

# THY KINGDOM COME

An Address Delivered in the City Hall, Glasgow

By Henry George

We have just joined in the most solemn, the most sacred, the most catholic of all prayers: "Our Father which art in Heaven!" To all of us who have learned it in our infancy, it oft calls up the sweetest and most tender emotions. Sometimes with feeling, sometimes as a matter of course, how often have we repeated it? For centuries, daily, hourly, has that prayer gone up.

"Thy kingdom come!" Has it come? Let this Christian city of Glasgow answer—Glasgow, that was to "Flourish by the preaching of the Word."

"Thy kingdom come!" Day after day, Sunday after Sunday, week after week, century after century, has that prayer gone up; and to-day, in this so-called Christian city of Glasgow, 125,000 human beings—so your medical officer says—125,000 children of God are living whole families in a single room.

## Prayer is Not Enough

"Thy kingdom come!" We have been praying for it and praying for it, yet it has not come. So long has it tarried that many think it will never come. Here is the vital point in which what we are accustomed to call the Christianity of the present day differs so much from that Christianity which overran the ancient world—that Christianity which, beneath a rotten old civilisation, planted the seeds of a newer and a higher. We have become accustomed to think that God's Kingdom is not intended for this world; that, virtually, this is the devil's world, and that God's Kingdom is in some other sphere, to which He is to take good people when they die—as good Americans are said when they die go to Paris. If that be so, what is the use of praying for the coming of the king-

dom? Is God the loving Father of whom Christ told—is He a God of that kind; a God who looks on this world, sees its sufferings and its miseries, sees high faculties aborted, lives stunted, innocence turned to vice and crime, and heart-strings strained and broken, yet, having it in His power, will not bring that kingdom of peace, and love, and plenty and happiness? Is God indeed a self-willed despot, whom we must coax to do the good He might?

### **We Must Work as Well as Pray**

Think of it. The Almighty—and I say it with reverence—the Almighty could not bring that kingdom of Himself. For, what is the kingdom of God; the kingdom that Christ taught us to pray for? Is it not in the doing of God's will, not by automata, not by animals who are compelled, but by intelligent being clothed with free will, intelligent beings knowing good from evil. Swedenborg never said a deeper nor a truer thing, nor a thing more compatible with the philosophy of Christianity, than when he said God had never put anyone into hell; that the devils went to hell because they would rather go to hell than go to Heaven. The spirits of evil would be unhappy in a place where the spirit of good reigned; wedded to injustice, and loving injustice, they would be miserable where justice was the law. And, correlatively, God could not put intelligent beings having free will into conditions where they **must** do right without destroying that free will. Nay! Nay!

“Thy kingdom come!” When Christ taught that prayer He did not mean that men should idly phrase these words, but that for the coming of that kingdom they must work as well as pray!

Prayer! Consider what prayer is. How true is the old fable! The waggoner whose waggon was stuck in the rut knelt down and prayed to Jove to get it out. He might have prayed till the crack of doom, and the waggon would have stood there. This world—God's world—is not a world in which the repeating of words will get waggons out of mire or poverty out of slums. He who would pray with effect must work!

### Divine and Human Intelligence

"Our Father which art in Heaven." Not a despot, ruling by his arbitrary fiat, but a father, a loving father, Our Father; a Father for us all—that was Christ's message. He is Our Father, and we are His children. But there are men, who, looking around on the suffering and injustice with which, even in so-called Christian countries, human life is full, say there is no Father in Heaven, there can be no God, or He would not permit this. How superficial is that thought! What would we as fathers do for our children? Is there any man who, having a knowledge of the world and the laws of human life, would so surround his boy with safeguards that he could do no evil and could suffer no pain? What would he make by that course of education? A pampered animal, not a self-reliant man!

We are, indeed, His children. Yet, let one of us fall into the water, and if he has not learned to swim he will drown. And if he is a good distance from land and near no boat or anything on which he may get, he will drown anyhow, whether he can swim or not. God the Creator might have made men so that they could swim like the fishes, but how could He have made them so that they could swim like the fishes and yet have adapted this wonderful frame of ours to all the purposes which the intelligence that is lodged within it requires to use it for? God can make a fish; He can make a bird; but does He, His laws being what they are, make an animal that might at once swim as well as a fish and fly as well as a bird? That the intelligence which we must recognise behind Nature is almighty does not mean that it can contradict itself and stultify its own laws. No; we are the children of God. But what God is, who shall say? But every man is conscious of this, that behind what he sees there must have been a power to bring that forth; that behind what he knows there is an intelligence far greater than that which is lodged in the human mind, but which human intelligence does in some infinitely-less degree resemble.

