Slavery Then And Now.

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

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

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

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

In Georgia a law forbade any congregation or company of negroes to assemble themselves contrary to the law regulating patrols. And every slave taken at such meetings might, by order of the justice, without trial, receive on the bare back twenty-five stripes with switch, whip, or cow skin. In South Carolina the police were forbidden to break into any place of religious meeting before nine o'clock, provided a majority of the assembly were white persons; if not, every slave present was liable to twenty-five lashes of the cow skin. A planter of San Domingo objected that the belief in a future state should be taught the negroes, as “such knowledge is apt to render them intractable, averse to labor, and induces them to commit suicide on themselves and their children, of which the colony, the state and commerce have equal need.” The legislature of Virginia passed a law in 1831, by which any free colored person undertaking to preach or conduct any religious meeting, by day or night, might be whipped not exceeding thirty-nine lashes, at the discretion of any justice of the peace. The same penalty fell upon any slave or free colored person who attended such meetings; and any slave who listened to any white preacher in the night time received the same punishment. The same law prevailed in Georgia and Mississippi. A master might permit a slave to preach on his own plantation, but only to his own slaves. North Carolina in 1831 passed a law which began: “Whereas, teaching slaves to read and write has a tendency to excite dissatisfaction in their minds and to produce insurrection and rebellion,” therefore, etc, “teaching a slave to read or write, or giving or selling to a slave any book or pamphlet shall be punished by thirty-nine lashes if the of lender be a free black, or with imprisonment, at the discretion of the court; if a slave, the offense is punishable with thirty-nine lashes on his or her bare back on conviction before a justice of the peace.” Georgia and Louisiana had similar laws. In Virginia, Georgia and North Carolina white persons teaching any colored persons to read or write, gratis or for pay, were to be punished by imprisonment or by fine of ten to five hundred dollars.

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

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

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

The laws to which my correspondent refers as recorded evidence, direct or inferential, of the atrocities of chattel slavery, were necessary parts of the system which gave to one man a right to compel another man to work for his benefit. The slave had to be kept in ignorance, had to be restrained in his liberty of association and movement, had to be denied the right to resist or to testify against a white man, and the master had to be given powers of coercion, whose abuse was testified to rather than prevented by provisions against maiming, etc, in order to enable the owner of his power to labor (for it was this, and not the person, that the apologists of slavery declared to be the essential subject of ownership), to keep and utilize his property.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In its society column the Journal says:

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

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

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

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

Henry George.

Why They Hate Him.

A True American In 1870 As In 1887.

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

New York Sun. April 30, 1870.

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

Dr. McGlynn did not particularly desire to have religious orders teaching in Sunday schools. As a matter of fact, while there are in his parish seven sisters of charity engaged exclusively in works of charity, they do not teach in the Sunday school, and have never been asked to do so.
Dr. McGlynn spoke of a bill which was passed in the assembly this year, but which met with opposition in the committee of the senate, the object of which bill was to protect the liberty of conscience of children in asylums, houses of refuge, etc. But a leading senator thought that there was no room for this act of justice, while they were so busy in granting or maintaining appropriations as favors. Dr. McGlynn said that it had been hoped that a leading member of this year's legislature would have introduced, and that members of both parties would have aided, the passage of a bill, the object of which would be to take the matter of sectarianism and its consequent theological bitterness and threatened dangers out of the field of politics, if possible, at once and forever. But legislators of both parties were probably too busy in buying, selling and bartering to find time or inclination for such an act of justice and statesmanship. In fact the putting of a stop to this matter of doing favors, in the shape of appropriations, would perhaps take away too much of their stock in trade. The intended measure had the cordial approval of influential Catholic clergymen and laymen, who would like to see some such measure incorporated into the constitution of every state of the union: and it is to be hoped that the people will demand from the politicians some such just and statesmanlike measure. It would be substantially as follows:

An act (or amendment to the constitution) to guard against the union of church and state, and to protect liberty of conscience:

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

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

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

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

Dr. McGlynn—Yes; the Catholic church, at a body, is committed by its highest authority in this country to that policy. It is sufficient to quote from the late council of Baltimore, signed by all our bishops, and approved by the pope. pp. 425, 429.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Letter from the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost

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

The Sumter gun has been fired!

Yours faithfully, Hugh O. Pentecost.

Tax the Income Back.

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

C.E. Turner.

An Anti-Poverty Excursion.

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

The Fourth in Kansas City.

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

T. G. J.

Delegates from the Seventeenth.

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

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

E.F. Eurreg.

Anti-Poverty

Hot Weather Doesn't Check The New Crusade

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Well, massa, I done left that situation open. I reckon you can get it if you want it.” (Laughter.)

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

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

When I was out in Pennsylvania last week my attention was called to a peculiar last there. They have got the whole earth under mined, and the ground sinks, and occasionally a great big hole, as large as this building. Will go down forty or fifty feet. Well, this happened, in many instances, where I was and the rain fell into the holes and then froze. Some of the miners thought they would like to abolish their poverty, so far as ice was concerned, and they determined to gather that ice. But the man who owned the hole that the ice was in (great laughter)—mind you, he bad never seen the hole, didn't make it himself, didn't make the earth around it, didn't pour the water in, and didn't freeze it when it got there, although he owned it all the same—he sent word to these men—he never had seen them, never does see them—that they must pay so much for every ton of ice they took out of the hole. Consequently they are in a state of poverty in the matter of ice. The ice was there last winter. They would have saved it up. They had all the means, but they couldn't get the permission of the man who owned the hole. (Laughter.) The ice wasn't worth anything to him. It remained there, and as summer came it rotted and melted away. The ice wasn't of any benefit to anybody, simply because the man who owned the the hole wouldn't allow it to be taken out. That is a perfect illustration of our industrial system. (Applause.) As the ice was, or would have been, of use to the men in the coal regions, so are all the bounties of God with respect to all men. (Applause.) Those men wouldn't have been in poverty in the matter of ice this summer if they had not been prohibited from taking the ice; and neither would any man willing to work be in poverty today in the matter of any form of wealth if he had the opportunity of going to the earth to take its fruits. (Applause.)

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

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

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

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

Be it resolved, That the Progress and Poverty reading club of the Twenty-third assembly district, New York city,' expresses its hearty approval of his action in refusing to retract the truth—(applause)—and,

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

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

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

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

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

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

The land is the great reservoir of the things we need for the development of the body and mind. No one but believes there is enough there to supply more than the whole population of the world today wants, and yet beyond this in the earth lie unknown, unimagined treasures ready to be brought forth at the touch of labor for generations yet to come. All that is necessary is the talismanic touch of labor and the earth will yield her best, her richest gifts. (Applause.) God could have put us in a world so small and so overcrowded that it would have been just a terrible scramble with one another to see which would get the little there was, and then it would indeed have been “the devil take the hindmost.” No;
God could not have done so, because He is God, and He has not done it (Great applause.) There is plenty to eat and drink and wear, and plenty to cover us from cold and shade us from the heat, and it is all in the earth.

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

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

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

There is another way in which the same evil can be wrought; it is going on now. This way is by getting hold of the other element land, so that men can not reach it and bring forth from it what God meant should be brought forth from it. I ask you if that system is not defeating the purpose of God to day as truly as slavery defeated the purpose son why working men have to buy themselves over and over again? and after all they are industrial slaves at the end. (Applause.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

And if it was done in the first Century of the Christian era, it can be done in the nineteenth too.
(Applause.) Will you tell me that the truths we utter here are not a fresh setting forth of Christianity? If
you do it is to be feared that you have been brought up under a narrowing influence, under a perverting
influence, which has changed the word as it came from the lips of Christ into a far other gospel; that
you have been under the influence of systems which have re-written the beatitudes and twisted them
out of meaning, that tell us “blessed are the rich, for they shall inherit the earth,” and “blessed are the
merciless, for they shall obtain money.” (Great applause.) “Blessed are ye when all men shall speak
well of you; rejoice ye in that day and leap for joy.” But those are not the principles of the Catholic
church; those are not the principles of Christianity; those are not the principles of the religion of Jesus
Christ. No, but hear them, the true beatitudes! “Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.”
“Blessed are they who hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall be satisfied.” (Applause.)

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

Of course that is very different from what the pro-poverty press says; but in the progress of every truth there are three stages. The first says “it is absurd.” The next says “it is impious.” The third says “everybody knows that.” (Applause and laughter.) We have got to the second stage now. By and by you of land to-the full extent of the rental value, “everybody knows that.” (Applause and laughter.)

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

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

And it is with a revival of the ancient spirit of heroism and unselfishness that you are engaged in setting forth these truths, a revival of that “enthusiasm of humanity” that has won its way in the world, that has fought on and on in all the centuries, and that in country after country and nation after nation has still gained the ascendancy. (Great applause.) And that “enthusiasm of humanity” is of the very essence of the religion of Christ. If Christianity is not now what it was in the beginning, it is not because of the lack of truth in it, or of the divine element in it; not the lack of verity in its faith or of grace in its sacraments, but because of the human element in it that has warped and distorted it, and turned it in opposite channels, and taken the very heart and life out of its teachings. But the divine element is reasserting itself; religion is once more becoming not a matter of custom, but a burning conviction of the heart. (Applause.) Indeed, I believe that many of you will bear witness that as members of the Anti-poverty society, we are better Christians and better Catholics than we could be anywhere else. (Applause.) What a ring it gives to those old familiar truths that have seemed to us
sometimes like trite platitudes, when we see their bearing in these living issues, when we have to stand up for them, bear ridicule and even suffering for them. (Tumultuous applause.) It gives us a sense of enthusiasm. That is why I say this movement cannot be killed. (Applause.) It is because in it is the self-sacrifice and enthusiasm that have carried the cross from land to land and planted it on the highest summits of the world. (Deafening applause.)

If I thought for one moment you were here to see what you could make out of the Antipoverty society, I never would place my foot on the platform of the Academy of Music again. But you are here because of the good you can do for humanity. Isn't that true? It is this enthusiasm that the rich and wealthy, “the fat and greasy citizens” cannot reckon with—cannot even understand. They do not see what under the sun you are in this hall for this hot night. They think you are a set of fools and dupes. (Laughter.) They cannot get hold of it. And yet that power of unselfishness is stronger than all the dollars and all the banks and monopolies from Maine to California.

When a man has once got that principle of self-sacrifice worked into his system, the more you seek to crush him, to frighten and browbeat him the more certain you may be that he will go straight on in the path of duty. (Great applause.) And it was this sight of one Life of perfect self-sacrifice that nerved the martyrs and the confessors of the faith through all the ages.

“By the light of burning martyr fires Christ's bleeding feet I track Toiling up new Calvaries ever With the cross that turns not back.”

This power of unselfishness which is growing in you, it is this which the world cannot reckon with and cannot understand, but has got to feel. (Applause.) There comes the lesson for you and me. You and I cannot afford to turn back. We have got to keep on. We are pledged to it. If you cut away from this Anti-poverty society you will be a sneak and ashamed of yourself all through your life. (Applause.) Remember the first treason to the truth begins in your own breast. Allow yourself to think that perhaps this is not going to succeed after all and that you had better hedge a little on the other side to keep on good terms with Mammon, though professing to be trying to east him down; allow yourself to think that it is not wise to be quite so earnest, that it is not well to come out so fully in defense of the land theory, which is the land fact (applause); allow yourself to think that in your own mind, and you have taken the first step toward the worst treason the world ever saw, the treason toward the truth which you know to be true and which you have no right to give away because it is God's truth. (Tumultuous applause.)

Do not allow yourself to say, This thing is going to fail. Look back in the centuries and see that Christianity has not failed. It has waded through every oppression; and the blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the church. And once more will shine forth the power of Christianity, the power of unselfishness, the triumph and victory of the cross. (Applause.)

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

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

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

The day of the Lord is at hand, at hand,
The clouds roll up the sky,
A nation sleeps starving on heaps of gold,
All dreamers toss and sigh.
When the pain is sorest the child is born,
And the night is darkest before the morn
Of the day of the Lord at hand!

Gather you, gather you, angels of God,
Chivalry, Justice and Truth,
Come down. for the world has grown coward and old;
Come down and renew us her Youth,
Freedom, Self-sacrifice, Mercy and Love.
Stoop to the battle field, haste from above
To the day of the Lord at hand!

Gather you, gather you, hounds of hell, :
Famine and Plague and War,
Idleness, Bigotry, Cant, Misrule,
Gather and fall in the snare.
Hirelings and mammonites. pedants and knaves,
Crawl to the battle or sneak to your graves,
In the day of the Lord at hand!

Who would sit down and whine for a lost age of gold,
With the Lord of all ages at hand?
True hearts will leap up at the trumpet of God,
And they who can suffer, can dare!
Each past of age of gold was an iron age, too,
And the meekest of saints may find stem, work to do,
In the day of the Lord at hand!

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

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

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

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

“Bear in mind that every cent is expended in the most economical way. As a result of our work, we find anti-poverty societies springing up all over, not only in cities like Philadelphia, but in small hamlets, where they form anti-poverty societies, not of one, but of four or five or more.” The following telegram was submitted to the audience, and received hearty assent: To the Chairman Anti-poverty Society Meeting, McCaull's Opera House. Philadelphia, Pa.: Our thousands here send you greeting. On with the new crusade.

The chairman then said: “We have now to listen to the 'Prophet of San Francisco,' as he has been called. (Great applause and cheers.) We do not need any introduction, and if there is any one who wants to know, you know,' after he is through, he will answer any questions that may be asked.” Mr. George, who was received with deafening applause, said:

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

There was in that great meeting a fitting response to it. The issue was met; the challenge was accepted. From that time dates the beginning of our victory. (Uproarious applause.) The mightiest force in the world is now clearly and fully arrayed upon our side. As Father Huntington (applause) has said here to-night (applause), it is indeed the spirit of Christianity against the perversion of Christianity. (Applause.) And I, I know, speak for more than myself when I testify to the deep satisfaction it gives me to find that this movement is taking clearly and decisively a religious phase that is bringing to some of us who have lost our faith a new and a firm consciousness of divine truth; a feeling that in this struggle we are on the side of all that is good and true, and that we are working in. our little way with a power that is mightier than that of man. (Applause.)

I was asked some years ago to address a congress of The Episcopal church upon the question, “Why workingmen do not go to church?” and I told them it was because the church had turned its back upon the workingmen. (Great applause.) It was because the church in all its branches and all its denominations, discarding the teachings of its founder, had become a mere prop for tyranny, had become a defense for all wrong and monopoly (a voice: “That is as true as you live”); had become a stiffer of conscience, a justifier of wrong and a barrier against the realization of the God-given aspirations of men. (Applause.) That eighteen centuries after Christ died the so-called Christian world is full of misery and suffering and poverty; that in the so-called Christian world the God that is really most worshiped is mammon; that the nations of so-called Christendom, armed, most of them, to the teeth, are maintaining even in what they call peace an industrial war against each other; that the hand of individual is against individual, as that of nation is against nation, is due to nothing else than the failure of those who have called themselves the ministers of Christ to teach Christ's truths. (Great applause.)

And as I listened here last Sunday night to that grand enunciation of the primary truths of Christianity—to that declaration of Dr. McGlynn—(deafening applause)—that no man, whether he be high priest, archbishop—(hisses and groans)—or pope—(hisses and groans)—could cut him off from the church of God—(Great applause. A voice: “They can't do it.”) that declaration that the highest and most binding authority is the authority of conscience; that promise to hold to his faith, to go forward, whatever might come, unalteringly; and as I heard the response that went up from this vast audience, I
believed, indeed, that a revival of true Christianity had come. (Great applause.)

Man needs a religion. But today that, all over the civilized world, so many men have turned away from the forms of religion, that so many men, in the bitterness of their hearts, have even made warfare against the most consoling of truths—the truth that there is above us a benevolent Creator, the truth that there is beyond us another life—is due to nothing else than what we see in this case, that the power of the ecclesiastical machine—(hisses and groans)—the power of church organization, has been turned against the very doctrines and truths of Christianity, has been used to justify wrong, to prop up tyranny, to put down the struggle for right and for liberty. (Tumultuous applause.)

But now once again—once again, for it has been raised time and time before, and many a time has gone down in blood—once again the standard of the cross, in its full, true meaning, is raised in this land; and in the response it has already met is the assurance that the fullness of time has come, and that it will go on to victory, not merely here, but all over the world. (Great applause.)

The truth that we have planted our feet upon is a fundamental truth, the truth that the earth has been made for all the children of men, the truth that we are all here equal heirs of the Creator's bounty, and it is a truth, that goes to the very bottom. (Applause.) Once make that sure and then we can build the edifice strong and true. (Applause.)

And what nobler work, what higher work, can any man address himself to than the work that we have undertaken, not merely to lift ourselves from poverty, not merely to make sure the conditions of our own children, but to abolish poverty from human society, to make sure the conditions of all children, to make it certain that all who come after us into this life shall' come here with opportunities to find full and free development for all their powers of mind and body—that God's will may be done on earth as in heaven. (Great applause.)

What may happen to us individually who knows! This full triumph we may not see in our own times, but there is a satisfaction and a glory in being able to take part in the work. We may not see the victory, but when we go from this we will go with the satisfaction of having done something to make the world better because we have lived—go with the consciousness of having done something on the side of that power that through all the long ages is steadily striving for the good. (Applause.)

Mr. George then announced that he would answer, for a few minutes, questions that might be put to him.

Q.—You said on a previous occasion that Mayor Grace would not charge any more rents than the state would charge.

A.—I think the gentleman must have misunderstood me. I said Mayor Grace would doubtless charge all the rent he could get. (Laughter.) But, as Father Huntington (applause) said, we do not propose to make the state the landlord in the sense that an individual is the landlord. We propose to take the value of land, that value that comes from the growth and improvement of the community, for public purposes; to take it by the agency of the state and use it for purposes of public benefits. Every man then, every member of the state, every citizen, man, woman or child, will be a landlord in the sense of being a land owner; and the individuals who improve land will have as full possession of land as they have now, subject merely to the payment of a just tax or rent to the community. (Applause.)

Q.—Mayor Grace holds land in Great Neck, and rents it for as much as he can get. Providing the tax was raised by the government, Mayor Grace would raise the rent; Mayor Grace puts the rental value up, too. (Laughter. A voice: “Chestnut.”)

