

root of self- and race-preservation, and can be denied only by such as would deny to society all right whatever to exist or to function. For all others, to comprehend the Single Tax is to accept it.

THE CHRISTIAN'S ANTI-POVERTY CREED.

(For the Review.)

By **GEORGE WALLACE.**

Some of my readers, brethren in the church, have not fully approved of certain articles I have had published from time to time in relation to the church and poverty. They have even expressed surprise that a loyal church member like myself should in any respect criticise the church. But if a church member, who is also a believer in Jesus Christ, discovers that the church is teaching or endorsing policies and practices not supported by the teachings of Christ, how can he be deemed loyal unless he faithfully points out what seems to be wrong? For example, I do not believe the enforced poverty of God's children is according to God's will; so believing, I cannot remain silent if the church defends the conditions which produce this poverty. That is a simple proposition.

DANGER OF MISLEADING THE PEOPLE.

The church by refusing to accept the teachings of Christ may do much harm; it may delude those who are within its fold, and it may cause many others to reject the Christian religion because they cannot accept the religion taught by the church. In conversation people have admitted to me they were led into agnosticism by the idea that such a religion was Christianity, but afterwards they discovered by study of the New Testament that it was not in line with the teachings of Christ.

REAL FAITH IS NECESSARY.

The Apostle tells us that without faith it is impossible to please God. Every Christian should have implicit faith that the world will be overcome through Christ. My own belief is very simple in relation to poverty. I believe in the God who made the earth and all the people thereon; that the teachings of Jesus Christ show us how to live in harmony with the will of the Creator; that any church refusing to accept these teachings of Christ has no right to call itself a Christian church.

Let me formulate and more fully elaborate these beliefs, with the hope of helping to make the truth clear to all:

FACTS AND DEDUCTIONS.

1. God made the earth and He made all the people; He gave them the earth with all its bounties for their use.

2. These bounties of nature are sufficient to furnish to all the children of God a comfortable livelihood, provided they are permitted to use them in accordance with His will.

3. This God, our Creator, is also our Heavenly Father. He impartially loves all His children; therefore He cannot be pleased with any system which permits some to seize upon the land or other bounties of nature for which they have no use, and thus extort a toll from others of His children for the privilege of using what is necessary to their gaining a livelihood.

4. Poverty is abnormal in a land of plenty; to force poverty on any of God's children is an offense against God.

5. The accumulation of unearned wealth inevitably causes undeserved poverty; laws which encourage this accumulation must also be an offense against God.

6. Undeserved poverty has not been discovered in any modern nation except where unearned wealth exists side by side with it.

7. Unearned wealth and undeserved poverty are always found where the private monopoly of land is permitted; it must be that they exist because of this monopoly, unless some other cause appears.

8. It always occurs that the greater the unearned wealth the greater the poverty; the gap between them is widest in countries where land monopoly is greatest in proportion to the land area and the population.

9. The true sense of the word Christianity is found in the applied teachings of Christ.

10. Churchianity has come to mean the applied teachings of the church; it should be changed so as to mean the applied teachings of Christ.

11. Jesus Christ always sympathized with the poor; when he mentioned men of great wealth they were not spoken of with commendation.

12. Christianity never made a pauper; if churchianity encourages the making of paupers it differs from Christianity.

13. True Christianity never endorses wrongdoing, and therefore cannot consent to whatever may be the cause of enforced, undeserved poverty; it follows that if churchianity consents to such wrongdoing it is antagonistic to true Christianity.

14. If churchianity is antagonistic to Christianity, the fact should be easily recognized and the antagonism overcome; if it cannot be overcome, churchianity should be blotted out. But it must be overcome.

15. If the church makes no protest against the causes of undeserved poverty, it is as guilty as if it consented; by silence it does consent.

16. The church cannot escape the duty of fighting against every cause which produces undeserved poverty; every individual in its fold should insist on the fight being kept up till the victory is won; those who fail to do so are not loyal members of the church.

SUGGESTIONS WHICH NATURALLY FOLLOW.