### The Power of Man

Yes; we are His children. We in some sort have that power of adapting things which we know must have been exerted to bring this universe into being. Consider those great ships for which this port of Glasgow is famous all over the world; consider one of those great ocean steamers, such as the "Umbria," or the "Etruria," or the "City of New York," or the "City of Paris." There, in the ocean which such ships cleave, are the porpoises, there are the whales, there are the dolphins, there are all manner of fish. They are today just as they were when Caeser crossed to this island, just as they were before the first ancient Briton launched his leather-covered boat. Man today can swim no better than man could swim then, but consider how, by his intelligence, he has advanced higher and higher, how his power of making things has developed, until now he crosses the great ocean quicker than any fish. Consider one of these great steamers forcing her way across the Atlantic Ocean, 400 miles a day, against a living gale. Is she not in some sort a product of a god-like power—a machine in some sort like the very fishes that swim underneath.

Here is the distinguishing thing between man and the animals; here is the broad and impassable gulf. Man among all the animals is the only maker; Man among all the animals is the only one that possesses that God-like power of adapting means to ends. And is it possible that man possesses the power of so adapting means to ends that he can cross the Atlantic in six days, and yet does not possess the power of abolishing the conditions that crowd thousands of families into houses of one room? When we consider the achievements of man and then look upon the misery that exists today in the very centres of wealth; upon the ignorance, the weakness, the injustice, that characterise our highest civilisation, we may know of a surety that it is not the fault of God; it is the fault of man. May we not know that in that very power that God has given to His children here, in that power of rising higher, there is involved—and necessarily involved—the power of falling lower.

### **The Father of All Men**

"Our Father!" "Our Father!" Whose? Not my Father—that is not the prayer. "Our Father"—not the father of any sect, or any class, but the Father of all men. The All-Father, the equal Father, the loving Father. He it is we ask to bring the kingdom. Aye, we ask it with our lips! We call Him "Our Father," the All, the Universal Father, when we kneel down to pray to Him. But that He is the All-Father—that He is all men's Father—we deny by our institutions. The All-Father who made the world, the All-Father who created man in His image, and put him upon the earth to draw his subsistence from its bosom; to find in the earth all the materials that satisfy his wants, waiting only to be worked up by his labour! If He is the All-Father, then are not all human beings, all children of the Creator, equally entitled to the use of His bounty? And, yet, our laws say that this God's earth is not here for the use of all His children, but only for the use of a privileged few!

### **The Boy and the Brickyard**

There was a little dialogue published in the United States, in the west, some time ago. Possibly you may have seen it. It is between a boy and his father when visiting a brickyard. The boy looks at the men making bricks, and he asks who those dirty men are, why they are making up the clay, and what they are doing it for. He learns, and then he asks about the owner of the brickyard. "He does not make any bricks; he gets his income from letting the other men make bricks." Then the boy wants to know how the man who owns the brickyard gets his title to the brickyard—whether he made it. "No, he did not make it," the father replies; "God made it." The boy asks, "Did God make it for him?" Whereat his father tells him that he must not ask questions such as that, but that anyhow it is all right, and it is all in accordance with God's law. The boy, who of course was a Sunday school boy, and had been to church, goes off mumbling to himself "that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to die for all men"; but that He so loved the owner of this brickyard that He gave him the brickyard too.

This has a blasphemous sound. But I do not refer to it lightly. I do not like to speak lightly of sacred subjects. Yet it is well sometimes that we should be fairly shocked into thinking.

### The Right of the Child

Think of what Christianity teaches us; think of the life and death of Him who came to die for men! Think of His teachings, that we are all the equal children of an Almighty Father, who is no respecter of persons, and then think of this legalised injustice—this denial of the most important, most fundamental rights of the children of God, which so many of the very men who teach Christianity uphold; nay, which they blasphemously assert is the design and the intent of the Creator Himself.