A.—Yes, it is a chestnut, but it is an objection commonly made. Mayor Grace, the gentleman says, is renting land to farmers, and if we increase the tax that Mayor Grace has to pay on that land, he will increase the charges to his tenants. He will not. Mayor Grace is probably getting from the farmers all that he can get. If he had the power to increase the rent, he would do so. To increase the tax on his land gives him no increased power. A tax levied on houses or on any other product of human labor that must; be constantly supplied does give power to increase the price, because it tends to check the supply. But a tax on the value of land in no way tends to check the supply of land. (Applause.) On the contrary,
it has the effect of forcing land into the market, because it will increase the tax that people who are now holding land vacant will have to pay, and thus make it impossible for them to continue to hold their land without getting some return. Consequently they will be anxious to find a purchaser, or find some one to take it off their hands. (Applause.) This is a well settled principle in political economy, that no reasonable political economist pretends to dispute, that a tax upon the value of land can not be shifted from the man who pays it—from the owner of the land to the user.” (Applause.) And it is something well worth keeping in mind, because much of the objection to our plan is based upon the notion that; the land owner can shift the tax upon his tenant. Land owners themselves, however, know better. (Applause.)

Q.—Don't you think you made a mistake when you said we may not see the success of this movement? I am fifty years of age and I expect to see the success of it. (Great applause.)

A.—I sincerely hope you may. I hope I may; but you and I may die before next Sunday night.
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For a long time I never believed that this reform could come within my lifetime. I do now believe it. We have at last got this question into discussion; and when it is once brought into discussion, private property in land is doomed. (Applause.) A very careful and a very cautious business man; a friend of mine and a member of the Anti-poverty society, puts it that within the next three years we will carry out this policy in the state of New York (“Hear, hear,” and applause), or at least elect a legislature pledged to do so. (Applause.) And when we once make a beginning in the state of New York, the other states in the Union will not be long behind. (Applause.)

Q.—Dr. McGlynn has been excommunicated for standing precisely on the same platform as Bishop Nulty. Wouldn't it be consistency and honesty for Bishop Nulty to resign under the circumstances?

A.—I am not the keeper of Bishop Nulty's conscience, The time may come, and it will not be very long, when all men who hold this truth will come together. (Applause.) I hope the Catholic ecclesiastical authorities will carry this policy out and attempt to excommunicate Bishop Nulty. And if you have any influence with Cardinal Simeoni (hisses and groans) please persuade him to do so. (Applause.) And when we once make a beginning in the state of New York, the other states in the Union will not be long behind. (Applause.)

Q.—I want you to explain away in some way the cobwebs from these men's minds who believe that Dr. McGlynn ought to have gone to Rome. I want the people to see it in THE STANDARD next week, so that it will brush away the cobwebs from their minds. (Laughter.)

A.—It is perfectly true, as the gentleman says, that there is an attempt—and it is far more successful outside of than in this city—to make it appear that Dr. McGlynn's excommunication is on account of some personal quarrel, is on account of some disobedience on his part to a proper order. It is nothing of the kind. (Applause.) It has been perfectly clear from the beginning of his thing to the last that what was required of Dr. McGlynn was his renunciation of the truth that he had avowed (a voice: “That is right”), the truth that the land was made by God for the whole people. (Great applause.)

When I went, bearing a letter from Dr. McGlynn, to visit Archbishop Corrigan—(terrific hisses and groans)—in order to explain to him this truth and to show him that there was nothing in it against religion, he brought out. the Italian letters from Cardinal Simeoni —(hisses and groans)—four years old—(a voice: “And a monkey.” Laughter, in which Mr. George joined heartily)—directing the suspension of Dr. McGlynn for having favored the Irish revolution. (A voice: “God bless him for it”) He stated clearly and emphatically that Dr. McGlynn was not reinstated after he had been suspended on a ridiculous charge of speaking disrespectfully of the pope. After Dr. McGlynn had explained he had never even thought of the pope, Archbishop Corrigan—(hisses)—declared that he would not reinstate him until he had renounced this doctrine. In the telegram commanding him to go to Rome, he was also commanded to renounce the doctrines that he had taught. Dr. McGlynn, as he clearly and emphatically
stated at that time, proposed to do no such thing. (Applause.) He would not and he could not renounce the truth. (Applause.) And even if there had been no other objection, it would have been a fool's errand for him to go to Rome. ("Hear! hear! and applause.)

But there was another objection, and a very serious objection. Dr. McGlynn planted himself upon the rights of an American citizen and an American priest (great applause); and he denied the power of propaganda or pope to call him to Rome, or to question him for his political action as an American citizen. (Applause.)

The machinery of the church has here been put openly and clearly on the side of reaction, on the side of abuse ("Hear! hear!"), on the side of wrong, just as it has been put over and over again before. (Hear! hear! and applause.)

But, thank God, in this case we have a priest brave enough and strong enough to stand up for the right, and at the same time to hold fast to his religion. (Deafening applause. A voice: “That is what kneels them out”) And for that reason we are not going to see that divorce between the spirit of reform and religion that has been seen on the continent of Europe, and in many individual cases is seen even in all English speaking countries.

The men who have made the atheists, the men who have made the materialists, the men who have inspired that spirit which seeks to convince men that there is no God and that there is no future, are the very men who have thus abased Christianity. (Applause.) And today Dr. McGlynn, excommunicated though he is (applause), stands for the spirit of true Christianity, stands, as Father Huntington said (applause), for the same spirit that, going out with the apostles, poor workingmen of Judea, and preached by slaves unto the down-trodden and oppressed, was yet powerful enough to overthrow the strongest empire of the world, and to plant the cross above the throne of the Cæsars. (Applause.)

Q.—I am myself of the Episcopal faith. I was one of a committee a few days ago which called on a clergyman to request him to appear before the labor lyceum and speak on the labor question. He said before he could do it he must get the consent of his bishop. (Hisses.) Does not our dear Father Huntington jeopardize his interests; does not his bishop scrutinize his acts, and will he not call him to account?

Before Mr. George could answer this question, Father Huntington rose to his feet, and requesting permission of the chair, said: “I think I can answer the speaker by simply denying my bishop is not that kind of a bishop and I am not that kind of a priest.” (Shouts of applause.)

Mr. George—I was going to say that if the test came in his case, as in that of Dr. McGlynn, Father Huntington, too, would be found faithful.

A voice: “Was not Mr. Pentecost blackballed in a clergyman's club?”

Mr. George—No man can take the side of the truth against “vested wrong” while it is yet strong without experiencing ostracism and persecution. It has been, I know, a bitter, bitter, bitter experience for Dr. McGlynn. It is the old story- Christ was not crucified by accident. Alter the manner of the times he would be crucified to-day if he came on earth and preached the gospel. And all men who stand for the truth must expect to meet opposition and persecution; but for all that, the truth will triumph in the end. (Applause.) As Whittier has sung:

Not in vain, confessor old,
Unto us the tale is told
Of thy day of trial;
Every age on him who strays
From its broad and beaten ways,
Pours its sevenfold vial.
Happy lie whose inward ear
Angel comfortings can bear,
O'er the rabble's laughter;
And while hatred's fagots burn,
Glimpses through the smoke discern
Of the good hereafter.

At the conclusion of Mr. George's remarks, the chairman announced that the collection amounted to $307.31.

**Queries And Answers**

**A Clergyman's Dilemma**

Warwick, Mass.—May I ask you to answer the following two questions?

1. Why must your land tax stay on the landowner and not distribute itself largely on the entire people?

   The same question, I notice, has, during this movement, been asked several times; but, as far as I know, never answered; only met by the blunt assertion that “it is the only tax which stays where it is put,” and also by reference to “authorities.” I cannot see why it would not largely distribute itself upon the entire nation, and consequently avail nothing as a remedy for the evils you would cure. I desire nothing much more than to be able to see that this could not happen, and that consequently your reform would at least do away with the unrighteousness of land owners living idly union the hard labor of the workers of the world.

   I see perfectly well that if all present taxes and conditions were maintained and the land tax only increased, it would stay where put: but with the increased prosperity and amount of ready wealth momentarily resulting from changing all taxes into a land tax, I cannot see why rent should not rise proportionately or equally with this increase of wealth and prosperity and bring it all back into the pockets of the landlords. Practically, this means that there could be no increase of wealth or prosperity; that all a heavy land tax could do would be to raise a large fund for common good—from the entire nation of workers, leaving the landlord where he is, and as he is. But even that I think a good, and would, therefore, vote for your reform even without other hope based upon it.

   If, for instance, a merchant in New York city now pays $1,000 in rent, and your tax would come and absorb part of that rent and deliver him from all taxes, and make his customers better able to buy, he would now be able to pay his former rent and the land tax to the landlord, and still be as well off as formerly. If then his landlord comes to him and says, “You must pay so much more rent now as this tax amounts to or leave,” will he not do it? If not, why?

2. But suppose your idea works to perfection, will the worker be as much at the mercy of the capitalist as now? Why would “the hands” in a manufactory receive higher wages? Why would not the capitalist be able to absorb every good the reform might work? You say. I know, that so much good and profitable land would be made free that the laborer could always make a living by his own work on his own land, and that wages could never drop below what he thus could make by his own labor on a new piece of land. Certainly not. But that might be little enough, after a short while. For does it not become more and more difficult for a man to make a decent living by his own independent work? The things now needed to a decent life are so many that without the aid of machinery one man cannot produce them or their value. Unable to use the machinery of the world, a man will therefore soon be unable to make even the humblest living even on free good land, for farming will not much longer pay—pay even living wages—unless it be organized on a grand scale, backed by large capital.
Briefly, we do all every day become more and more dependent on the use of machinery; as much dependent thereon as on land or air. Soon he, who in our civilized communities cannot, make use of machinery, must starve, and the owners of the world's stock of machinery will own us all.

I cannot see that your reform affects this fact at all. And yet surely it is a rapidly spreading disease, which must be cured, else with or without free land we shall all soon be slaves.

Finally, though it should be impossible for me to see the power in your remedy which you ascribe to it. I rejoice in your movement, and work for it the best I can, because of its ennobling purity and influence, because of its high aim—"justice," and because I feel sure that even if you are mistaken, you have made the people think, and think in the right line, on these important matters, and the movement you have inaugurated must therefore help us at least to find the true remedy—become a link and factor in the true progress of mankind.

(Rev.) H. Tambs Lyche.

(1) You could not have read the numerous answers to this question which have already appeared in The Standard or you would not say that they were merely blunt assertions and references to authorities. The answers we have given are elaborations of what is almost self-evident: (a) that a high land value tax increases the market supply of land, and under the operation of the familiar law of supply and demand, tends to reduce its value; (b) that a low land value tax diminishes the market supply of land, and therefore tends to increase its price; (c) that the reason that a tax on products is shifted to the consumer is because a tax on a product discourages its production and therefore, under the law of supply and demand, tends to decrease the supply and consequently to increase the price; and (d) that land values are determined by the margin of production, which is high or low according to the demand for land. We have also called attention to the well known fact that where burdens on land are high (as in Elizabeth, N. J., when that town was staggering; under a heavy debt) land values are low; that where government is corrupt (as in Brooklyn, N. Y., a few years ago), land values are low; and that when corruption is diminished and there is a prospect of low taxation (as in Brooklyn, N. Y., when a strong reform movement came into power), land values rise. We have also reminded our readers of what is familiar to every one, that landlords who find it possible to raise their rents do not wait for the imposition of a tax to enable them to do it, but do it at once. And as to our citation of authorities, we have done no more than to quote from one of the greatest and most candid economists, John Stuart Mill, in whose work on political economy you will find a complete elaboration of this point, the results of which have been accepted by all critical students of political economy since. It would be well if you read what he says on this question.

A tax on land values cannot increase the value of anything, because the value of products is determined by the cost of production on the least productive land in use, and the value of all land is determined by the value of the least productive land in use. As a tax on land values cannot bring-into use land of lower productiveness, it cannot raise values.

You say that with increased prosperity, resulting from changing all taxes into a land tax, rent would rise and the landlords be thus enabled to shift the tax back upon the community. This would not be so. The first effect of shifting all taxes to land values would be to bring into the market a great deal of vacant land now held for speculation. That would reduce land values, and it is probable that present taxes all laid upon land values would so discourage land speculation as temporarily at least to eliminate speculative values. We should then begin an era of unexampled prosperity, and as you surmise, a new unearned increment would appear—that is, the actual value of land would begin to increase. This increase would go to the landlord, but not the former rental values. They would be absorbed in taxation. We do not propose, however, that the land value tax should be limited by what we call "the necessities of government." We would increase the tax as rental values increased, so that there would be no inducement present or prospective to occupy land except for use. The reason we would begin with
merely shifting present taxes is because that is the easiest step in the right direction. It would involve the whole question of private ownership and leave nothing to be done after the light for shifting taxes was over and the victory won but the detail of increasing the tax.

You are in error about your illustration of the city merchant who now pays $1,000 rent. The tax would absorb part of that rent, and a large part of what it did not absorb it would cut down by reducing land values generally. The merchant would be free of taxes, his customers would be able to buy more, his business would be brisker, and most of the rent he paid would be for his benefit as a member of the community. But he would not pay a higher rent simply because he was able to. Men do not pay more than market value for things because they happen to be able to. If his landlord said to him, “You must pay more than the market value for these premises or leave,” the merchant would go next door, or next door but one, or across the street, rat her than pay the increase. But when the value of his land had risen, the landlord would be able to raise the merchant's rent, and as the merchant would be able to pay it, and would be enjoying the benefit of more valuable land than before, he would pay it. But the public having seen the advantage of this kind of a tax, would not hesitate then to set up public libraries, run street cars free, build public halls, provide for widows and orphans, and in other beneficent ways find use for more revenue, which they would raise by increasing the land value tax.

In a previous letter, which could not be answered because it was mislaid, you gave an excellent illustration of your difficulty on this point. You imagined an island with one bridge to the main land, for the use of which the owner charged toll. You then supposed a single tax on the income of this bridge, and asked if the bridge owner could not increase his toll so as to make the island community pay his tax for him, provided the necessities of the people required them to go to and from the main land. To that question we answer yes, up to the point of impoverishing the people, because there is but one bridge. But suppose that there are many bridges; that some are more convenient than others; that only the few that are most convenient are used by the people; and that all that are not used are closed up by the owners in the expectation that when the population of the island is greater they will come into profitable use. In that case the most convenient bridge would command the highest toll; the next best bridge less toll, and so on down. Now the owner of the most convenient bridge could not raise his toll until population increased, for if he did his customers would go to the next convenient bridge; and if the toll was raised on all the bridges one of the unused bridges would be opened for the lowest toll that had prevailed before, and this would so decrease the custom of the other bridges that the old toll would be resumed. Not until increase of population has made such demands on the bridges in use as to make it profitable to open one of the others could the toll be increased on the more convenient bridges.

Now suppose you put a high tax on bridge values. The owners of the unused bridges, not able to hold them out of use and pay the taxes, would try to sell them, and if they could not sell them would abandon them. The result would be that nearly if not all these unused bridges would be open and free, and as free bridges they would be used by many of the inhabitants who would prefer the inconvenience to paying tolls. Under these circumstances, how could the owners of the more convenient bridges increase their tolls so as to make the users of their bridges pay the bridge tax?

(2) One conclusive reason why the worker would not be as much at the mercy of the capitalist as now is that he would be sure of a living. Now he must get a job of a capitalist or starve. Now it is with him a question of low wages or none. Then he would not be dependent on a capitalist for a job; he could get a living without any one's permission. Then it would be, at the worst, a question of low wages or better wages. The hands in a factory would receive high wages, because they would not surrender their independence and become cog wheels in a big machine unless it were made exceedingly profitable to them. No one would go into a big factory for a mere living. The capitalist could not “absorb every good the reform might work,” because the suction power of capital is gone when land is free.

When we say that free land, by enabling every one to make a living, would keep all wages up to the living point, we do not refer to agriculture alone, as you suppose. There are many things besides
farming that the poorest could do on their own account if land were free and taxes abolished. And the freeing of land would free men from dependence on bosses by another influence. Men would be independent, not only because they could themselves get a living directly from the soil, but because nearly every one with small capital would go into business for himself, thus at once reducing the supply of men willing to work for a boss and increasing the demand for such men. And this condition would be maintained, because when men had learned a trade and got a little capital together as every one would be able to do [note that this was so when cheap land was plentiful], they would also go into business for themselves. Under such circumstances it is extremely doubtful if men would be willing to lose their independence in a big factory without sharing in the profits, and that in all production on a large scale a system of voluntary co-operation would spring up naturally, which, based as it would be on common ownership of land, would be successful. And still another influence would operate. It would be impossible to accumulate large private fortunes, and the power which great aggregations of capital exercise in a community where large numbers of men are dependent would be gone.

You speak of machinery as if it were a product of nature, over which labor has no control. Pray, what is machinery but a product of the land drawn forth by labor? We need only the land to give us machinery. The “owners of the world's stock of machinery,” indeed! Why, the same brawn and brain that made the existing stock of machinery can make another stock, and with free access to land would do so very quickly if the owners of the existing stock tried any capers. It is the private ownership of land that makes us in any degree dependent on the owners of machinery now. If labor would make new machinery it must first get permission of land owners, and land owners charge the highest price possible for their permission. With free land no one's permission would be necessary. Put a farmer, a carpenter, a mason, an iron worker, a machinist, a weaver and a tailor, all in a condition of absolute destitution, on a productive island, and it will not be long, if the island be free, until they have dwellings, clothing and food in abundance and of good quality, and will have accumulated such capital as will allow them to carry on production with the best tools. But if the island be privately owned, the owner will have these things and the artisans will be grateful to him for an occasional job to keep the wolf away.

The idea that the community must take possession of machinery in order to give the people the advantage of the abolition of land ownership is due to an imperfect conception of the functions of land in the complex processes of modern industry. But let the truth be once grasped that land plays the same part in the most complex industrial conditions that it plays in the most primitive, and this fear of the power of machinery in free production will be recognized for the nightmare that it really is. It would be as impossible to maintain a corner in machinery as a corner in potatoes, if land were free.

Anarchy—Socialism—Communism.

Brick Church, N. J.,—It has been the good or bad fortune of your correspondent to have participated in discussion on various occasions as to the right of anarchists, communists and socialists to the enjoyment of freedom of speech. It has been said by some of the disputants that “they are a dangerous set,” “a bad lot,” “their tendernesses are to menace and destroy.” Your correspondent has contended that they have as perfect a constitutional right to freely express their opinion in private or in public as the writer so long as they refrain from advocating violence against life or property. This has been met with the assertion that they (meaning, in particular, anarchists) are a shrewd company, and have their quiet or secret meetings whereat the use of dynamite and violence is advocated. The writer still maintains they have the same guaranteed right to free speech as any other citizen of the United States, and with the same subjection to reasonable limitations. Am I right? If not, wherein am I in error? Will you, if in your power, present to your readers, should you consider it of sufficient
importance, a synopsis or outline of the main principles, theories and demands of these “peculiar people,” as the East Orange Gazette lately termed them?

