to discover, or rather to re-discover and to re-promulgate the magnificent teaching of our Declaration of Independence, of the equality of men and of the unalienable rights of men to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. (Applause.) I know that these things are all contained in germ in the gospel, in the parables of Christ, in the teachings of the Christian church; and yet, somehow or other, they failed for all these centuries to find their perfect application.

And we must say apologetically that it was not the business of the church to teach either monarchy or republicanism. It was the business of the Christian church to teach certain religious truths, to preach pure morals, to stand for the supremacy of the moral order in the world, to give to poor, weak, sinful man spiritual help and medicine. But it has been true and it shall be true of political questions in the teaching of the Christian church; and yet, somehow or other, they failed for all these centuries to find their perfect application. (Applause.)

The principles of political emancipation, of the restoration of the masses of men to their God-given inheritance of natural opportunities, are all conveyed in the gospel of Christ, are all taught in the teachings of the Christian church, at least in germ. But it remains for men through the painful experiences of ages to be compelled to learn how they shall right their secular wrongs, how they shall undo their political and social evils, and all that they need from the Christian church, and all that they should tolerate from the Christian church, is the general principle of truth and morality, the prayers, and its blessings and its comforting, holy sacraments. (Applause.)

The Roman empire became speedily Christian in its highest places, and the Roman emperors were glad to conciliate the Christian church. They were glad to lavish power and wealth upon the Christian church, not merely that it might be the almoner and educator, but that it might also be in great measure the special policeman, well paid to keep down the mob. (Applause.)

And because of its crimes the Roman empire fell. It is really deserved to fall. And the Christian church, in spite of a few of the blunders and crimes that it began to contract because of its alliance with that Roman empire, must still remain, in spite of its human advocates, as a witness of Christ's truth, as the minister of his sacraments, as the teacher of morals to those who would practice even while the preacher did not practice himself. The Roman empire was broken into many fragments by sturdy barbarians from the north, men full of martial vigor, men with many natural virtues but still barbarians and savage. They were able to destroy the Roman empire, but they were not able to destroy the Christian church, for that, in spite of its human side, had within it a divine element. It still stood for Christ. And so the barbarian fell on his knees before the Roman altar and eagerly craved Christian baptism and Christian doctrine and Christian sacraments and Christian morals. And the barbarians, become Christian, full of gratitude to the church that had rescued them from savagery, that had taught them to read, that had given them gentle manners and nobler arts, lavished everything in their new gratitude at the feet of the church, the mistress, of a mother who taught them, who nursed them, as it were, into spiritual life.

And here was the second blunder. A thousand pities that the church accepted the trust, accepted the lands, accepted the gifts of the newly converted nations, allowed her councils in great measure to be so mixed up with the civil parliaments of these new founded nations that it was hard to say where the council ended and the parliament began, or where the parliament ended and the council began. Bishops, noblemen and sovereigns were all mingled in one common council, church and state in almost inextricable confusion. It seemed good, it seemed wise, an admirable thing that there should be such an excellent understanding between the spiritual and the temporal power. But the clear, cold light of history makes plain that it was a horrible blunder. And for us to repeat the blunder would be the most unpardonable of crimes. (Applause.)

You owe to that condition of things all the squabbles and the conflicts and the interminable wars between church and state continued for hundreds of years during the dark ages. You owe to this the temporal power of the pope. You owe to this the pope's assumed right to restore the Roman empire in the person of Charlemagne. You owe to this the principle of the pope to control the empire of Germany, to crown the emperor of Germany and to call him the sovereign of the holy Roman empire, of which Voltaire not only truly, but wittily, said that it was called holy Roman empire because it was neither holy nor Roman. It was not Roman, but German, and it was decidedly unholy. (Applause.)

It was through this beautiful union of church and state with the sanction of Peter's successor, who himself was at the head of the whole order, that you find bishops entangled with all the duties of the state, with which their civil tenures to lands, with which their bishoprics were enriched, to actually furnish so many soldiers and not unfrequently willing, or not unwilling, to lead these soldiers, clad in mail, engaged in the frays of their petty lord.

And from this beautiful union of church and state that rose from the gratitude of newly converted people's lavishing everything at the feet of the church, came the indescribable corruption, the degenerate ignorance, the degradation of morals both in the clergy and the laity, the interminable confusion of the middle ages. And it was that condition of things, that need of reformation, a need that still continued for centuries in spite of the cry that was going up from thousands of the faithful for reformation of the church both in its head and in its members, it was that condition of things that continued so long in spite of the prayers of so

many saints and sages, in spite of the sincere conviction and the earnest desire of all men everywhere, it was the continuation of that influence that made necessary the protestant reformation. (Applause.)

It is not my business here to-night, dear friends, to justify the destruction of any of the good things that that protestant reformation destroyed. I believe as a matter of history, a matter of intense conviction, that in endeavoring to reform things, it destroyed as much as it reformed; that in endeavoring to brush away cobwebs and reform abuses it actually took away from the teaching and custody of the Christian church many precious doctrines and sacraments. But at the same time it seemed that this protestant reformation became, as it were, a necessity, a matter of course to be delayed no longer, and to be foreseen by any intelligent, sagacious spirit, as are the physical tempests that, no matter how much they may destroy, are yet absolutely indispensable to the general equilibrium of nature. After a protracted heated term of many days in hot climates, it becomes absolutely necessary that there should be a tempest of thunder and lightning, hurricanes, tornadoes. I know that the tornado or hurricane is no respecter of persons or institutions. I know that the thunderbolt of heaven may rive the steeple of God's church as well as it may destroy a building dedicated to unworthy or unholy uses.

And so it may be with great political, great social revolutions. They may do much harm. They may do great wrong in the effort to effect radical remedy. They may tear up the roots of the old things, without which we should be but ill. And yet that storm, that tempest, that hurricane, becomes, as it were, a necessity because of the criminal stupidity, the carelessness, the heartlessness, the meanness, with which those in authority, whether in church or state, repel as rebellious the cry that goes up from thousands of places all over the world, the cry begging for justice, for truth, for mercy, for reformation. (Applause.)

It is the tendency of power everywhere to aggrandize itself. It is a rare thing for power to abdicate or to give up a tithe of what it possesses. The love of power, of self, like other passions, grows by what it feeds upon. You may find cases, several in history, of great emperors who abdicated individually the imperial throne. But you will find few, if any, cases of emperor or king who voluntarily diminished one jot or tittle of the imperial or kingly power. Though they abdicated the throne, they left it with all its power of despotism unaltered to their successors.

During these middle ages the papacy gradually grew to be a sort of universal sovereign, largely built up by the wish of the people themselves in their gratitude to the power that had done so much for them. But in spite of all that, we must say that it was a great misfortune that the church enjoyed such power. The church would have been a still wiser mistress if she had as speedily as possible taught the children she had educated to go out and prove themselves, if she had spurned the kingly office that was offered to her. Even though the crown should have thrice been offered to her she should have thrice refused it. It is a thousand pities that the church forgot the spirit of her master in not repeating "all the ages, My kingdom is not of this world." (Applause.)

They justify the union of church and state as necessary for the liberty of the church. To that we may say that the best union of church and state does exist to a great extent here because of the admirable liberty that is given to all churches to do as they please, to teach as they please, provided their teachings do not conflict with public morality. Here, then, I say, we need no better union of church and state than we have. And what we call separation of church and state is the best union, where the church will respect the rights of the country and the country will respect the liberty of all churches to teach their creeds. (Applause.)

The temporal power, the wealth lavished upon the church, became a most fruitful source of corruption of popes, and cardinals, and prelates, and priests. The pope to a great extent became a temporal ruler, enriching his family, providing husbands for his nieces and wives for his nephews. (Laughter.) It is largely to the papal court and to ecclesiastical courts, to popes and cardinals and bishops, that we owe that odious word with which the dictionary of all European languages has unfortunately been enriched—the word "nepotism." The pope, the successor of Peter, the feeder of the lambs of Christ, becomes a temporal ruler. He is making treaties with France against Spain and treaties with Spain against France. He is forming alliances with foreign powers against Italian principalities. Then he allies himself with the Italian principalities against these foreign powers. And thus Catholic countries have had to look upon him time and again as a foreign enemy, and while calling him holy father they have hated and sent them out to shoot this holy father. (Laughter and applause.)

This went so far that Pope Alexander VI of infamous memory—his holiness, Pope Alexander VI, well known as Rodrick Borgia—had his illegitimate children occupying his palaces. And Caesar Borgia, a great swash-buckler, a bully, a brute, a desperado and adventurer, in the name of and by the authority of his father, his holiness, Alexander VI, was actually traveling up and down the unfortunate Italian states killing and robbing and murdering in the name of his father, the holy father, the pope. (Applause.) And Lucrèce Borgia, well known upon these boards (great applause)—she was another one of the beautiful children of his holiness, Alexander VI. And it is significant that at the time that his holiness, Alexander VI, ruled the Roman church, a chubby, dexter haired little German boy was playing round the streets of a town in Saxony, a boy whose name was Martin Luther. (Applause.)

And after Alexander VI there was a pope, Julius II. And he did not leave it to any son of his, if he had one, as I believe he didn't. He actually went on horseback to conquer the rebellious city of Bologna. And he had a cast made of himself in metal, sword in hand, and this in the name of him who said: "My kingdom is not of this world." (Applause.)

All this because it was indispensable to the liberty and the dignity, and the decorum, and the support of the holy see that it should enjoy the temporal power which it had inherited by a special providence of God for nearly a thousand years. During the middle ages the pope at the head of Christendom assumed as much as he could of power, temporal as well as spiritual. And he asserted his right to interfere with the feuds of princes, protesting that he did not judge concerning the sin. And, on that pretense, there is nothing in human life in which priest, pope or bishop could not interfere.

"We are bound to take our religion from Peter." Yes; properly understood and only with very great reservations. Now, there is nothing unchristian in that. The very definition of the pope as the papal infallibility is hedged about with all sorts of reservations. This teaching power of the church is a gift of infallibility, it is when the pope, at the head of this Roman church, as the successor of St. Peter, teaching the uni-

versal church, defining something, settling a great controversy about religion, teaching something, not as a new doctrine, but simply defining more explicitly and in clear and unquestionable terms with the seal of authority—much like a decision of the supreme court of the United States—not a new thing, but the old constitution and the old faith of the church. (Applause.) That is all. (Applause.) And it is the teaching of Catholic theology, of Roman theology which I have learned in Rome, that it is not in the power of councils or popes, or council and pope together, or the whole Catholic episcopate called together, to teach any new doctrine as a doctrine of the Christian faith. If it is a new doctrine, then it cannot be a doctrine of the Christian faith. (Applause.) All that they can do is to define that such and such a doctrine is contained in the original deposit of faith. The mere fact of their coming out to teach a new revelation would condemn them out of their own mouths.

Now, that immediately brushes away ninety-nine one-hundredths of all this rubbish that we hear about every day, that we heard last Sunday or read in the newspapers that there had been uttered on Sunday the pope sitting in his high chair—somebody put emphasis upon the word high—the pope in his high chair (laughter), that everything that the pope utters from his high chair is an oracle of God, that we are bound to believe all that the holy father says. A man in this very city dared from a Catholic pulpit to preach such rubbish as that last Sunday. (Hisses and cries of "Preston.") He said substantially that every word of the holy father was the utterance of the Holy Ghost. Now, is not that monstrous? Will the crowd ever hear such trash? (Cries of "No! no!" and applause.) Does it not make the cheeks of you Catholics tingle and burn with shame? (Cries of "Yes! yes!")

Now, what does theology say? That the pope simply is the representative, the successor, of Peter in defining the faith, the dogmas, most of which must be pretty well defined after these nineteen centuries, so that surely there can remain but little more to be defined. And it must be something that is already commonly accepted, and as good as defined, and taught in the general deposit or teaching of the church or it would not be capable of definition. With that exception what is told in our theology by the pope is fallible to anybody else. We are perfectly free as Catholics to believe—we know by painful experience—that he is capable of the most egregious blunders and crimes. (Applause.) We know that one pope will criticize and deplore the improvidences, the imperfections, the crimes of his predecessors, by which whole nations have been lost to the Catholic faith.

Pope Pius V squabbled over the legitimacy of Queen Elizabeth. And if the people of England were content to have an illegitimate woman reign over them, what business was it of his? But he was bound to stick up for the legitimacy of Henry VIII's second wife, Queen Catharine. But if the English Catholics were such fools, if it was a foolish thing, were pleased to have another kind of a woman to reign over them, that was "their funeral" and not his. (Applause.) And then the pope gets himself mixed up in an alliance with that brutal despotism of Spain to invade England and depose Queen Elizabeth. And what wonder, then, that the patriotic Englishmen hated the very name of pope? What wonder, then, that they could hardly find anything worse to frighten children with, as a sort of bluff, than to talk about the pope. (Laughter and applause.)

So far it is from being true that the pope's every word is the oracle of the Holy Ghost that it is the explicit teaching of Catholic theology that the pope may utter blunders, not merely in private conversation, but that he may go into the pulpit of St. Peter's church—next door to his—"prison," and from the pulpit of that church preach a sermon, and that sermon may be as full of heresies as a plum pudding is of plums.

The pope as a preacher in St. Peter's church, or any other church, teaching a single congregation, may be so ignorant of his theology and the definitions of the church as to teach heresy upon heresy. And some poor layman, some student, sitting at the foot of the pulpit, might say, "Well, isn't he a fool of himself?" And somebody might very truthfully say after making the usual genuflections to the pope: "Well, holy father, of course, it is a long time since you have studied your theology, and permit me to tell you very frankly that there were half a dozen heresies in this sermon. You said so and so, and the opposite was defined by the council of Constantinople, and so and so, and the opposite was defined by the council of Trent, and is the teaching of all the theologians;" and the pope would have to acknowledge his mistake. And it would be the duty of the theologians to laugh him up and say "What are you talking about?" And the pope might print his sermon in a book, and it might be the duty of the theologians to humbly petition him to allow them to put that book on the index of forbidden books until carefully expurgated. This may seem all a joke, but I assure you it is sound Roman theology. And now you see how much importance is to be attached to this New York theologian (applause) about every word that the pope utters being the oracle of the Holy Ghost. While they claim the right to rule and to demand of everybody else obedience, they have never yet dared to say, except some of these New York theologians, that the pope is assuredly guided by the Holy Ghost in all his utterances and that we are bound to obey him in everything because the Holy Ghost won't permit him to command anything wrong. Now, that is making of the pope a grand lama, a kind of fetish worse than the Delphic oracle, it is actually asserting for the pope what the pope has hardly ever dared even in his highest flights, even sitting on his highest high chair, to say for himself. (Laughter.)

The pope has no right to rule the flock of Christ. How much! In what way? In things that common sense would suggest to be his business. But these flatterers of the pope, these adulators, these men ignorant of theology, who flatter the human vanity of the pope, the natural love of power in the pope, just as natural and as great as in any other man, these men are making of the pope a kind of divinity, are making of the pope such a power as the world must simply reject with loathing and with unspeakable indignation. (Applause.) "All you subjects of the pope are bound to obey him. Are we? In what? In things that belong to his office, say, and nothing else. Has he a right to send a telegram to one of us, saying, 'Come over here to Rome; I want to talk to you about something.' I shall not exactly tell you what, nor say how long I shall keep you here." And in the good old times he might have stuck you into jail and kept you there for life by virtue of his kingly power as the temporal as well as the spiritual ruler of Rome. Has he a right to do that? I say, no. (Cries of "No! no!" and applause.) This power is necessarily limited by the very nature of the case that every man's conscience is the final arbiter of the pope's right to rule and to demand of everybody else obedience. The Christian church will best fulfill its mission when it goes back as near as it can to the spirit and the condition of its founder. That pope in all modern times will be the

greatest of popes, the greatest of all popes except himself, who shall, like Peter, without temporal power, without scrip or staff, walk about the earth and who shall be a man among men, who shall spurn from him the flatterers, who shall almost literally kick in the mouth the men who so debase their manhood as to come to kiss his foot. (Great applause.) He will be the greatest of popes who by some miracle shall be elected to the chair of Peter—nothing short of a miracle can permit in the existing circumstances the existing men to elect such a pope—who, elected as if by a miracle, shall use all the monstrous power that has been given to him, to abdicate that power, to break it, to smash it, to grind it to powder and make it impossible for his successors for a thousand years to build it up again. (Applause.)

When a little while ago some one said that he would be one of the greatest of the popes who should be seen walking down Broadway (laughter) clad in the ordinary habiliments of a modern man and refusing to let men carry him upon their shoulders, when all men would carry him in their hearts, it was looked upon as blasphemy. "What! The pope to wear such a thing as an ordinary mortal?" As if it were worse almost than denying the trinity to assert that the pope should walk the streets with a hat of modern fashion (laughter), with a hat that should not be 500 years behind the fashion. As if it were necessary for the dignity and the honor of the office of Peter that he must wear a hat, if he wears a hat at all, 500 years old. So that, no doubt, from that point of view, it will be eminently a proper thing 500 years from now, when perhaps stovepipe hats will be five hundred years behind the fashion, for the pope to be seen carried on some kind of vehicle up and down Broadway wearing a stovepipe hat. (Great laughter.)

Now is it a necessary concomitant of the office of Peter that he must be worshipped like a grand lama with three genuflections, one at the door, one at the middle, one at his chair; after which there comes a kind of a scramble to get at his foot and kiss it, and carried on men's shoulders in a position in which it is hard for anybody to look very dignified? Is it necessary, in order to do the will of his master, to preach the gospel as he preached for six, seven, nearly eight hundred years the best of his predecessors, that the pope shall for all time to come be a temporal ruler, shall have a kingdom over that to rule in spite of his subjects, as if those so-called subjects were so many cattle, born upon his estate, with no more rights than cattle? Is it necessary for the office of Peter that his successor shall be to-day the worst enemy of his country, that he shall be the chief obstacle to the liberty, the unity and the independence of Italy?