Better to me, higher to me, is the Atheist, who says there is no God, than the professed Christian who, prating of the goodness and the Fatherhood of God, tells us in words as some do, or tells us indirectly as others do, that millions and millions of human creatures—[at this point a child was heard crying]—don't take the little thing out—that millions and millions of human beings, like that little baby, are being brought into the world daily by the creative fiat, and no place in this world provided for them. Aye! tells us that, by the Laws of God, the poor are created in order that the rich may have the unctuous satisfaction of dealing out charity to them—and attributes to the same Laws the state of things which exists in this city of Glasgow, as in other great cities on both sides of the Atlantic, where little children are dying every day, dying by hundreds of thousands, because having come into this world—those children of God, with His fiat, by His decree—they find that there is not space on the earth sufficient for them to live; and are driven out of God's world because they cannot get room enough, cannot get air enough, cannot get sustenance enough.

I believe in no such god. If I did, though I might bend before him in fear, I would hate him in my heart. Not room for the little children here! Look around any country in the civilised world; is there not room enough and to spare? Not food enough? Look at the

unemployed labour, look at the idle acres, look through every country and see natural opportunities going to waste. Aye! that Christianity that puts on the Creator the evil, the injustice, the degradation that are due to mans injustice, is worse, far worse, than Atheism. That is the blasphemy, and if there be a sin against the Holy Ghost, that is the unpardonable sin!

**"Give Us This Day Our Daily Bread"**

Why, consider—"Give us this day our daily bread." I stopped in a hotel last week—a hydropathic establishment. A hundred or more guests sat down to table together. Before they ate anything, a man stood up, and, thanking God, asked Him to make us all grateful for His bounty. So at every meal-time such an acknowledgment is made over well-filled boards. What do men mean by it?

If Adam, when he got out of Eden, had sat down and commenced to pray, he might have prayed till this time without getting anything to eat unless he went to work for it. Yet food is God's bounty. He does not bring meat and vegetables all prepared. What He gives are the opportunities of producing these things—of bringing them forth by labour. His mandate is—it is written in the Holy Word, it is graven on every fact in nature—that by labour we shall bring forth these things. Nature gives to labour and to nothing else. What God gives are the natural elements that are indispensable to labour. He gives them, not to one, not to some, not to one generation, but to all. They are His gifts, His bounty to the whole human race. And yet in all our civilised countries what do we see? That a few men have appropriated these bounties, claiming them as theirs alone, while the great majority have no legal right to apply their labour to the reservoirs of Nature and draw from the Creator's bounty. And thus it comes that all over the civilised world that class that is called peculiarly "the labouring class" is the poor class, and that men who do no labour, who pride themselves on never having done honest labour, and on being descended from fathers and grandfathers who never did a stroke of honest labor in their lives, revel in a superabundance of the things that labour brings forth.

### Heaven Parcelled Out : An Allegory

Mr. Abner Thomas, of New York, a strict orthodox Presbyterian — and the son of Rev. Dr. Thomas, author of a commentary on the Bible—wrote a little while ago an allegory. Dosing off in his chair, he dreamt that he was ferried over the River of Death, and, taking the straight and narrow way, came at last within sight of the Golden City. A fine-looking old-gentleman angel opened the wicket, inquired his name, and let him in; warning him, at the same time, that it would be better if he chose his company in Heaven, and did not associate with disreputable angels.

"What!" said the new-comer, in astonishment, "is not this Heaven?"

"Yes," said the warden, "but there are a lot of tramp angels here now."

"How can that be?" asked Mr. Thomas. "I thought everybody had plenty in Heaven."

"It used to be that way some time ago," said the warden; "and if you wanted to get your harp polished or your wings combed, you had to do it yourself. But matters have changed since we adopted the same kind of property regulations in Heaven as you have in civilised countries on earth, and we find it a great improvement, at least for the better class."

Then the warden told the new-comer that he had better decide where he was going to board.

"I don't want to board anywhere," said Thomas; "I would much rather go over to that beautiful green knoll and lie down."

"I would not advise you to do so," said the warden; "the angel who owns that knoll does not like to encourage trespassing. Some centuries ago, as I told you, we introduced the system of private property in the soil of Heaven. So we divided the land up. It is all private property now."

"I hope I was considered in that division?" said Thomas.

"No," said the warden, "you were not; but if you go to work, and are saving, you can easily earn enough in a couple of centuries to buy yourself a nice piece. You get a pair of wings free as you come in, and you will have no difficulty in hypothecating them



for a few days board until you find work. But I would advise you to be quick about it, as our population is constantly increasing, and there is a great surplus of labour. Tramp angels are, in fact, becoming quite a nuisance."

"What shall I go to work at?" asked Thomas.

"Our principal industries," responded the warden, "are the making of harps and crowns and the growing of flowers; but there are many opportunities for employment in personal service."