Is it your opinion that the anarchist is a dangerous element, which should be frowned down on every occasion for the maintenance of peace? If you do, and can give good and sufficient reasons therefor, your correspondent will henceforth cease to maintain their right.

Theodore Atworth.

When free speech is denied to one man or class of men on account of the opinions they express, the right of free speech is at an end. That country cannot boast of its freedom of speech where the discussion of unpopular opinions is prohibited.

The terms “anarchist,” “communist” and “socialist” are very liberally used nowadays by people who have not the slightest conception of their meaning. An anarchist, in the true sense, is not one who believes in or advocates violence. He is an extreme individualist, one who would carry to its uttermost the political doctrine that that government is best which governs least; accordingly he would have no government at all. He would have everyone free to do as he pleases, believing that where this absolute liberty prevailed no one would please to do wrong to another. In India it is said that there is a people who do not punish delinquents by force. If a wrong be done, the fact is ascertained judicially, but no sentence is imposed. The offender, however, becomes an outcast. He is perfectly free. His individualism is preserved. But his fellow men will not associate with him. That is a type of anarchy. Violent outbreaks against the existing order of things, which are usually attributed to anarchists, are not the work of anarchists at all. Anarchists are noncombatants. Liberty of Boston is the organ of anarchy in this country.

Communism is typified by various communities in this country, such as the Shakers, the Oneida community, and so on. The New England township system is communistic on the political side, and falls short of complete communism only in the fact that the wealth of the township is not held in common and devoted to the general good.

Socialism, which among the ignorant is associated with anarchy, is at the opposite extreme. The anarchist would abolish governmental action and control, while the socialist looks to governmental action and control as the great means of improvement.

**Government Leasing.**

New York.—I have been an interested reader of your paper for some time, and have also read your books. On general principles your arguments are irrefutable; but in matters of the detail of your plan I do not fully understand you. In your issue of this date Mr. C. Bauman (on page six) asks you a question which I have been thinking of putting to you. Your answer to Mr. B. is not a satisfactory one to me. Within one or two blocks of the Dakota apartment house on Seventy second street, this city, you will find “shanties” on ground equally valuable as that on which the Dakota stands. Would not the “squatters” living in those shanties have to go if your plan of taxation was adopted? Also, if in place of shanties the ground was occupied by cottagers, would not these latter be forced to move on under your system? Or would you expect any man, because he happened to be slightly poorer than his fellows, to move further away from the heart of the city, simply for the public good?

Suppose that I should now purchase a lot on say 180th street, west of the Harlem river, and erect thereon a cottage to suit my purse and circumstances, which are those of a well-to-do workingman. In the course of five or ten years, after the city’s population had reached my location and increased the rental value of the lot I occupied, could not any one who could afford to bid a little higher
rental than I take my lot from me and compel me to move on to a place where rentals were not yet too high for my income? If so, would not the humbler folk be constantly driven to the outskirts of the city, just as they are now, and always have the least comforts just as they do now? Of course, I understand that in such event I would be paid the actual cost or value of my improvements, and also that I would be recompensed in a measure by common improvements and pensions for thus moving on for the public good, but would not the effect of your system be as here stated?

I understand that under the plan you propose the government would lease or let the land to the people in plots to suit to the highest bidders of rent. If so, for what term of years would you propose to make the leases? If for one or two year terms only (leases to be renewable yearly or frequently at the current rental value) who would make any substantial improvements on the land, since a holder of land this year might be outbid for it next year? If for a long term of years at a given rental, say thirty or fifty years, would these leases be transferable, and if they were would there not probably be then a speculation in leaseholds where we now have a speculation in deeds?

These are a few of the questions which have prevented my full conversion to your ideas.

Titus K. Smith.

You have not read THE STANDARD carefully, nor have you read "Progress and Poverty."

It has been distinctly stated in those columns, over and over again, that there would be no bidding to the government or leasing—by the government. Men would deal with real estate pretty much as they do now, in form; but the rental values of the land determined by such dealing would be assessed for all public revenues.

The shanties near the Dakota flats are squatters' shanties. They may be torn away by a landlord at any time. They are shanties because their owners have no certainty of tenure. If our plan of taxation were adopted they Would not “have to go,” in anything like the sense implied by these words. The tax would not fall upon the squatters, but upon the owner of the land. If the land were not valuable the landlord would drop it, and the squatters, assured of their tenure, would put up better buildings; if the land were valuable the landlord would pay the tax and build, in which case the squatters would go farther away, unless they preferred to spend some of their higher wages for better quarters for they would get higher wages in consequence of the business boom that would result from this system of taxation. In any case the landlord would have to put up good buildings on the land or let the squatters do it.

When every man has an equal chance to make a living and is secured the full product of his labor, as would be the case under the land value tax, it is pity wasted to pity an able-bodied poor man. Under such circumstances, if a man were so poor, and remained so poor, that he had to move to free land every time the land he occupied acquired a value, it would be his own fault. But the penalty for his fault would be exceedingly light compared with what it is now; for, whereas now he must move whenever the owner of the land wants him to, and has no place to move to which a landlord does not control, then he could move to places close at hand where there would be no tax or rent to pay.

But in practice, in cities especially, people who had not accumulated enough to buy a house would rent a house. Many people would prefer that, just as they do now, even if they were able to buy. So the building and renting of houses would be a business as it is today, with this difference, that of the rent that which was paid for the location would go into the public treasury instead of going into private pockets. Then the house builders who made the prettiest, most homelike and comfortable houses would get the best tenants, and there could be no extravagant rents, because the free land on the edge of the city would perpetually offer opportunities to house building mechanics to increase the number of houses without paying out their capital for land.

Caledonia, Minn.—I am told that for some years California levied all taxes on land and that the system was changed for one of taxation of real and personal property. If this is true, please answer in
Notes and Queries how long the single tax was used and why abolished.

P. J. Smalley.

It is not true. The California system has been from the first the attempted taxation of all property.

A Reporter's Views.

Newark, N. J.—Having some knowledge of the manner in which articles are prepared for the ordinary newspaper, I can well understand why it is that people who get their ideas of the land question from these newspapers only should so often take the wrong side. I have met many such people, and an objection I have often heard from them is that ambition would be crushed, and men being rid of competition would not expand their energies under the new system as they do now. And this objection is generally followed up by some reference to the wonderful inventions, etc., which the objectors say resulted from this struggle and competition. My answer is that these inventions, while coming naturally in the train of some accidental discoveries, are of slight advantage to the great mass of men, who are today in a more helpless position, with less outlook and chance to make themselves independent than formerly: and, moreover, the very progress of invention is hindered by our present system, which permits great monopolists and corporations by the use of bribery and the laws delay” to reap all the profits of the inventor's work.

Daniel A. Dugan.

An Episcopalian Clergyman Speaks Out.

Dr. De Costa's Fearless Statement of the True Inwardness of the Excommunication—The Protestant Pulpit Largely Subsidized—These Obsequious Preachers Earn Their Money.

At the Episcopal church of St. John the Evangelist in this city. Dr. Do Costa, preaching from the text, “What does it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?” said:

On July 4 a man was excommunicated, nominally for disobedience, but really—as all the world knows—for teaching certain views on an economic subject. By that excommunication the rights of the man, the priest and the citizen were invaded and violated. But what do the people, what do the supposed leaders of thought say? What do the great body of the preachers of righteousness say? The overwhelming majority of the preachers are dumb, while others, instead of standing by liberty and truth, openly take sides with capital, many of them applauding the pope, jeering at his victim, and obeying capital rather than God. What is more, those who have protested violently against ecclesiastical trials and have opposed all attempts to discipline men notorious for their denial of the church's creed and for the violation of their ordination vows, even where a full and fair trial was provided for the accused, now exult in the condemnation and excommunication of a man of blameless life and unchallenged orthodoxy. And why? Because the excommunication is supposed to be in the interest of capital. Capital has its thumb upon Archbishop Corrigan and the pope, and the pope and the archbishop have a thumb upon every one of the ten thousand or more priests in the United States,
scarcely one of whom has yet dared to protest against this violation of the sacred rights of an American either or say a generous word on behalf of his wronged and outraged brother.

In the Protestant world the capitalist is his own pope, and is now putting down his thumb directly wherever he can get a chance. The Protestant pulpit is largely subsidized and muzzled, and while it while impossible in a Protestant body to excommunicate a man for any mere economic opinion, there is, far and wide, a significant and painful silence in a thousand quarters, where, irrespective of the truth or error of any land theory, we have reason for expecting an outspoken and indignant protest against the violation of human rights. How different it would have been if the pope had interfered with some denominational dogma. Then there would have been a volcanic explosion and the pulpits every where would have rung with vehement protests against Rome. As it remains, however, it is not a question of dogma; but it is fancied to be one of dollars, which are more than dogma or righteousness. These obsequious preachers earn their mercy. They pay dearly for it, but the time may come when the blind leaders of the blind may wake up to a sense of the situation and with stricken and agonized conscience ask, “What shall it profit a preacher if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?”

**What a Leading Methodist Minister to Say About the Excommunication.**

The venerable Dr. Lucius H. King, one of the leading divines of the Methodist church, preached an eloquent sermon last Sunday in the Forty-ninth street Methodist church, of which he is pastor, on the excommunication of Dr. McGlynn. He said:

“Now we have the strange sight of one of the most faithful, conscientious, God-fearing and God-loving ministers that ever stood in any pulpit, Protestant or Catholic, disrobed and cursed with many great and grievous anathemas. And what for? First, they say, because Dr. McGlynn didn't go to Rome. Well, Rome is a bad place for a man to go to, for from it justice and mercy long ago fled away. Paul went and they cut off his head before he left. Second, they say he has certain theories about land, and while they do not profess to know exactly what the theories are they are opposed to them. Dr. McGlynn believes in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, and that God is not a stepfather, but a real father—not simply 'my father,' but 'our father.' He believes that God has given this world for the accommodation of his children, as we find in Psalms, cxv., 116. And Dr. McGlynn thinks it is unfair for a few men to gobble up the whole of it and leave no standing room for the rest. The early church, under the direction of Peter, whom they claim as a foundation, went much further. They sold all their property and put it in a common fund for the use of all. (Acts. iv., 31-37.) The Jewish propaganda came together, seized these men and put them into prison. Were it not for Protestantism the same course would be pursued against Dr. McGlynn, and he would be left to rot in a dungeon. But, thank God, he lives in America, where a man can think, speak and write with no fear of servile police or loathsome cells. In the past they scourged Parnella for saying, 'The stars would fall;' they put Campanella seven times to the torture for saying that the number of worlds was infinite; in the name of Jesus they shut up Galileo for having said that Jupiter had moons. It was this spirit which anathematized Pascal in the name of religion, Montaigue in the name of morality and Moliere in the name of both. And now, if they dared to do it, they would burn Dr. McGlynn at the stake in less than forty-eight hours.

“Another charge is that Dr. McGlynn made a speech at Chickering hall after his archbishop had forbidden him. He was suspended. While under suspension the archbishop offered Dr. McGlynn a church at Middletown, showing that he himself considered these objections frivolous, for a minister ought to have as good a moral character to preach at Middletown as at St. Stephen’s.

“Another thing they now say is that Dr. McGlynn may want to get married. Well, 'marriage is honorable.' God provided the first man with a wifh, Christ performed His first miracle at a wedding,
and St. Peter had a wife, for we read that Christ cured Peter's wife's mother, who lay sick of a fever. St, Paul says, 'He that getteth a wife getteth a good thing.'

These are the charges against Dr. McGlynn, for which he is turned over to the devil to be eternally tortured. The real beginning of ecclesiastical hostility to Dr. McGlynn is that twenty-two years ago he publicly took a position in favor of the free schools and in opposition to state appropriations for sectarian institutions. Since that they have looked upon him with a jealous eye. And how could it be otherwise. Bring lire and water in contact and there is commotion and explosion. That great organ of the Roman church, the Freeman's Journal, says: "The public schools are a devouring fire, pits of destruction, and ought to go back to the devil, from whence they came."

Dr. McGlynn says. 'No, they are a grand institution. From them I received my education.' 'Woodman spare that tree, touch not a, single bough. In youth it sheltered me, and I'll protect it now.' It has long seemed to me that the most beautiful thing left to us by the demagogues, vagabonds and thieves who have had dominion over us is the public school system. They are the flower gardens of heaven and the nurseries of the republic. And when I have heard the propa—gander hiss out that they are pits of destruction, I have felt that the silly goose ought never to swim in the free waters of the republic."

Dr. King close by eulogizing the excommunicated priest.

"We are at the point of u tremendous revolution," he cried, "and Dr. McGlynn leads the conquering host."

Dr. King will continue the discussion of the subject on Sunday evening next.

The Fourteenth District's Picnic.

Dr. McGlynn will deliver an address to the members and friends of the Fourteenth district club, U.L.P., at Sulzer's Harlem river park, on the evening of Saturday, July 30. Miss Agatha Munier's choir will render some of their popular anti-poverty choruses, and Miss Munier has promised to sing the beautiful Irish ballad, "Killarney." The committee of arrangements promise their friends an enjoyable afternoon and evening. The dancing will be under charge of Mr. Joseph P. McCloskey.
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Stones For Bread.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pick up the first newspaper that comes to hand. Here in a daily paper of July 14 is the story of a lawsuit for $8.34 brought by a woman whose business is to make button holes at eighty cents a hundred. Wretched pay, isn't it Dr. Dexter? Softly though, the story isn't told yet. The woman is described as comfortably dressed, with gold earrings and massive rings. She doesn't make the button holes herself at eighty cents a hundred. She hires other women to do the work and pays them so much less than eighty cents a hundred as to make a handsome profit. Talk of the golden rule, Dr. Dexter, to the man who pays eighty cents a hundred for making button holes; or to the woman who hires other women to make button holes for less than eighty cents a hundred; or to the women who by actually making button holes for starvation wages keep other women out of work and force them to choose between starvation and sin; or in the people who buy the garments whose button holes are made at eighty cents a hundred. Talk to these people, Dr. Dexter, and learn how little influence the platitudinous papping of the pulpit has upon every day life and action. The woman who buys those garments will tell you that love for her neighbor is all very well, but she owes a duty of economy to her husband and her children; the man who sells the garments will tell you he might as well go out of business and lie down and starve as to pay higher prices for work than his competitors are paying; the middle-woman will wonder from what asylum you have escaped; the poor, starving wretches who do the actual work of button hole making will ask you if you want them to face the alternative of starvation or sin, that their sister-women may be relieved from it.

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

Look at the coal mines of Pennsylvania, Dr. Dexter. Read in the New York World of July 16 this
terse summary of the situation, written by a World reporter on the spot after full investigation:
The barons are now complete masters of the situation. The men are slaves. Every form of extortion is practiced
with impunity. The laws are defied. Penury and squalor reign triumphant.

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

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

Dr. Dexter, to men circumstanced as we are in this nineteenth century of Christianity, such
preaching as yours is but the crackling of thorns under a pot. You bid us apply the law of Christ to our
lives, and when we point out to you that our whole social system is founded on a denial of that law;
when we urge on you that the law which society repudiates, the individual cannot possibly observe;
when we entreat you, in the name of the Master whom you are vowed to serve, to aid us in righting the
monstrous wrong which has brought poverty into the world and compels men to damn their souls that
their bodies may live, you turn contemptuously aside and are as one that mocketh.
What would you think, Dr. Dexter, of an earthly father who, leaving his children for a time, should make plenteous provision for their comfort, and then give to one or two among them the right to claim that provision as their own exclusive property, to be doled out or withheld from the others, as the favored ones might see fit? Could such a family observe the golden rule? Would not the disinherited ones become the slave of the more fortunate, and the fortunate become the tyrants of the slaves? Would not lying and stealing and evil speaking and envy and hatred abound? Yet such an earthly father would be but an antitype of the heavenly Father in whom modern Christianity asks us to believe. Is it any wonder that churches should be empty?

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

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

Out Of The Mouth Of An Enemy.

The World has investigated the labor movement in politics for the benefit of its constituency of politicians. Its investigation consisted of interviews with men of prominence in the labor movement, each of whom was requested to answer a series of questions. To the first question, “Do you and organized labor in your section favor independent political action at the fall elections this year?” fifty-nine replies were in the affirmative, four in the negative and five non-committal. To the second question, “Would you hold a national convention for the purpose of thorough' organizing your party? If so, before or After the elections this year?” twenty-four replies favored the holding of such a convention before the elections this year, twenty-three after, and three opposed A national convention until the states were organized. To the third question, “Do you favor a labor nominee for the presidency in 1888?” sixty-six replies were in the affirmative, three opposed and four non-committal. The opinions as to which of the two old parties the strength of the new movement will be derived from indicate a general belie! That about seventy per cent will come from the democrats and thirty per cent from the
The most important question was: “What, in your judgment are the great issues which demand a new party?” To this the replies were various in form, but significantly uniform to substance. Said one, “The great issues are land, labor, money and transportation;” said another, “The great issue underlying all others is the moral right of the whole people to the use of the land, upon which and out of which they must live;” another writes, “The Clarendon hall platform is the best;” and another, “The great issue demanding a new party is the land question.” Of 68 persons interviewed, 51 declare for the doctrine of the land for the people. Of these 51, only 9 are from New York and Brooklyn; from Albany, Troy, Middletown, Binghamton and Auburn, there are 1 each; and from Buffalo, 2; from Newark and Trenton, N. J., 1 each; from Altoona, Erie, Mauch Chunk, Johnstown, Harrisburg and Pittsburgh, Pa., 1 each; from New Haven, Danbury and New London, Conn., 1 each; from Providence, R. I., 1; from Manchester, N. H., 1; from Cincinnati, O., 1; from Vincennes and Elkhart, Ind., 1 each; from Chicago, Springfield, Peoria and Jacksonville, 111., 1 each; from St Louis, Mo., 1; from Parsons, Kan., 1; from Berlin, Col., 1; from Des Moines, Creston, Grand Rapids and Burlington, Iowa, 1 each; from Holland and Battle Creek, Mich., 1 each; from Minneapolis, Minn., 1; from San Francisco, Cal., 1; from Portland, Ore., 1; from Covington, Ky., 1; from Baltimore, Md., 1; from Charleston, S. C, 1, and from Houston and Galveston, Tex., 1 each.

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

The Tariff And Land Monopoly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

That low paid labor is not necessarily cheap labor is now confessed by many of the most
conservative political economists, but a practical illustration of the truth of the statement was recently
given by a southern cotton manufacturer in a conversation with the writer of this article. The
manufacturer said that he obtained nearly all bosses and foremen from the northern states or Europe,
and had, of course, to pay the northern scale of wages to induce them to come. The great body of the
workers, however, are, he said, southern whites and their wages are lower than those paid in the north.
“Does that not give you a great advantage in competing with northern mills?” he was asked. “Oh, no,”
the manufacturer replied, “Our people are not so skillful as the northern operatives and the latter really
turn out more yarn or cloth for the money paid them than ours do.”