One of the most unpardonable, and, in some ways, amusing aspects of the subject, is that the greatest sticklers for this temporal power, this kind of pope, are those who call the spiritual and the temporal sovereignty of the vicar of Christ, are men converted from English or American Protestantism. Talk about Irish Catholics! I am glad to vindicate the Irish blood within me by saying that the most incredible subservience, the most brutal adulation of the pope, comes from converts, English and American, to the Catholic faith. And some of the best hopes of resistance to the undue assumption of temporal power, the restraining of the pope's power where it has no business to-day in the rebellious spirit of Irish Catholics. (Great applause.)

"The beneficence of the pope's influence in politics." It is the curse of nearly every nation. It has been the curse of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, England, Ireland. God forbid! God forbid that the hated thing should have an ill-omened revival. There is a sort of revival just now, but I am glad to believe—in fact, I think I know—that it is a sort of opera bouffe revival. One of the greatest humorists of the age, Prince Bismarck, thought he might as well amuse himself by capturing a few rocks away out in the Pacific ocean, a portion of the Caroline islands upon which some German settler had built a shanty, and Bismarck thought he might as well take those islands. The Spanish hitlagoes got their blood up about this, and Bismarck, the humorist, thought it too huge a joke to have a war with Spain over such a trifle; and only too glad to get any kind of half-way decent way of backing out of such a comic opera situation, sent somebody to Rome to ask his holiness, the pope, to kindly consent to be arbitrator in this very unpleasant controversy that had arisen between Germany and Spain.

And the pope, the successor of Peter, the representative of Christ, was actually flattered, intensely flattered, by the attention of Bismarck. And he fell in love with Bismarck. There was a kind of flirtation between him and Bismarck, and they exchanged portraits. (Great laughter.) And the flatterers of the pope began to tell him that he was one of the greatest of the popes. "Have you heard the roar of our lion?" punning upon his name, Leo, which you know means lion. "Have you seen the revival of the dignity of the holy see? It seems we are in the middle ages again, when the pope was the arbitrator of nations." (Laughter.) And that opera bouffe performance of the Caroline islands is one of the chief glories of this "most glorious reign." This adulation, piling it on an inch thick, is really something too disgusting.

There was a pope who died about ten years ago, who lived in the papacy some thirty-one years. One would have supposed that there never had been a pope before him. He was a great, immortal, wonderful man whom the Lord, in his singularly loving providence, had granted to our age. And the poor old man was hardly fairly cold before he was forgotten and another man was selected in his place. And it is really amusing to see how the man who was made a god of but a few years ago is now coldly dismissed by the title of "Your predecessor." The flatterers of the present pope are wise. People do not like to hear too much praise of their predecessors or successors. If you wish to be courteous to the pope have a care that you do not praise Pius IX too much now in any of your addresses to Leo XIII. And do not be too ready to praise any cardinal whom you happen to know as one eminently fit to fill the see of St. Peter, for such a man would then have a chance of being related to some very obscure bishopric. (Applause.)

Now, my dear brethren and sisters, is it not near the time for those of us that are Catholics to raise our voices and protest that it is no part of our religion to engage in this fulsome adulation and deification of a poor old gentleman, seventy-eight years old, with one foot in the grave; a poor, tottering, absent-minded old man, who is flattered by his worshippers with the notion that he is one of the greatest of the pontiffs and can arbitrate the quarrels of nations? Imagine Bismarck, if he had any really serious business in hand, committing it to the arbitration of the pope. (Laughter.) Imagine anybody seriously going to Bismarck and proposing to him that he should submit to the arbitration of the pope the question of the possession or the restoration of Alsace and Lorraine! (Cries of "Ah! ah!" and applause.)

So far it is from being true that the pope in politics, by being in politics, is furthering the kingdom of Christ, is preaching the gospel

to every creature, that his being in politics is the chief impediment to the universal preaching of the gospel and the coming of the glorious day foretold by the master, when there shall be but one Christian fold, of which fold shall be the spiritual and loving shepherd. It is through the temporal sovereignty of the pope that Italy, which would be perhaps the greatest of Catholic countries, is to-day forced into an attitude of bitter hostility to the papacy because of its clinging to the rotten old timbers of the accursed temporal throne.

To drop up that tottering throne in '30 and since, the pope, prompt to act, called the bayonets of French and Austrians and Spaniards, so that the Romans were compelled every day that they walked the streets of their native city, to witness the shame of a foreign garrison, brought there by the pope to keep them slaves. What wonder, then, that they hated the accursed thing?

We here are just beginning to get a taste of it in the alliances of corrupt political factions with the ecclesiastical machine. We have had a taste of it here in the recent election. (Great applause.) We had a taste of it at seventeen years ago in the not very secret alliance, offensive and defensive, between the Tweed Tammany ring and a clique of Catholic priests, ratified by a clandestine meeting one Sunday evening in the back room of the episcopal residence in Mulberry street between Peter B. Sweeney and Archbishop McCloskey. (Applause.) And the object of that alliance between that infamous corrupt political faction and this ecclesiastical machine was to rob the public treasury; it was by clandestine arts, not by open persuasion, but by the clandestine arts of Peter B. Sweeney, by inserting clauses in the acts of the legislature, that the legislators themselves would not understand, to secure public money for Catholic schools.

And one chief reason of this alliance to-day between these two corrupt machines is that the corrupt democratic machine expects to get and does get Catholic votes, through the influence of the confessional and the pulpit and all the arts (great applause) of which the ecclesiastical machine is master. And the object of that corrupt political faction, to retain the enormous appropriations that are given every year, not by new legislation, but by old legislation, at the rate of a hundred dollars and sometimes a hundred and ten dollars a head for every person of the name of Sweeney in public institutions. So that out of your treasury to-day that ecclesiastical machine is practically receiving well on to a million dollars yearly; though it may be a surprise to most of you to hear it to-night from this platform for the first time.

And one of these institutions, the so-called Catholic protector, not satisfied with the between three and four hundred thousand dollars a year that it must be receiving from your treasury, has been a perfect nuisance at the doors of the legislature at Albany, constantly begging for additional appropriations and bode for the politicians with its promises and its threats—with the implied promise that politicians good to that institution would not be forgotten at the polls and that the politicians who should refuse would not be forgotten either. (Applause.) And if in the last presidential election I supported Mr. Cleveland, it is my firm purpose, as you will easily understand, to do what I can to support the candidate of the united labor party at the coming election. (Applause.) What I did say for President Cleveland—it was not much—was not so much out of love for President Cleveland as it was out of love for the Catholic church, to do something, to vindicate the Catholic church from being actually nothing but a wretched tail to the kite of corrupt Tammany hall, so that, because of the dissatisfaction of Tammany hall with Mr. Cleveland, he should lose the suffrages of these very people and be antagonized by them. It was too sad a sight; and I for one did what I could to show that there were priests as well as Catholic laymen who could afford to maintain independence and not be dictated to by that machine in politics. And seventeen years ago in published interviews, with a certain prudence and moderation, I put very clearly before the public mind the question: Is it a proper thing to have any such alliance?

And if they must have Catholic schools, which I do not believe; if we must have private charities, if we have the fun of getting them up we should also have the luxury of supporting them out of our own purses. And I do not care to say much about myself, but it occurs to me that if I am somewhat in disfavor with that ecclesiastical machine of late it was not entirely because of some very public occurrences with which you are so familiar, but because of this more ancient history that I am now recalling. (Applause.) This infallible pope who can never say anything wrong or do anything unwise, this infallible, impeccable pope, whom it would seem as if it were the duty of everybody to consider impeccable, has time and again deceived the politics of nations as to-day he does the politics of Italy. There are in that country good men, holy men, learned men, gifted men, priests, bishops and members of religious orders who are hungering for contention between their church and their country, but they scarcely dare to speak.

Of course it is the fashion for a few days for the new pope to be a little liberal and want to reform things. Good old Pius IX started as a liberal, but he did not want to go quite so far with such reforms as others. Then he took the back track. My predecessor in St. Stephens, Dr. Cummings, while on a visit to Italy, heard of the pope, who was on his travels, at Bologna, heard from friends of the pope right there, who felt it was their duty to say to Pius IX, with all the professions and adulations and reverences, "Holy father, there would be some little reforms desirable in your temporal administration, and of course, your holiness, in your wisdom, will see you must not overlook them, at the same time you will excuse and forgive us; our great devotion to your holiness compels us to speak, but just a few reforms are needed." And the pope said: "Am I pope, or am I not?" (shaking his head emphatically.) (Great laughter.) And then the final, unapproachable sentence was: "I had enough of reforms in '43." No more reform for him.

And so this present pope but yesterday, or a few days ago, when King Humbert was willing to show that he was not a Catholic, when he sent some offerings of kindly respect and friendship to the pope, they were thrown back in his face.

And the present pope is trying to strengthen his alliance with England, with Russia, with Prussia, at the expense every time of the poor Catholic people (applause), of north Germany, of Poland, of England, of Ireland. (Applause.) The pope in politics! Look at the outrage recently put upon the faithful people of Ireland by sending a commission of two Italian prelates to investigate them at the dictation of an English lord, with the object of repressing their patriotic sentiments in order to obtain the help of England in building up his rotten temporal throne. (Applause.)

The pope in politics! Infallible! Most fallible of men. He can scarcely take a step but what he is sure to make a blunder worse than a crime because he has no business in politics. It is his business to preach the gospel to every one, and every man should stick to his own

trades, and the ecclesiastical club, like every other cobbler, should stick to his last. (Applause.) And a man who might make a good priest would make, as a rule, a very poor politician, of which I, myself, am a conspicuous example. It is one of the signs of the times, that the church and churchmen, who are criminally neglecting their own business of preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments to the poor, they seek to control education and politics, of which you have examples lying loose all around you in this very city and all over this country. (Applause.)

I differ myself that although I am not much of a priest I am a better priest than I am a politician (cheers and applause), and I think I can safely say, as a matter of fact, that not the least of the crimes charged against me was substantially that I was too single minded and too enthusiastic and too childlike in my belief in the teaching of the church and the divine efficacy of the sacraments of Christ. I believed that religion needed not the pulpit, wretched, miserable aid of sham parochial schools, that it needed not alliances of a corrupt political faction, that all it needed was to raise up priests with the spirit of Christ to send out to preach the gospel to every creature, to administer his holy sacraments, and that we in this magnificent field of perfect freedom would speedily bring the whole land to acknowledge the beauty of the religion of Christ. I am sure that in not the least of the churches—that over which I happened to be pastor—there were no political preachers, and no priests who were in the pews (great applause), even when they were sent through ecclesiastical channels by the vicar general or the boss of Tammany Hall. (Rises and applause.) And it is clearly true that you can be good Catholics, and I pray that you shall be all the better Catholics, for refusing in the name of religion to take your politics from Rome; for the more of your politics you take from Rome the less religion you will have (applause), and the more you refuse to take your politics from Rome the more likely you are to preserve your religion in its purity and to win for your religion the respect and the friendship and even perhaps the fellowship of your fellow countrymen. The Catholic religion is best today where it has been remotest for generations from the intrigue and the politics of the court of Rome. (Applause.) The Catholic religion has been purest, it has the most perfect allegiance of all those who call themselves Catholics at all in Holland, in Ireland, in England, in Scotland and in North Germany—in all those countries where the church is shorn of temporal power, where it has no voice in politics.

I know that such a sermon as I am preaching is not one likely to be heard from any Catholic pulpit (laughter); and yet I assure you on my honor as a man and my faith as a priest that I have taught nothing that is not compatible with the strictest Catholic theology. (Great applause.) I wish again and again to plead guilty to the charge of being a very poor politician. Nay, more; I wish to say, rather in vindication of myself than in confessing a fault, that I am no politician at all. I am a priest, and nothing but a priest. (Cries of "Good, good!" and applause.) If I seem to have made myself singular in coming out from time to time upon secular platforms, it never was in spite of my priesthood; it was because of my priesthood. (Applause.) It was because my heart was breaking with love at the painful spectacle of large masses of men continuing to be estranged from the church of Christ because of her apparent heartlessness toward their miseries; because of her apparent readiness to side with their oppressors; of her apparent readiness to be a volunteer policeman to club down the aspirations of struggling nationalities; to retard the progress of science; to be an enslaver rather than an emancipator of the masses of men. And I was glad to come out upon some secular platforms that might have seemed political, but to me were entirely non-political; to show that I was entirely free from the taint of politics, and to show the preventing of misery and poverty, that it was the teaching of revealed as well as of natural religion; that God is the father of all, and therefore we are all his children, equally entitled to natural bounties, and that landlordism, whether in Ireland or America, is against natural religion.

I deny the right of the pope, or of any man on earth, because I am a priest, to forbid me, a free man, a citizen, at the request of my fellow citizens, from fulfilling my duty as a citizen in coming to consult with them about their economic and political affairs. I deny the right of pope, propaganda or bishop to interfere with my political right, to interfere with my right as a man and citizen, and I assert my right not merely as a man and a citizen, but also as a priest, and just because I am a priest, all the more to bring whatever light I can from natural or revealed religion upon public platforms and to show the people light upon a complex problem of political economy.

Because of all this routine and misinformation and sticking up for authority, whether right or wrong, there are men and women here, some actually excommunicated, others as good as excommunicated, for simply holding a truth in political economy; a truth of natural religion which is actually the teaching of religion itself. "The pope is his high chair, the great friend of science, the promoter of liberty." "The church has always been on the side of liberty, of science, of progress." So said the theologians last Sunday, and so said some of the politicians on last Wednesday at Cooper Union. (Hisses.) About a thousand years ago an Irish bishop was clubbed as heretical for teaching that there were antipodes; but I have seen people from the antipodes and have had them dining at my table and all none the worse. (Laughter.) And the pope himself sent a cardinal out to the antipodes, Cardinal Moran of Sydney, a man whom he called all the way from Sydney to make archbishop of Dublin in spite of the unanimous wish of the people and clergy of Dublin and the bishops of Ireland. He sent all the way to Australia to bring back an Irishman named Moran, a nephew of Cardinal Cullen (hisses and groans), to make him archbishop of Dublin to please Queen Victoria. What had the Holy Ghost got to do with that, I should like to know? (Great laughter and applause.) While this man was coming on his long voyage from Australia the bishops and clergy of Ireland so browbeat the pope, almost threatening a schism, that the pope was really compelled to appoint Archbishop Walsh. And so the Australian priest was met at Brindisi on the way from Australia and told that he was not to be archbishop of Dublin, but that the pope would send him back a cardinal. There is the pope in politics ready to sell out poor Ireland. (Cries of "That's it! That's it!" and applause.) There's the man Simoni writing an insulting letter to the bishops of Ireland, calumniating the pope as good as written by a little Anglo-Irish impudiculous lord of Erington. The foolish people of Longford elected the man as a home rule member, and he went to Rome to do the dirty work of the English government, which he no doubt succeeded to a large extent in doing, as the duke of Norfolk has actually complimented the pope for his "restraining influence in British politics," which, being interpreted,

means having used his ecclesiastical club to club poor Paddy into submission. (Great applause.)

Now there is enough Irish blood in me, or rather I say there is enough of the red blood of a man in me, to make me angry—to make me say, at all hazards, to you Catholic men and women, to make me willing to say to all the world if I could, let the pope mind his own business. Insist upon it, clamor for it, petition, demand, threaten to rebel, refuse supplies, tighten your purse strings (cries of "That's it!" and applause), compel that ecclesiastical machine to give the clergy and the people the election of their bishops by the very same system by which all the great doctors and saints and confessors for eight hundred or a thousand years were elected, and the control of your temporalities. Demand a voice as to the amount of salary that shall be paid to your archbishop, who has practically the incredible right to name his own salary.

Every pope's authority is limited always by right reason and common sense; and when priest or pope interferes with your politics or dictates to you unduly about the education of your children, in such matters tell them to mind their own business. If they choose to excommunicate you for that, you can say with a clear conscience: "Let them excommunicate me." And as much as we value these sacraments, we are theologians enough to know that God never limited his own power. Thank God, it is the teaching of Catholic theology that conscience is supreme. (Great applause.)

There come times for nations and individuals when they must fall back upon that reserved right of conscience; and it is my own case to-day. I had no misgivings. I am as near to God to-night perhaps as I ever was in all my life, an excommunicated, isolated priest. (Applause.) And so shall it be with each one of you.

And now, before I end, is it not monstrous to hear from any pulpit the assertion that we must take our politics from the pope as well as our religion? When we hear that corrupt gang of politicians in Cooper Union last Wednesday glorifying the ecclesiastical machine in order to bolster up their own and talking about the magnificent things the pope has done for civilization, is it not monstrous, I say, that with such utterances in our newspapers we should look in vain in the editorial columns for even an exclamation of surprise? What has befallen such papers as *Harpers Weekly*, and the *Tribune*, and the *Herald*, and all the newspapers that but a little while ago would have been ringing with denunciation of the ecclesiastical machine for interfering in our politics. The only paper that has made an utterance, as far as I know, at all is the *New York Times* to-day, which actually adjudges us the honor of being the only ones to make a vigorous protest as Christians, as Catholics, as Americans, against such an outrage.

But the *Times* minimizes us much as it can the horrible utterances of Mr. Preston (hisses) and asserts that after all they are only his individual utterances, although he is the vicar-general and that not a particle of weight is to be attached to them beyond what belongs to the utterances of Mr. Preston. And the *Times* says that it would be a pity that so erratic a character as Mr. McElvyn should carry off the glory of being about the only one to stand up for Americanism against this interference of the ecclesiastical machine. And so the *Times* does what it can to minimize the utterances of Mr. Preston and to make lighter our protest and to justify the interference of the very same ecclesiastical machine which, because, after all, it is eminently proper that it should discipline a priest who was "denouncing the rights of property" and who was actually going in for "general robbery and confiscation." Of course it is hardly necessary to say that the *Times* is calumniating you and me and that in effect it is actually justifying the monstrous interference of that ecclesiastical machine with an American political party and with one American citizen.

