

his energies and his talents to the work of ameliorating the conditions of the industrially submerged. The word "ameliorating" is used advisedly, for the reason that it expresses the limitations of individual effort toward correcting social wrongs. Jacob Riis was of the very highest type of individual citizen, but he lacked the social sense. He devoted his life to the victims of poverty, but he never appreciated the cause of poverty. He saw the bruised and mangled men, women and children, but he never grasped the real cause of their condition. His work had its place, and men will honor him for what he did, but it must be apparent upon reflection that no amount of such work will avail, so long as present conditions prevail.

S. C.



ECONOMIC ENVY.

Somewhere in Henry George's writing the original suggestion is made that Jesus opposed riches not so much in themselves as in the almost necessary method of acquiring them. The idea is that He saw how riches were not earned but came by methods in which the rights of the people were ignored. Woe to those that joined field to field had been spoken as long ago as Isaiah, and doubtless the evil had continued. If this process could flourish in England within modern times, who can say what it was in past ages? The history that speaks against the classes and for the masses is exceedingly meager. It was true in the days of Jesus as in other days that the destruction of the poor was their poverty, and He must have seen the various methods in which this proverb was true. It is altogether likely that the anathema of the Son of Man was directed primarily against the spirit and method of the rich.

So in our own day it seems to me that the hatred and envy toward the rich, of which the poor, and especially the leaders of the poor, are accused, is directed against unearned riches. There is a spirit of fairness in human nature. What a man really deserves we do not object to. Objection and envy arise when we see some one unjustly rewarded, when we see honor go where it is not deserved but is gained by chicanery or fawning, when we see riches got not by personal labor but by some means whereby the labor of others is appropriated. Such hatred, or call it envy if you please, ought to be. How shall those that love the right not hate the thing that is evil?

I do not believe that there would exist any hatred or envy toward the rich, should there be any rich, if people felt that riches were honestly earned. If you hear workingmen speak out, the

commonest expressions will be, "How did he get it?" or "Did he earn it?" or "No man can get to be a millionaire by just working." The laboring man who thinks and criticises knows that the millions are unearned millions, hence his discontent and his hatred.

If the rich men of Palestine had honestly earned their riches, can we conceive of Jesus saying of them that it would be harder for them to enter the kingdom of heaven than for a camel to go through the eye of a needle? If the rich men of our day had honestly earned their riches, can we believe that any of us would begrudge what had been squarely and fairly got? I do not think so. I believe that the whole strain and stress of the relations between rich and poor, now and always, is and has been based on the conviction that great riches do not come by honest labor, but by wicked methods of sharpness and selfishness and law, through which the rewards of labor are diverted from the laborer to the lord and master.

How this diversion mainly occurs, how the man on top is enabled to turn the earnings his way, is the great question which the modern world is face to face with and must solve. Those who are Singletaxers and have embraced the doctrine which Henry George taught, those who know the facts which he told and the facts which they see about them every day, they know that the chief method by which labor is made to lose its own reward is due to legal lordship over land and all that is implied in the word land. They believe that if you take away landlordism, mine-lordism, terminal-lordism, right-of-way-lordism, the main means and methods of robbing labor will be removed. They believe that until this is done there can be no peace in the economic world, and that hatred and envy will continue. They believe that until this is done all civic leagues, all talk of harmony between capital and labor, will be as sounding brass and tinkling cymbals. This is why in season and out of season they work to spread this gospel of peace and righteousness. This is why men rise up and will continue to rise up to preach the doctrine, men of all sorts, from McGlynn, the Priest, to Fels, the Jew. This is why the idea, in spite of slurs and defeats, goes on spreading slowly but surely throughout the world.

JAMES H. DILLARD.



THE DISEASE OF CHARITY.

In the realm of the impossible there are some things that are fixed and immovable. Although countless experiments have been made to get substitutes for all kinds of things, there are three

things for which there are no substitutes, and nature defies us to find any. These are liberty, justice, and land. There may be many substitutes for many things produced from land, but for land itself, mother earth, there is no accessible duplicate.