"I love flowers," said Thomas, "and I will go to work growing them. There is a beautiful piece of land over there that nobody seems to be using. I will go to work on that."

"You can't do that," said the warden. "That property belongs to one of our most far-sighted angels who has got very rich by the advance of land values, and who is holding that piece for a rise. You will have to buy it or rent it before you can work on it, and you can't do that yet."

And so the story goes on to describe how the roads of Heaven, the streets of the New Jerusalem, were filled with disconsolate tramp angels, who had pawned their wings, and were outcasts in Heaven itself.

You laugh, and it is ridiculous. But there is a moral in it that is worth serious thought. Is not the ridiculousness in our imagining the application to God's Heaven of the same rules of division that we apply to God's earth, even while we pray that His will may be done on earth as it is done in Heaven?

#### **The Christian Gospel of Justice**

Really, if we could imagine it, it is impossible to think of Heaven treated as we treat this earth, without seeing that, no matter how salubrious were its air, no matter how bright the light that filled it, no matter how magnificent its vegetable growth, there would be poverty, and suffering, and a division of classes in Heaven itself, if Heaven were parcelled out as we have parcelled out the earth. And, conversely, if men were to act towards each other as we must suppose the inhabitants of Heaven to do, would not this earth be a very Heaven?

"Thy kingdom come." No one can think of the kingdom for which the prayer asks without feeling that it must be a kingdom of justice and equality—not necessarily of equality in condition, but of equality in opportunity. And no one can think of it without seeing that a very kingdom of God might be brought on this earth if men would but seek to do justice—if men would but acknowledge the essential principle of Christianity, that of doing to others as we would have others do to us, and of recognising that we are all here equally the children of the one Father, equally entitled to share His bounty, equally entitled to live our lives and develop our faculties, and to apply our labour to the raw material that He has provided. Aye! and when a man sees that, then there arises that hope of the coming of the kingdom that carried the Gospel through the streets of Rome, that carried it into Pagan lands, that made it, against the most ferocious persecution, the dominant religion of the world.

#### **Why Christianity Was Persecuted**

Early Christianity did not mean, in its prayer for the coming of Christ's kingdom, a kingdom in Heaven, but a kingdom on earth. If Christ had simply preached of the other world, the high priests and the Pharisees would not have persecuted Him, the Roman soldiery would not have nailed His hands to the cross. Why was Christianity persecuted? Why were its first professors thrown to wild beasts, burned to light a tyrant's gardens, hounded, tortured, put to death by all the cruel devices that a devilish ingenuity could suggest? Not that it was a new religion, referring only to the future. Rome was tolerant of all religions. It was the boast of Rome that all gods were sheltered in her Pantheon; it was the boast of Rome that she made no interference with the religions of peoples she conquered. What was persecuted was a great movement for social reform — the Gospel of Justice—heard by common fishermen with gladness, carried by labourers and slaves into the Imperial City. The Christian revelation was the doctrine of human equality, of the fatherhood of God, of the brotherhood of man. It struck at the very basis of that monstrous tyranny that then oppressed the civilised world;

it struck at the fetters of the captive, and at the bonds of the slave, at that monstrous injustice which allowed a class to revel on the proceeds of labour, while those who did the labour fared scantily.

That is the reason why early Christianity was persecuted. And when they could no longer hold it down, then the privileged classes adopted and perverted the new faith, and it became, in its very triumph, not the pure Christianity of the early days, but a Christianity that, to a very great extent, was the servitor of the privileged classes. And, instead of preaching the essential Fatherhood of God, the essential brotherhood of man, its high priests engrafted on the pure truths of the Gospel the blasphemous doctrine that the All-Father is a respecter of persons, and that by His will and on His mandate is founded that monstrous injustice which condemns the great mass of humanity to unrequited hard toil. There has been no failure of Christianity. The failure has been in the sort of Christianity that has been preached.

#### **Equal Natural Rights Can Be Secured**

Nothing is clearer than that if we are all children of the universal Father, we are all entitled to the use of His bounty. No one dare deny that proposition. But the men who set their faces against its carrying out say, virtually:—"Oh, yes! that is true; but it is impracticable to carry it into effect!" Just think of what this means. This is God's world, and yet such men say that it is a world in which God's justice, God's will, cannot be carried into effect. What a monstrous absurdity, what a monstrous blasphemy! If the loving God does reign, if His laws are the laws not merely of the physical, but of the moral universe, there must be a way of carrying His will into effect, there must be a way of doing equal justice to all His creatures.