And now I prophesy that the know-nothings of the future will not be so much your native Americans as they will be Irish Catholics (cheers and applause)—that the men to put to shame you Americans of protestant and puritan faith, the men to put you to the blush in their magnificent protest against the interference of any ecclesiastical machine will be men of Catholic faith and men largely of Irish extraction. (Applause.)

And now, dear friends, I will end with the thought that is always uppermost in my mind, the thought of universal charity, of supreme love that makes us embrace with tenderest affection even those who would put us to death. It is natural enough that we should be all the more indignant at the abuses of something that has been very near and very dear to us. We may condemn the crime, but we must have infinite pity and infinite charity for the offenders. And I think I can safely say, with all sincerity and honesty, that in all my action I am prompted not by hatred but by much love (applause), not by hatred of that Catholic church which has ever retained for its faith and sacraments, my profoundest allegiance and affection—not by hatred even of those men who are its administrators. I am philosopher enough to know that they themselves are the creatures and the victims of the machine. It would be a heroic man that, being elected pope, could be so far above his surroundings as to use his power to crush the very machine that had made him king. But this is my hope and this is my prayer. That that power that now seems so wonderfully entrenched shall in the providence of God be broken up either by mighty revolutions that shall reduce the machine to impotence and poverty so that all the unworthy shall be driven from the ship, and that poverty, destitution, persecution, martyrdom may purify the church; or the other alternative which seems far more difficult of fulfillment—that in the providence of God there shall come a great man with wondrous genius, with mighty heart, with dauntless courage to smash the machine that shall have created him, to make the first use of his power in kicking away the thresholds which they will have placed him; in disposing with the useless lackeys, and soldiers, and guards, and servants, in vacating his so-called prison of the Vatican with its four thousand rooms and its pagan museum and princely courtyards, and making a free donation of all his things to the people of Rome, and saying to the people of Italy and the world: "I ask nothing but your love, that you will lend me your ears that I may preach to you the truths of Christ; I ask none of the earthly gifts beyond what may be necessary for my poor shelter and raiment, and I shall be cautious in becoming even the almoner of your charities. I have more than enough to do to preach Christ, and Him crucified, to teach men to pray, to teach them morals and virtue, and to administer the consolation of Christ's sacraments. Tempt me not with power and with wealth. I will give you all that I have if you will but give the allegiance of your minds and the worship of your hearts to His love that is in Christ."

When such a man shall come upon the world, when such a man shall sit in the chair of Peter he shall be the blessed precursor of the coming of the kingdom of heaven. (Great applause.)

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Henry George Speaks on the Tariff Question.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 12.—The announcement that Henry George would speak on the tariff question on last Sunday night filled Lincoln hall to overflowing half an hour before the time fixed, and a great crowd had to be turned away. Mr. B. Hettzel presided, and in a few words introduced Mr. George.

Mr. George began by speaking of the great Reading strikes as evidencing that while men were crying "peace, peace," our industrial organization was in reality passing into a state of chronic warfare.

He alluded to the letter of Mr. George W. Childs in regard to the strike, published in the Philadelphia morning papers, paying a high tribute to Mr. Childs' personal character, but taking issue with his assertion that American workmen were in a prosperous condition and that this prosperity was due to the tariff. Mr. George reviewed the tariff arguments at considerable length, showing that protective duties could not raise wages and could not benefit manufacturers, but that they in reality only resulted in benefiting monopolists and enabling them the better to fight their workmen when the latter tried issue with them in strikes. He declared that protection could never accomplish anything for workmen, and that the emancipation of labor could only be brought about by the securing of the abolition of monopolies and the securing to all men of their equal and unalienable rights. He ceased the popular disposition to accept the transparent fallacy of protection to the state of things brought about by shutting out labor from the natural opportunities the Creator has provided for his exertion, thus leading men to look on work as a good thing in itself.

Mr. George gave a brief exposition of the principles of the anti-poverty movement and showed how the application of the principle of the single tax would in Pennsylvania break up the monopoly of coal land and solve what are now called the difficulties between capital and labor. He hailed the opening of the tariff discussion as the beginning of the greatest possible relief of protection to the state of things brought about by shutting out labor from the natural opportunities the Creator has provided for his exertion, thus leading men to look on work as a good thing in itself.

At the conclusion of his address Mr. George answered many questions from the audience. A large collection was taken up. Louis F. Post of New York will be the speaker at the next anti-poverty meeting in Lincoln hall next Sunday night. Mr. Post will also discuss the tariff question.

From Lawrence J. McParlin.

LOCKPORT, N. Y.—Election being over, time enough has elapsed to allow the smoke to raise from the battlefield so that we may examine the results of the contest.

We have gained far more than any of the "old guard" expected. Seventy thousand votes cast by men in the state of New York who fully understand the principles of the united labor party at the recent election means at least 50,000 active, earnest aggressive workers first, last and all the time for our party.

In Niagara county, with few exceptions, our votes came from young men. At our semi-monthly meetings, which continue right along, those young men are present and bring new recruits every meeting. The good work goes on uninterrupted. We cannot stop now if we wanted to. Inquiries for our documents come to me daily from different parts of this county, and I supply them promptly. This headquarters don't close up the day after election like those of the old parties.

I have been in labor movements—political I mean—since 1876 continuously, and as a result of that experience I am forced to the conclusion that the word "labor" in the party name is detrimental.

I could not help noticing that every speaker in the last campaign had to explain that this party, although called the united labor party, was not simply an organization of laborers, farm hands, etc., but included brain workers, professional men, clerks, business men, etc.

Why did they do this? Simply because they saw in the audience before them clergy-men, lawyers, manufacturers, merchants, clerks, students, and last and not least, I was very sorry to say, comparatively few laborers and mechanics as generally understood. We get our assistance now from that great humane, liberal, educated mass, known to many by the name of the middle class. We get our workers from the thoughtful among the old labor unionists, from young mechanics just past twenty-one years, and profess socialists.

The "laborer" the owner of the "labor" I am sorry to say, is a rare bird for our party, although this is a free (?) country. I myself lost a non-political position last Monday night that I had held for seven years, and I was removed for no other reason than the single one, viz.: activity in connection with the united labor party. I knew it was coming as it was threatened five weeks before, but I told them go ahead; I never sold my birthright for a mess of pottage. Fortunately I am comfortably situated financially and their threats had no effect on me, but many a poor fellow in the last campaign, who would have spoken out in no uncertain tone, was handicapped by knowledge that work for this party meant idle days this winter. It is a sad state of affairs, but true it is.

LAWRENCE J. MCPARLIN.

State Committeeman 33d District.

From the Indianapolis Anti-Poverty Society.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind.—On Nov. 23, 1887, six persons met in the court house here and formed the anti-poverty society. The wise-acres shook their heads and predicted a failure. Dec. 4 we held our first regular meeting in Bricklayers' hall with twenty-seven persons in attendance. Jan. 1 (last night) we moved into a larger hall. This is our progress in two months. When we outgrow this hall we will get a larger one. It is the sentiment of this society that we must have a hall of our own. We have written for president this year if we have to write our tickets on the morning of the election.

I have been voting the republican ticket since 1873, or ever since I have been a voter, with a strong faith in high protective tariff, and all that the party leaders have seen fit to cram down my throat. But, thank God, I have had the clay of common sense moistened by the spittle of reason daubed on my eyes by reading "Protection or Free Trade?" until the scales have fallen away, and I think I see the dawning of a better day in the single tax and free trade doctrines of the united labor party.

THOS. J. HUNSON, Treasurer A. P. S.

A Sunday Evening Service in Harlem.

The first of a series of Sunday evening mission services for the preaching of the gospel of the new crusade will be held on Sunday evening, Jan. 10, at Arion hall, 2,233 Third Avenue. The service will be conducted by Rev. Charles F. McCarthy.

HOW LAND MONOPOLY LOCKS UP CAPITAL.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—That money invested in the purchase of the fee simple or perpetual title to land, apart from the improvements that may have been made upon it, has nothing to do with its cultivation, becomes manifest if we consider that the whole expense of cultivation is borne by the renter. If the land be cultivated by the owner, then, in that case, it is only that part of the purchase money which would pay for a year's rent that contributes to its cultivation. This is true of the land merely. If there be houses and other improvements upon it, the use of these also must be paid for by the tenant. But these improvements are necessary, and are not to be classed with land, which is ready made for us by the beneficent Author of nature, and will never leave us. Land may be impaired in value, but it cannot be destroyed or added to; and it needs not to be replaced, like houses and fences, ditches and hedges.

And since the absolute ownership of land contributes nothing to its cultivation or use, in country or in city, it follows that all capital invested in land, apart from improvements, is an unnecessary investment, and contributes nothing to production. Like the capital which formerly was invested in slaves in the south, it is diverted from any practical use to society, and only benefits the individual owner at the expense of the public.

In each case it is as if monopolists were permitted to build bridges over the highways, where there are no streams to be crossed, and yet people were compelled to pass over them.

The amount of capital thus unnecessarily invested in land can be shown to be vastly greater than the capital actually employed in production in this country.

The census report of 1880 states the aggregate assessed value of real estate in the United States to have been a trifle over thirteen thousand millions, or thirteen billions of dollars. But the universal rule of assessment is to undervalue property to the extent of from fifty to one hundred per cent; and hence the true value was twenty billion dollars.

The census report furnishes no data nor estimates of the relative values of land and the improvements thereon, but my observation justifies me in the opinion that the value of the land is quite equal to the improvements, taking the whole country into view.

If I am right in this conjecture the result will be that ten thousand millions or ten billions of American capital serves no other purpose than to enable its owners to exact rent, or, as Mr. George would say, to impose a fine upon those who till or use the land.

When slavery was abolished no property was destroyed. There was only a change of titles. And in like manner, if Mr. George's policy of taxing land to the full value of the rental should be adopted, nothing would be destroyed except the current value of certain old parchments and records, and even they would be preserved as mementoes of a past and effete civilization. But such instruments would still represent value as regards all houses and improvements upon land.

Mr. George has shown that by taxing lands to the full value of the rental, no land owner could afford to hold the land idle and pay the taxes, and the consequence would be that instead of landless people seeking homes, as under present circumstances, the homes would seek the landless people, and that instead of seeing the laboring classes tramping the country in pursuit of capital and land for employment, we should see land owners and capitalists in pursuit of labor.

If the proposed system of substituting land value taxes for all others were to be imposed the present year, conditioned to go into immediate operation, the mass of land owners, especially those of small holdings, would be taken by surprise, and would suffer great inconvenience. But years must elapse before such a law can be passed; and it might be given, as regards lands actually cultivated, a prospective operation of a long term of years. In the meantime lands unused and held for speculative prices should be taxed to the extent of their possible rental.

The south was sanguine of success until near the close of the war. The abolition of slavery at the end of four years from the commencement of the struggle took the mass of the slaveholders by surprise. They were overwhelmed with bankruptcy. Not many of them escaped that fate. They were wholly unprepared for the new order of things. The political and social cataclysm had turned society upside down. They lay stunned and prone on the earth for nearly a decade before they began to see that the earthly revolution they thought they had passed had opened up a new world of opportunity for development and progress in wealth and power. They began at length to realize that the institution which they had hugged to their bosoms as something more precious than life was in reality a chain that bound down their energies and their social forces as firmly as it held their slaves, and every southern state has now entered upon a career of prosperity never before dreamed of. Labor and the capital they had invested in labor have been set free. They can no longer invest from year to year their accumulating gains in slaves, and the consequence is that they build railroads, cotton, tobacco, woolen and iron factories, explore the hidden treasures of nature, and find invaluable mines of iron and coal and marl and phosphate where they had never in slavery times the means of looking for them.

And so it will be when the monopoly of the earth shall be abolished. But the good will come without the frightful circumstances of civil war and social revolution which ushered in the liberation of the south. Not only the capital heretofore devoted to active uses, but all the vast accumulations which men now bury in the earth must find investment in agriculture, in manufactures, in domestic and foreign commerce, or remain idle and useless in the hands of its owners. There can be no more investments in land for the sake of the "unearned increment." Men will buy land on which to build houses for dwellings and factories, and workshops, and for cultivation by hired labor; but never to hold it in idleness. And this must go on from generation to generation. Capital will even be on the qui vive for new fields of employment and for laborers to employ.

The census of 1880 stated the personal property of the United States to have been three billions eight hundred and sixty-six millions. This embraces all movable property—goods, wares, merchandise, the current crops on hand or on the way to market, all farming implements, cattle, horses, and other domestic animals, with all furniture, carriages, and whatever pertains to the household or the family. But it embraces also the active money capital and the raw material employed in all branches of business. If we add fifty per cent for undervaluation, and suppose that half, or five billions, of this personal property is now actively employed in production, it will still be but half of the amount now unproductively, unnecessarily, and mischievously employed in monopolizing the earth. The effect of Mr. George's policy will be to treble the amount of capital which is now actively employed in production, while

it will emancipate the earth from the thrall-dom of monopoly. DANIEL R. GOODLOE.

IN SOUTHERN INDIANA.

A Township's Ground Rents—Charity and the Poor.

EVANSVILLE, Ind.—An incident occurred here a few days since which very forcibly illustrates the growth of land values. It also shows how large a fund society would have with which to "promote the general welfare" if we would only "establish justice" by taking for the use of society those values which it alone creates and which justly belongs to it.

Union township, in this county, has 350 acres of school land, which for some unaccountable reason has escaped the clutches of land speculators, and is still owned by the township. Every year these lands are rented to the highest and best bidders, and the rents are applied to the support of the township schools. The improvements consist of an ordinary farm house and a barn on each of the four seventy-acre farms, into which the tract is divided. There are no other improvements worth mentioning, and it would be safe to say that their total value would not exceed twelve hundred dollars for each farm. The land in question is situated about eighteen miles from Evansville, which is the most convenient market. It is low, rich, bottom land, producing malaria, mosquitoes and corn in abundance. The water privileges are excellent, for almost every year, indeed sometimes several times in the same year, the Ohio river overflows its banks, and covers it with water, sometimes for six weeks at a time, forcing the renters to move and wait for the flood to subside. Corn is the sole crop raised, and the renters must run the great risk of losing everything from the floods. Last Tuesday these farms were rented, the renters giving good security for the rent.

The following extract from the Evansville Courier of Jan. 4 shows the result: The school lands in Union township were rented yesterday morning. There were four lots of seventy acres each, and they were rented as follows: Lot 1, Henry Sanders, for \$3.50 per acre; lot 2, Louis Neal, for 10 per acre; lot 3, Conrad Roth, \$11.75 per acre; lot 4, Joseph Hilley, \$11.50 per acre. There are three school houses to be supported out of this fund. It will be seen that the land brought splendid rental.

Southwestern Indiana has never had a "boom" like many sections of the south and west, but on the contrary is rather conservative. It has a slow, healthy growth, and land values here are more real and less speculative than at most points. The above item will give you an idea of what those values are. Very few of the farmers of Union township own the land they cultivate. One man owns, directly or indirectly, a very large part of the township, probably one-third of it in value. These renters work hard, live hard, and get but a bare living, and a poor one at that.

The very same paper that contained the above item—indeed the paper below it—contained the same column—contained another item which also forcibly illustrates something else. It shows what happens when, refusing to "establish justice" we permit labor and capital to be robbed:

During the month of December Trustee Philip Spiegel issued the following orders: 236 families supplied with groceries, 86 loads of coal, 29 sick persons provided with medical aid, 29 orders issued for shoes, 10 per cent shoes, 10 orders given for dry goods, 10 persons sent to the poor house, 6 coffins provided and 9 funerals provided for the friendless dead, 35 people granted passes to other places. A vast quantity of other relief has been granted.

Mr. Spiegel is trustee of Pigeon township, which is the one referred to in the above paragraph, and it is in the same county as Union township. The city of Evansville now covers nearly the entire township. This relief, given by the trustee, is by no means given as a matter of course to whoever chooses to apply. Unless the applicant is well recommended the case is rigidly investigated, and relief, if given, is usually so given that the applicant, to put it mildly, is not encouraged to call again. In fact, only last month a man whose only crime was that he was poor and had failed to find work, finding himself without bread for his children, applied to the authorities for aid and was refused. When urged to try again he said he would rather die.

Last winter a poor widow applied and was refused, until an indignant remonstrance was signed by the neighbors, and then very little aid was given. I mention these cases to show that all cases of want and suffering have not been relieved. Besides, the citizens of Evansville are not behind those of other cities in works of charity. We have all sorts of benevolent societies. The ladies have a benevolent organization which in a quiet way does an immense amount of charitable work.

The sisters of mercy and the little sisters of the poor are constantly working to relieve want. We have hospitals and homes for the friendless. We have wealthy citizens who do much charitable work. And yet with all our charity we do not even check the tide of poverty.

If charity will not abolish poverty, why not try justice? In so doing we will "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." CHARLES G. BENNETT.

Propaganda Work in Brooklyn.

The Nineteenth ward association of the united labor party in Brooklyn has taken rooms at 294 Hooper street, corner of Harrison avenue. There will be addresses and discussions on economic subjects on Friday evenings, and electors of the ward are invited to attend.

What It Will Do!

THOMASTON, Conn.—The throwing open of natural opportunities to the people will be the miraculous opening of the wall of a burning, crowded theater. It will afford a speedy and absolutely safe escape for the crowd which must otherwise be suffocated or trampled to death. JOHN C.

Anti-Poverty in Paterson, N. J.

PATERSON, N. J.—Our anti-poverty society meeting of Sunday, Jan. 8, was well attended. Rev. Mr. Parker delivered an interesting address, which was listened to with close attention. The cause is marching on. X. Y. Z.