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

Ohio Workingmen And Mr. Foran

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In a neatly bound and handsomely printed little volume, entitled “The Margin of Profits,” issued by Messrs. G. P. Putnam’s Sons, Mr. Edward Atkinson of Boston describes a novel style of cooking stove, or, more properly, cooking oven, of which he is the inventor.
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The feature of Mr. Atkinson’s invention is the surrounding the cooking oven with a complete wall or box of non-conducting material, so that the utmost power of every heat wave is utilized for the processes of cookery. While the water in the interior of the oven may be at boiling point, the outside of the apparatus remains of the precise temperature of the surrounding atmosphere.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The pope, conversing with an American Archbishop, said:

Dr. McGlynn lost his best opportunity by not coming to Rome while Cardinal Gibbons was here. He would have seen that the church, by not condemning the Knights of Labor, was the supporter of the many against the feudal system, whether the feudality is represented by slavery, territorial right or modern capital.

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

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

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

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

The strike of the operatives of the Garner mills at Cohoes is also of peculiar interest. These mills, owned by two young ladies residing in this city, are said to be worth, including a great deal of surrounding land and some nine hundred tenements, at least $8,000,000. One of the "rules of the estate" has been that which is enforced on some of the coal estates in Pennsylvania, that if one of the members of a family occupying one of these tenements takes work elsewhere the whole family has to remove. The wages paid have been extremely low, ranging from $1 per day for a man to $1.25 per week for a child and averaging, it is said, 62½ cents per day for all employed. Five thousand operatives struck a couple of weeks ago for an advance that would bring wages to the price paid in eastern mills; but in the face of the determined attitude of the mill managers, and their inability to hold out, about the only hope of crippling the mills is that enough of them should be able to remove and find work elsewhere. About eight hundred have already gone.

What The Tax Would Yield

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

Franklin, Pa., Penny Press.

At first the theory of land taxation, as advocated by Mr. Henry George and his followers, presented to our mind so many objections that we were afraid to apply the tests, and sacredly let it alone, brooding, however, all the time over our present system, unjust in theory and iniquitous practice, till we read Mr. William T. Croasdale's articles in The Standard on the "Shoemaker's Field," the "Sailors' Snug Harbor" and the "Randall Farm," and then we began to think in earnest. First, we made a rough estimate of the value of four squares of our city, those lying east and west of Thirteenth street and north and south of Liberty street, and from those estimates we found that a land assessment and taxation alone of those four squares, were every building and improvement removed from them, at our present rate of taxation, i.e., 27 mills, on a fair salable valuation, would yield a revenue of at least one-fifth of the whole taxes now received by the city from lands, improvements, personal property and
general and special taxes. With this starting result we began looking up facts and figures. To our
surprise we found a lot on Liberty street assessed for taxation at $841, while the owner wanted $2,200.
or the assessment was 38 per cent of his sale valuation on it, while the poor hovels, shanties and homes
of the poor or humble are assessed at about 85 per cent of their real value. Worse ones than this met our
view. But we were not looking up errors of judgment, mistakes by or frauds of officials. All we wanted
and all we want to use are the naked facts, that we may apply the theory of land taxation in our city and
see what the results will be, that we may pursue the course best for our city and citizens.

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

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

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

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

It is a notorious fact that the poorest buildings on Liberty and Thirteenth streets yield their
owners the largest percentage of income. On the other hand a gentleman who wants to build a fine
building en Liberty street said in our presence a few days ago that he could not afford to build a fine
building, as his taxes would be so high, and also that a $3,500 building would bring him in as much
money as a $10,000 building, and he would have only one-third as much tax to pay. If the vacant lots
west of Snook & Co.'s block were taxed at the same rate per foot that the lot is on which the building is
erected, how soon would that vacant place be built up with fine buildings? Other lots, for instance one
whose owner valued it at $2,000, when it was wan4 ed to build a manufactory on it, at a rental of six
per cent on the $2,000 valuation, although really not worth more than two-thirds of that sum, would not
be rented for a manufactory at all, which has been vacant and almost unproductive since the timber was
cut off it in the early part of this Century, would have a fine house or a busy manufactory on it before
the winter winds would blow. So with a hundred other vacant lots in this city.

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

The present real estate value of that square is $100,000. The improvements are worth $106,000.
The present assessed valuation is $96,539. The actual rate of assessment then is not more than forty-
seven per cent. on its present worth.

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

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

Pauperism in England.

According to the London Times there are in England and Wales 729,095 paupers, being a proportion of 20.2 to each 1,000 of population. In London, with an estimated population of 4,149,533, the number of paupers at the end of April was 95,654, or 23.1 to each 1,000 of population.

In considering these figures, it must be borne in mind that the Times statistics embrace only those who have actually given up the struggle for existence and thrown themselves on the community for support. No account is taken of the enormous mass—a majority of the English people, in fact—who are clinging desperately to the ragged edge of starvation, and preserving the last remnant of their self-respect by a mode of life which would disgust a decently bred hog. Nor is any enumeration made of that very large class to which the whole royal family, nearly all the nobility and most of the “gentry” belong, who drag out luxurious and useless lives at other people's expense.

A Few Pertinent Conundrums

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

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

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

C. B. B.

The Hebrew Jubilee.

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

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

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

Here the old man stopped, and after a prolonged silence, broken only by the arithmetical ticking of a dozen clocks, he continued slowly, as if in profound thought:

“Our laws were indeed just; the people have an inalienable right to the land, and individual monopoly is at variance with the spirit of equity; but many generations will come and go before the justice of this claim shall be generally recognized among the Gentiles.”

Commenting hereon Mr. Fraser says:

As I now ponder over the old man’s words their full depth and significance appear to me in a new and striking light, and I see, for the first time, how closely his ideas agree with those of Mr. Henry George, and how strange it is that Mr. George’s theory, that private ownership in land is prejudicial to the best interests of society and utterly opposed to the fundamental principle of equity and justice, should have so start led the present generation, seeing that its truth had been acknowledged by the early writers of the holy scriptures and by the framer of the Hebrew law.

How Small Competitors Are Crushed.

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

Emmett T. Smith.

A Catholic Who Knows His Rights, and, Knowing, Dare Maintain.

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

Let every Catholic who believes in the land theory do all in his power to convince his fellow Catholics of the real nature of the doctrines and then they cannot be fooled by misrepresentations. I do not for one moment admit that there is anything un-Catholic in the theory. I am an ardent believer in every dogma of the Catholic church, which I consider not a mere human institution, but of divine origin, speaking the words of eternal truth through its infallible head, the pope. Yet one cannot fail to recognize the miserable tendency to err in the human side of the church. In fact, this fallibility and weakness of its members is only a stronger proof of its divinity, for had it been only a human organization it would have been whelmed by its own corruption just about four hundred years ago.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thomas B. Preston.

Will Be Excommunicated With a Quiet Conscience.

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

M. Lemmer.

Rome at the Helm.

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

Does Home Claim Political Allegiance?

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

It is the duty of every true Catholic to oppose with all his might this movement of Rome in politics. Otherwise the old prejudice which a century could scarcely overcome will revive in fresh vigor. “Catholic and traitor” will again be heard, and the cry of “no popery” ring throughout the land.

A.K.

The Pope He Is a Happy Man

Jay Kayelle in Toronto Grip

The pope he sat in the Vatican,
In St. Peter's chair sat he;
And he said, “Such a fix as I've got into,
I ne'er in my life did see.”
An' aye as he swiftly twirled each thumb,
He sighed to himself, "Me miserum!"

“ Here's the Irish priests all a-crying 'Woe !
For the land is desolate;'
But the English bishops they say 'Not so,
Pay no heed to their lying prate.'
Ehen ! I can but twirl each thumb.
And helplessly sigh, Me miserum!”

“I'll send two prelates over the sea,
And try what Italian finesse
Will do, to make matters more smooth for me,
and help me out of this mess.
At present I can but twirl each thumb,
And sigh to myself, Me miserum !

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

“So unfortunate! just when the swerving mind
Of English society
Is turning to Rome, in fact, going it blind
With fashionable piety—
Cries Ireland, 'Oh father, why are you dumb
Over these our wrongs?7—*Me miserum!*

“If I say to Ireland, 'Submit to wrong,'
Parnell will the Moses be,
Who from bondage will lead them forth e'er long,
But in that case—good by to *me,*
They will say I just sat and twirled my thumb,
While poor Ireland wailed, *Me miserum?*

“If I say to those who believe in me,
Who to faith and to church are true,
'Bun courage, Belle Erin! I bless you, be free!
Then, England, good bye to you,
To the gold, to the lands, we had planned would come
To Mother Church, *Me miserum!*

“*Eheu!* I have fallen on an evil day,
For the schoolmaster is abroad,
and the demon of thought we no more can lay
In the name of the church or of God.
McGlynn I have bounced—but he'll make things bum
In the states, I suppose—*Me miserum!*

“No, which shall I keep, and which let go?
Poor Erin, or Albion rich?
Could I soft sawder both, how blest! but, no—
There remains but the question—*which?*
I dare not think. Go, bid Gounod come,
Be music my solace—*Me miserum!*

**Are Catholics Rome's Subjects?**

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

    The same paper of the 9th said: So far as receiving any endorsement from the Catholics of this
city,” Dr. McGlynn's visit has been a complete failure. A Sentinel reporter says that Irishmen were as scarce as hen's teeth at the labor picnic.

Which, if true, shows conclusively what obsequious slaves “his Catholic people” or “subjects” are to the bishop, and it further demonstrates the need of Dr. McGlynn's work to show Catholics that they do not belong soul and body to the pope and his satellites. How long will it be before American Catholics will become true and real American Citizens by discarding the authority of, and allegiance to, all foreign potentates and acting upon their own judgments as patriotic Americans? The authority used to silence McGlynn may some day blot out our system of free government if it can exercise influence over a sufficient number of its “subjects.”

W. S. W.

A Presbyterian Clergyman Spreading the Light Among the Miners.

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

My bible says, “The profit of the earth is for all.” Whatever the wise writer of Ecclesiastics meant by the words he certainly got down to the truth when he said that. And it makes very little difference, to my mind, whether or no the writer of the 115th psalm believed in land taxation. His words, “The earth hath He made for the children of men,” are as the blast of a trumpet to me.

John F. Scott,
Pastor Presbyterian Church.

Dr. McGlynn Doing God's Will.

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

Samuel Quinn.

The Coming Demonstration at Wheeling.

Henry George will speak at a grand demonstration of the Knights of Labor to be held at Wheeling, Pa., on the 30th.
It Will Be Submitted to Popular Vote.

West Virginia Democrat.

As we understand the case, Dr. McGlynn was given the alternative either to renounce a political conviction or be excommunicated. He could not renounce his conviction, and Rome expelled him from her church. As we understand the case, it was this: The archbishop, exercising authority in this free country, claims a right to prohibit a priest from advocating a particular economic proposition; the archbishop claims a right to say that a priest shall not argue in favor of the George land theory. The question was not whether a priest may make political speeches, but whether he may advocate a doctrine which, in the opinion of the archbishop, is an unsound doctrine. If the church forbids her priests to make political speeches, so far so good; but if the priest may speak on public questions, then the church in Rome, three thousand miles distant, must not dictate the political opinions of an American citizen. . . . The question is not whether the George's theory be correct; the precise question is whether Rome shall dictate the political opinions of a native born American priest. If this question be submitted to a popular vote, it will be decided against Rome by a thousand ballots to one. This is the view of every intelligent Catholic with whom we have consulted.

Anti-Poverty In Philadelphia

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“The object of this crusade is to abolish poverty by asserting the great truth of natural religion,
of right reason and of natural justice, and giving ourselves no rest until we shall have made it practical
by incorporating it in all our laws and, if need be, in our constitutions.

“It is claimed that there should be, in the interest of trade and civilization, an undisturbed,
perpetual possession of larger possessions of the common estate. It is necessary that those who build
homes, factories, etc., should have undisturbed possession of their property, else they will not make
these improvements. Then men find that from the increased value that comes to land by density of
population there is an enormous advantage accruing from the individual ownership of the land thus
held in undisturbed possession. But they make the mistake of confounding the undisturbed possession,
which is essential to civilization and progress, with the absolute ownership, which is a crime against
natural justice. Henry George has taught the distinction between the two, and how the one and the other
can be reconciled without doing injustice to either. All that is necessary is that those who have the
undisturbed perpetual possession shall simply pay a just equivalent for the privilege to those to whom
the joint undivided state confessedly belongs; so that the possessors shall be perpetual tenants while the
whole community shall be the joint owners. By the payment of the rent under the form of a tax from
the possessors to the owners, each individual member of the community will enjoy his share of the
common estate through the fund that is paid by the individual possessors into the common treasury.”

At the conclusion of his address, Dr. McGlynn found it difficult to retire, such was the
demonstrations of approval on the part of his audience.

Catholics Are Independent.

Trenton, N. J., July 13.—I am glad to see a Catholic who is not made of putty, and I am more
than pleased to know that that Catholic is an American. This McGlynn business is about the biggest
question now agitating people of the Catholic persuasion. There is no way of coercing these Catholics
who follow Dr. McGlynn to return and lie down like dogs.

We are certainly on the threshold of a great reform, and Dr. McGlynn will do more good as a
free man in six months than live hundred slave priests would do in one thousand years.

T. R. E.

Another Reverend Recruit.
Rev. Alexander Jackson of the First Presbyterian church, Pittsburgh, Pa., has enlisted in the ranks of the new-crusade. On July 11 Mr. Jackson delivered an eloquent discourse on the land question, in which he declared his convictions in unmistakable terms. The address was attentively listened to and received with evident favor.

Erie K. of L.

The six assemblies of Knights of Labor in Erie, Pa., held a grand picnic at the new pleasure grounds, Four Mile creek, on Wednesday of last week. The order is in a very flourishing condition in Erie, having gained 2,500 members in eighteen months. The gathering was a very large one, and would have been still larger had the boats been able to accommodate all who wished to go. It was addressed by Henry George, who was most warmly and enthusiastically received.
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The Party Of American Liberty.

Though the newspapers and other professional society saviors are doing their best to mislead the people concerning the case of Dr. McGlynn, the truth is spreading despite the efforts to corral it, and the mass of the people are coming to see, understand and resent the impudent outrage on American citizenship committed by the Roman machine, at the instance of Archbishop Corrigan, on Rev. Dr. McGlynn. To readers of THE STANDARD the facts are too familiar to need elaborate representation, but a brief summary may be useful in enabling all concerned to call them to mind in due order.

First—The attempt was made, direct from Rome, four years ago, to have Dr. McGlynn suspended because, in his Irish land league speeches, he avowed his belief in the common ownership of land. Cardinal McCloskey refused to suspend him, but did induce him to promise to refrain from making further land league speeches.

Second—All of this excitement died out long ago through the reversal of Rome's policy toward Ireland. The doctrine of the land for the people was openly preached by Bishop Nulty and other prelates and priests in Ireland, while land league meetings were freely held, with Archbishop Corrigan's consent, in the basements of the Catholic churches in this city.

Third—So far from objecting to participation of any kind by Dr. McGlynn in politics, Archbishop Corrigan deliberately sought to use the influence he supposed that the doctor had obtained by supporting Mr. Cleveland's candidacy for the presidency; and, at the archbishop request, Dr. McGlynn went to Washington to urge the promotion of General John Newton, then in the army and new the commissioner of public works for this city.

Fourth—Last summer, because of mere newspaper rumor, the archbishop presumed to caution Dr. McGlynn about his relations with Henry George, and intimated that the latter was in some way committed to socialism. Fifth—When, at Dr. McGlynn's request, Mr. George called on Archbishop Corrigan to tell him what his views really were, the archbishop would not listen to the man he had misrepresented, but insisted on talking about the land league difficulty of four years before, and finally told Mr. George that he had called a meeting of his council for that day to consider the question of Dr. McGlynn's suspension. Up to this time Dr. McGlynn had not spoken for George or taken any part in the
canvass, and Mr. George carried with him the first authoritative information that the archbishop could receive, that it was Dr. McGlynn's intention to take part in the canvass. Yet so eager was the archbishop to suspend the doctor that he had actually, in advance of any such notice, called his council together to act in the matter, using the four-years' old letters from Cardinal Simeoni to Cardinal McCloskey concerning the Irish land league speeches as his authority. Here it is clear that the archbishop sought to suspend Dr. McGlynn for merely believing in the land doctrine, and in advance of any renewed public advocacy of it.

Fifth—The actual suspension of Dr. McGlynn, on Oct. 2d, was for his disobedience to the Archbishop's command issued to him and to several other priests not to attend the Chickering hall ratification meeting on Oct. 1st. That suspension was for two weeks. It was respected by Dr. McGlynn, and at the end of that time he resumed his priestly functions.

Sixth—His next suspension was attributed to two offenses, one contradicting the pope's declaration, the other declaring that private ownership in land is unjust. Dr. McGlynn disavowed any thought of contradicting the pope, and Archbishop Corrigan tacitly accepted the disavowal, but the prelate publicly declared that because “he never withdrew the main statement that private ownership in land is unjust” Dr. McGlynn was suspended for the remainder of the year.

Seventh—When the first telegram came summoning Dr. McGlynn to Rome he did not refuse to obey it, but truthfully declared that owing to his illness he was unable to go at once. While insuperable obstacles to obeying the order still existed a second dispatch came from Cardinal Simeoni, ordering Dr. McGlynn not only to come to Rome, but, before doing so, to condemn in writing the doctrines to which he has given utterance in public meetings, or which have been attributed to him in the press.” This order remained unrecalled, and a necessary part of all subsequent orders up to the time of the excommunication; and it was thenceforward absolutely useless for Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome without previously recanting the truth. Under the circumstances, it is the very height of mendacious impudence for a man as familiar with the facts as Monsignor Preston to tell the public that Dr. McGlynn was not summoned to Rome because of any expression of opinion.

There is no possible escape from the evidence showing that an American Catholic priest, born in the city of New York, orthodox in belief, blameless in life, and of acknowledged ability and popularity, has been excommunicated by the Roman machine because he would not allow his archbishop to dictate his opinions and control his acts in American politics. Neither is there any doubt that the secular and Protestant religious press, as a whole, and the Protestant clergy, as a body, have lent their sanction to this proceeding and rushed unasked to the vindication and support of the papal claim of a right to interfere in American politics.