To find a substitute for liberty is equally impossible for in all the catalogs of imitations, there is nothing like it, Justice alone, of the three things enumerated has attracted the attention of our philanthropists and sociological sidesteppers and the best they can do is charity, as it is now administered by a large expensive and elaborate machine.

Now, when the worthy poor—imagine great numbers of worthy people who are also poor, in a republic—are at last located, what are the conditions exacted? What price do the worthy poor have to pay in exchange for the charity which they receive? Is it not the price of their self-respect, the whole of it, every last atom?

Does not self-respect lie at the bottom of a wholesome life? Is it not the foundation of virile, competent, useful American citizenship? Can a man or a woman, or even a child accept public charity and at the same time retain that pedestal of all the virtues, self-respect? Did ever a man, or woman in all the history of humanity do anything worth while who did not have a foundation of self-respect to build upon? And yet this is the price that our charity mongers compel their victims to pay; and it is one of the sublime commentaries, as the worth of this principle that many people have died and will continue to die rather than pay the price. It is too high, they simply cannot do it, so they yield up life instead.

To the Biblical inquiry: What has a man got that he will not give for his life? The answer in many cases is, self-respect. It is the most valuable, the most precious and priceless thing in the world; and this is the price of charity, that is, of the organized variety. Hence, it is the most expensive thing that man or woman has ever bought.

Now, what is charity, real charity? Is it not born of sympathy and does it not find its finest, freest, and most sincere expression in self-sacrifice? Much self-denial?

What charity is there that can compare with the multitudinous, yet unchronicled, acts of real charity, which in the daily lives and contacts of poor people in the slum and semi-slum districts lend aid and comfort to each other?

This is the only real charity practiced in our vast, complicated and hypocritical society.

It is the only kind that is not exploited in the

press, and that is not cheapened and vulgarized by the ink-smear and stentorian press agent.

What does the check of "Dives" amount to compared with unheralded, yet oft-repeated heroism in the "warrens" of the poor?

Giving money to "charity," settlements, and so forth, is usually a species of insurance premium to perpetuate privileges, when it is not used as a stimulant to a deadened and moribund conscience. "Charity giving" on the part of the rich is in all the world of organized injustice but a cheap means of purchasing immunity, at least for a time, from drastic and dangerous revolutions.

It is the cheapest and most unworthy substitute for justice that an Anti-Christian Society has yet been able to find.

HENRY H. HARDINGE.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

SINGLETAX CAMPAIGN IN COLORADO SPRINGS.

Colorado Springs, May 30.
The successful culmination of George J. Knapp's campaign for municipal Singletax in Pueblo aroused a flame of enthusiasm in Colorado Springs Singletaxers. Shortly after the November election we engaged him to manage a similar campaign for us.

All the schedules of the taxpayers for the year 1913 have been copied, and work at figuring them out is going forward to have them ready to mail to the taxpayers. An explanatory letter will accompany each schedule, showing each taxpayer how much he would have saved if the city's revenues for the year had been raised by the taxation of land values only.

The petitions will be ready to submit to the qualified voters for their signatures about the first of June. The details of the law have not yet been entirely settled, but it is certain that provision will be made for a separate assessment of the city's land by the Somers System. To make this possible a section of the law will confer the duties and powers of City Assessor upon the present Finance Commissioner.

We are confident that the law will pass because the tax-paying public is tremendously dissatisfied with the present system of assessments and taxation. This is because the Assessor, together with certain of the business interests of the city, took advantage of a change in the law, requiring that the assessment of all property be changed from the one-third valuation to the full valuation. Under cover of this, right or wrongly they managed to have down town values multiplied by two instead of by three, with the result that it was necessary to multiply the valuations of a large number of small taxpayers by four. The full valuation law itself is a source of discontent, because under Colorado law, \$200 of personal property being exempt, the full value assessments caused many of those who had been escaping under this rule to pay taxes, and many of those who had formerly been paying but two or three dollars to pay from 50 to 100 per cent or more. These different things raised