Unfortunely We Are Not All Valets or Maid Servants.

There is, after all, a good deal of method about the so-called eccentricity of the eccentric Winans family, the Baltimore millionaires. They gave a ball last week in their splendid mansion to their valets, coachmen, chambermaids and other men servants and maid servants, allowing them to invite other men servants and maid servants without fear of the expenses. Of course the people were on their good behavior, the fine furniture and things were not injured, and all the guests went away firmly convinced that what the demagogues tell the workmen about the heartlessness of the capitalist and the great wrong between capital and labor is a bore. One such incident is a more powerful argument against revolutionary theories than a book full of counter theories, and it is the easiest thing in the world for the well to do to multiply such arguments.

GOOD WORDS FROM MICHAEL DAVITT.

He Denounces the Protection Hamburg and Declares for Taxation of Land Values.

Michael Davitt recently spoke at a great meeting of the English land restoration league at Rotherhithe, England. Rev. Stewart Headlam, Dr. Glennie, Wm. Saunders and John Murdoch also spoke, and the American single tax men were represented by Silas Mainville Burroughs of Medina, New York, now temporarily resident in London. Mr. Davitt said:

The landed Tory party are endeavoring to divert attention from the real cause of poverty by raising the cry that they are really want in not protection against the foreigner who sends cheap food into the country, but against the land monopolists in Great Britain who levy every year a tax of £150,000,000 on the land, and a million on the workers. The value of the land is estimated at £400,000,000 a year, and it is in the hands of a comparative few. It is the people who give the land this value, and in justice and right as much their property as is a pair of boots that any man has for his own. Do not be misled by this Tory cry of fair trade. It is simply the usual trailing of the red herring across the path of the great social movement which has for its ultimate object the full and permanent relief of the distress which the poor are now experiencing. Fair trade means high rent, low wages and dear food for the masses. Lord Salisbury has not been able to adopt it as part of his programme, because of his unholy alliance with the liberal unionists, who whose aid he has been able to drag on the Irish people; but even if it could only be such a policy that they can hope to put it into effect, it is a failure. The only sure remedy for the misery and poverty which the industrial masses are subject to is the restoration of the land to the state and the appropriation of the revenue to the public use. The land is the property of Great Britain, therefore, must do it to organize, as the people of Ireland have done, and attack the aristocratic power in its most vital part. And its most vital part is—rent. By such means you will have a new year's blessing. British land lordism as low as you have brought down a kindred system in Ireland. This ground rent monopoly operates against every one but the landlords themselves, and the poor are only tenants, who have a million while the buildings upon it, which are not much more than half the value of the land, are taxed at £7,000,000 a year. This must be reversed. Taxes must be placed on the unearned increment.

Taxes on Industry and Premiums on Idleness.

London Christian Commonwealth.

Time gives an artificial glamor of righteousness to the most flagrant wrongs. This is the only explanation which we can find for the fact that city inhabiting men have so long soiled their hands with the gross exactions which, with the sanction of the law, have been so long imposed on them under the title of "ground rents." What principles ought to guide a government in the imposition of taxation? Surely this if no other—to tax as lightly as possible the honest laborer and as heavily as possible the "unearned increment," which the many produce and the few enjoy. For in taxing the latter, society is but resuming possession of its own. Now surely on this principle, how would the tax on the "unearned increment" be regarded by our "good government" as a large part of the possession of society. The plainest dictates of wisdom would surely lead them to lay upon it a heavy burden of taxation for the good of the community. Consider, however, in governments to discover that this £150,000,000 is taxed to the extent of £500,000. That is to say, the "unearned increment" is taxed at the rate of one penny in the pound, as heavily as possible, enjoys an especial and peculiar immunity from the burdens of taxation. Taxation is imposed lightly where it ought to be imposed heavily, and heavily where it ought to be imposed lightly. Not all the royal commissions that have been sent to improve the housing of the working classes so long as a fundamental principle of good government is thus flagrantly ignored. The consequences, of course, are seen in over-crowding and disease, and in the vast numbers of the poor who are driven to the streets and on the other hand poverty. It is difficult to say which is the greater evil, that men should pay for their industry, or that men should be paid for their idleness. Both of these evils result from the present system, the one a fact implies the other, for if the produce of labor is taken from the laborers, to whom can it be given but to the idlers?

"The Weight That Crushes Labor."

The Toledo (Ohio) Industrial News, having invited expressions of views as to what is necessary to "lift the weight that crushes labor," a Chelsea (Mass.) subscriber replies as follows:

Believe in going to the root of the evil. That is the place where the trouble lies. Destroy the root and felled the tree, it will be easy work to strike off the branches afterward. Where then is the root? Why the land, of course. Without land no labor, and no owner of the land can make any terms to the one that gets his sustenance therefrom. Private ownership in land, then, is the principal dog in the manger. I am after the big dog now. Tax the land to its full rental value, and take the taxes off production, and the one that uses the land will be forced to pay a fair tax for the privilege of using the land, and this dog in the manger claiming something he never made as his own. If we were not born under the laws that sanction it we would look upon it as something criminal. It is speculation in land that raises rents and lowers wages.

The Unprotected Laboring Man.

Savoyard in Louisville Courier-Journal.

Who is the laboring man? Is not the settler who pre-empted a home in Kansas, toiled early and late, withstood the ravages of grasshoppers, braved the terrors of cyclones, dreamed of the hour when he could lift the mortgage off his farm, and labored longer than from sun to sun to that end—his not something of a laboring man? Would you protect him by keeping a tariff tax on the lumber that formed his house, the nails that held it together, the iron that covered his floor, the stoves in which he burns taxed coal—in short, every article of furniture he owns, including table furniture of every kind? Would you keep a tariff tax on the burned wood that incloses his fields, and the iron that shoes his horse and enters into the construction of all farming utensils, including engines, saws, spades, trace chains, gear, hoes and what not? Even the salt which he curries his pork—unprotected pork—is taxed. What other tax is there? The New Englander cures his fish—protected fish—is not taxed.

said against his confirmation on the ground that his sympathies are with the great corporations whose acts are likely to be reviewed and passed upon by the supreme court. The fact that Mr. Lamar was formerly a secessionist and that he still retains a personal friendship for Jefferson Davis is of the least possible consequence a score of years after the war, but the fact that he recently removed Commissioner Sparks for resisting the efforts of railways and land speculators to gobble up more public lands, is one of present and vital importance. But so far as the latter fact is remembered at all, it will be effective in securing Mr. Lamar's confirmation. The democrats will all vote for him, and most of the republicans will vote against him, on party grounds; but it is likely that Stanford, Jones, Sabin, Don Cameron and other millionaire republicans will resist party pressure and vote for Mr. Lamar's confirmation, because he is the kind of man that they personally desire to have on the supreme bench, and because the other appointments, for which his promotion was originally designed to prepare the way, are likewise to the taste of millionaire monopolists.

Mr. Anderson of Iowa introduced in the house on Monday a resolution asking why, in view of the repeated violations of law by the Pacific railroad companies, the attorney general has not already proceeded, under the specific authority conferred upon him by statute, to forfeit the grants, privileges and franchises conferred upon them by the United States. If Mr. Anderson can induce the house to pass this resolution the public will await with very great interest Mr. Garland's answer to the query it propounds.

A letter from Gen. N. M. Trumbull of Chicago to a friend in the east asks for contributions for the helpless families of the anarchists hung in Chicago in November and of those who were at the same time sent to the penitentiary. Contributions may be sent to General Trumbull, 106 Hammond street, Chicago.

Of course the members of the anti-poverty society will see to it that Miss Agatha Munier shall have a full house on next Sunday evening at the Academy of Music. The services Miss Munier has rendered to the society free of all charge would of themselves, even were the concert less attractive, entitle her to the fullest support on this occasion. Though the music will be the principal feature of next Sunday evening, it is not intended that the continuity of the meetings shall be broken, and Dr. Edward McGlynn and Henry George will make brief addresses.

Readers of THE STANDARD in Massachusetts will be pleased to learn that petitions to the general court for the adoption of the Australian system of voting are being extensively circulated. Blanks may be obtained by addressing room 11, 45 Eliot street, Boston, Mass.

DR. MCGLYNN'S POSITION.

UNITED LABOR PARTY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK. OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 28 COOPER UNION.

My Dear Mr. George: With reference to your editorial of last week, I desire to re-affirm in the columns of THE STANDARD what I said as to the duty of the united labor party in the coming presidential campaign at the anti-poverty meeting on New Year's night, as very fully reported in your last issue.

I would add that what we should do is not an open question. Those of whom I am one, who were requested by the Cincinnati conference of July last, and charged by our Syracuse convention, to take action in view of the approach of the national contest, are of one mind on the subject, and will in due time take steps to carry out the plain intent of the mandate. When we shall have entered as a distinct party into the presidential contest on the lines of our Syracuse platform, I should feel recreant to a clear duty if I allowed myself to be diverted by any issue of tariff tinkering, or even by a contest for absolute free trade, from exclusive and unswerving support of our fundamental reform. EDWARD MCGLYNN.

See the Humber of Protection.

NEWARK, N. J.—Some time last spring, in writing for some tracts, I said that I could not see why the question of "free trade or protection" could not be left out of the discussion until the fight against the injustice of private ownership of land (or rather of natural opportunities) was won. You answered asking me to read "Protection and Free Trade" and then let you know what I thought. I invested at once, and have not only read it carefully more than once, but have also studied the subject from points of view which were never suggested to me before.

Mr. George's work is the first argument worthy of the name that I have ever read on the side of free trade. After reading "Progress and Poverty" I expected to be interested in anything written by the author, but never dreamed of being convinced; but the position taken in the first chapter favoring high wages, and claiming that the protective tariff was not a cause for their existence, was not only new to me, but convinced me that I was at last to read an argument. I have now given the subject far consideration, and conclude that the tariff is a good thing for the few, but as far as benefiting the manufacturer as such or his employees, or any one who works for a living, either on a salary or by day's wages, is concerned, it is a first-class fraud. Still, under present conditions, I don't think it makes much difference to me which wins. The right way for those who think as we do is in the coming election to make the fight as hot and the discussion as free as possible. F. J. WERNER.

Encyclopedia Britannica.

We have received volumes V and VI of the Encyclopedia Britannica issued by Henry G. Allen & Co. of New York. It is a marvel of cheapness, a reduced fac-simile of the original edition, engravings and all, sold at \$2.50 per volume.

PARTY PRINCIPLES AND POLICY.

NEW YORK.—Whether or not the united labor party shall place a ticket in the field in the coming presidential contest is a question that involves establishing the policy to be pursued by the party until its mission is performed, if it is to follow a consistent and intelligently considered course.

In obedience to the instructions of the Syracuse convention, the New York state committee of the party will, as soon as deemed advisable, issue a call for a national conference of congressional district delegates representing citizens who believe in restoring justice in the fundamental relations of men through the administration of all monopolies by, and for the benefit of, the people. The adoption of the Syracuse platform will settle and proclaim the political principles of the new national party. Next will arise questions as to the policy to be taken up and persevered in in order as speedily as possible to bring those principles into operation through the law. A most important question of policy to be considered at the outset will be whether or not the party shall enter candidates in the presidential canvass. No principle announced in the Syracuse platform requires one course or the other. Neither does any principle in the code of morals commonly accepted by men or bodies of men. It is a question of policy only—of deciding upon the most direct road to a goal.

The question is not one of abandoning the political organization. It is to be assumed that the local and state bodies already formed will be strengthened and that the work of uniting new branches to the main party will be pushed on.

Let those earnest men who are positive that duty demands that they should never again vote for a democratic or republican candidate face the question if they really should be voting for principle—voting to further their cherished principles—in case they insisted upon standing up and being counted next November as uncompromising and world defiant believers in the new political economy. By this "policy" might they not rather further put off the day of success? Would not the expenses of a national campaign draw seriously on the vitality of the party? Would the satisfaction of trying to be counted compensate for the danger of crippling the party in localities where local candidates might be placed in office, there to promote true reform principles, if it were not handicapped with a presidential ticket? In cutting off completely from the two old national parties, would the labor party not be reduced to a dead quantity in the eyes of the managers of both, the percentage of votes now drawn from each being not far from equal? On election day could the party's own friends be relied on to march loyally up to the polls in unbroken ranks only for the purpose of being counted? Is a full count possible, conditions being as they are? Beyond these questions arises one paramount to all others. Shall the new party ignore living issues—the every day conflicts of right against wrong in the busy world—and soar above the heads of common men until human clay is brought up to the party's ideal? In other words, will those who believe in enthusiastically voting direct for the party's principles demand that all supporters of those principles must accept that course as the only one prescribed by conscience?

There is little force in instituting a parallel between the methods of the prohibition party and those recommended by the advocates of a full ticket in every campaign for the united labor party. The prohibitionists, impractical and theatrically heroic, support a socialistic measure destructive of personal liberty and of not only the rights of property but property itself. The united labor party is bent upon proceeding in a business-like way to establish perfect freedom and render every man absolutely secure in his property—the product of his labor. The success of the prohibitionists would involve a great and sudden change in the body politic—in its effects resembling the outburst and overflow of torrents of water at the breaking down of a convulsive revolution. The labor party intends no convulsive revolution, no jarring even, in the course of public affairs, but hopes to assist toward the attainment of a reign of justice with a steady motion like that of the constantly progressing current of a broad river.

The tariff is to-day a live national issue. It was the one subject of the president's message; it has already in the current session been made the subject of acrimonious debate in both houses of congress; the partisan editors have taken the opportunity once more to air their cut and dried opinions as to free trade or protection; the managers of the republican party are congratulating themselves that President Cleveland has cornered himself, and that he is their captive. Thus the field is being laid off for the approaching national political battle.

Are the radical tariff reformers among the single tax men going to the polls in November simply to be counted as upholders of a policy, but not immediately applicable principle, while feeling that their votes might be made the means of turning the course of legislation, perhaps decisively, in a direction which will finally carry their great principle to an ascendency?

Another view of the tariff question merits patient consideration. There is in the united labor party a not inconsiderable body of men who think that not only the single tax but the abolition of customs duties, be it also that the present equilibrium in what are termed protected trades should be preserved until the absorption of land values by a tax shall in a measure have opened up natural resources to the skilled labor they believe would be displaced by importations of goods under a reduction of those provisions of the tariff affecting such trades. These men would not now oppose the many modifications of the tariff that they see can undoubtedly be made without disturbing any branch of the labor market. But glassblowers, cigarmakers and workers in certain subdivisions of the manufacture of metals, for example, look upon themselves, in regard to the tariff as it affects their means of employment, as in the same position as are owners of vacant lots with respect to the land value tax. Protected workmen and vacant land owner alike may assent to the principle that the community has a right to absorb the "unearned increment" of land, and that in such case no other taxation is necessary. But no man possessed of vested legal rights desires his own interests to be singled out for destruction in advance of others of its kind or before the substitution of compensating advantages. The New York owner of a vacant lot in Pennsylvania may be reconciled to having the value of that lot taxed away from him if he can thereupon take up one of like value in New York by paying no more than the tax on it. But he will fight against giving up his Pennsylvania lot if he is to be but one of a few local land owners so to suffer. And to many workers in highly protected industries, as the phrase is, the natural course of change from the present system to that under the single tax seems to be first to shake land values generally. Who would lose in that case? Only speculators in the needs of labor and capital. All who had land for use could continue using it. But if a protected industry

goes by the board, or its stability is seriously weakened by the withdrawal of the prop that has upheld it, the opportunity of employment for its workers is put sadly in jeopardy. They can discount the chances of loss through strikes, lockouts and improved machinery, but they will not of their own volition add to the risks before them.

Here, then, is room for the differences as to policy respecting action on the tariff that do exist in the united labor party. And for other reasons many of its members might wish to be free to vote for or against one or other of the old parties' national candidates, the success of their own party being admittedly beyond all possibility. In view of certain inability to poll its full vote, would not practical wisdom point to no nomination of a national ticket by the united labor party?

A few evenings ago, at a meeting at which thirty active members of the united labor party of New York were present, a ballot on the question of putting up a presidential ticket resulted in eight votes being cast in favor of the policy and twenty-two opposed to it. As to taxation, all were in favor of the single tax: only one favored the tariff as it stands, with a preference for priority of reduction in all other forms of taxation; nineteen favored absolute free trade with the single tax in force, the rest not voting; all voted not to have the question of the tariff as now presented to the country by the old parties introduced in the labor party; all voted that members of the labor party should be left free to hold whatever opinions they wished in regard to that issue as it now stands.

What would be the effect if this single tax, anti-monopoly party should, instead of permanently camping apart from the other parties, adopt as its invariable policy the two following rules: First, never to enter a contest leading to such a division in the party's ranks as would put one set of its adherents in opposition to another equally true to the cardinal principles of the party; second, that the party whenever possible assist in all movements heading in the direction of that social organization which it is striving to establish.

In accordance with the first of these rules, the party would not, as a national organization, enter the presidential contest of this year; nor would candidates for congress be nominated. Following the second, it could on numberless occasions sway, or at least intelligently assist in guiding, those tendencies which are already bringing many monopolies under municipal and state management and supervision, and, what is of higher importance, concentrating taxation on real estate.

In what estimation would his fellow citizens hold a member of the legislature who, making professions of a determination to destroy monopolies, would at the same time vote for a bill providing for state ownership of railroads, while the casting of his single vote might result in the passage of a law establishing a commission empowered to supervise the acts of railroad companies, disclosing the true cost of constructing their roads and preventing stock watering, overcharging and discrimination in rates? In the long fight between monopoly and the people the united labor party, many times in many places, will have placed before it such a choice between idealism and gradual improvement. Living issues to-day, local and national, are whether the people or private monopolies shall manage water works, gas works, bridges, docks and the telegraph. The question as to modes of taxation is ever prominent. It is not only the duty of the new party everywhere to cast its influence with those who are moving along with it against minor monopolies, even if but for a short distance, but to lend its aid in rating questions of taxation in order to enlighten men as to the sure means of putting an end to land monopoly.