The cause of this remarkable exhibition is not difficult to find. Any one who has watched the long struggle between Bismarck and the popo in the new German empire will see the cause at a glance. Professor John Burgess, in an article in the current number of the Political Science Quarterly, in discussing the causes of Bismarck's final and humiliating surrender, says:

But the government, especially the president of the ministry, Prince Bismarck, had now became fully possessed with the idea that the liberal, progressive and radical elements in German politics could no longer be relied upon for loyalty and patriotism and were resolved upon union with the conservative elements.

In other words, Bismarck, having determined in his own mind that a monstrous and burdensome military despotism is essential to the maintenance of royal and aristocratic government in a united German empire, deliberately courted an alliance with the pope for effecting such a union of all kinds of arbitrary, autocratic power as would render the struggles of liberal Germans for greater liberty and for partial disarmament futile. Precisely the same motive has brought about the tacit understanding between the saviors of society, the press, the Protestant clergy and the Catholic ecclesiastic machine in New York. Themselves ignorant of the principles and purposes of the great political land and labor movement, and unwilling to study or consider it, they fear to trust to a free debate before the great
tribunal of the people and seek any alliance, however unnatural, that may be offered to them to resist the
growth of popular movement that they distrust and fear. It is needless to say that this huddling
together of the alarmed and ignorant “classes” is a gratifying though unintentional tribute to the
strength of the new movement on the one hand and on the other a most disgraceful confession of the
loss of the old-time American spirit of independence among a considerable number of our people.

Though such an exhibition of cowardice and want of faith in the people is humiliating to every
American, it is by no means prejudicial to the prospects of the new party, looking at it merely from a
partisan standpoint. The great heart of the American people still beats true to liberty and independence,
and it will never injure any party to have it known that it stands alone in resenting and resisting foreign
dictation in our politics. The old know nothing party, with considerable success, appealed to this
sentiment long ago, but it was a party secret in its methods, narrow in its aims and representing hatred
and prejudice rather than principle. This new party has gathered around a great principle. It has no
prejudice against foreigners and no hatred toward the Catholic church. It believes in absolute freedom
of conscience, and seeks to impose no restraints on religious convictions. It proposes not to interfere
with the faith of our Catholic fellow citizens, but rather to rescue them from the tyranny of a machine
which thousands of Catholic priests and lay men regard as well nigh unbearable. The new party has no
quarrel with religion and, on the contrary, welcomes the most devout priests and preachers to its
platform and cheers their most impassioned appeals to men to imitate the life and character of Christ.
Such a party is equipped as no other ever has been to lead a new crusade to rescue the cross of Christ
from the more than barbarian hands of a political ring that is using it as an instrument of political
tyanny and as the means to gratify lust and greed. This new party is the first that in principle, attitude
and leadership ever was in a position to attack the abuses of power by the Roman machine with the full
concurrence of thousands of sincere and devout Catholics. If it must, then, stand alone as the champion
of American liberty against all foreign aggression, papal or otherwise, it surely enters the field well
equipped for the conflict.

But will it, stand alone? That is a question that concerns the old parties more than it concerns
the new one. The crowds that defied the terrible heat in the two principal cities on this continent on last
Sunday evening to applaud every utterance in support either of Dr. McGlynn or of American freedom
showed on which side the natural enthusiasm of the human heart is enlisted. Take, too, the pulpit
utterances on that same Sunday. Bead the ringing words of the venerable Dr. King of the Methodist
church, lauding the courage and piety of Dr. McGlynn and glorying in his courage and patriotism; read
Dr. DeCosta's thoughtful words in the Episcopal church of St. John the Evangelist, rebuking the great
majority of preachers for obeying capital rather than God in this matter, and contrast them with the
utterances on the same day by two Baptist preachers, one in Brooklyn and the other in New York, who
falsely or stupidly, as the case may be, insisted that Dr. McGlynn's suspension and excommunication
were justifiable acts of mere church discipline. Can any one imagine the sermons of the latter appealing
to any sentiments higher than narrow sectarianism or mammon worship? Can any one, on the other
hand, imagine a generous or patriotic an listening to Dr. De Costa or Dr. King without feeling a glow
of warmth and sympathy? In the long run, the people will flock to hear such preachers as these, and
once again and in this materialistic age, as Mr. Pentecost puts it, Christian preaching will successfully
meet the old time test, which is that the common people hear it gladly.

But the common people rule in America. If the old parties persist in ignoring the universal
sentiment among such people against anything like foreign interference in American politics, so much
the worse for the old parties and so much the better for the new. Pious members of the latter are already
persuaded that it is providentially led. Its less devout members express amazement at its good luck.
Whether it be providence or luck, certainly nothing could be more fortunate for the new party than that
its confused and stupid opponents should thus abandon to it the sole defense of the great principle of
American independence from foreign dictation. The people who enter it through that door will study
with sympathetic interest and eager attention the doctrine that Protestant monopolists and boodlers so
hate, that, like Prince Bismarck, they welcome the power of the pope in suppressing it, and the result may be a growth so rapid that the expected success of 1892 will even be realized in 1888. However it may be with individuals, the new party can certainly thank God for the enemies it has made. Their cowardice, stupidity and ignorance have done more for the good cause than could have otherwise been accomplished by ten years of advocacy not thus aided. We have much cause to love our enemies, and to pray for those who have spitefully used us, and I am almost tempted to wish long life, and continuance of their present temper, to Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Simeoni, Archbishop Corrigan, Monsignor Preston, Joe O'Donoghue and Dick Croker, since they have taught me the Christian virtue of suffering fools gladly—seeing how useful they are.

William T. Croasdale.

Ernest Work in California.

Judge James G. Maguire of San Francisco, writing from Boulder creek, Cal., says:

I addressed a meeting in San Jose last Saturday evening, and have been invited to speak there again on a week from Wednesday as our meeting was not satisfactorily advertised. I will go. I have also engagements to speak at Santa Cruz, Sacramento and Stockton during the next two weeks.

The pamphlets were received in due time, and are being used effectively. Another lot of 6,000 has been ordered by our secretary, which, of course, has not yet arrived.

I tell you those pamphlets are mighty educators. Our present great effort is to get the nucleus of a club, as far as possible, in every town and city for the purpose of getting the “Land and Labor library” into the hands of the people.

Bishop Nulty's letter is an immense thing. The Italians, to be consistent, should certainly excommunicate him for teaching heretical truths. It will do us a great deal of good.

A Short Story, but Full of Meaning

Cincinnati, O., July 12.—In a recent issue the American Engineer says:

Railroad builders are looking far ahead. and are recognizing that the west will stand just so much railroad construction during the next five years, and if material and labor will not advance too far, they propose to go on and cover the country with tracks before competitors do, even though the construction is not particularly productive for two or three years. These long headed investors are buying adjoining real estate, and will have it help them out. This activity in real estate is legitimate. The crowded old world will crowd into the new as fast as possible. Land will become year by year scarcer. Fortunes will be made by buying land and holding it until the necessities of the world's millions compel them to pay enhanced values. Lumber territory and mineral territory are being picked up by shrewd men to be held and let out to their greatest advantage. Could any warning be plainer?

An Engineer.

The Suburbs Of Great Cities.
Value of Land Near Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Baltimore.

The Baltimore Sun has been lately engaged in ascertaining the value of land in the vicinity of several large eastern cities, the purpose being to show that Baltimore's suburbs offer better inducements to investors than those of the other places. At the same time, however, the facts brought out prove, what such investigations must invariably prove, that land owners possess the power to impose on the rest of the community for the use of their land a tax which advances in proportion to the necessity of the community for the land, and which rests only a shade below the point at which it would drive capital to other uses. A dispatch from Boston to the Sun says that suburban lots of from 3,500 to 5,000 feet in area located in the thickly settled suburbs of Boston sell at from thirty to fifty cents a foot. Lots of the same area located about five miles from the Boston city hall are now selling at from eight to twelve cents per foot. This land is being purchased in large blocks by speculators, who either hold it for higher prices or erect family hotels such as fill New York city. The locations are very convenient to horse and steam transportation, and the land within the past year or two increased 100 per cent in value. Within seven miles of the city, where each lot of land is subject to restrictions as to cost of building constructed, land sells at from thirty to fifty cents a foot in lots of about 5,000 feet. The residences constructed thereon must not cost less than $10,000. In a suburb not over two miles of the city hall private residences costing from $25,000 to $160,000 are constructed on land costing from fifty to seventy-five cents per foot. This is in a first-class neighborhood, and the place is said to be the handsomest suburb in the United States. Each estate is from 10,000 to 30,000 feet in area. From ten to fifteen miles from the heart of Boston good lots of land from 5,000 to 10,000 feet in area sell at about five cents a foot. It is located near railroad depots and churches, and is considered good investment for any speculator.

The Sun's dispatch from New York says that the demand for suburban lots within fifteen miles of New York is on the increase, as the surplus population cannot find accommodations within the city limits. In what is known as “the annexed district,” above the Harlem river, the demand is very large, and lots sell for all sorts of prices, according to locality, but $300 to $1,000 per lot of twenty-five feet front may be said to be the average figures. On Long island, Staten island and in New Jersey lots sell from $60 to $400, but in certain favored places sell for more.

The Sun's Philadelphia correspondent gave an interesting account of the value of land on the different lines of railroad running in and out of that city. The object of the dispatch was to show the price of land adapted to cottage and villa residences from ten to fifteen miles out. Those lands range, according to situation and proximity to railroads, from $3,800 to $5,000 per acre at Bryn Mawr, a fashionable settlement, in lots of an acre or more. At Wayne, another settlement less fashionable, the value of land ranges from $2,000 to $3,000 per acre, the cost of building lots of moderate size ranging from $500 to $1,500 per acre. At Ridley park and Sharon hill, the chief places on the P. W. & R railroad, building lots sell from $500 to $2,000, seldom for less than $1,000 if near a station. Similar prices range all along the different railroads between the several points mentioned, proximity to a station, of which there is one every mile or so, governing the value of the land. The lines of the Pennsylvania, the Reading, the Philadelphia, “Wilmington and Baltimore, the West Chester, Germantown and other railroads are clotted with these cottages and with summer residences of a high class, and the drift of population along them and across the river toward the cheaper, poorer and less healthy lands of New Jersey is continuous.

In commenting on the facts given by its correspondents, as above, the Sun says:

“We cite these facts to show the potential value of lands from ten to fifteen miles around Baltimore, where the price along our best railroads is now singularly low, but where investments may be made that in the course of a few years will give a handsome profit. Except within a few miles of the city, and in villages either contiguous to it or within fifteen or twenty minutes' distance of it by rail, the
highest price at which lands can be bought by the acre is five hundred dollars near to stations, and much less as the distance from the rail or the distance from town on the rail increases. On Charles street avenue extended, where there are many fine villa residences stretching along it at various points to its terminus at Bellona avenue, five miles from the city, the price of land is higher, but is not one-third of that obtained for land by the acre within the same distance around Philadelphia. The York road, for a distance of five miles, shows a continuous string of closely built houses, or of villa residences and cottages, up to Govanstown, and the price of land by the acre, or of building lots, takes a corresponding value, but so inadequately low as compared with the price in suburban Philadelphia, and in the environs of Cincinnati and Pittsburgh, as to astonish visitors from those cities.”

More Law.

An English Authority Shows Private Land Ownership Unwarrantable in Law and Opposed to Public Policy.

New York. — In “The Science of Law,” international scientific series, by Sheldon Amos, M. A., professor of jurisprudence in University college, London, and in the Inn s of Court, examiner in the University of London, etc., etc., I find the following remarkable passages:

Page 166—Land, as a subject of ownership, might, indeed, be treated as the class of things set apart for the service of the state, though in the earlier stages of the development of the community the quantity of land, and the limited number of uses to which it is capable of being turned, combined to keep this aspect of it out of sight. Yet, in fact, the relation of a state to its territory, which in modern times enters into the essential conception of the state, implies that the land cannot be looked upon, even provisionally, as a true subject of permanent individual appropriation. This view obviously commends itself from the mere fact that the land is the only indestructible commodity in the country, having an existence co-extensive in duration with that of the state itself: and that the culture and produce of the natural soil must always be a matter of urgent state concern, quite independently of all considerations of the classes of persons to whom, from time to time, the task of laboring on the soil is, as it were, delegated.

A period may, however, arrive when the density of the population and the fixed limits of the national soil make this view of the essentially political character of the land not only plausible, but irresistible. If the land is looked upon as susceptible of permanent appropriation by some persons, other persons must, by the same theory, be regarded as possibly excluded from it—that is, banished from the territory of the state. Before reaching such a crisis as this, states are usually arrested by an imperious appeal to review the conditions and tendencies of their land laws. The state is brought face to face with the fact that the spurious notion of the possible appropriation forever of the national soil by private persons has made alarming progress, both in popular theory and practice. The cure is to be sought through a variety of changes in the laws of ownership as well as through more direct governmental action—such as is exhibited in the imposition of land taxes, the preservation of commons, and the facilitation of purchases of small plots of land by other persons than those who, by the mere force of their wealth, are absorbing the whole soil.

The political influence, moreover, of large land owners is of itself a sufficient ground for a watchful jealousy on the part of the state. Whatever be the issue of the controversy as to the economical and social advantages of large and small farms, and however undoubted is the importance of security of tenure to the cultivators, still the paramount dominion of the state over every part of its territory is a fact which, in a high condition of social progress, cannot be emphasized too strongly or made to be felt
too universally and really.

Much of the preceding might be an extract from “Progress and Poverty,” and we can readily forgive the writer's somewhat lame and impotent conclusion as to the possible “cure.”

William Lewis.

**A Clergyman's Fourth of July.**

The following is an extract from an oration by Rev. Albert Walkley of Manistee, Mich., delivered at the Fourth of July celebration held at Eastlake, a neighboring town. The address was listened to with close attention, and the speaker was loudly applauded by several thousand people:

The whole great land question has got to come up in our country for settlement. It is the root of monstrous evils in the old world, and it seems to be at the root of terrible injustices in this land. As the case now stands, the earnings of the community go into the hands of individuals, instead of into the coffers of the community, where it belongs. Men who sit by, and with folded arms watch cities grow up without moving hand or foot, pocket enormous profits, which belong to the communities themselves. God made the world, God owns the world; it belongs to men to use it. Not here and there a man to fence all God's world in and call it his, but the land and water and air are yours and mine, to use. This great question is coming in some form to the front for settlement. Just what form it will take no one can tell.

We see it beginning in the land forfeitures of the railroads, we see it in the more genuine respect paid the settler on land, we see it in the outcry made by the land grabbers' papers, we see it in the alien land laws passed in state legislatures, we see it in the whole agitation going on all over the country. The mind of the masses is stirred, stirred by the sense of justice. There is a quiet revolution in the depths; it is gathering strength. It is different from former revolutions: it is deeper; is being all filled by conscience: it is taking in the spirit of the Christ; it is going to utter itself in no French revolution tone but, more like the sermon on the mount, more like the good Samaritan parable.

What are we going to do about it? Well, first we are going to think, think carefully, wonderfully candid. And when we have thought out our course we are going to act, though, in the American way of No red flag in this, no cry of “Down with capital!” no harsh mimes, no defiant tone, save so far as it defies wrong. We are to meet men as men. We will work for the law, we will agitate, we will vote, and if we are in legislature or congress we will work there and vote. The American way is the sure way—hen it does a thing it does it for good and forever. In this great work we wish to enlist not the passions, but the moral sentiments. It is very likely we will have to form new parties. For my own part I look with little or no hope to the two great parties. One of them never was, in the true sense, a party. The other has done its work, and I don't believe that, in the political world, there is any resurrection of the dead. No! I look forward to a new great party—a third party. Always third parties have been decried, but they have done the work. I look to a party more filled with conscience than even the great republican party was, more saturated with moral enthusiasm. Why halt ye between two opinions? “If Baal be God, serve him; but if Jehovah be God, serve him.” All hail the right! It is more than party.

**The Slaughter of the Innocents.**

New York Herald.

Rosettes and streamers of white crape or satin hung from the front doors of hundreds of houses
in the tenement quarters of the metropolis. Through the streets rattled hearses bearing the bodies of little children to their final resting places in the cemeteries across the East river, followed by coaches filled with mourners. Judging from the number of funerals that pass over the ferries to the city of the dead one would suppose that New York was a plague stricken city.

During the six days from Sunday to noon yesterday 1,130 deaths had been recorded at the bureau of vital statistics of the health department, more than one-half of them children, and most of those under five years of age. The lives of thousands of babies who need fresh air, nourishment and proper medical treatment in the poor sections of the city are slowly ebbing away.

Registrar of Vital Statistics Dr. John T. Nagle and his corps of clerks are kept busy these days recording deaths and is suing burial permits. During one of his breathing spells Chief Nagle, speaking to a Herald reporter on the subject of infant mortality, said:

“Pure air and proper treatment and nourishment would go far toward preventing so many deaths among infants. The majority of the babies that have succumbed to the heat of the past fortnight were bottle-fed children.”

The deaths for the present week, by days, were as follows: Sunday, 256; Monday, 200; Tuesday, 208; Wednesday, 164; Thursday, 105, and Friday, 143. Total, 1,130. Those for the past five were 3,728, as against 3,180 last year and 3,303 in 1875.

The Telegraphers Wheeling Into Line.

New York Sun.

Editor John Taltaval of the Electric Age said yesterday that the telegraphers' union (national assembly 45, K. of L.) was not particularly awed by the decision of the convention of railway telegraph superintendents at Boston on Thursday to forbid operators to join the union. Mr. Taltaval said that the union would continue to deprecate the teaching by its members of telegraphy to beginners without the consent of the chief telegrapher. “The union,” Mr. Taltaval said, “no longer advocates strikes. We have got enough of that unphilosophic kind of action. Our energies are now directed not against the companies, but the two political parties. The George theory of land taxation has taken a stronghold on our members. I myself was recently converted to his views. Our organization is even stronger than it was before the great strike, and its membership is increasing every day. At least 350 of the employees in the Western union building are believers in the George doctrine, and will vote with the new party. Even some of the superintendents and others who were our bitter opponents during the strike have become converts to the new scheme of land taxation.

Good Lord Deliver Us!

Cincinnati Times-Star.

No considerable section of the American people has gone so clean daft as to believe that the George-McGlynn land robbery scheme is a political question. This will only be adopted when thievery and burglary are sanctioned as pure and holy, and in conformity with an upright standard of morality. Dr. McGlynn's present course has nothing to do with his conscience, about which he prates so loudly; it is based upon jealousy of his brother priests and upon his supreme egotism. He has raised himself out of his church, and in a short time will raise himself out of any further public
The Boss's Lament.

Air—“Pity, Kind Gentlefolks.”
(Enter the boss, wringing his hands, and singing.)