And so there is. The men who deny that there is any practical way of carrying into effect the perception that all human beings are equally children of the Creator, shut their eyes to the plain and obvious way. It is, of course, impossible in a civilisation like this of ours to divide land up into equal pieces. Such a system might have done in a primitive state of society.

We have progressed in civilisation beyond such rude devices, but we have not, nor can we, progress beyond God's providence.

There is a way of securing the equal rights of all, not by dividing land up into equal pieces, but by taking for the use of all that value which attaches to land, not as the result of individual labour upon it, but as the result of the increase in population, and the improvement of society. In that way every one would be equally interested in the land of his native country. Here is the simple way. It is a way that impresses the man who really sees its beauty with a more vivid idea of the beneficence of the providence of the All-Father than, it seems to me, does anything else.

One cannot look, it seems to me, through nature; whether he look at the stars through a telescope, or have the microscope reveal to him those worlds that we find in drops of water, whether he consider the human frame, the adjustments of the animal kingdom, or of any department of physical nature, he must see that there has been, a contriver and adjuster, that there has been an intent. So strong is that feeling, so natural is it to our minds, that even men who deny the Creative Intelligence are forced, in spite of themselves, to talk of intent. The claws on one animal were **intended**, we say, to climb with, the fins of another to propel it through the water. Yet, while in looking through the laws of physical nature, we find intelligence we do not so clearly find beneficence. But in the great social fact that as population increases, and improvements are made, and men progress in civilisation, the one thing that rises everywhere in value is land, we may see a proof of the beneficence of the Creator.

#### **How Natural Revenue Grows**

Why, consider what it means! It means that the social laws are adapted to progressive man! In a rude state of society where there is no need for common expenditure, there is no value attaching to land. The only value which attaches there is to things produced by labour. But as civilisation goes

on, as a division of labour takes place, as men come into centres, so do the common wants increase, and so does the necessity for public revenue arise. And so in that value which attaches to land, not by reason of anything the individual does, but by reason of the growth of the community, is a provision intended—we may safely say **intended**—to meet that social want. Just as society grows, so do the common needs grow, and so grows this value attaching to land—the provided fund from which they can be supplied. Here is a value that may be taken, without impairing the right of property, without taking anything from the producer, without lessening the natural rewards of industry and thrift. Nay, here is a value that **must** be taken if we would prevent the most monstrous of all monopolies. What does all this mean? It means that in the creative plan, the natural advance in civilisation is an advance to a greater and greater equality instead of to a more and more monstrous inequality.

### **Help to Bring the Kingdom on Earth**

“Thy kingdom come!” It may be that we shall never see it. But to the man who realises that it may come, to the man who realises that it is given to him to work for the coming of God’s kingdom on earth, there is for him, though he never see that kingdom here, an exceeding great reward—the reward of feeling that he, little and insignificant though he may be, is doing something to help the coming of that kingdom, doing something on the side of that Good Power that shows all through the universe, doing something to tear this world from the devil’s grasp, and make it the kingdom of righteousness. Aye, and though it should never come, yet those who struggle for it know in the depths of their hearts that it must exist somewhere—they know that somewhere, sometime, those who strive their best for the coming of the kingdom, will be welcomed into the kingdom, and that to them, even to them, sometime, somewhere, the King shall say: “Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.”

## LITERARY NOTE

### Vision and Fervour of "The Prophet"

Henry George made a number of speaking tours through Great Britain and Ireland. On the first of these, in 1882, he wrote: "Sure as we live, we have kindled the fire in Britain, and there is no human power that can put it out."

As the result of a visit to Scotland in 1884 the Scottish Land Restoration League was founded. During that visit the Duke of Argyll attacked "Progress and Poverty" in "The Nineteenth Century" magazine. The Duke entitled his article, "The Prophet of San Francisco," the term, of course, being applied contemptuously. But George's followers adopted it, so that, originally written as a jibe, it became popular as a title. Henry George replied to the Duke of Argyll in the same journal in which the Duke's article had appeared. The reply was styled "The Reduction to Iniquity." Later, the two articles were published under one cover, entitled "The Peer and the Prophet," and the Land Restoration League spread them through city and town, and into the Highlands. The term, "Prophet of San Francisco," was used as a slogan, while "The Peer and the Prophet" was as a gospel to the people, showing them their rights in the land.