In case a presidential ticket is not nominated, the hundreds of thousands of supporters of the Syracuse platform throughout the country will be a tempting catch for both the old parties. The bidding of the platform makers for their votes may bring about the adoption of the Australian system of voting; it may put members of the new party in some of the state legislatures, there to agitate the true principles of taxation; it may give to all government employees the benefits of the eight hour law, an advantage to the new party, for those workmen who have time to read are generally with it; it may establish a law assessing land values generally from other real estate values; it may aid in restoring to the national government powers over the issue of currency that have been largely usurped by the banks. Who can say what it may not do in such doubtful states as Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Indiana with respect to land value taxation?

If the united labor party sets up a national ticket, it walls off the voters for that ticket from the rest of American citizens, and the coming campaign will be conducted by the old parties either with no regard to the new party or with both striving to create a popular impression that it is in the field simply as an assassin.

The fear that the party supporting the Syracuse platform could degenerate into a party capturing body of strikers juggling as a balance of power between the two great parties, and the fear that it may fall to pieces unless it votes, solidly and uniformly, directly for principle by having candidates for every office from corner to president, are equally groundless. Never with greater zeal did crusaders of old hasten to arms at the call to defend the faith than will the men who have seen into the merits of the principles of that perfect platform press forward to aid in their triumph when the word goes forth that there is a bare hope of success for any one of their measures.

The campaigns already fought by the united labor party have made men pause and think and finally understand that this new party believed itself possessed of imperishable principles. Respect for the sense of the party and its managerial tact will be deepened if it adopts a policy guided by high principle, based on sober reason, easily comprehended by the rank and file, and attractive to the conscientious mass of citizens from whom must be drawn that majority necessary to bring the party's principles into practical measures. J. W. SULLIVAN.

The Twenty-First Assembly District.

The twenty-first assembly district of the united labor party of New York held its regular meeting on Tuesday evening, Jan. 3. Dr. William S. Gottheil of the county executive committee reported a request from that body that each assembly district should give expression to its views regarding a presidential nomination. For some discussion, in which Dr. Gottheil, Treasurer Rathbun and others took part, the following preamble and resolution were unanimously adopted:

Whereas, the members of the Twenty-first assembly district, united labor party, believe the principles for which we are contending to be right; that the espousal of such principles means honest, earnest and consistent work; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-first assembly district of the united labor party place itself on record not only as favoring a national conference, but as demanding the interest of right and of economic truth a national conference, a national convention and a national candidate.

It was decided that at the next meeting, on January 10, the question of a national free trade should be discussed. H. H. C.

PROTECTION WANTED.

American Industries Threatened by a Deluge of Natural Gas—Why Not a Tariff Against the Bowels of the Earth as Well as Against the Outside of It?

WASHINGTON, D. C.—I was shocked, upon reading this morning's newspaper, to learn that natural gas had been discovered in Chicago. It is reported to have been accidentally struck by the Cook brewing company while boring for water. Now, I have lately been reading Professor Sumner, and therefore do not demand that the energy, foresight, sagacity, capacity, self-denial and several other things of the Cook brewing company go unrewarded. But, recalling the professor's "Forgotten Man," my sympathy goes out toward a large number of "forgotten men" who will suffer if the Cook brewing company should continue their boring and discover sufficient gas to light and heat the city of Chicago. I foresee that an enormous amount of suffering must accrue to multitudes of people. The occupation of the employees in the gas works will be gone. Thousands of gas meters, purchased at considerable expense, will be rendered useless. As the gas will be used for heating as well as lighting, serving as a substitute for wood and coal, the demand for these articles will be decreased—the wages of coal miners in Pennsylvania and Illinois will diminish. Not one cord of wood will be burned in Chicago where two are burned now; so fifty per cent of the wood cutters in the forests that supply the city, of the wood haulers who transport it, and of the wood sawyers in the back alleys who reduce it to a length and size of stove consumption, will be thrown out of employment. As a philanthropist—not a professional philanthropist, but only an amateur one as yet—I inquire, with tears running down my nose, what ought to be done?

I will express—no, on second thought, I will mail—to you a proposition that strikes me as being practical, efficient and unobjectionable. Let a protective tariff be levied upon that gas. Figure how much it will cost to pump it from the bowels of the earth, and levy a duty which shall rise in price considerably above that of the artificial article; enough, in short, to protect the present gas makers and wood dealers from the ruinous effects of competition. Even if the tariff should be made practically prohibitive, the Cook brewing company would be as well off as they now are, while the reduction of wages and loss of employment above lamented would not ensue. For further arguments in support of such a tariff see some seventeen thousand pages in the Congressional Record, and in the Congressional Globe before it was misnamed a record. True, this natural gas does not come from Europe or South America, but are not the subterranean regions from which it is brought to all intents and purposes as foreign as the transatlantic or transisthmian regions? In any event, this objection, if it be an objection, is purely technical and does not affect the principle which I am advocating—the great principle of protection to American labor.

P. S.—I have read the above, as my custom is, to my wife, and asked her what she thinks of it. She suggests to me, that instead of so managing that the people of Chicago and thereabout should have more work to do, and have to do more work than is necessary to obtain light and fuel, would be simpler and better for them to have less work to do, and have to do less work in order to obtain it. In other words, that as the Cook brewing company did not make the natural gas it must rightfully belong with the rest of the earth, to the inhabitants of the earth, and that all the citizens of Chicago (at least) ought to be allowed to participate in the benefits of the gas underlying Chicago, by a reduction of the expense of lighting and heating their houses and places of business, instead of all the profits accruing to the Cook brewing company. While this suggestion seems to me a very just one, and perfectly practicable as soon as the public mind shall have become familiarized with the idea that nature's gifts to all should be so used as to redound to the benefit of all, yet I hesitate to advocate such a measure at present, lest the Cook brewing company should call me a "communist."

J. L. MCCREERY.

A Question for the "Herald."

NEW YORK CITY.—The Herald, in a recent editorial, under the heading of "A Word With Wage Earners," says:

Now, about this coal strike. We wish we could get the workmen by the buttons and have a little talk with them after this fashion:

Do you know what happens when a fellow rolls a rock down stairs? Well, this happens—hits the edge of every stair in the whole flight, but when it gets to the bottom it rests there.

If coal is not minded it becomes scarce. Then the market price rises, of course, and who are the people that suffer? Why, like the rest, the high price bumps against the rich man, but he hardly feels the hardship, because it glances off. It bumps against the man who is simply well to do and hurts him a little, for he can't afford the extra expense. When it has done its bumping against this class and that class it ends by resting on the poor man's family. So long as coal is scarce it eats up his earnings, for he must have it, no matter what it costs, and the greatest inconvenience and the greatest suffering fall on the very class which has organized to relieve itself of its many burdens by the present strike.

That is the naked fact, and it is worth consideration. Workmen will always distrust such advice as the Herald gives them, because, though they know that strikes will cause more suffering to themselves than to their employers, they also know that were it not for past strikes they would be to-day much worse off than they are.

If the striker fellow had not thrown the rock so that it would hit the edge of every stair in the whole flight, then the employer fellow would have done so, only in which case the rock would not have hit the edges of the higher stairs of the flight, and therefore, as you may well see, would have struck the harder on the last edges of the stair and hardest of all at the bottom, where the wage earners live. A WAGE EARNER.

From a Member of the North American Phalanx.

The reference in a recent issue of THE STANDARD prompts me to say that I was, from beginning to end, twelve years—from 1843 to 1855—a member of that once famous attempt at industrial association, the North American phalanx.

Of the many similar institutions that sprang up in the early forties, this was by far the best endowed both in capital and business talent, and lasted much the longest.

Many happy remembrances cluster about that period of my life, but unlike some others, I have always considered it a bad failure. Those whose faith in the theory and the timeliness of that practical attempt has been less shaken attribute the breaking up to pecuniary embarrassment, aggravated by a destructive fire. But it could scarcely be called a pecuniary failure. Notwithstanding the loss by fire of something like one-third of the nominal sharehold property, and a great loss in buildings not well adapted to other purposes, the final settlement brought over sixty per cent to the shareholders.

After this an intense and continuous busi-

ness struggle has absorbed my energies. Still I was able to join in a co-operative grocery store which made and saved money to all concerned. But after several years of success it was given up and the profits divided—a failure in my estimation the greater from its pecuniary success.

The first I saw of your writings was in the Popular Science Monthly, perhaps ten years ago. The next was your conversation with David Dudley Field in the North American Review. I am ashamed to say that I never read "Progress and Poverty" until about a year ago.

I am now satisfied that the abolition of land monopoly by the single land value tax underlies all other social or political reforms. I am oppressed with the magnitude of the question, the radical changes involved and the opposing forces that will be arrayed against it.

Land monopoly is as old as slavery, and you attack it in the interest of many more millions of unduly requited laborers than men in slavery at the south. They cannot understand it and rapidly appreciate your efforts; but land and other monopolists can. These will follow more or less blindly pro-slavery precedents in sustaining laws and institutions based upon the private ownership of land.

This struggle must come, and my hope of a peaceable solution lies in the wisdom, religious devotion and persistent energy of the Anti-poverty society.

The trifling mode of leisure that I now enjoy comes too late in life to be of much avail for any cause; but at least I hope not to be a stumbling block. N. R. FREXER.

Antislavery More Important Than Voting.

OLD TOWN, Me.—I have been reading the editor's resume of "The Cause and THE STANDARD," and find in it much food for reflection.

If our friends who so stoutly insist upon having candidates to vote for would carefully review the trend of events during the past year, I think they would see that there are other and more important things to be considered.

If there is one object more than another that demands our moral and financial support, it is THE STANDARD. It must of necessity be the great educator, and is the only candidate that we cannot afford to have defeated.

The discussion now going on in relation to a presidential ticket seems to be between sentiment and expediency. There are in all new movements, honest enthusiasts who are guided by emotional desires rather than by mature reflection. They readily perceive a social wrong, and when a remedy is proposed hasten to apply it.

There are others who, willing to examine an argument, combat with each proposition inch by inch until firmly convinced of its truth and justice. These are guided by expediency as well as by sentiment.

Now, diplomacy—policy, if you please—is not to be despised. No man better recognized this than honest Abe Lincoln. On the other hand, a honest man may have sentiment of the right sort, yet be wholly wanting in tact.

I cannot help feeling after all that the counsels of Messrs. Croasdale and Post are wise. I do not wish to be understood as holding aloof from those of our brethren who believe in immediate political action. "Be sure you're right then go ahead" is a good motto; but when there is a great reform to be accomplished men differ widely in opinion as to how it shall be accomplished.

There is, there can be, no doubt as to the justice of the proposed remedy. The question is how can we most surely and speedily put it in practice? Have we already reached men enough? Have we a nucleus large enough to go into politics to the extent (as one correspondent expresses it) of nominating a full set of candidates from corner to corner?

Does not this desire more often spring from an enthusiastic love of the cause than from a careful consideration of facts? No one doubts that the setting up of candidates attracts attention; but will successive defeats encourage those not familiar with our principles to more readily examine them?

Campaigns cannot be carried on without the use of money. Would not the funds thus used be better spent in distributing literature among the masses?

If we are to make a political effort it seems to me that it should be in the direction of the legislative branches of government alone. We cannot hope to elect for some time either governors or a president, but we can by massing our forces aid in securing in the near future some very essential legislation.

In some communities the adherents of the single tax idea may hold the balance of power, and in such instances should make the most of it. Of course where there is a prospect of electing a candidate of their own it should be attempted, but let there be no political dickering, no sacrifice of principles. This is not expediency; it is criminal cowardice.

Beyond these limits I fail to see how our cause is likely to be promoted by entering the field of politics. It may be asked how and when are we to determine our real political strength? But made up as we now are of scattered units, this is hardly a question for the present.

Before we can reasonably hope for a general acceptance of the single tax idea, there are other vexed questions intimately related to it that are more likely to receive early and favorable legislation. It matters not so much which of these questions shall first occupy the minds of our legislators as that a breach shall be made in the economic errors of tradition.

Let us educate further before attempting too much with the ballot. Let us "agitate, agitate, agitate!"—hammer, hammer, hammer. E. M. EDWARDS.

Benjamin Franklin's Opinion.

MURRAYVILLE, Ill.—I would like to draw attention, through THE STANDARD, to what Benjamin Franklin says in one of his letters published in the Century a year and a half ago. The most serious charge that he brings against Thomas, oldest son of William Penn, is that "he took the quit rents, which had hitherto been public revenue, and put them into his private pocket, thus compelling the people to resort to other subjects of taxation in order that they might procure the necessary legislation and administration of the laws."

It seems to me that instead of using the expression "confiscate rent," we should do better to speak of "restoring rent to the public treasury." "Restore" would tell everyone that rent had been public revenue. "Ground rent" would at once make the distinction between rent and interest on capital in improve-ments, which has been so long confused with rent that the term is fixed in the public mind. Everyone knows the meaning of "public treasury," while very few know that "quit-rent" implies a public treasury.

Let me suggest to every friend of the cause who is selling, giving or loaning copies of "Progress and Poverty" that he make a reference mark after "confiscate rent" and write in the margin "restore ground rent to the public treasury." WM. GAMM.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.

Land Values Depreciating and Radical Ideas Spreading.

The following notes taken from a letter to Rev. Father Sylvester Malone of Brooklyn from a correspondent in Ireland indicate the strong current of radical sentiment running beneath the politics of that country which is seldom noticed in the pro-poverty press:

In Ireland the Irish party is doing what the labor party is doing in America—fighting the landlord's right to the earth which God created for all. We are battling against the garrison that has robbed us of our rights for seven centuries. The rent has been reduced from twenty millions a year to fifteen millions, and I am sure that under the land act which allows leaseholders to get their rents reduced another five millions will be sliced off, and then the state may purchase the land at ten years' purchase—say one hundred millions—and free the white slaves of Ireland with English gold as you freed the black slaves of the southern states with the sword. Our slaveholders got grants of lands from the kings and queens of England on condition that they should supply soldiers for the armies of England, placed sailors on their fleets, control the proprietors in a matter of the best of parliament they put taxes on tobacco, tea, whisky, etc., to pay the soldiers and sailors and thus got rid of the obligations under which the lands were granted. We, the masses, are going to resume our ancient rights to the land and go hand and hand with George and McGlynn in their movement in America. What has done much to lift many farm laborers from severe poverty has been the erection of 15,000 houses, each upon half an acre of rich land. These cost £100 each, the state having lent \$1,500,000 for the purpose on the security of the rates.

We are preparing to build fifteen thousand additional houses. Thus in a few short years thirty thousand families of the very poorest people in the country will be lifted out of their mud cabins, where they had no gardens, and placed in comfortable cottages surrounded with a small quantity of the best land to be had in a nice elevated position, and paying only one shilling a week for all this comfort. The other shilling a week will go upon the rates of the land for supporting the poor and be collected with the poor rate.

I was valuing a farm last week of one hundred acres near Trim, and I spoke to the farmer about the George theory, to put all taxation on the land and take all off buildings, and he highly approved of it. He had expended £1,000 in buildings and improvements on his farm, and thereupon got an additional tax put on him. Of this he complained to me bitterly, saying that he was afraid to make needed improvements because his taxation would be further increased. Hence the laborer is idle, the mason is idle, the carpenter is idle, and the slater and plasterer and painter are all idle. So that "spread the light" of your theories is my word and you must succeed.

I get THE STANDARD every week and like it very much.

A few instances will suffice to show the degree to which the land courts are reducing rents in Ireland. In the case of seven small farms which previously rented for £70, the rent has been reduced to £40; for three farms at Ballin, near Longwood, the old rent was £106, the new rent is £84; a farm at Dunderry, old rent £135, new rent £90; a farm near Navan, old rent £90, new rent £75. Good landlords like the Trim town commissioners employ valuers who sympathize with the tenants and who make large reductions; but bad landlords get valuers to swear that everything is going splendidly and land is worth as much as ever. So that the judges who are linked in with the landlord class give only small reductions.

All this sort of work is going on all over the country. Still the price of produce is so small that hardly any rents can be paid, and the exasperation of the people against the government for the imprisonment and rough treatments of William O'Brien is so great that on many estates the tenants will pay no rent at all.

Believes in Utilizing the Two Old Parties.

LYNCHBURG, Va.—If those who are for the single tax are fighting for principle, as I, believing with them, think they are, why do they antagonize any party who agrees with them in any particular?

There seems to me that too much abuse is bestowed upon the two old parties. All recruits must come from two parties; in some sections largely from one; in other sections mainly from the other.

Now, if the principle be carried out partially even by either party, why not strengthen that particular party's hands? If the single tax men who were republicans refuse to help a democrat going toward the principles we believe in, and the single tax men who were democrats refuse to aid any republican candidate when he may be striving toward abolishing some taxes, our principles will fail unless we can command a majority at once all over the country.

A better way seems to preserve organization and help either of the two remaining parties who will carry out any of our principles.

It is useless to say that this does no good, because each party is compelled to conciliate the united labor party vote, and let the one doing the most conciliating get our help.

Protection is further from our position than tariff for revenue only, and any discussion of tariff brings up taxation for consideration.

In this state the dominant party goes for "assessing land held for speculative purposes at its full value," and in other ways leans towards our creed.

In a state election we may, if successful, put the new system in operation almost immediately; and as such, state should show at once the feasibility of the plan, our chances for success would grow in other states, "until the whole were lessened." Vote for our principles no matter who advocates them, should be our motto. Throw our weight with one or the other of the two parties most like our creed, and wherever we see a chance for local victory seize it. THETA.

Anti-Poverty in the Queen City.