Pity, kind working folk, slaves of humanity,
Cold blows the wind of free trade, coming on;
Grant me a tax for my business, for charity,
Give me protection, or I'll be all gone.
Don't call me lazy bones, please; for I'm bold enough;
Fain would I have you all pay what I owe.
I've kids at the factory—wait till they're old enough,
They shall all work for the gifts you bestow.
Look at my jewelry, sheeny and sparkling!
What would I be without that, do you think?
It might as well be in the dirty mine, darkling,
As go to my uncle's for victuals and drink.
What would my girls do without their pi-anner?
What would my boys do without their cigars?
They're not made of common clay, like their Aunt Hanner,
Who went to the poor house, last year, by the cars.
I'm getting too old to turn tramp in the summer time;
I'd surely catch cold if I slept on the grass.
Grant me a few years to have a good bummer time—
Just a few years, till this movement may pass.
Have I not paid all my hands every Saturday?
Is not my cash all invested in land?
Why these new-fangled ideas in this latter day?
Eat bread and milk; thrive, and let the tax stand!
There's good Mr. Atkinson, tells you the truth, my dears;
If you don't like low wages, you know you can die;
That Father McGlynn is a man without ruth, my dears,
He wants to get rid of our dear poverty.
Such wickedness takes a man, sure, to the lake, my dears,
Where brimstone is waiting for communists all;
And the dear little angels will all see him bake, my dears,
And giggles celestial will greet such a fall.
That aristocratic man, Archbishop Corrigan,
Has cursed him with candle, with book and with bell.
That curse will pursue him from New York to Oregon,
And what the result will be no man can tell.
Then don't waste your strength in this awful hot summer-time,
But vote for protection and let the thing pass;
I'm getting too old to turn tramp for a bummer-time,
I'd surely catch cold if I slept on the grass.

Egypt.
A Very Peculiar Case of Excommunication.

The Independent.

The threatened excommunication of Dr. McGlynn is now a fact. It has not been done with great display of horrors. No bells have been tolled, and no lighted candles have been dashed on the cathedral door, and no horrible catalogue of curses has been repeated. For we would all laugh at all that now; but the major excommunication has been pronounced, and Dr. McGlynn is definitively excluded from all the privileges of the church, and from the kingdom of God on earth and in heaven.

This is a very peculiar case of excommunication. Dr. McGlynn had never been suspected of any heresy. His worst fault has been his opposition to parochial schools, and that was pardonable before the council of Baltimore. Now, the only heresy charged against him is what may fairly be called a new one, that of holding that all land belongs to the state and should be reclaimed by the state, and that the best way to reclaim land is by imposing a tax on land equivalent to the rent of land, exclusive of buildings and improvements on it. This is doubtless a political heresy, but it is not quite easy to show how it is a religious heresy. For holding this doctrine, and for taking part in public meetings in which it was taught, and for refusing to submit to dictation from the archbishop or from the pope himself as to what he regarded, and perhaps correctly, as his political opinions and actions, Dr. McGlynn is now expelled from the church of Rome and the kingdom of God, and forbidden the sacraments and Christian burial. He has clung to his church, he loves it passionately, he has been a faithful priest, there is no breath of scandal against his character; all his offense is that he has held a doctrine which he believes to be political and social, which has never been condemned by the church, and he refuses—here is the contumacy—to submit his liberty in this matter to the behest of the authorities of the church.

Now the important question is, How will the American Catholics take this action? Will they instantly submit and throw their loved priest overboard? We might have thought so, but we cannot well think so any longer. A priest made the remark that the archbishop's suspension of Dr. McGlynn had made suspension respectable, and that the pope's excommunication made excommunication ridiculous. Last Sunday evening the Academy of Music was packed with a wildly enthusiastic crowd hurling defiance at the excommunication. Irving hall was equally packed with an overflow meeting. The support of the good priest could not have been more complete from both men and women. Dr. McGlynn's own speeches at these two meetings were as sweet and as Christian words as man ever spoke . . . . Archbishop Corrigan has not yet rung down the curtain on the case of Dr. McGlynn. He may now appeal and demand a trial. This much has already appeared, that Catholics are not slaves.

The “Evening Post” Editor Must Have Lost His Blue Pencil

A correspondent of the New York Evening Post has been visiting the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico. He writes:

These Indians do not occupy a reservation. They are entitled to vote at the territorial elections, but owing to their fear of taxation they never exercise this right. They are all amenable to the laws of the territory. Yet it is an historical fact that no Pueblo Indian has ever been brought up for punishment under the territorial laws, and they have never had recourse to these laws for the settlement of any trouble among themselves. The land belonging to this tribe is owned in common, but the governor and council make a division of it, giving to the head of each family the amount which in their judgment his circumstances will enable him to care for. When the crops are harvested, instead of each having his
own, the crops, or their proceeds, go into a general pool and the governor distributes according to the destitution, abilities and needs of each family. If a man deserts his family and refuses to assist in their support, the governor immediately takes his land and all dividends away from him, and he is allowed no rights in the tribe until he returns to his family. . . . They are just what their name signifies (Pueblo means town). They are town Indians, and they live as town people should, industriously, lawfully and peaceably. They never rove about in search of blood and conquest, and about the only instance ever known of their acting on the offensive was when in 1680 they rose in justifiable rebellion against the Spanish rule and drove the invaders from the country.

Benument and Fletcher Revised

Vincennes, Ind., News.

Julett Corrigan—Why, slave, 'tis in our power to damn yet Master McGlynn. Very likely 'Tis in our power then, to be damned, and scorn ye!

Rack-Renting Landlords

A Record of Failure in Burlington, Iowa, Through High Rents

Burlington Justice.

Editor O'Brien came to this country to show up the iniquities of an Irish landlord, the marquis of Lansdowne. What had his lordship been guilty of? Attempting to collect his rent — attempting to collect his rent! Well, in the name of common sense why shouldn't he collect his rent? or, failing to collect, why shouldn't he evict the tenants? You reply that he demands too much rent. But if the land is "his land" has he not the right to demand any rent whatever? No, not more than the people there can pay. Well, if that is true of Irish landlords it follows that it must every here be true. Yet do not Burlington landlords demand every possible cent from their tenants just as Irish landlords do? Do they not in many cases demand so much that the land cannot be used at all? Look at the vacant lots within the built up part of the town, or lots occupied by mean and decaying buildings or used as lumber yards that, but for their exacting owners, would not be idle or use d for higher purposes. Back rent, that is the highest possible rent, is universal. Look anywhere. Take the tour corners of Fourth and Jefferson streets. Most of us can remember back fifteen or eighteen years. At the southeast corner Otto Lorenz probably lost money; then Frank Ost, we think, did not make a living; and the numerous changes of tenants since indicate that they were not prosperous. There was Lorentz, Lorentz & Esau, Esau & Huelsebus, Biepe & Huelsebus, Biepe alone and Waterman. Mr. Keipe paid $900 a year under a lease. Mr. O'Brien having died his heirs suddenly attempted to increase the rate to $1,300. Mr. Riepe refused, and, as he had paid beyond the term of his lease under a previous verbal understanding that the rent would not be raised, it was informed that he could legally hold another year; thereupon the owners, without consulting Mr. Riepe, leased it to Mr. Raab for three years, at $950, $1,000 and $1,050 a year: Mr. Raab agreeing to make certain improvements, amounting to $400 besides. The Sunderland house lost money for its proprietors. The Lawrence was a failure. Naudain evidently lost money and had to quit. At the northwest corner Colby the druggist lost money. Will Ewing, though showing more than ordinary energy, was so discouraged that he moved away, and George Henry, having the advantages of unusual activity, energy and skill in his occupation, though he may be making money now, will find as
the years roll on, that the growth of his own rent and the increasing rent that all the people will have to pay, added to increased competition, will keep his income about where it is. The northeast corner was first occupied we think about eighteen years ago by Hutchinson & French: they weren't successful, dissolved, and Hutchinson & Schramm succeeded, who, a few years later failed and were succeeded by Chris. Boesch who failed, while Lang Bros. announce that they will quit on July 1st. Yet notwithstanding that every occupant of this corner for eighteen years has been unsuccessful, the landlord has increased the rent from $1,200, that Lang Bros. have paid, to $1,400 annually. If the rent paid by the many occupants of these four corners has not been rack rent what is rack rent? The owners of those corner lots are not bad men; on the contrary, they are fully as kind and generous as the average man. They have done no more than the laws of their country permit them to do. They have done no more than you would do had you been owner. Had Lord Lansdowne, living here, in Canada, or in London, owned these lots he would have collected no more rent. To us then it seems illogical to attack the individuals, Mr. Jones, Lord Lansdowne, or Mr. Hedge. It is the infernal system that is alone at fault.

If there is a wrong you, by your laws, have given the landlords power to commit that wrong. The remedy is to change the laws.

**Dr. McGlynn's New London London Lecture**

Dr. McGlynn's recent lecture at New London, Conn., was a singularly lucid exposition of the causes of, and remedy for, the industrial congestion which has been the most marked result of the enormous increase in labor saving appliances.

“A century ago, “said the doctor,” any one who could have foreseen then multiplication of labor saving appliances would naturally have expected that not only greater productions would have followed, but the laborer would have hail more hours of leisure for recreation and culture with fewer hours of labor, but such expectation has not been fulfilled.

“Larger numbers of women and children have been drafted into the ranks of labor, when the children should be at school, or better yet, at play, and women are too frequently doing a man's task. Is it a necessary law of civilization and progress that they are to be purchased only at such a sacrifice of human life and hearts? The price is too dear to to pay. Is it a necessary consequence of the law of God? Justice must be the law of God, and if God is the God we have been told. He is, men ask in bitterness of spirit if this is the law. These laws are not of God, but rather of a demon breeding vice and crime unknown in primitive limes.

“Should those who by labor, luck or ingenuity have created wealth be compelled to “pay the profits to the few, getting for themselves merely a living? The very idea of justice and equality arises in the brotherhood of man, and men have been thrown into hostility to the church by the injustice of laws and customs that sanction such injustice. Labor and industry, the fruitful employment of the faculties in healthful working' are the natural laws of life. God imputed the law of life and man has no right to surrender life to indolence or to escape the tasks and battles of life until called hence.

“That we have the right to the equal enjoyment of the bounties and benevolence of nature is a self-evident truth. Any deprivation of these rights is an injustice. All men have the right to labor on the material of nature and man's natural wages are what he is able to make from these materials or its equivalent. The ownership of property springs from man's realization of his ownership of himself. It is a sacrilege for men to say, 'I own this coal mine or that water power.' If that is so, then he must have made it. But the title to the bounties of nature cannot be said to exist, not even to the whole human family, but to Him who made them, Almighty God.

“The only feasible plan to get over the monopoly of land is to take away private ownership and
make it common property. Taxation would be rent paid into the common treasury and the value of property would fix its rent. This would emancipate labor, for land could not then balanced in to hold for a rise nor for any reason kept unused. The coal mine could not be kept idle until the price of coal advanced. With the change poverty would disappear, and with it crime, and then would begin the coming of the kingdom of God on earth.”

**Thinks He Will Look Up the “Theory”**

Correspondence Northwestern Labor Union.

In a recent conversation I asked Mr. C. B. Moses, a prominent contractor and builder, what would be the effect of abolishing all tax on buildings and improvements, and without any hesitation he replied that it would cause the biggest boom in the building trade ever known in this or any other city, and explained that if two men each own a thousand dollar lot, and one build a thousand dollar house, he not only pays twice as much tax, but often more than three times as much as the one who holds his lot vacant; and further he did not see any injustice in taxing them both alike, and not fining the one who improves. I told him this would hurt speculation in real estate, and he thought that was of little consequence. Mr. Moses is quite a large property owner, but his interests as a builder are probably greater, and he is a man who would not hesitate to advocate a good thing for all humanity on account of some little patch of land in his possession, the value of which might be affected. However, on telling the gentleman that this was the kernel of Mr. George's land theory, he was a little surprised, and said he would look it up.

**The New Party.**

North American Review.

The era in American politics which began with the candidacy of Fremont closed with the defeat of Blame.

When in a time of strong feeling and clashing interests no man can state a principle which will be a test question between the great political parties, and a presidential contest, fourth on questions of personal character, is decided by the foolish utterance of an irresponsible speaker, it needs not even the son of a prophet to tell that the time for the drawing of new political lines has come, and that essentially new political parties must soon appear.

The republican party died at heart some time ago—with the second administration of Grant, or at least with the early part of the administration of Haves; but partly for reasons similar to those that make the days of the autumnal equinox warmer than those of the vernal equinox, and partly because of the weakness of its opponent, it still held its place. If the great party that fought the war and abolished slavery had become but a party of the ins, the great party that claimed political descent from Jefferson had become but a party of the outs. It needed only that the ins should take the place of the outs to destroy both. And this, thanks finally to the Rev. Dr. Burchard, the election of 1884 accomplished. Now that the republican party has lost control of the national executive and no disaster has occurred, and the democratic party has gained it and no particular good been done, the old prejudices, old fears, old hopes, old habits of thought and touch, are so broken down that new issues can readily come to the
front and new alignments of political forces take place.

The process of disintegration and reconstruction is now going on—the growth of the prohibition party on the one side and of a labor party on the other, and the readiness with which the republicans and democrats have united in some of the recent municipal elections when threatened with what seemed to them a common danger, show how rapidly. The prohibition movement, a natural effort to bring into politics, in the absence of larger questions, a matter on which a great body of men and women feel strongly, is in itself a significant evidence of the disposition to turn to social questions: but the great movement now beginning in the rise of the labor party takes hold of these questions lower down, and what ever importance prohibition may for some time retain in local politics, the drawing of political lines on a wider and deeper issue must throw its supporters to one side or the other of the larger question.

The deepest of all issues is now beginning to force its way into our politics, and in the nature of things it must produce a change that will compel men to take their stand on one side or the other, irrespective of their views on smaller questions. Of all social adjustments, that which fixes the relation between men and the land they live on is the most important, and it is that which is coming up now.

It has been, of course, for a long time evident that American politics in the future must turn upon the social or industrial questions, and while the questions growing out of the slavery struggle have been losing importance, these questions have been engaging more and more thought, and arousing stronger and stronger feeling. What men are thinking about and feeling about and disputing about must ere long become the burning question of politics, and the organization of labor, the massing of capital, the increasing intensity of the struggle for existence, and the increasing bitterness under it, have for years made it clear that in one shape or another the great labor question must succeed the slavery question in our politics. In farmers' grangers and alliances, and anti-monopoly associations, in trades unions and federations, and notably in the enormous growth of the Knights of Labor, a vague, but giant power has been arising. which could only reach its ends through political action. What has delayed the crystallization of these forces into a political party has been the indefiniteness of thought on such subjects. Discontent with existing conditions there has been enough, but when it came to the improvement of these conditions by political action there was no agreement. In short, up to this time, labor has not gone into politics, because it did not really know what to do in politics. This great vague power has been like a vast body of unorganized men anxious to go somewhere, but utterly ignorant of the road and without leaders whom they have learned to trust. And while one has called “this way!” and another “that way.” and constant efforts have been made by little parties starting out in this or that direction to get the great mass to follow them, the main body has refused to move.

The greenback labor party was a protest against the wasteful and unjust financial management which has enriched the few at the expense of the many, and it appealed with great strength to the debtor class; but the issue that it tried to raise was not large enough to move the great body. So with the various anti-monopoly movements, and with the local labor parties which have here and there from time to time carried a municipal or county election, and sometimes by combining forces with one or the other of the two great parties have carried a state. With all such movements the fatal weakness has been that they could formulate no large vital issue on which they could agree.

Political parties cannot be manufactured; they must grow. No matter how much the existing political parties may have ceased to represent vital principles and real distinctions, it is not possible for any set of men to collect together incongruous elements of discontent and by compromising differences and pooling demands create a live party. The initiative must be a movement of thought. The formation of a real party follows the progress of an idea. When some fundamental issue that involves large principles and includes smaller questions, and that will on the one hand command support and on the other compel opposition, begins to come to the front in thought and discussion, then a new party, or rather two new parties, must begin to form, though, of course, one or both may retain old names and develop from old organizations.

That now is the situation. Gradually yet rapidly the land question has been forcing itself upon
attention; and that process or education that has been going on in central labor unions, in assemblies of
the Knights of Labor and in the movements, abortive though they may have been in themselves, by
which it has been attempted to unite the political power of the discontented classes, has been steadily
directing thought toward the relation between men and the land on which they live, as the key to social
difficulties and labor troubles. And this process has been powerfully aided by the interest and feeling
that the Irish movement has aroused in the United States. Here, in fact, the tendencies of that movement
have been more openly radical than in Ireland. Shut out of Ireland the Irish World has freely circulated
here, and in the beginning of the Irish movement sowed broadest among a most important section of
our people the doctrine of the natural right to land; and while the influential editors and politicians and
clergy who have been so ready to assert or to assent to the truth that God made Ireland for the Irish
people and not for the landlords, have been careful to avoid any insinuation that this continent was also
made by the same power and for an equally impartial purpose, they too have been unwittingly aiding in
the same work.

I was originally of the opinion that the first large steps to the solution of the labor question by
the recognition of equal rights to land would be taken on the other side of the Atlantic, and in what I
have done to help in arousing sentiment there have always had in mind the reflex action on this
country, where, as I have told our friends on the other side, I believed the movement would be quicker
when it did fairly start But, although I have known better perhaps than any one else how widely and
how deeply the ideas that I among others have been striving to propagate have been taking root in the
United States, they have reached the stage of political action quicker than the most sanguine among us
would have dared to imagine. In going into the municipal contest in New York last fall on the principle
of abolishing taxation on improvements and putting taxes on land values irrespective of improvements,
the united labor party of New York city raised an issue, which by the opposition it aroused and the
strength it evoked showed the line along which the coming cleavage of parties must run. We did not
win that election—few among us really cared for winning, for we were not struggling for offices. But
we did more than win an election. We brought the labor question—or what is the same thing, the land
question—into practical politics. And it is there to stay.

The coming party is not yet fairly organized, nor is the name it will be known by probably yet
adopted. But it has an idea, and that an idea that is growing in strength every day, and that from the
opposition it provokes. no less than from the enthusiasm it arouses, must gain support with accelerating
rapidity. For so monstrous is the notion that some men must pay other men for the use of this planet—
so repugnant to all ideas of justice and all dictates of public policy is it that the values created by social
growth and social improvement shall go but to swell the incomes of a class; so opposed to the first and
strongest of all perceptions is it that the rights of individual ownership which properly attach to the
products of human labor should attach to natural elements that no man made; and so clearly does the
simple means by which the common right to land can be secured, the taking of land values (i.e., the
value which attaches to land by reason of social growth and improvement, and irrespective of the
improvements made by the individual user) for public purposes harmonize with all other desirable
reforms—that our present treatment of land as individual property can only be acquiesced in where it is
not questioned or discussed.