If any article of this creed is wrong I would be glad to have some one point out the error; otherwise I must assume that it is not erroneous.

What is the fact as to the church's attitude on the creation of poverty? It either consents or it does not. As it seems to consent, I have from time to time by urgent exhortation and loving entreaty tried to lead the clergy—they being the leaders of the church—up to a higher standard of Christian faith and action. How can a loyal member of the church and lover of humanity do otherwise? When spoken truth is needed to save humanity, silence is **sinful**.

The established church of England has thirty-nine articles in its creed; here I have only sixteen. So you may conclude I am not trying to start a new church or a new religion. No new religion is necessary if the church can be induced to accept and boldly proclaim the real teachings of Christ.

THE CHURCH'S ENVIRONMENT.

My suggestion that the clergy are too much hampered by the wealth represented in the pews, has been more earnestly disputed than any other. Yet many believe it to be true. At least no other explanation is given for the church's silence concerning the causes which produce poverty and distress among the children of God.

In the agitation raging in England, Bishops and other clergymen boldly oppose proposed laws intended to help humanity, on the ground that such laws would deprive the church of its financial support. Their acts imply a belief that the church of Christ can exist only by keeping a large proportion of God's children in abject poverty! What an insult to the Christ! While not a believer in Socialism, and not a disciple of Karl Marx, I must confess he was at least partly right when he declared in one pithy sentence that "the established church of England would rather abandon the thirty-nine articles of its faith than give up the thirty-ninth part of its income."

In a recent Roman Catholic publication it was seriously urged that if the wealth of the rich should be lessened it would seriously cripple the church and charitable institutions. Other churches seem to have a similar belief, though not so boldly stated.

But the true believer in Christ accepts no such doctrine. It is not necessary to maintain poverty—that is, poverty-creating conditions—in order to keep alive the church of Jesus Christ. As to charitable institutions, there would be less and less need for them as poverty decreased. Let us do justice to all; then buildings now used for charitable purposes may be devoted to other uses.

WHY NOT MAKE A TEST?

So long as the belief widely prevails that wealth in the pews controls or hampers the utterances of the pulpit, the church will be greatly retarded in its work. In fact, it cannot carry on the work successfully. Is that belief well founded?

The best way to determine the matter as to this belief, is for the clergy to boldly utter the truth as Christ gives it to us; then let us see the effect pro-

duced on the wealthy pewholders. The effect on the common people must be beneficial. Why not try it, earnestly and persistently? Then the truth will fully appear, and we will know if the present belief is well founded.

THE SINGLE TAX BRIEFLY STATED.

(For the Review.)

By ELIZA STOWE TWITCHELL.

- (1) Man is both an individual and also a social being.
- (2) As an individual being he creates a value by his labor of body, mind and spirit—by his whole individual Self.

LABOR-SAVING.

(3) As a social being he creates a labor-saving value by his co-operative efforts with others, and also by his social needs.

(4) These values are always expressed separately. They are always distributed separately, by means of two separate Channels, and by only two.

(5) The value of man's individual-labor-products is expressed in prices and distributed through the Channel of WAGES, i. e. WAGES for labor, and WAGES for capital.

(5) The socially-produced-value is always expressed in land value, and distributed through the Channel of GROUND-RENTS, i. e. the annual price for the use of land.

MORAL.

(a) The full value that each individual creates, (by his labor, his capital, or by both), should go to the individual that so creates it—or at least approximately so.

(b) The value that is created by all socially should go to all collectively. This value can be collected by the State by assessing land according to its true value, and the sum thus collected can be used for the social good, in which all would share equally, i. e., all would share equally in the value produced by all collectively.

PRACTICALLY.

(1) Today, the social value (some two billion dollars annually) is most of it flowing out of its natural Channel, going to enrich a few—the great Monopolies. It is this social value that gives them their unearned wealth, their industrial strength to keep up prices, and also their power to corrupt politics.

(2) Because a comparatively few individuals are thus given the power to reap the chief amount of the social value that is created by all, the WAGES of both labor and capital are lower than is their natural level, times are hard, and many are unable to find employment.