CINCINNATI, O.—The second meeting of the anti-poverty society here has done much to increase our membership and strengthen the movement. E. T. Fries and H. M. Ordman made strong speeches and C. H. Ritch read the poem "Right Here in Cincinnati" which was printed in last week's STANDARD. Our organization has applied for admission to the league of anti-poverty societies, and the agitation will go on here whether the party nominates or not in the coming election.

Believes in Capturing One State.

NEW YORK CITY.—Until I read the article of J. Z. White in THE STANDARD of Dec. 31 I was decidedly in favor of a candidate of our own. But now I am convinced that Brother White has solved the problem when he says we should exert ourselves to capture one state and by introducing our doctrine in that state the consequent social and business improvements would force other states in self-defense to adopt them also. WILLIAM SCHWAB.

A FLASH IN THE PAN.

It is about twenty years ago since, for my own good, I left Grandfield, a town on the Pacific coast in which I had settled with the intention of sharing in its growth. Nowadays, having arrived at full maturity, when I am tempted to try the part of reformer, I turn over in my mind the events connected with my departure from Grandfield.

Soon after going to live in the place I formed an intimacy with a young man named Fulton. He was a handsome, intelligent fellow; tall, slender, dark, with pleasing features and of attractive manners. Socially he was a favorite, and perhaps his expenses in social life were a little more than he ought to have incurred. At any rate, I was prepared from time to time to have him ask for a temporary loan. But I was surprised one day when he came to me with a downcast air and told me that he could not just then repay the last loan I had made him, and that he was going to leave Grandfield.

I had some difficulty in inducing him to reveal the cause of this decision, but at length he told me. He had been gambling at the Deerfoot club rooms and had lost all his own money and a good deal that he had borrowed. He saw disgrace before him if he stayed in Grandfield. He would go away, solemnly pledge himself never to gamble again and start anew in a strange place.

Fulton left the town, and people wondered why he had abandoned prospects so good as his had been. I heard from him often afterward. He proved true to his word. He never gambled again. But what he had passed through—his succumbing to temptation, the sudden loss of his hard earned money, the struggle he had undergone when he had been confronted, as he told me, with the alternative of confessing to his friends that he had been gambling or of appropriating to his own use some of the cash that passed through his hands at his place of employment—all this made a deep impression on me, and for a long time I found his case constantly recurring in my train of thoughts. There were other Fultons in Grandfield, I argued, who might be ruined by the Deerfoot club rooms and such places. Ought not some public spirited citizen to start a movement to break up the players "banks?"

I had lately been hearing once in a while of two gamblers named Sharp and Keep. The twain had come from San Francisco to Grandfield about a year before, rumor said, with hardly a penny, and had been steadily pushing their fortunes successfully. Beginning with winning small bets at cards or billiard playing, and drawing heavily on several occasions from other gamblers, they set up a "place" for themselves after a time, and were now the recognized leaders of their profession in Grandfield. The men about town who told me all this did it with an air that conveyed a certain respect for Sharp and Keep's business talents and some envy for their success. I remember asking one of them if he did not think that Sharp and Keep had meritorious features in their characters. Certainly, he said. Both were temperate and generous. They were cool, sensible fellows—thoroughbred men of the world. He spoke of them with admiration.

Here were additional grounds for indignation on my part against Messrs. Sharp and Keep. It was only the more outrageous, it seemed to me, that men having any commendable traits of character whatever should be engaged in fleecing their fellow-men and sowing the seeds of vice in a community. It was surprising, moreover, that they were actually tolerated by some of the more respectable citizens. I thought it high time that the firm of Sharp & Keep should be crushed out. As I have said, I was very young in those days and new to the frontier.

While I was walking along the streets one day in this frame of mind, my attention was attracted to a large new building in the business part of the town. I stopped to look at it. An acquaintance, a house builder, who happened to come along, said that the finishing touches were being put on it that day. He had built it himself. He grew confidential and said that, though the ground floor was for stores, the upper part was fitted out for gambling rooms—the finest in the state outside of San Francisco. The building was Sharp & Keep's, and they had already paid him cash down for everything. Their new club rooms were to be opened that night.

Grandfield was not a very large place, yet I had not known before what was the purpose of the building. I argued to myself that but very few others could know it. I had by this time half planned my method for crushing Sharp & Keep. I would go there, select a witness or two from among the men looking on at the game, and partly coerce and partly cajole them into appearing at court and testifying against Sharp & Keep in the suit I would bring against them.

I went down town that evening nervous to carry out my plan. If any one happened to see me enter the gambling den, knowing it to be such, my character would suffer only until I brought the suit and closed the game. Besides, having now been a year in Grandfield, I felt secure in my reputation. I was surely above suspicion. The front of the new building did not show a single light as I passed along on the opposite side of the street reconnoitering. It was not until I had looked in at the main entrance that I saw a flickering gas light in the hallway of the second floor. I summoned my resolution and walked boldly up the stairway. When I had mounted to the second floor hall I saw a bright light through the faint glow of a door. I walked to the door and stood still for a moment, listening. I could hear a rattling, clicking sound from within the room. A game was going on, and the counters—the "chips"—old hands call them—were being handled. I heard no other sound, and hence inferred that but very few persons could be playing. I opened the door, stepped inside, closed the door behind me, turned so as to face the length of the room—and was astonished to see that there were at least fifty men crowded about the gaming tables.

I was rather surprised that, though there were many present whom I knew, no one greeted me. All were closely watching the games. At each of four tables sat a man drawing cards one after another from a deck, and I could see that loss and gain was somehow determined by the order in which the cards came out. The clicking of the "chips" occurred as they were taken up and laid down as lost or won. Men were growing richer or poorer there suddenly and they had no time to bid good evening to anyone. The silence, the selfish way with which the players handled their counters, the eager interest with which they watched the drawing out of the cards, the air of desperate business of the whole proceeding, made the scene one the like of which I had never before looked upon. What struck me most forcibly was that I, a young man of my high character, could be there without the fact putting a stop to the game.

While I was taking observations a pleasant faced man whose name I did not know, but whom I had seen about town, approached me and asked me if, since I was not playing, I would step into the rear room. Without knowing what he meant I followed the direction he indicated, passed through a short corridor and entered a room where, under a flood of gas-light, was such a display of refreshments, solid and liquid, and glass and silver ware, as I had seldom seen. Here I was greeted heartily by several acquaintances in the crowd. Nobody, however, appeared to be surprised to see me there, and I felt the absence of any expression of the kind to be an imputation on my established character. Men stood about in groups, eating, drinking, smoking and chatting. One asked me how the tiger had treated me, and looked blank when I said I did not know what he meant. Another observed that I appeared very blue and that he would lend me "a tenner" if I had been "cleaned out." I had been in the refreshment room but a few moments when the men who had been in the gambling room began pouring in, some one saying that the games had suspended for half an hour, during which time the formal "opening" would take place. Well, I had come there to get witnesses, and I decided to remain a little while and seek them out. Among those present were men whom I would never have suspected of going to such a place, and whose presence deeply grieved me. The crowd was a vulgar democracy in behavior, the differences of station usually recognized being leveled off by a gross familiarity on the part of all. A common, glib-tongued rowdy, with a horse voice, nominated for master of ceremonies ex-Judge "Tard, a brilliant lawyer, whom I had often heard called a rollicking blade without understanding the significance of the words. He was a stout, red faced, carelessly dressed man, with a hearty laugh, an unctuous manner and a powerful voice. He put a chair on a table, climbed up and seated himself in it, proclaimed himself chairman of the evening, and proceeded to make a speech which caused his audience to howl with delight. Among other things, I remember he said that Sharp & Keep were the most public spirited firm in Grandfield, and models to its business men. They were live, pushing, thorough-going; they were opposed to having wealth hoarded; wherever they went money was put in circulation. The erection of their magnificent building had given labor to workmen of the town, and had put money into the pockets of the men with capital. Grandfield was big enough to encourage enterprise in whatever shape it came. Then, taking as his examples men in the room, he showed that the profession of Sharp & Keep was superior in its scope to every other in the place, since in its dealings it embraced representatives of all.

When the judge had ended his drollery, which was horrifying to me, he announced that a song would be sung by a well-known singer. I was deeply pained at seeing the tenor of our choir make his way to the side of the chairman, where he stood and sang a popular air, "California Gold." He finished amid great applause. I now thought of going home and was eluding my way through the crowd when I heard the chairman making a wordy introduction for one whom he termed a rising young citizen—one who could with equal grace teach in Sunday school and vanquish the tiger in his jungle—and then he called out my name.

The crowd made a lane for me to the chairman's table. I turned and walked down and stood beside it, while the air was rent with cheers, shrill whistling and the stamping of applauding feet. I was in those days a slender youth of medium size and had a weak voice pitched high. I looked fixedly at the crowd a moment, and when silence had been restored I said:

"Gentlemen—I have never gambled in my life. (Enthusiastic cheers and uproarious, ironical laughter.) I am proud to say I am a teacher of a Sunday school class. (Redoubled hilarity.) I came to this place to-night with a mission. (Snickers.) What I have seen here has made me firm in my resolution to carry out that mission. (Silence.) I have been amazed at what I have seen here. (Inquiring looks.) If I can I intend to have this place closed. (Murmurs.) My mission is to get witnesses to appear in court against Sharp & Keep. How many of you will be true to your manhood and stand by?"

A tumult drowned the rest. So many men started for me at once that they fell over one another and the crowd was thrown into the direst confusion. While speaking I had noticed a doorway behind opening into a hall. I made a dash for it, gained the hallway and fled with the speed of the wind into the street and away to my boarding house.

That night I could not sleep. In a highly excited state of mind I saw flitting before my mental vision a countless number of distinct views of the gambling den. How human nature had been revealed to me there! What greed, shamelessness, recklessness, depravity! How equally significant of nerves unstrung by the excitement of the play had been the silence in the gaming room and the boisterousness in the refreshment room! It seemed that the face of every man in the crowd stood out

again before me in a strong light, each countenance varying from its wonted expression to those successively imparted by the passions aroused by the game, the drink, the rough bantering and the carousal. While I sought sleep in vain a score of plans for my course of action in carrying out my intention of closing the den passed in and out of my mind. Meantime, while thought racked me and my temples throbbed, I tossed about from right side to left, from lying face up to face down, from a stretched out position to one curled up. I was young. I had not yet learned how to be philosophic, and I was tasting of the feast that an advanced reformer prepares for himself.

The next morning I rose feeling sore and stiff, and afflicted with such mood and nervousness as the most guilty wretch at the previous night's revelings. I had perfected my plans, however. I would wait, first, on the editor of the local newspaper and then on the prosecuting attorney and thus endeavor immediately to win to my side public opinion and the machinery of the law. Grandfield had a morning journal, a little sheet that retailed town gossip and caught some of the telegraph news sent from the east to San Francisco. I glanced over it while at the breakfast table. My attention was soon fastened on a local article which described the opening on the previous night of Sharp & Keep's Deerfoot club rooms. Grandfield, the article went on to say, was goaded in every respect, and it remained for Sharp & Keep to set up a suite of club rooms unrivaled outside of San Francisco. Then followed a florid description of the new building and the rooms, not a word being said about the games. The bar, liquors, refreshments, furniture and decorations were beautifully again in print, the innocent of Grandfield being left with the impression that Sharp & Keep were simply providing a public social meeting place for gentlemen, while the guiltily initiated could read, appreciate and chuckle at the writer's audacity and ingenuity. I thought it hardly worth while calling on the editor of that paper, especially when a man breakfasting with me said that Sharp & Keep had paid half a dollar a line for the notice.

Well, the law—the majestic, incorruptible law—was yet on my side I was confident. I went to the house where I was employed, told a member of the firm that I had important business to attend to outside for an hour and went direct to the prosecuting attorney's office. A bland young clerk informed me that the attorney had unexpectedly been called to San Francisco that morning. At the time it did not occur to me that my mission had anything to do with the attorney's business away from town. I had not yet had that experience with men that breeds haunting suspicions.

Judge Ward's office was on my way as I returned toward my place of employment. The jolly old reprobate saw me from a window and called me to him. He shook hands with me cordially and asked me to come in his back office and have an eye tooth sharpened. He put me in a comfortable chair, sat directly in front of me, and with abounding good nature told me not to make an ass of myself. I was very young, he said, and so he could almost forgive me. Did I not know that if gambling was not carried on at a fine, respectable place like Sharp & Keep's the lively boys of Grandfield would be driven into bad company at worse places when they felt like making a little venture? Did I not know that Grandfield was made attractive to the up country miners, lumbermen and railroad construction force through such a high toned place as Sharp & Keep's? Did not that all mean money for Grandfield's hotels and merchants? How would I like to see the floating population of Grandfield desert it and go over and enrich its rival, Littlefield? Worldly wisdom, young man, worldly wisdom. The big earth could not be measured by the short, narrow tape line of Sunday school morality. Good day and better sense to me.

I returned to my bookkeeping with a feeling of depression. During the day some of the men who passed along the street in front of my window looked at me disdainfully, or, at least, reproachfully.

In the evening, on my way to my boarding house, I slipped into the combined post office and book store to make a purchase. The salesman who waited on me was obliged to search a little while for the article I wanted, and in the meantime I stood screened by a showcase from observation from the body of the store. There a group of men and boys were loudly gabbling and cawing over a choice morsel of gossip. Some one had gone to a gambling house somewhere, lost a pile of money, and then, traitor like, had threatened, as they expressed it, to "squeal" on its proprietors. Somebody asked who had done such a mean trick. I thought I would faint when my name was shouted out in chorus by nearly all present.

That evening at the supper table, where the boarders usually were sociable, there was an embarrassing silence—a chilly atmosphere, it seemed to me. I soon finished eating and went to my room, feeling that I was under the ban of what had been a pleasant circle. I sat there for a while in deep thought, my gaze directed toward a photograph on the mantelpiece. Ah, sweet girl! I knew where to go for tender consolation, for the inspiration of sweet hope, for the elixir of sympathy. I spent half an hour in putting on my best appearance and arraying myself in my finest clothes, and then wended my way to her home. As I approached the house it occurred to me that her father was an outfitting merchant whose dealings were chiefly with Grandfield's floating population. I heard her playing the piano in the parlor as I entered the front yard—I knew all her tunes. In response to my ring at the bell her father came to the door, and with a stolid manner said she was "not in."

The shock almost stunned me. I took a long walk to recover from its effects. It was an hour later when I found myself half a mile out of town tramping along in the dark like one mad. A voice hailed me, saying that I must follow the other way if I was going to town, and telling me that if I wanted company I could have it. Here, I thought, in conversing with this stranger I could for awhile escape my almost dis-

tracting thoughts. I took the way with him, and he led the conversation. He said he knew me by sight as one of the young men of Grandfield. As a class, he knew, they were great sports. He himself was a festive blood. He liked to make money and win money. He was going in to Sharp & Keep's to see their new place and try a play. A rumor had reached out where he worked that some fellow the night before had won a heap of money, got drunk at the opening, and had then gone out and tried to get the police to interfere with the game. Such a man, he believed, ought to be ducked in the river, and if the other boys were willing he would join in and do it; would not, I too?

It happened that the next day was the end of the month. When the clerks were about closing up our house one of the firm came to me and told me that my services would no longer be required with them. Business was dull in Grandfield. He did not wonder much at it, since there were busybodies in the town whose meddling interfered with its prosperity. Some folks never knew when to leave well enough alone.

At my boarding house the frigidity of the atmosphere converted my fellow boarders into icicles whenever I was about. I remember venturing the attempt to explain matters to a lady whose amiability I had often admired, but she said that she would not try to decide as to which was the true story amid so many conflicting rumors. As a friend, however, she would suggest that I leave Grandfield! No young man could expect to habitually visit a notorious gambling house and revel in low company and at the same time maintain a standing "in society."

Later, on the same day, my landlady asked me for my room, as some of the other boarders would quit the house if I was not made to.

It was now that it occurred to me that I ought to leave Grandfield for my own good. I packed up my clothes, went to the railway station, bought a ticket for San Francisco, and with a feeling of isolation departed in the next train, without bidding good by to a single soul in the town of which I had hoped through a self-sacrificing public spirit and a high reputation for morality to become a leading citizen.

Some years afterward I met the pleasant faced man who had spoken to me in Sharp & Keep's. He knew me. He introduced himself as Sharp. He said he had dropped speculative life and was now in legitimate business. Keep was in the penitentiary. The firm had gone up in Grandfield like a rocket and come down like the stick. Embellishments of clerks and cashiers had caused loss to some of the business men, the vane of public opinion took a turn and Sharp & Keep were ruined. A good thing, he said; there were no honest professional gamblers, and no man who gambled as an amateur ought to have a place of trust.

From the time of my experience in Grandfield to the present day I have never tried single-handed reform. Misrepresentation, hate, detraction, ridicule, clamor—all these await the picket reformer. Reforms come with an upheaval in which the sinners play the leading parts. He who meantime reforms himself and attends well to his own affairs has in hand a task that will occupy his time.

HAGAN DWEN.

The Lesson of the Abolitionists.
WEST SUTTON, Mass.—Inclosed is postal note for \$2.50 for THE STANDARD for 1888.

In the matter of nominating a national ticket would it not be wise to take counsel of the past? The old abolition apostles confined themselves to the agitation of the great wrong of the chattel form of human slavery. They consecrated themselves to this work, and brought all the energy of their earnest souls to bear upon this single moral question. They sought not office for themselves or their friends, and thus proved their usefulness, and by a faithful devotion to principle, without hope of reward, save that which flows from a consciousness of duty well performed, and the full faith that at some day, in some way, victory would crown the right. None knew better than they that national conviction of wrong must precede national action for its extirpation.