As this discussion goes on, and it is now going on all over the United States, the principle of
common rights in the land, brought to a definite issue in the proposition to abolish all other taxes in
favor of a tax on land values irrespective of improvements, must win adherents, and permeate and bring
in line under its standard those associations and organizations whose existence is a proof of widely
existing discontent, but which have lacked the definiteness of purpose necessary to successful political
action.

As yet the united labor party of New York is the strongest organization on the new ones, and the
convention which it will hold in Syracuse on the 17th of August will probably give an impetus to
organization throughout the country, the way for which is now being prepared by the formation of land
and labor clubs. “What is known as the union labor party formed at Cincinnati in February by a gathering composed of some delegates from the farmers’ alliances of the west, greenbackers and Knights of Labor, with self-appointed representatives of all sorts of opinions and crochets, was one of those attempts to manufacture a political party which are foredoomed to failure. Sooner or later its components must fall on one side or the other of the issue raised by the more definite movement. On which side the majority of them will fall there can be lit tie doubt. While the new party aims at the emancipation of labor, and in its beginnings derives from the organization of labor that has been going on the strength which wherever it has yet appeared has made it at once a respectable factor in politics—it aims at the improvement of the conditions of labor. not by doing anything special for laborers, but by securing the equal rights of all men. It will not be a labor party in any narrow sense, and in the name which it will finally assume the word labor, if not dropped, will at least be freed from narrow connotations.

But questions of name and questions of organization, are to us who sec the coming of the new party, and who know its power, matters of comparatively unimportant detail. We have faith in the idea, and as that moves forward we know all else will follow. We can form no combinations and will make no compromises. How our progress may affect the political equilibrium, and give temporary success, locally or nationally, to either of the old parties, we care nothing at all. Even whether our own candidates, when we put them up, are elected or defeated, makes little difference—the contest will stimulate discussion and promote the cause. We follow a principle that through defeat must go on to final triumph. And because the new party that is forming is clustering round a great principle, we have no fear that it can be captured or betrayed. The “politicians” who would anywhere get hold of its organization, would get but an empty shell, unless they, too, bent themselves to serve the principle.

What is the deep strength of the new movement is shown no less by the manner in which the Catholic masses have rallied around Dr. McGlynn than by the political power it is exhibited when its standard has been fully raised. Whoever has witnessed one of those great meetings which the Anti-poverty society is holding on Sunday evenings in New York, must see that an idea is coming to the front that lays hold upon the strongest of political forces—the religious sentiment; and that the “God wills it! God wills it!” of a new crusade is indeed beginning to ring forth.

Our progress will at first be quicker in the cities than in the agricultural districts, simply because the men of the country are harder to reach; but whoever imagines that the foolish falsehood that we propose to put all taxes on farmers will long prevent the men who till the soil from rallying around our banner leans on a broken reed.

Henry George.

Makeshift and Cure
Milwaukee Review.

If the natural law of demand and supply were otherwise allowed tree scope, there would be no call for many of the arbitrary, and, in some sense, even tyrannical restrictions of trades unions and K. of L. assemblies. . . . A system that encourages men to shirk, so as not to work themselves out of a job; and to waste, in order to provide work for others, can be defended only as a makeshift and as a war measure pending a radical cure of a fundamental evil. This cure—simple, feasible, efficacious—consists in the abolition of all taxes, direct and indirect, except that levied on the unearned increment of land values.
A Campaign Lie

In the July number of the Forum, appears an article by Professor W. T. Harris entitled “Henry George's Mistake About Land,” the intent of which is to demonstrate that “Mr. George is mistaken in supposing that private property in land exercises a power to rob capital and labor.” This intent Professor Harris carries out, evidently to his own satisfaction, in an essay of about 3,500 words, including copious notes and extracts. Briefly stated, the professor's argument is this:

“The total income of the people of the United States, as figured out by Mr. Edward Atkinson, is $7,300,000,000, or forty cents a day for each inhabitant. The rental value of all the land in the United States, as figured out by Professor Harris, is $400,000,000 yearly, or a little more than two cents a day for each inhabitant. The total taxation, national and local, is stated at four and a half cents a day for each inhabitant. With these figures as a basis for his argument Professor Harris demonstrates several highly important conclusions. Here they are:

1. If all ground rent were taken from land owners by taxation, and if by some machinery of administration it were distributed equally among the whole people of the United States, each individual would receive at most but two cents a day.

2. If all taxes were remitted, save only a tax on land, it would be necessary, inasmuch as the revenue required for national and local purposes largely exceeds the rental value of land, to exact from land owners a considerable tax in addition to the rental values, or, in other words, ground rents would have to be increased from four per cent on valuation to seven and a half per cent. Under these circumstances people would refuse to rent land. “A seven per cent tax on land would destroy our agricultural interests, all except the market gardening. No gram' could be exported, and without a protective tariff none could be raised for the home market.”

3. The average income of the whole country being but forty cents a day, and there being one wage earner to three persons, “or, more accurately, to 2.9 persons,” it is clear that all men who earn more than $1.35 a day, or $34.50 a month each, are “on the side of the bloated bondholder already and cannot complain of land and capital robbing them of the products of their labor.”

4. When the author of “Progress and Poverty” announces that—

The simple and sovereign remedy which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whosoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen crime, elevate morals and taste and intelligence, purify government and carry civilization to yet nobler heights, is to appropriate rent by taxation—

he evidently supposes that as “ground rent produces poverty by robbing capital and labor, its confiscation would restore enough to capital and labor to remedy the evil.” But inasmuch as it appears that “the total ground rent is an insignificant item compared with the total income of the nation,” it is “necessary to conclude that Mr. George is mistaken in supposing that private property in land exercises a power to rob capital and labor. And such indeed must be our conclusion in whatever way we approach the study of actual statistics.”

It is not difficult to show that Professor Harris' statistics are as untrustworthy as the argument he builds upon them. The actual ground rents of the city of New York alone, as has been shown in the columns of The Standard, are largely in excess of $100,000,000 yearly, to say nothing of the rental values of the various franchises which have been begged, bought or stolen from the municipality. The immense rental values of natural opportunities in the shape of coal mines, iron mines, gold mines, silver mines, lead mines, tin mines, zinc mine, copper mines, quicksilver mines, nickel mines, graphite mines, salt wells, oil and gas wells, quarries, water power, etc., have no place in Professor Harris' statistics. Nor does he take any account of the taxing franchise (dependent in great degree upon land monopoly) possessed by railway, telegraph and telephone companies, irrigation companies and similar
Equally easy is it to point out the professor's amazing ignorance of economic laws, and the curious weakness of his logic. He has a queer sort of an idea that landlords can tax rents at any figures they please, as when he remarks that “to pay all taxes, both national and local, ground rent would have to be increased to seven and one-half per cent;” and yet, at the same time he shows a dim knowledge of the fact that this isn't altogether so, for later on he says that “a seven per cent tax on land would destroy our agricultural interests, all except the market gardening.” It is worth while, by the way, to remark in passing that, as a matter of fact, the wheat growers of the west actually do pay a ground rent of seven and even twelve per cent in the shape of interest, since the money in vested in their lands will command that rate, while the market gardeners of the east get off with four and five per cent. But the sublimity of logical inconsequence is reached in the assertion that without a protective tariff no grain could be raised for the home market. The spectacle of the western farmers sitting idly by the road sides, leaving their broad prairies untilled, while Europe and the eastern states were crying out for food, and their wives and little ones were perishing (to say nothing of their own personal gripes and other inconveniences), and all because of an unpaid seven per cent tax upon a non existent value, would be extraordinary indeed. By what economic magic the imposition of a protective duty on grain would amend matters Professor Harris may think he knows, but doesn't explain. My untutored simplicity would suppose that if the western farmers abandoned their lands, the value of the land would be extinguished, the tax on it would fall to nothing, and there would be a fine chance for eastern intelligence to engage in agriculture—always supposing western stupidity to remain sitting by the roadside.

But, the cause of labor emancipation would be weak, indeed, were it compelled to stand or fall with the accuracy of Professor Harris' and Mr. Atkinson's statistics and logic. Even were it true, which it is not, that the rental value of land under present social conditions were less than the sum annually required for public purposes, the fact would have no economic significance, save to show the necessity for retrenchment in governmental expenses. Whether the legalized robbery of the people by the land owners amounts to two cents or two dollars daily per head of population is a minor question. For the advocates of emancipation demand the absorption of land values by taxation, not merely because, under the present system, an immense tribute is extorted from labor and capital without any shadow of right or a penny of compensation, but also, and chiefly, because that system checks the production of wealth, hinders the increase of population, fosters crime, intemperance and greed, creates poverty, shortens human life, drives women into sin, destroys religion and makes this earth a hell. The slave is not worrying over the question whether his master gains cents or dollars by the unrighteous theft of his labor. The slave wants freedom. What the absorption of land values by taxation will do is this: It will compel the men who now hold natural opportunities idle to permit their use and to surrender to the community whatever share of their production accrues without human labor. The owner of a vacant city lot will cease to find a profit in withholding it from use; he must either build upon it himself or dispose of it to somebody who will, or, finding that it has no value, abandon it to whomsoever cares to take and use it free of tax or rent. The mine owner will have to work his min: or abandon it. The land miser who now adds acre to acre of agricultural land, trusting to the growth of population to create a demand which shall enable him at some future time to lay a tax upon his fellow citizens, will have a rude awakening and discover that his land is useless to him unless he cultivates it. The farmer will no longer be obliged to pledge himself to years of toil for the benefit of some city idler in order to obtain permission to plow and reap; the merchant will have around him a community engaged in wealth production by the application of labor to natural elements, and eager to utilize his services for the exchange of their products. The laborer will need no union or assembly to protect him; his power at any time to apply his labor directly to the natural elements of wealth will make his product the measure of his wages. The man who works will live in comfort, without privation in the present or fear for the future; the man who cannot work will be well taken care of; and the man who can work and won't work,
but wants to live upon the work of others, will be allowed to lie down and die, and the sooner the better.

To say that under such a system, with the fetters stricken from the wrists of labor, the fences torn from around the unused land, the wealth created by the community returned to the community, poverty would have any chance of existence, is to say that a hungry man will not stretch forth his hand to grasp a loaf that lies beside him. The population of a European kingdom might be absorbed by the United States each year for generations to come, and the country would be but the richer for it.

As for the moral tone of Professor Harris' article, it is even more amazing than his statistics and his logic. He makes no attempt to dispute the fact that there is a robbery; his only effort is to show that the robbery doesn't amount to much. “You fellows,” says the professor, “are making a mighty fuss about a very small matter. What's the use of bothering about a stealing which, after all, only amounts to two cents a day for each one of you? You'd be very little better off if the stealing were stopped, and the poor landlords would be in a deuce of a condition.” Such a code of ethics would make petty larceny a virtue and shop lifting an industry to be encouraged.

Essays such as this of Professor Harris' are in essence akin to the “campaign lies” with which our newspapers have made us familiar. If uttered ignorantly they evidence a wanton recklessness like that of the boy who thinks the pistol isn't loaded; if put forth with malice prepense they show a despicable moral degradation. Professor Harris has either read “Progress and Poverty” or he has not. If he has, he must be fully aware that in representing that work as advocating the taxing away of existing ground rents merely in order that they may be divided among existing people, and as looking to that remedy alone for the abolition of poverty, he is giving utterance to a deliberate falsehood. If he has not read it, he is abusing the confidence of the readers of the Forum. In either case he ought to be ashamed of himself.

T. L. McCready.

Good Words for a Good Man and True

New Jersey Unionist.

A few days ago the Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost started for Watch hill, R. I., where he will spend the next six weeks of his vacation. During that time he will take absolute rest, having declined scores of invitations to deliver addresses in various parts of the country. It is not out of place to say here that no clergyman ever came to Newark and in so short a time made for himself so enviable a reputation. While the bold stand he has taken on the labor question and its true relation to Christianity has startled many in his own fold, and, it may be confessed, has shaken the confidence of a very small number who seem incapable of rising to the occasion of the new order of thought that is spreading all over the land, the pleasing fact remains that Mr. Pentecost has carried with him the overwhelming majority of his people, and it would be difficult to name a clergyman among the hundred or more who preach in this city every Sunday who is more affectionately regarded by their flock than is the pastor of the Belleville avenue Congregational church. Outside of Newark, among the people at large, no one of our clergymen is so well known and so much esteemed. We join with his congregation in wishing him a most delightful and health-giving holiday, praying that when he returns to his field of labor he may be able to work with even greater force and zeal than he has shown in the past.
Publishers Notes.

Soldiers of the new crusade! Do you hear the bugles sounding? All along the line they're ringing out, warning every good man and true to take his place, to stand shoulder to shoulder with his fellows, to nerve his heart to the contest, to push the enemy home! Hear the clarion voice of Father Huntington—that priest of God, that apostle of the new crusade—how it rings out above the turmoil of the battle. If every one of the 4,000 men and women who attended the great Anti-poverty meeting of two weeks ago would but make nine converts, and each number of each group of ten thus formed make but nine more—how often would this have to be repeated to range every man and woman beneath the banner of true liberty? Just four times! Ah! Think of it! Think how speedily the kingdom of God might be brought upon earth if men would but really work for it!

Men and women who read The Standard, who among you doesn't know nine people to whom the gospel may be preached with hope of success? All around you are your brothers and sisters as eager to hear as you can possibly he to speak. Why don't you go for them? Won't you go for them? Tear the bandage of falsehood and error from their eyes and give them to see the truth glorious. With the record of the past and radiant with promise for the future.

What man has done man can do. Here are a few letters taken at random from among hundreds that reach us, showing how people who are really willing to work are succeeding in spreading the light:

Danbury, Conn.—Enclosed is remittance for three additional subscribers. I will undoubtedly send you another list of names during the week.

We keep pegging away in season and out of season, and are actually forcing the truth into many who would never believe anything if they were not forced to. We feel we are slowly but surely gaining ground, and will be able to give a good account of the new party. A large number who have not openly east in their lot with as have signified their intention of doing so at an early day; and the more we agitate the more the intelligent portion of labor realizes that there can be no improvement the condition of the wage earning class except by independent political action. The revolution which is now fairly started needs constant agitation and hard work from every thinking man.

C. H. Jennings.

Richmond, Mo.—Enclosed find draft, for which send The Standard to the following four addresses.

To say that we are pleased with The Standard, and the noble work in which it is engaged, would be but to mildly express our regard for our paper; it is our text book, our Bible: we await each copy with eager expectancy. The more we study the social problems now confronting us, the more we see the beauties of the land value tax theory; as compared with our present burdensome system It is as a “Great Eastern” to a hand hollowed canoe, a Pullman palace car to an ox wagon, a great factory to a hand loom, a self-binder to a scythe, as money as a medium of exchange to primeval barter. The tax assessor has just paid us his annual visit. and the injustice and absurdity of the present corrupt system is fresh in our minds. Some of our friends here own houses, some stock, some growing harvests and some stocks of goods. As houses, stock, growing crops and goods are very bad things to have in a community, the assessor forthwith tines us to the full extent of our damage to the country.

The cross of the new crusade has many earnest friends in this portion of the country, brave men and women, who will work for the cause until it finally triumphs, or until death shall bid them cease their labors. I sell ten copies of The Standard weekly over my news counter, besides those that take them by subscription. Send me some advertising matter. I am doing all I can to spread the light.

J. C. Williams.
Auburn, N.Y.—Herewith I send a list of seven subscribers for THE STANDARD, and post office order to pay for same. This is the result of devoting the first week of my vacation to discharging a small portion of my indebtedness to THE STANDARD and the sacred cause it represents. Accept this as a pledge of better things that I intend shall follow.

H. W. Benedict.

Madison, Pale—Enclosed find money order for nineteen new subscribers and four renewals. We are not going to sleep out here while this new crusade goes on. Dakota is sorely in need of reform, as over two-thirds of the land, in one way or another, is in the clutches of the Turks.

As for myself, you can count on every nerve that is in me. Now that we know what to do, “easier were it to hurl the rooted mountain from its base than to force the yoke of slavery on men determined to be free.”

From the first day I read your book, “Progress and Poverty,” six years ago. I knew that this new crusade would come sooner or later, and I knew also that mankind would have to submit to what is plainly and unmistakably right. Man, after all, is really no devil. Even if he were as bad in inclinations and desires he is not strong enough to battle successfully against what is eternally just.

Man is a very weak-kneed animal when lie lacks the main quality of strength. Moral courage. And this kind of courage our opponents lose the moment they understand the nature of the reform we want. For to see, in this case, is practically to be conquered. If every man had a clear idea of what a single tax on land values meant, both in theory and in its practical operation, at least nine-tenths of the whole population would favor it. So there is our line of action, to agitate and educate, to make people read, think and study. In this connection the slanders and misrepresentations of our enemies serve a great purpose, They save us a great deal of stimulating work, so we may more fully devote our time and energy to constructive, educational work.

Eight here let me say to the subscribers of THE STANDARD that the easiest and cheapest and most efficient way for us ordinary men to do good work is by pushing the tracts. I always carry some in my pocket, and hand them to people in season and out of season. If you cannot send for a variety, get one that will fit all cases, as No. 20, “Thou Shalt Not Steal,” and the whole neighborhood may be set a-thinking.

E.H. Evenson.

Quebec, Canada.—Just a day ago I met at Kingston an enthusiastic, energetic young fellow, vice president of the Toronto branch of the Anti-poverty society. He is a most active canvasser for THE STANDARD and its doctrines. A son of Sir Richard Cartwright, he is most assiduous among his influential relations, confident of winning them to open, as he has many of them to secret, sympathy and support. He called with the object of starting a branch of the Anti-poverty society in Kingston, and has probably already succeeded in doing so, though I was unable just then to give him further help than simply names of already convinced and also of half persuaded parties. The reform journal, the Kingston Whig, has already written some editorials which show an appreciation not only of the importance but of the certain benefits of the land movement. The editor of the other journal, though he admits occasional articles of a softened tone, is obstinately prejudiced against the movement. Shouldn’t happen that I return to Kingston I hope to convert him.