In 1889, when Henry George made an extensive Lecturing Tour in Britain, he wrote that he found a decided advance: "It was not this time to hear a strange thing that they gathered; it was to hear something of which they had more than an inkling . . . Our ideas are in the air: men get them without knowing where they come from; men get them without thinking they are getting them."

The first lecture of the series was in Camberwell Green Chapel, London, Mr. Albert Spicer (afterwards Sir Albert) in the chair: the last in the Dublin Rotunda with Michael Davitt in the chair.

In his addresses Henry George uncompromisingly attacked the existing social system, and politicians and

churchmen who upheld it. Giving precept and example, with vivid word picturing, he showed the failure of charities and welfare movements to secure adequate relief of social conditions. He pilloried those complacent Christians who prayed and gave alms and let injustice continue. He proclaimed that prayer and church going would not serve instead of justice; that there was no substitute. And when he spoke at Glasgow he made telling reference to the motto of that city: "Let Glasgow flourish by the preaching of the Word."

Many good Scottish folk were disturbed and alarmed by Henry George's forthright pronouncements and his criticism of some of their cherished institutions. But his manifest honesty of purpose, the earnestness with which he pleaded the case for the poor, and his references to the Scriptures to support the doctrine of equal rights in the land, were compelling. He won by his sincerity and fervour. Truly was it said of him by William Jennings Bryan: "He was as guileless as a child and as earnest as a martyr."

Some of the addresses were delivered in churches, and on Sunday evenings; and, with a service of prayer and hymns, the address really became a sermon. This was so with the chief lecture in Scotland, in the City Hall, Glasgow, on Sunday, evening, April 28, 1889. The Rev. J. M. Cruickshank, of the United Presbyterian Church, assisted by two choirs, conducted the service, and the hall was crowded. Henry George delivered a moving address, his text being "Thy Kingdom Come."

The Sermon was printed by the Land Restoration League, and, like "The Peer and the Prophet," was spread throughout Scotland. It was subsequently published in England and in America, and became one of the popular Penny Booklets, many editions of which have been issued. The letterpress has now been carefully examined and corrected, for an edition of 5,000 copies—portion of a general reprint of six of Henry George Lectures, 30,000 in all.

May, 1932.

P.J.M.

Reprinted 1946, 5,000 copies.

## WHO IS RICH AND WHO IS POOR

If we set aside for the moment the narrower economic meaning of service, by which direct service is conveniently distinguished from the indirect service embodied in wealth, we may resolve all the things which indirectly satisfy human desire into one term—service; just as we resolved fractions into a common denominator. Now, is there not a natural or normal line of the possession or enjoyment of service. Clearly there is. It is that of equality between giving and receiving. This is the equilibrium which Confucius expressed in the golden word of his teaching that in English we translate into "reciprocity." Naturally, the services which a member of a human society is entitled to receive from other members are the equivalents of those he renders to others.

Here is the normal line from which what we call wealthiness and what we call poverty take their start. He who can command more service than he need render is rich. He is poor who can command less service than he does render or is willing to render; for in our civilisation of today we must take note of the monstrous fact that men willing to work cannot always find opportunity to work. The one has more than he ought to have; the other has less. Rich and poor are thus correlatives of each other, the existence of a class of rich involving the existence of a class of poor, and the reverse; and abnormal luxury on the one side and abnormal want on the other have a relation of necessary sequence. To put this relation into terms of morals, the rich are the robbers, since they are at least sharers in the proceeds of robbery; and the poor are the robbed.

This is the reason, I take it, why Christ, who was not really a man of such reckless speech as some Christians deem Him to have been, always expressed sympathy with the poor and repugnance of the rich. In His philosophy it was better even to be robbed than to rob. In the kingdom of right-doing which He preached, rich and poor would be impossible, because rich and poor in the true sense are the results of wrong-doing. And when He said, "It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven!" He simply put in the emphatic forms of Eastern metaphor a statement of fact as coldly true as the statement that two parallel lines can never meet.

Injustice cannot live where Justice rules, and even if the man himself might get through, his riches—his power of compelling service without rendering service—must of necessity be left behind. If there can be no poor in the kingdom of Heaven, clearly there can be no rich.

And so it is utterly impossible in this, or in any other conceivable world, to abolish unjust poverty without at the same time abolishing unjust possessions. This is a hard word to the softly amiable philanthropists who, to speak metaphorically, would like to get on the good side of God without angering the devil. But it is a true word nevertheless.

—From "The Science of Political Economy," by Henry George.