By such a course of proceeding they showed to politicians their greatest threat, viz.: a united body of brave, intelligent, honest and earnest men and women. They had no measures of expediency to adopt or mere policies to follow, which are the usual, if not the inevitable, accompaniments of partisan organizations. They escaped the petty jealousies which party nominations always engender. They escaped the vast expenditure of money which all political campaigns always entail. They escaped the waste and diversion of a vast amount of mental energy which every political canvass is sure to make.

Had Garrison, Phillips, Pillsbury, Foster, Wright and their coadjutors run for office when the anti-slavery crusade was started, can any suppose for a moment that their eloquence would have had the convincing influence that it did have?

History is the record of the experience of the past. In view of this fact would it not be well to recur to the lessons which its pages teach before deciding the question of a national campaign for carrying forward the principles of the Anti-poverty society?

JASON WATERS.

From Sanctuary of Liberty Assembly No. 5, 789.

MEMBERS OF LABOR ORGANIZATIONS and others wishing to canvass for subscribers to this paper on a liberal commission are invited to send their names and addresses to the publishers of THE STANDARD, 25 Ann street, New York.

NOW READY.

NEW POPULAR EDITION OF

PROGRESS AND POVERTY,

BY HENRY GEORGE.

Large type, 32 pages. Price 35 cents.

HENRY GEORGE PENTECOST, DR.

25 Ann Street, New York.

Illustrated by HENRY GEORGE.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

POPULAR EDITION.

PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE?

AN EXAMINATION OF THE TARIFF QUESTION
WITH SPECIAL REGARD TO THE
INTERESTS OF LABOR.

By HENRY GEORGE.

One Volume, Paper Covers.

PRICE, THIRTY-FIVE CENTS.

Now in press and ready for delivery September 12.

When this book was originally published, in May, 1886, it seemed to me that the tariff would be the first of the economic questions to come into political issue in the United States, and I looked to it as a means by which the underlying land question would be brought into general discussion.

But events then unforeseen are bringing the land question into the discussions of "practical politics" with greater rapidity than I expected, and it now seems likely that it will be an awakening as to the larger question that will lead the masses of our people to consider the subject.

This gratifying change, however, instead of lessening the interest and usefulness of this book, gives to the matters of which it treats so much more immediate and practical importance as to call for the publication of a popular edition. It has already done much, and I trust destined to do more, not only to place the tariff question in its true light, but to clear away confusions of thought that obscure the full scope and beauty of the simple measure, which securing equality with regard to natural opportunities, will emancipate labor and give free play to productive forces.

HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George's Works.

Progress and Poverty, paper.....	35
" " cloth.....	1 00
" " half calf or half morocco.....	2 50
Social Problems, paper.....	20
" " cloth.....	1 00
" " half calf or half morocco.....	2 50
Protection or Free Trade? paper.....	35
" " cloth.....	1 50
" " half calf or half morocco.....	3 00
Property in Land, paper.....	10
The Land Question, paper.....	10

For sale by all booksellers, or sent postpaid on receipt of price.

HENRY GEORGE & CO., 25 Ann Street, New York.

Henry George's Buch

Fortschritt und Armuth

Eine billige deutsche Ausgabe von

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Preis 35 Cent.

ist jedoch erschienen und durch alle Buchhändler und Colporteurs zu beziehen. Wird nach Empfang des Preises portofrei verandt vom Verleger

HENRY GEORGE,
25 Ann Street, New York.

NOW OUT.

THE GERMAN EDITION

OF

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

PRICE IN PAPER COVERS,

Thirty-five Cents.

Address HENRY GEORGE,

25 Ann Street, New York.

HEAVEN AND HELL,

From things heard and seen by Emanuel Swedenborg.

Chapman edition, paper, fifteen cents, postpaid. This work includes the laws of the spiritual world and describes the condition of both good and evil men after death. It treats, among other things, of the sun of heaven and the light and heat, the proceeding of the garments and labors of the angels, their government, worship, occupations, conjugal relations, etc., of the state of the heathen and young children, of the rich and poor, and of the wise and simple in heaven.

Intercourse between the soul and the body, paper, five cents; and all other writings of Swedenborg and of New Church authors. Catalogue free. Address New Church Board of Publication, Room 2, Cooper Union, New York.

J. C. JACKSON, Business Manager.

ANTI-POVERTY DOCTRINES IN A

NUTSHELL.

Thirty pamphlets on various phases of the social problem. The question of the hour. All should understand it. Will be sent post paid on receipt of fifteen cents in stamps, or will be sent free to any one sending twenty-five cents for six months' subscription to the *Tax Reformer*, a sixteen page journal. Address, ANTI-POVERTY PRESS, 184 William St., New York.

HENRY GEORGE'S SOLUTION

OF THE LABOR PROBLEM.

WHY I PREACHED ON IT.

by

HUGH O. PENTECOST.

Minister to the Belleville Avenue Congregation,

Church in Newark, N. J.

A sixteen-page pamphlet. Price 3 cents.

Sent by mail on receipt of price. Address as above.

\$5.00 LABOR LIBRARY—30 STAND-

ARD works, by 31 authors—Marx, Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Kropotkin, Dechamps, Hyndman, G. Land, Babel, Annie Besant, Lesslie, Brautwhit, George, Speeches of anarchists and traitors, etc., bound in 3 vols.; cloth, \$5; postpaid, \$5.50. Complete list mailed free. 250 1/2 Bowery, New York.

JUST OUT.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE GEORGE HEWITT

By Louis F. Post and Fred C. Leubuscher.

1 vol., paper covers. Price, 20 cents.

Four-page tract—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 500 copies, \$1.00.

Eight-page tract—25 copies, 20 cents; 100 copies, 50 cents; 500 copies, \$1.00.

Other numbers in preparation. Address

HENRY GEORGE, 25 Ann Street, New York.

THE SINGLE TAX.

Special edition of ready-printed newspapers containing current Single Tax reading matter. All sizes; low prices. UNOS PRINTING CO., 15 Vandewater street, New York.

GERMAN TRACTS.

ISSUED IN THE LAND AND LABOR LIBRARY.

NOW READY.

No. 41. The Syracuse Platform. 2 pages.

No. 42. "First Principles." Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 43. "Socialism—Its Truth and Its Error." Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 44. "Taxing Land Values." Henry George. 8 pages.

No. 45. "It is the Law of Christ." Rev. S. H. Spencer. 4 pages.

No. 46. "The Case Plainly Stated." H. F. Ring. 8 pages.

No. 47. "Progress and Poverty." Henry George. 8 pages.

No. 48. "The Case Plainly Stated." (Swedish.) H. F. Ring. 8 pages.

No. 49. "Salvors' Snug Harbor." Wm. T. Crossdale. 12 pages.

Prices, free by mail: 2-page tracts—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 500 copies, \$1.00.

Four-page tracts—25 copies, 10 cents; 100 copies, 25 cents; 500 copies, \$1.00.

Eight-page tracts—25 copies, 20 cents; 100 copies, 50 cents; 500 copies, \$1.00.

Other numbers in preparation. Address

HENRY GEORGE, 25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

25 Ann Street, New York.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE LAND AND LABOR LIBRARY.

We are now publishing under the title of "The Land and Labor Library" a series of short tracts on various phases of the social problem. These pamphlets contain facts, figures and arguments expressed in concise, vigorous, language easily understood. As a means of propaganda we recommend them to all who desire to help on the movement for social reform. Those who wish to have these tracts placed where they will do good but who are unable personally to attend to their distribution, can remit the price to us, as we have every facility for forwarding them where they are needed and will be read.

The following have already appeared:

No. 1. "First Principles." By Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 2. "Land and Taxation." A conversation between David Dudley Field and Henry George. 4 pages.

No. 3. "The Right to the Use of the Earth." By Herbert Spencer. 4 pages.

No. 4. "A Christian Minister on the Remedy for Poverty." Sermon by the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost of Newark, N. J. 2 pages.

No. 5. "A Sum in Proportion." By T. L. McCready. 2 pages.

No. 6. "The Settler's Nightmare." By Louis F. Post. 4 pages.

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

Renewals and new subscriptions are pressing upon THE STANDARD as the new year advances. Here are a few out of the many expressions of congratulation and good wishes that come to us:

Boston, Mass.—I have taken your paper from the start, and the other three gentlemen whose names accompany this have done the same. We have been taking them from the very beginning, and we have come to the conclusion that it is better for you to have as many paid subscribers as possible; and with that end in view we enclose \$3 for four papers for one year. I thought five members last Saturday and distributed them in the office, and shall continue to do so as my means permit. We are all members of Boston Typographical Union No. 13, but we plainly see that the single tax will do more to advance the cause than the labor problem. We shall do our best to get more names. **JOHN LAYTON.**

NORTH TARRYTOWN, N. Y.—I enclose \$3 for which send eighteen copies of THE STANDARD in one wrapper for three months. Our land and labor club No. 33, Tarrytown wish to inform you that it is their unanimous wish that there shall be a national ticket in the field next fall. We want to see the issue kept before the people. Our club is small in numbers, but our members are all sincere. We are doing all we can for the petition for the Australian system of voting.

CHEROKEE, Mich.—I have read THE STANDARD during the first year and consider it the very best paper printed in this country. It is a pity that every man in the country cannot afford to read it.

I have asked our newsdealer to send for a dozen STANDARDS and have told him that if he could not sell them I would take them for distribution among my friends.

SEABOARD, Conn.—I enclose check for \$6 in payment for the enclosed list of renewed subscriptions. We are keeping the movement before the people in every possible way; and we hope, during this year, to increase your list of subscribers from this town considerably. **DUNHAM & LEAVENS.**

COLLINGS, O.—I enclose \$2.50 for THE STANDARD for 1888. Never in my life have I been so pleased with a paper as with THE STANDARD. Never was a political paper conducted so strictly in accordance with truth and religion as yours. And the good which it has already done is incalculable. The single tax is the topic of conversation wherever I go, and those that favor it are many. I find it a very easy task to make converts, and the way I account for it is this: That the truth is being readily understood and gladly accepted.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.—I enclose my subscription for 1888, and wish THE STANDARD a happy new year. This time last year I was beginning to think that the devil had a mortgage on this world and was running things to suit himself; but since I have read the sermons of Dr. McGlynn on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man I have got new faith, and believe that God still reigns in heaven and prosper you all in the good work, that His will may be done on earth as it is in heaven. **JOHN BURNS.**

MOUNT PLEASANT, Mich.—The tracts I received from you some time ago are doing their silent work. I have a mortgagee, a bella, one of the fairest in the state. Many of the farmers tell me that they never did fall very deeply in love with the present plan of doing a man because he doesn't live in a hole in the earth or a bark share in a diad. We shall have a united labor club here shortly and work for good results in 1888. Any man who is now thoroughly posted in regard to the glorious results to be obtained in the cause of the single tax, and who can't be a little work now and then in other ways as occasion presents itself.

SPRINGFIELD, Mass.—For enclosed remittance send me one copy of "Protection and Poverty," new edition, one "Protection or Free Trade," one copy "The Single Tax," and balance in such other tracts as you think best. I am not so situated as to do very effective work in the cause. I have taken THE STANDARD for six or eight months, and send it out among those who I think may be interested enough to do some thinking for themselves when the subject is fairly presented to them; and I also get a little work now and then in other ways as occasion presents itself.

T. W. R.
These are our terms for subscriptions to THE STANDARD:
One subscription, one year, . . . \$2 50
One subscription, six months, . . . 1 25
One subscription, three months, . . . 63

Three or more subscriptions:
One year, each, . . . \$2 00
Six months, each, . . . 1 00
Three months, each, . . . 50

After the first club of three has been sent, subsequent subscriptions may be forwarded at the same reduced rates.

Recruit subscriptions, for four weeks, will be received, singly or in clubs, at different addresses at fifteen cents each.

Don't neglect the recruit subscriptions. They afford opportunity for quiet but efficacious missionary work, such as you cannot obtain in any other way. If you can afford it, see that every clergyman in your neighborhood gets at least one four weeks' course of THE STANDARD, and every lawyer and school teacher and storekeeper as well. Even if not a single one of them becomes a steady reader of the paper—if not a single one becomes a convert to the principle of the single tax—still you will have done them good. Seed will spring up more quickly and certainly if the soil be prepared beforehand; and when you send a man four successive numbers of THE STANDARD you are preparing the soil of his mind for future seed sowing in a very effectual way. It is much gained to force a man to see for himself what it is we are trying to accomplish, how thoroughly we are in earnest, and what an enormous body of sober, earnest men have been attracted to the support of our principles. Push the recruit subscriptions, STANDARD readers, and keep the gospel of the new crusade flying through the mails.

And don't forget the recruiting fund when you have any money to spare for the advancement of the cause. It enables us to supply tracts to people all over the country who are anxious to distribute them but can't afford to buy them; it sends books and other literature to clergymen and others who are anxious to read and investigate; it supplies recruit STANDARDS to many who would not otherwise be reached. The fund is insufficient for the work it has to do. It is for you to say whether it shall be strengthened or not.

The contributions to the recruiting fund for this week have been:

Michael Ryan	\$1 25
W. B. Howarth	50
L. B. Boyce	50
P. L. Butler	50
D. L. Leavens	2 50
J. F.	2 50
A friend	50
Total for the week	\$15 6

Previously acknowledged, \$20.00
Total to date, \$20.00

Here is a letter which points the way to the doing of mighty efficient work:

GALVESTON, Tex.—I enclose list of postal notes for \$13 to cover the enclosed list of subscribers. This is the best I could do for you this far; but I have the sample copies sent me, and will put them where they will do most good as soon as I can get a bit of time, and hope to show some results.

Meanwhile I have "subsidized" my newsdealer to the extent of guaranteeing him the sale of eight more copies weekly. I will take the excess each week and have them left at barber shops. Should there be no excess shortly—as I hope will be the case—I will have him increase again. I mean to keep him some eight or ten copies a week ahead of his regular demand. **HENRY M. KUEHN.**

It is not to be expected that every STANDARD reader should be able to imitate Mr. Kuehn's example with his newsdealer; but there are enough who can do it if they will only to far more than double THE STANDARD'S circulation. Think this over, John Smith. Figure out if you can spare five, ten, fifteen or twenty cents or more a week, and use it in encouraging your newsdealer. See that he has a card of THE STANDARD (which he can get from us on application) well displayed upon his stand, and that THE STANDARD itself is kept well in view, where his customers can see it. Get the newsdealer himself to read the paper and to take an interest in pushing it. Watch his sales week by week, and as you find them increasing see that his orders increase likewise; as Mr. Kuehn says, keep him a certain number of copies each week ahead of his demand. And let it encourage you to know that, so far as we have heard, wherever this plan has been faithfully tried it has never failed largely to increase the number of THE STANDARD'S readers.

GRANT, Iowa.—I enclose remittance for one new subscriber to THE STANDARD, two copies of "Progress and Poverty," and four copies of "Protection or Free Trade." I have been hoping to send you a number of subscribers, but I had several nearly persuaded. But the cheap literature of the day and the prejudice kept some of them from subscribing and pinching poverty prevents others. For the last year I have been trying to induce men to take THE STANDARD. One for a year and two for six months have been the fruits of my labor. One of the latter I have induced to renew for a year. The other will not renew yet, but wants a copy of "Protection or Free Trade." I may be able to do more in the future because I shall have more time and the next three months. My work seems small alongside of what others have done; but I am a farmer, living ten miles from town, so my opportunities are very good.

I make an impression sometimes, even if I don't get subscribers. A short time ago I stayed over night with an old friend, an old-time abolitionist. He had never read Henry George's writings, and all he knew of our doctrine was from the prospectus of the paper. I pointed out to him the injustice of our present method of taxation, and gave him the reasons for the single tax on land values. His wife and two sons were present, and I answered all their objections, which were by no means foolish ones, apparently to their satisfaction, and have promised to send them tracts and papers. It will take time and patience to do away with old ideas and bring in new ones. Many will not listen as did my old friend's family, but allow their prejudices to blind their understandings. **J. A. ROMIG.**

It seems to us that for a man situated as he is, friend Romig has done remarkably well—well enough to make some other readers of THE STANDARD who enjoy equal or better opportunities feel just a little ashamed of themselves. Three subscribers to THE STANDARD, copies of "Progress and Poverty" and "Protection or Free Trade" put in circulation, and a whole neighborhood informed of the principles of the single tax reform—we call that a pretty good year's campaign for "a farmer ten miles from town." If every STANDARD reader would do as much, the new crusade would go forward with a bound. You agree with us, John Smith, don't you? How many don't you do as much yourself? How many new subscribers have you sent us? How many of your neighbors have you talked to? How many books and tracts have you put in circulation?

Friends, in this cause of ours every one can do something. It is only the man who isn't willing to work who can't find work to do in plenty. Even the Nicodemuses who dare not speak out their convictions, can utilize their recruit subscriptions and spread the truth by sending THE STANDARD for four weeks to all their friends in succession.

In the Flatwoods of Florida.

BAY VIEW, Fla.—You can count me in as one more vote when the time comes. The first STANDARD I read I clapped my hand on my knee and said: "Them's my sentiments." I have talked to these natives down here in the flatwoods about this theory, and they immediately see the injustice of taxing their orange groves at a value of \$50 per acre while Mr. Diston's lands around them are taxed at \$2 an acre; while, if one Peter wants to marry Liza Jane he must split rails or work as a herring at \$15 a month for four years and six months to be able to buy forty acres of that land—that is, if the land doesn't increase in value and if he and Liza Jane keep company that long.

I went over to a sugar boiling the other day and the old patriarch of the place took me by the elbow and led me to the family residence, and while the old lady dusted the best rawhide chair, the old man said:

"Now, Dick, you're supposed to be a tofable sensible sort of chap, and I want you to tell me what nonsense this is you've been telling my boys. Why, the other day my son Tom commenced to tell me that economy couldn't benefit the whole people, and went on to a whole mess about this Henry George theory. What is it, anyhow?"