What a great mass of ignorance and prejudice yet to be contended against! Looking solely to that side, one is indeed tempted to become disheartened. I suppose you meet constantly with gentlemen such as I made the acquaintance of last Friday on the boat down from Kingston. I gave a STANDARD to an intelligent looking priest whose interested eye I caught. He read it and passed it on to another, when
I lost sight of it. I ventured some time afterward to ask another priest (of whom there were several on board) if he would care to see a copy of The Standard, at the same time offering him a copy. He alarmed and then stern, and said that he never read the paper, but always returned it unread. A long discussion followed, in which my clerical acquaintance made several rash assertions regarding the land doctrine and the church's attitude toward it, most of which he was compelled to retract, eventually becoming reconciled to the view that perhaps after all the church might pronounce in favor of the theory, and that civilization might receive considerable impetus from it. Particularly he was warned that he had no right to take the name of the church in arguing against the theory; that henceforth he was in all fairness bound not to prejudice any mind seeking truth in the matter by appealing to alleged church teachings.

I rather welcomed, as an instance of old, middle age, blind prejudice, a little incident which interrupted some what the first rapid, harmonious flow of the discussion. A younger cleric I heard whisper, with a chuckle, to my friend that he had disposed of George and his heresy by tearing up The Standard. My friend was evidently ashamed of the tactics of this hero, and became himself more honest and direct in discussion.

My first contact with the clerics enables me the better to appreciate the difficulties of Dr. McGlynn's position. They are the men least qualified for cool, impartial debate.

Here in Quebec I hope to do some quiet work. Some lovely enthusiasm is awakening among some of my friends to whom I had sent The Standard. You'll hear of effective work from them soon, I hope.

R. Balmer.

There, see what your fellow soldiers are doing.

Earnest workers by the thousand are laboring all over the length and breadth of the land, each in his own neighborhood, to drag men out of the darkness of error into the full brightness of truth. Dare you rest idle while your fellows are bearing the heat and burden of the fray? Up and be doing! And see to it that the next mail brings us a goodly list of recruits in the guise of new subscribers to The Standard.

Middletown, July 11.— How can one better celebrate a birthday for the money than by giving $1 for five “recruit subscriptions.” Besides, I want to be the first at the new shrine. The names are given, as be low, with directions. These “Publishers Notes” are most urgent. Am doing all I can think of for the cause, praying God to bless, as I know He will, the new crusade and Rev. Dr. McGlynn and all anti-hypocrites.

A McGlynn Catholic.

This “recruit subscription” idea is catching on. One earnest friend of the cause called on us the other day and gave an order to send The Standard for six weeks to more than six hundred clergymen. Just think of the amount of good that will do! And from all quarters orders are reaching us for two, for five, for a dozen six weeks' subscriptions to The Standard to various addresses.

Keep these “recruit subscriptions” in mind. You must certainly have a number of friends or acquaintances whom, either because they live at a distance or for some other reason, you cannot attack personally. The Standard will do your attacking for you. We will send the paper for six weeks—

To any two addresses for 50 cents.
To any five addresses for $1.
To any twelve addresses for $2.

* And you may rely upon it that the man must be a thorough pagan indeed who can read The Standard for six successive weeks and not understand the necessity for reform in our social system.
Hurry on your “recruit subscriptions,” and spread the light among your friends. Only remember that these ”recruit subscriptions” cannot be renewed at the same rate.

The following letter comes to us from a valued friend and an earnest worker. It contains a good idea, which land and labor clubs and anti-poverty societies all over the country can easily put in practice:

Since reading Herbert Spencer's “Social Statics” some ten years ago, I have been a believer in the doctrine that land is the common heritage of all mankind, that the right of any present occupant of the earth to an equal share in its riches with all other occupants, implies also the same right of any future occupant.

It is, of course, apparent to any reflecting mind that a present generation may not ethically restrict or in any way impair the natural rights of generations to follow. The law of primogeniture was abolished because it did violence to the manifest rights of second or later corners, whom everybody considers, in our time, to be as a matter of course, beyond question, entitled to the same consideration as a first corner.

It may well be believed that no person who is capable of reasonably close thought on the subject, and whose thought has been directed to a consideration of it, really believes in the private ownership of land, in the same sense that he believes in the ownership of the hat, or the boat which his own labor has fashioned from material furnished by nature or land. In other words, we all possess a moral sense which distinguishes between right and wrong in most fundamental questions as unerringly as the sense of touch or feeling distinguishes between a hard or a soft, a warm or a cold object.

Country children in this latitude, will soon be going out on berrying excursions; they will most likely go for the berries on to land to which, under existing conditions, some one holds a title, but the children very likely may not even know who the owner is, or knowing it, they do not realize what it implies, or they care nothing about it, as the custom often is, in country places, for people to gather berries or nuts wherever they may be found, without a thought of whose land they grow on.

As illustrating the workings of the moral sense, the youngest child in the merry party will feel that he has an unquestioned right to all the berries he picks, and to no others.

This same moral sense would as certainly claim an unquestioned right to an opportunity with all the rest to gather berries from any particular locality or bed, where the berries were, “Oh, oh, how large, how thick they are,” even though Ben or Tom lay have chanced first upon the spot. Should “Ben or Tom lay claim to a n exclusive right to gather all the berries because they were on the spot first, and had perhaps in order to fortify their claim, walked around it thus enclosing” it by an imaginary line, the instant and spontaneous reply would be: “You didn't make the berries; I've as a good a right to them as you have.” The instinct of fair play would voice itself, and though Ben's or Tom's unenlightened selfishness might resist yielding any share to the others or the party, "their moral sense as soon as it had opportunity to assert itself, would assent to the justice of the others' claims.

Of course we have only to apply this illustration of children in the berry field to children of a larger growth in the coal field, the gold held, or any other field of natural opportunities, to see what should be done. Every honest and intelligent person must see that there is absolutely no ground of justice in the claim we so often hear made, by implication if not in terms, that God save the good things of this earth to the Bens or Toms simply because they chanced to be on the ground first, and that He left the others out of His plans and provisions and bid them make the best terms with Ben or Tom they could. Nature invites and welcomes children into this world in an unending succession; has she restricted her bounties and opportunities to only a limited number, those who come first, and whose greed or ignorance and indifference to questions of right has prompted or permitted them to fence in all the opportunities?

An affirmative answer implies a perverted or lost moral sense, and does violence to every feeling of justice. The broad doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, when
rightly understood, permits no such errors.

The so-called doctrines of Henry George are at bottom questions of morality. “Thou shalt not steal” means not only that you may not, under cover of night, take the sheep or poultry of your neighbor Smith, but it means that you may not appropriate to your exclusive individual use, under cover of custom or legal enactment, the common property of Smith, Jones and Perkins, or any number of people. It is not less an infraction of moral law to rob many than to rob one.

The work of The Standard and of the various branches of the land and labor party is now, and is likely to be for a long time yet, mainly educational. The hard cake of custom is not easy to break, and many good and ordinarily wise citizens think they have as good a right to the land which they buy as they have to the book obtained in the same way, and no doubt good men in time past, thought they had as good a right to the slave bought with money as to the book acquired by purchase. Nevertheless, most people at heart love justice and admire fair play. Our work, then, is to get our ideas before the people. We need some more striking means of getting our fundamental truths and ideas before the masses. Comparatively few of them subscribe for The Standard, nor do they read Herbert Spencer, Mill or Henry George, and a discouragingly large percentage of the tracts so woven broadcast, it is feared, “fall upon stony ground, or where there is not much depth of soil.” I live in a city of 120,000 inhabitants, and it is probably within bounds to say that not ten per cent of the adult population have ever read “Social Statics,” “Progress and Poverty,” or so much as heard of such a paper as The Standard; and yet these people must be reached; they must be convinced that existing systems of land tenure are inimical to the masses and in favor of classes; they must first be brought to think correctly, and then they will vote wisely.

This land agitation has come to stay until the question is settled on right principles, and we want some means to reach the “Judean fishermen,” such men as were the disciples of the Great Reformer. “The common people heard Him gladly.” While I do not, I think, undervalue propogandism by means of books, papers, tracts and lectures, yet I am convinced that there is a way to reach a large class of worthy citizens whom these means rarely touch. Why not employ the same means to propagate our ideas that enterprising business men use? I would like to see every Henry George club or branch of the land and labor party own or control a large and well-located bill board. Let them throughout the country be of uniform size and design, so far as possible, and adapted to receive a certain number of bills; then let the bills be prepared under competent supervision and a series of bills printed in three inch plain letters, or any size thought best; let them set forth in terse, striking phrase some fundamental truth bearing on our reform; let one set remain up ten days or a fortnight and then replace by others, giving a series of progressive object lessons, so to speak.

An associated effort in this way would bring the cost to a small sum; it would challenge criticism, stimulate thought and discussion, and the more discussion truth gets the brighter it will shine. I am convinced that it would prove a valuable adjunct to our books, papers and tracts.

W. B.

We shall be glad to hear more from some of our readers on this subject.

A New York manufacturer—who asks us not to give his name, because as yet a belief in the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man is supposed to be incompatible with business principles—sends the following letter:

I have noticed with regret that the recruiting fund is not receiving the support which it deserves. In order, therefore, to give it another little boost, I send you a further contribution, this time for $100. I can see nothing but good to come from the widest discussion of your theories, and it is with this idea that I am anxious to do my share.

Another friend sends us a contribution of $20 from Kansas, with the frank statement of why he
My whole heart is in the new crusade. I long for its success. I Avant to work for it. I Avant to talk for it. I want to do all in my power to hasten along its triumph. And yet, whenever I try to talk about it to my friends I find myself literally unable to do so. The silliest arguments upset me, and I only get myself laughed at and called a crank. I go home, and when I am alone I can disprove every one of the arguments that stumped me, but when I meet my friends again I find myself just as awkward and embarrassed as ever. So I have concluded that somebody else has got to do the talking for me, and I don't know any one that can do it better than The Standard. Here is twenty dollars to help you get listeners. Add it to the recruiting fund, and may God speed the cause.

J.T.C.

Cheyenne City, Wyo.—Enclosed please find a $3 postal note as mite toward the recruiting fund. And furthermore, you may consider me a monthly contributor to the amount of $1 or more until Nov. 1, 1888.

The rapidity and certainty of success with which our cause is moving (ill me with enthusiasm and delight. Five years ago, when I first read “Progress and Poverty,” I looked for the beginning of the agitation twenty years hence. And lo! here we are in the midst of the fight, with the crown of victory in sight. It fills me with a sense of solemn duty never felt before. It makes me feel that every man and woman is my neighbor. It has melted what little malice I ever had against those who have off the toil of others, feeling that it is a system rather than individual men that is to blame for the misery and degradation that fester in the heart of our civilization.

A. G. Groh.

The recruiting fund shows up well this week. Here is the statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previously acknowledged</th>
<th>$197.76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.L., New York</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.T.C., Kansas</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.M. Blessing, Cleveland, O.</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.N., Britton</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Dunn, New Orleans</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.S.D., New Orleans</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hall</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.J.S., New York</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.G. Groh, Cheyenne, Wyo</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Invalid</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“One who longs for the kingdom.”</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas. T. Hopkins, New York</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A.S.</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total to date</strong></td>
<td><strong>$343.81</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, do you want some words of cheer to strengthen your resolve and kindle the fire of enthusiasm within you? Listen, then, to what some of your brothers and sisters are saying to us:
Nenia, Ill.—I am a regular subscriber to The Standard. Though my subscription began last week I had procured the paper regularly since April 10 through newsdealers. I want to know if I can obtain all back numbers previous to April 10, and if so the price of the same. Let me have these if you possibly can, as I want to complete my file. If I mistake not greatly full files of The Standard will sell very high some day. Next to buying real estate I opine the best investment one could possibly make would be in piling up an unlimited number of Standard files.

REV. John B. Barnhill.

Alma, Wis.—Enclosed find renewal of my subscription to The Standard. I could not think of going without it.

I have read all your books. They are marvels, and “Progress and Poverty” is a great moral instructor. It has given me more genuine religion than I had any idea I was capable of holding. That it is a pleasure to read this book I cannot say; at any rate I felt more like crying than laughing when I read it, but it is a great boon to know that all the misery and wretchedness in the world is not caused by our loving Father in heaven, and that “man, proud man,” should shoulder some responsibility in the premises and make an end of it. Of course I will take a hand in the coming struggle, and you may hear from me occasionally. After reading your books I am astonished at my proficiency in discussing political questions. No matter how they attack the theory, a reply is at hand. Yours in haste,


Idaho Springs, Col.—Enclosed find renewal of my six months' subscription. The Standard is the most instructive and interesting newspaper in America. May it live long and prosper.

J.R. Richards.

Northfield, Minn.—The Standard is one of the best papers I have ever read. The people should uphold and stand by that grand man, Dr. McGlynn. It will be glory enough if he can drive the Italian propaganda from interference in American politics.

J.S. Tripp.

St. Louis, MO.—Enclosed find draft for renewal of four subscriptions to The Standard. I also enclose $1, for which send an assortment of tracts, especially some of McGlynn's and Pentecost's discourses. As a rule, I don't think much of the gentlemen of the cloth, but I am ready to take off my hat to such as these two.

G.H. Mott.

Chicago, Ill.—Enclosed find post office order for six months' subscription to The Standard. I have been bred a Roman Catholic and I glory in the stand taken by Dr McGlynn, and also in St. Stephen's parish for so nobly standing by him. If his grace, the archbishop, is going to excommunicate Mr. Feeny, Miss Munier and others of that little band, me and others will have their hands full before they get through. We must stand by that priest, and by The Standard. The standard of truth, of liberty, and of justice will bring him and us safely through.

Thomas J. Canty.
North Cambridge, Mass.—My father renews his subscription to THE STANDARD for one year. He says its worth cannot be overestimated. It is truth itself.

Harriet E. B.

Tampa, Fla.—I send remittance for six months of THE STANDARD and a copy of “Progress and Poverty.”

I have been raised and am now a Methodist, brought up to detest the Catholic church. But if my church takes the side of injustice, I am no longer a Methodist, but a McGlynn Catholic. I am a convert, soul and body, mind and strength to the “land theory.” I believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Robert R. Roberts.

Minneapolis, Minn.—Enclosed find subscription to THE STANDARD for one year. You publish the best paper in the United States, and I would not be without it if it cost double the money. We are gaining ground here all the time.

Alex Stewart.

So the cross of the new crusade advances, and the cause goes marching on.

A New Principle of Cure.

How Long Physiological Experimentation, With Laboratory Research and Bedside Experience, At Last Rewarded The Patient Investigation.

Fame and Fortune His, but Only After Years of Hard Work, with the Outlay of Much Money in Experimenting.

We recently had the pleasure of a half hour's chat with Dr. William M. Baird, the Speaker of the New Jersey Assembly, Member of the New Jersey State Board of Education, ex-President of the Washington, N.J., Board of Health, etc. It was the Doctor that so ably and manfully presided over the New Jersey Legislature last winter during the turbulent scenes there, and won for himself the praise of political friend and foe a like for his quiet and determined stand then.

The Doctor has enjoyed a large practice for years, and has performed many large operations, and his courage and skill in that direction are well known.

He has become greatly interested in a novel remedy and original method of cure that by its test of experience on invalids promises a brilliant future.

We asked the Doctor if the remedy was peculiar to one plant. He said: “Briefly, I was, some seven or eight years ago, experimenting on the various vital principles of plants. For instance, we do not give Cinchona Bark, but Quinine, which is the active principle of the crude drug. Atropine is the active principle of Belladonna, etc.

“Now, while experimenting on the physiological action of certain drugs, I found “that certain ones had a certain definite action; another would be directly opposite. I at once began combining, in various ways, different alkaloids, and then, by chemical processes, extracting the vital principle of the
combination, I at last succeeded in securing a result that I little dreamed of in the beginning. I got an exceedingly active principle that had a peculiarly desirable action on the human system. I was still not satisfied, but continued my investigations upon animals until I learned definitely the exact action of the remedy.

“I presume I performed over a thousand experiments on animals before I tried it upon the human person, and then upon myself before I gave it to any patient. The effect of this purely vegetable remedy was peculiarly marked on the glandular system, in other words, on the part of the human body that regulates the secretions and excretions of the body. The three most prominent glands of the body are the Liver, Pancreas and Kidneys; but the whole mucous membrane of the stomach and intestines is lined with minute glands, which throws out a fluid that acts on the food as it passes down the alimentary canal, or else throws off certain excrementitious matters that they find in the blood. The Liver secretes certain substances, i.e., takes up from the blood certain substances, and makes new matter from it: it also excretes cholesterol, which is known to be the waste matter from the brain and nervous system.

“You can imagine my pleasure at finding this remedy to act so promptly on the glandular system, when I tell you that the medical profession have never had till now a remedy that gave satisfactory results in this respect. It is true, calomel was somewhat of a stimulant to the liver, but it does not increase the excretion of cholesterol when that is in the blood in excess.

“A series of long and costly experiments were necessary to prove the results.

“The best proof, however, is the result of treatment of patients. I at last perfected the machinery for manufacturing, so that I was able to put it on the market in acceptable shape. I saw how it throws off the waste matters of the blood, and thus purified it, so that I at first called this medicine Dr. Baird's Blood Granules; but I found that it acted so much further than the blood that I dropped the word 'Blood' and simply called them Dr. Baird's Granules.

“They are in no sense similar to the various 'Blood Remedies' now on the market. I stake my professional reputation on the merits of these Granules. The result has far exceeded my expectations.

“They are so small, being no larger than a mustard grain, that no one objects to taking them. Indeed, they are the easiest medicine to take that I ever saw. A very unusual test during the last month was had by the results of their use by certain patients who ordered by mail. These orders were all from patients scattered over the country, and were in answer to our advertisement. The orders came to me through the mails, between the 28th of May and the 7th of June. They amounted to 739 orders. Of these 739, 41 have ordered four times since, either for themselves or friends; 173 have ordered three times, or more; 415 have ordered, twice or more; 713 have ordered once since the first orders, leaving only 20 out of 739 to hear from, and the first order only one month ago. The figures tell their own story. One lady, here in New York) suffered excruciating pain from piles; she was cured in one week.

“Here is a gentleman, Mr. Zerreck, from Jersey City, who represents the woolen house of J.B. Efison & Sons, Philadelphia, Pa. He has been a great sufferer from malaria of various symptoms. He is enthusiastic over their use.” Has gained live pounds in a few weeks. Is it any wonder he is enthusiastic? I know that there is nothing equal to them for Dyspepsia, Malaria, Piles, Headache, Nervous Exhaustion, etc., as well as for purifying the blood.”

We left the doctor, well pleased with his account of a subject we were much interested in.

The Doctor also showed us his original method of operating on Piles and Rupture, when an operation is practicable. The Doctor gladly receives patients at his New York office, 157 West 23d street, AV here he may be consulted free of charge. His Granules may be had of all medicine dealers by mail free of postage. Price, 25 cents; 5 boxes, $1. Address

Dr. Baird,
157 West 23d st-, New York city.