"Well, now, Mr. McMullen," I said, "suppose that you are Uncle Sam, and have a thousand boys or so following different pursuits, and the whole raft of them try to save money enough to buy a home by doing without things, eat, so they eat nothing but potatoes and bacon, and mend up their old shoes and clothes. Wouldn't the merchants have to go out of business and the manufacturers have to shut down for want of a market, and wouldn't a great many of the boys be thrown out of work and have to go without even potatoes and bacon?"

"Wal, that's so," he answered. "Economy don't help things that a-way, for sartin. But how about this taking all the land away from weuns?"

So then I started to tell him the difference between the two systems of taxation, when he cut me short with:

"Wal, I'll be busted if that ain't so! I always thought it mighty strange I had to pay for my own work!"

So you see these Florida flatwoods of ours are not the most sterile soil in the world. **ALBERT S. RICHARDS.**

THE BRITISH FARMER.

While London streets are filled with men vainly seeking for work complaint of "hard times" is elsewhere heard. Hammers are idle in ship yards on the Clyde, navies stand with folded arms about the Manchester ship canal, girls of thirteen walk the streets of Newcastle selling their souls for enough to eat, and "father, mother, three children and two female neighbors" "tease him" for fifteen hours in a Glasgow garret to earn eighteen pence. From the mining regions of Cumberland and Lancashire, from the farming districts of Kent and Essex, from the hills of Wales and the highlands of Scotland come reports of workers idle and mouths in need of food.

The concentration of agricultural land into big holdings has driven small farmers and farm laborers into the towns. Districts which once supported large rural populations have been converted into great farms, sheep runs or game preserves, while, remarks Professor Thorold Rogers, "there is collected a population in our large towns which equals in amount the whole of those who lived in England and Wales six centuries ago, but whose homes are more squalid, whose means are more uncertain, whose prospects are more hopeless than the lot of the poorest serfs of the mediæval cities."

The condition of affairs in rural England is illustrated in the hamlet of Market Lavinton, Wiltshire, whose inhabitants have sent an address to the prime minister complaining of the tyranny of the "chief steward"—the lord of the manor. In their address they say:

"The parish contains 3,637 acres of land which is of such quality that five or ten acres is capable of maintaining a family in comfort. Instead of seeing that the wants of the parishioners are provided for, the chief steward has let 2,238 acres to one farmer. To make room for him four farmers were displaced and the number of laborers greatly reduced."

Some of these laborers have gone to America and produce corn and cheese, which are sent to this country and sold in Wiltshire markets.

The wages of laborers in the parish are only nine shillings per week. Carters and common work long hours on week days and Sundays for 11s. 6d. Thus men have to labor for six shillings a week, and the fruits of their labor would cost to supply their families with food only, in the workhouse; under such circumstances men, women and children live in a state of semi-starvation.

In addition to this the farm of 2,238 acres is "rated" at £1,078 10s. or 9s. 6d. per acre. The 491 acres in small holdings are "rated" at £96 12s., or 37s. 5d. per acre. As the "rating" is founded on the rent it follows that the small holders pay in rent and rates four times as much as the large farmer.

While small occupiers have thus been oppressed the large farmer has not prospered. Immediately after the last harvest the chief steward's deer park was seized all the crops, stocks and implements for arrears of rent, and now carries on the farm, after discharging ten laborers of the few previously employed, thus adding to the distress of the population.

It appears that all the capital which the large farmer brought into the concern, and all the money which he borrowed from his friends, have been lost. Thus the farmer has lost his home, his capital, his stock, his implements, and he and his family have worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

Notwithstanding the fact that vital statistics show a large excess of births over deaths the population of the parish was diminished, for the chief steward seems to do all in his power to drive away the people. Policemen, who are not paid, but are controlled by him, are employed to prevent children from playing in the market place. They are instructed to seize and summon men who gather nuts or blackberries in woods formerly open to the public. Spaces previously used as playgrounds have been inclosed. Fox cubs are shot, and the deer park is enclosed by a land occupied by small farmers.

These efforts to make a waste and a wilderness are carried on in the center of a county which might produce sufficient to feed a population of half a million. The land is worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

Notwithstanding the fact that vital statistics show a large excess of births over deaths the population of the parish was diminished, for the chief steward seems to do all in his power to drive away the people. Policemen, who are not paid, but are controlled by him, are employed to prevent children from playing in the market place. They are instructed to seize and summon men who gather nuts or blackberries in woods formerly open to the public. Spaces previously used as playgrounds have been inclosed. Fox cubs are shot, and the deer park is enclosed by a land occupied by small farmers.

These efforts to make a waste and a wilderness are carried on in the center of a county which might produce sufficient to feed a population of half a million. The land is worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

Notwithstanding the fact that vital statistics show a large excess of births over deaths the population of the parish was diminished, for the chief steward seems to do all in his power to drive away the people. Policemen, who are not paid, but are controlled by him, are employed to prevent children from playing in the market place. They are instructed to seize and summon men who gather nuts or blackberries in woods formerly open to the public. Spaces previously used as playgrounds have been inclosed. Fox cubs are shot, and the deer park is enclosed by a land occupied by small farmers.

These efforts to make a waste and a wilderness are carried on in the center of a county which might produce sufficient to feed a population of half a million. The land is worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

Notwithstanding the fact that vital statistics show a large excess of births over deaths the population of the parish was diminished, for the chief steward seems to do all in his power to drive away the people. Policemen, who are not paid, but are controlled by him, are employed to prevent children from playing in the market place. They are instructed to seize and summon men who gather nuts or blackberries in woods formerly open to the public. Spaces previously used as playgrounds have been inclosed. Fox cubs are shot, and the deer park is enclosed by a land occupied by small farmers.

These efforts to make a waste and a wilderness are carried on in the center of a county which might produce sufficient to feed a population of half a million. The land is worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

Notwithstanding the fact that vital statistics show a large excess of births over deaths the population of the parish was diminished, for the chief steward seems to do all in his power to drive away the people. Policemen, who are not paid, but are controlled by him, are employed to prevent children from playing in the market place. They are instructed to seize and summon men who gather nuts or blackberries in woods formerly open to the public. Spaces previously used as playgrounds have been inclosed. Fox cubs are shot, and the deer park is enclosed by a land occupied by small farmers.

These efforts to make a waste and a wilderness are carried on in the center of a county which might produce sufficient to feed a population of half a million. The land is worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

Notwithstanding the fact that vital statistics show a large excess of births over deaths the population of the parish was diminished, for the chief steward seems to do all in his power to drive away the people. Policemen, who are not paid, but are controlled by him, are employed to prevent children from playing in the market place. They are instructed to seize and summon men who gather nuts or blackberries in woods formerly open to the public. Spaces previously used as playgrounds have been inclosed. Fox cubs are shot, and the deer park is enclosed by a land occupied by small farmers.

These efforts to make a waste and a wilderness are carried on in the center of a county which might produce sufficient to feed a population of half a million. The land is worked and starved, the chief steward has looked on and profited.

your three-chimneyed houses somewhere clear of my property.

I need hardly tell a man of your shrewdness that cunning, that resistance will be utterly useless, and it is only a question of time and money, of both of which I have plenty.

Such is the use which many Scottish as well as Irish and English landlords are making of their "fund for improvements." In a country half the area of which is owned by seventeen individuals there are silent wastes where once amid the heather nestled the crofter's cabin. His little farm brought forth plentiful crops. Fuel cost but the labor of cutting peats from turf deposits and cattle and sheep roamed over rich pastures. Then were the deer of the forest and the fish of the streams free to him. His wants were simple and his mind content. But within the memory of men came great changes. The deer in the forest and the fish in the stream came to be reserved for the rich. Pasturage was restricted and soil and turf gave out. Improvements that swelled rent and little by little what had been common enjoyments came to be luxuries. Corn, fish, beef, meal, potatoes, cheese, whisky and ale ceased to be exported and finally grew insufficient to meet common wants. When heather or grass was scarce dulce or sea weed was given to the cattle and even human beings were at times driven by hunger to eat it, "and a drink of hot milk, which they had not of their own, they got of their neighbors."

Then came the clearances. Cotters and crofters were driven from their little farms to make way for sheep runs and deer preserves. Not merely were families here and there evicted, but whole townships were swept away. Oftentimes the peasants suffered extreme cruelties, but they made no resistance lest in doing so they should bring down the vengeance of heaven and suffer eternal damnation for interfering with what their ministers told them was foreordained of God. Some of the evicted crofters strayed into the towns, some went to foreign lands, and those who remained settled along the bleak sea shore where the soil was so poor and yielded such scant crops that many of the men were compelled to resort to the sea for fish to gain subsistence.

In time all the available land was in use, and further increase in numbers caused a division and subdivision of the crofts until the minimum sized lot from which a famer could live was reached, and a famer could had to go without land and to depend upon the good will and charity of their neighbors. Every improvement in the appearance of the croft and every change that tended to lighten the work, but swelled the rent and increased the landlord's "fund for improvements," while they offered no security against eviction if the factor or the ground officer became offended. Patiently and faithfully the peasants slaved from one year's end to another, and paid their rent regularly, save when bad seasons destroyed their crops, or when the wind and sea wrecked their boats. But the rent was always paid when the men had the means, and they got along with hunger as best they could.

What wonder then as rents increased and times grew harder, that these crofters should come to gaze frequently at the landlord's deer park. What wonder when they gazed at their wives' hunger stricken faces and heard their bairns crying for food, that they forgot their minister's warning that it was an offense to heaven to trespass on the landlord's domain, and the flintlock came down and a deer was shot.

Angus and Murdo McLeod, fishermen, were recently tried before the sheriff at Stornoway, on the island of Lewis, upon a charge of killing two deer. Hunger was no excuse, for, said the sheriff, "this is one of the greatest offenses of the kind I have observed in this island, and although people make light of it I hold that it would be as well for these men to go and take a man's furniture out of his house and his horse out of his stable as it were for them to take these deer." And so Angus McLeod was fined £2, with 28s. 6d. expenses, or ten days' imprisonment, and Murdo McLeod 30s., with 28s. 6d. expenses, or seven days' imprisonment. Being without money and without friends who could pay their fines they went to prison.

Such occurrences have been frequent of late years among the crofters, especially in the island of Lewis, one of the Hebrides. This island is owned by one individual, Lady Matheson. Its area amounts to 406,000 acres, and its population numbers 27,000 souls. Twenty-five thousand crofters and cotters are settled upon 50,000 acres, 2,000 people are collected together in the town of Stornoway, and the remaining seven-eighths of the island is given over to sheep and deer. The crofters' land is the poorest on the island and the hardest work can bring forth but meager harvests. Testimony before the crofters' commission in 1885 showed that twenty or thirty years ago a great part of the island was cultivated by crofters and that many clearances were made quite recently. In the parish of Lochs alone twenty-six townships were depopulated to make room for the sheep farms of Park.

The result of all this was that there were many crofters without land and whose only food was potatoes received from neighbors who had land. And so, when there seemed likely to be a general famine, and with a sense of their wrongs to spur them on, they went in a body to the forest and helped themselves to the deer which had for years eaten their grass and their corn. Where upon her majesty's government ordered a powerful turret ship to hasten north and suppress the rebellion. As a more lasting measure of relief, however, the government has arranged for the transportation of 1,200 families from the "congested crofter district" to British Columbia. For, as a high land peasant said, "there seems to be nothing for it but that the deer and the sheep should be sent away or that the people be sent away out of the kingdom." But is it as he further said, "The old people cannot be sent away without the young people. It is only the young people who can go and it is only they that support the old people. If the young people go the old people will die, and it is hard for them to see the sheep and the deer enjoying the fruit of their fathers' blood."

So the fiat has gone forth among the peasants that the sheep and the deer must go, and raids are being made that will soon make such properties as Mr. Wilmans' 400 square miles of forest utterly worthless for sport.

Moreover, the crofters' commission, appointed to inquire into the condition of the crofters and with power to reduce excessive rents, has been doing dreadful work in the highlands. Thirty, forty and fifty per cent reduction in rents have been ordered in many parts, and even the duke of Argyll has had twenty-six per cent lopped off the tribute he was exacting from his clansmen for living in Argyshire and forty-four per cent of the arrears of rent wiped out. The commission were particularly severe in his grace's township of Moss, where thirty-five years before some crofters had obtained permission to settle, and by hard toil had converted a worthless piece of marsh into a garden. The duke, from his luxurious halls at Inverary, observing what they had done, saw that it was good and blessed them with a rent of from £1 to £4 apiece. But when the crofters' commission came along it cut down his rents by half and sent

celled three-fourths of his rent arrears, so that his "fund for improvements" was sadly diminished. And it is likely to become less in the not distant future, for the doctrine that God made Scotland for all Scotchmen equally has set the heather afire and is spreading through the highlands with a rapidity that portends speedy change in things as they are.

HENRY GEORGE, JR.

CURE FOR THE DEAF

PERK'S PATENT IMPROVED CUSHIONED EAR DRUM PERFECTLY RESTORES THE HEARING, and performs the work of the natural drum. Portable, comfortable and always in position. All conversation and even whispers heard distinctly. Sent for illustrated book with testimonials FREE. Address F. HISCOX, 325 Broadway, N. Y. Please mention paper.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

REV. EDWARD MCGLYNN, D. D., PRESIDENT.

The thirty-eighth public meeting of the society will be held at

THE ACADEMY OF MUSIC
SUNDAY EVENING, JAN. 15.

Concert for the benefit of

MISS MUNIER,

for which the following artists have volunteered their services:

MR. DI CARLO,
MR. ALBERT BARNES MYERS,
MR. S. B. MILLS,
SIGNOR DUCENZI,
MR. CARL HAUSER,
MR. NAUSBAUM,

and the CONCORDIA CHORUS, consisting of

Mr. M. O. Dalton	Miss Maria Byrne
Miss M. O. Dalton	Miss Maria Byrne
Miss Katie McGee	Miss Maggie Kavanagh
Miss Maggie Malloy	Miss Annie Claffey
Miss Helena Malloy	Miss Matilda Leopold
Miss Anna Laughlan	Miss Maudie Donnelly
Miss Susan Sheridan	Miss Emma Roe
Miss Katie Martin	Miss Lizzie Flood
Miss Annie Martin	Miss Katie McGill
Miss Berntha Frohisher	Miss Rickards
Miss Jennie Fox	Miss Fanny
Miss Annie Casey	Miss Eva Orr
Miss Loretta McMorris	Miss Della Dunn
Miss Cassie Gallagher	Miss Sampson
Miss Mamie Elliott	Miss May Hanonhy
Miss Maggie Elliott	Mr. Thomas McCabe
Miss Dana Ochs	Mr. William B. Scott
Miss Emma Ochs	Mr. George Talmie
Miss Maggie Kennedy	Mr. Francis H. Richter
Miss Anna Kennedy	Mr. H. C. Johansen
Miss Julia Clark	Mr. Joseph Walsh
Miss Essie Clark	Mr. Hill
Miss Katie Murray	Mr. J. J. Donohue
Miss Annie Murray	Mr. Charles Prince
Miss Mary Wynne	Mr. Lord
Miss Katie Keefe	Mr. Healy
Miss Annie Derby	Mr. Bolger
Miss Aggie Derby	Mr. White
Miss Mary Derby	Mr. Limberger
Miss Maggie Ward	Mr. Duncan

Rev. Dr. MCGLYNN and HENRY GEORGE will make brief addresses.

PROGRAMME:
Part First.

- Overture—Morning, Noon and Night. Supper
- Orchestra, under the direction of Mr. McAufliffe.
- Opening Remarks by the chairman, Rev. Dr. McGlynn.
- Chorus—Unfold Ye Portals. Gounod
- Concordia Chorus.
- Baritone Solo—"The Palms." Faure
- Mr. Albert Barnes Myers.
- Piano Solo—Cradle Song; (b) Old Folks at Home; (c) Waltz, Caprice. Mills
- Mr. S. B. Mills.
- Address—Rev. Dr. McGlynn.
- Tri-o—Ti Prelo O Padre. Nicolai
- Miss Di Carlo, Miss Munier and Mr. Duzenzi.
- Part Second.
- Selections—National Airs.
- Orchestra, under the direction of Mr. McAufliffe.
- La Pregeliera. Donizetti
- Miss Munier.
- Violin Solo—Selected—
- Mr. Carl Hauser.
- Adante Fideles. Novello
- Solo, Concordia Chorus and Orchestra.
- Address—Mr. Henry George.
- Tenor Solo—If With All Your Hearts. Mendelssohn
- Signor Duzenzi.
- Duo—Quis Est Homo. Rossini
- Miss Di Carlo and Miss Munier.
- Xylophone Solo—Selected—
- Mr. Naubaum.
- Infinite. Rossini
- Miss Di Carlo, Concordia Chorus and Orchestra.

Admission, 50 cents and \$1.00.
Tickets on sale at the Anti-Poverty Society office, 30 Cooper Union, and at the office of THE STANDARD.

Box office at Academy open at 6:30 p. m. Sunday.

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY IN PHILA.

DELPHIA.

The Society will hold meetings every Sunday evening at 8 o'clock at Lincoln hall, corner of Broad street and Fairmount avenue.

Everybody invited. Admission free.

A LIVE CHRISTIANITY.

Speakers have been secured as follows:
Sunday, Jan. 22, 1888. Louis F. Post, Esq., of New York; Sunday, Jan. 22, 1888. Wm. J. Vorwerk of Philadelphia. By order of Executive Committee.

J. H. MINTYRE, Secretary.

UNITED LABOR PARTY, COUNTY EXEC.

THE GENERAL COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED LABOR PARTY of the city and county of New York will meet at 125 COOGAN BROS. CO. on Thursday evening, January 12, 1888, at 8 o'clock. Delegates to said committee have been appointed as follows:

First assembly district.	12
Second assembly district.	13
Third assembly district.	14
Fourth assembly district.	15