

we should be called in consultation in all our illnesses, but we should be glad to have a little more explanation of the things done to us.

"We do not like to think of our doctors as veiled prophets or mysterious attendants, shut out from all sickbed comradeship except through cold professional ministrations and all the time irresponsible to our utmost needs of sympathetic assurance.

"Nor should it be considered strange if thousands among us, influenced by a sentiment just now astonishingly prevalent, should allow themselves to be disturbed by the specter of a medical trust in mystery and, like all who are trust affrighted, should cry out for greater publicity between physician and patient."

#### THE CLERGY AS ALLIES OF PRIVILEGE.

An extract from "The Menace of Privilege," by Henry George, Jr., which Prof. Franklin H. Giddings, of Columbia University, reviewing it in the New York Times of February 3, 1906, commends "to the very serious consideration of all sober-minded men."

Privilege desires to have itself called just; or at least it strives to avoid being called unjust. Aiming to control the teaching of morality, it follows the course pursued with the university: it becomes patron. It sits high in the temple. It makes large gifts. It raises shrines of splendor and grandeur in praise and thanksgiving. It sends missionaries to preach the word of faith to the benighted in remote parts.

And since the clergy are only men, who, in common with most other men, find it difficult under present social adjustments to get a living and be independent, they do what other men do—take the line of least resistance. . . .

There is no Established church in this country and no body of our clergy is dependent upon the political powers. . . . But the receivers of government favors constitute a privileged class. And it is from that class that the clergy "chiefly expect to obtain preferment." It is to them that the clergy "pay court."

"There was a time," said Dr. Falkner, rector-emeritus of Christ church, Germantown, in a sermon at the opening session of the convention of the diocese of Pennsylvania, "when the poor came to the Episcopal churches seeking and obtaining aid for body and soul, and felt that they were

helped through its ministers. Is this so to-day?" Dr. Falkner had to confess that there are churches in which "the presence of the poor is regarded as bad form. If Christ Himself were to enter them, the pew openers would ask: What is that carpenter doing here?"

That this is true of some of the Episcopal churches "in practice if not in theory," says the Churchman, "and not in Philadelphia alone, the observant church goer will find himself constrained regretfully to admit. The spirit is not dead yet of which Bishop Potter gave the other day a curious illustration in his reminiscence of an old-time sexton of Grace church, who, when taken to task for ordering a poorly dressed woman from one of the pews, replied: 'Why, if we permit that, they'll soon be praying all over the place!'"

The Churchman thinks that if that spirit is not dead, "it is dying." Yet no explanation is made as to why or how it is dying. The Churchman frankly says that "as society is organized to-day, there cannot but be distinctions of class. These arise inevitably from differences in education, opportunity, occupation, race." The word "opportunity" would suffice to explain class distinctions. Those who possess natural opportunities must have great advantages over those who have them not. The difference is as between abundance and scarcity. But do the churches preach equality of opportunity? Here and there, yes. But they are as voices in a wilderness. The generality of the churches not only do not; they avoid the subject as a lion in the way. . . .

A daily newspaper relates the distressing story of Rhode Island's "gagged and bound" clergy. "The taking of bribes," says the correspondent, "is not looked upon as a crime by some leading church workers and men of substance in the country. For this reason the pastor, unless he wishes to terminate abruptly his career of usefulness, is bound to defer to the sentiment of the community. Take the case of the big mill towns. No country clergyman can afford to offend the mill owner, who is in a large sense his patron and on whom, in some degree, his livelihood depends."

And who that has been through the hard coal regions of Pennsylvania has not found the clergy there, taking them generally, modern examples of the chaplains and confessors of the

predatory barons of old? It was formerly the practice in the anthracite fields for the operator to deduct a percentage of the men's wages for "religion." The operator divided the aggregate sum in proportion to the respective faiths of the men, but practically selected the minister in each denomination to receive the money. If, with the passing of the old-style petty autocrats from the anthracite regions and the coming in their place of the great companies, the dispensing of stipends out of the miner's earnings has all but ceased, the bondage of the clergy to the "coal owners" is no less real and deadening.

Nor is the bondage different in its effects in other places. Wherever Privilege rears its head it seeks the moral sanction. It desires and obtains the benefit of clergy. Sydney Smith declared that the theological division sought by the bishop of Peterborough could best be shown by mapping England in colors as the geologist does to indicate differences in the earth's formation. How well this might be adapted to present the dependent condition of the clergy in certain parts of the United States: black for the livery of the coal interests; dark red for the iron ore; blue for steel; brown for timber; checkered for railroad; peach-blossom pink or robin's-egg blue for the tribe of fashionable pastors who, in eloquent periods, prate to the monopoly-made rich of righteousness and justice, but omit any mention of how monopoly robs the poor.

At a meeting not long since in New York State of a southern educational society, a Protestant Episcopal bishop spoke up in deprecation of the caution in expenditures some one advised in fear of an early financial crisis in this country. "The country to-day," said he, "is in the hands of a dozen capitalists who control affairs, and who, as a matter of self-protection, will prevent any calamity!" Apparently the bishop spoke figuratively, for there is no such concentration of wealth and power as his words describe. Yet even in this sense had he anything to say in disapprobation of a state of things so opposite to the theory of our government—a government of, by and for the people, and not, as his remark implied, by and for "a dozen capitalists"? He said nothing about this.

"Things are not so bad," remarks a newspaper, "as when Wesley complained that one man would not listen to him for fear of hearing something

against cock-fighting, yet the reluctance of our preachers to touch their most influential parishioners on the raw is proverbial."

Does this explain why, when, not long since, 200 ministers of various Protestant denominations gathered in Holy Trinity church, in Philadelphia, to petition the Almighty to redeem the city from political corruption, no part of that prayer, or of the addresses that preceded or followed it, even alluded to the powerful public franchise corporations that bought and paid for that corruption in order to rule and rob the city and its people? These clergymen knew whence came the corruption funds, the campaign "dough," the bribe money. The very school-child knew that. Yet not one minister among them spoke up and said that civic rule was rotten because this railroad company, that traction company, such-and-such lighting system and so-and-so telephone corporation—the names of which all could give—were putting contamination into the civic blood. Two months later, when a gas franchise steal of unprecedented audacity shook the public from its lethargy into a tumult of indignation, these clergymen rushed in and helped kill the project; but they stirred not until the general population was surcharged with excitement. . . .

There are givers of oblations who have acquired great wealth by means contrary to the laws. These may, in seasons of great excitement, be arraigned and chastened. But there are other and larger givers who enjoy legal and social sanction, whose process of heaping up is, nevertheless, in utter conflict with morals, since it is through possession of government-made advantages, which work injustice by taking from the many much that is rightfully theirs. Why decry Mr. Rockefeller's use of the rebate, if he may without question possess the railroad and the pipe line, both properly public highways? Why charge Mr. Rockefeller with acts of tyranny or villainy in the producing and refining fields, if he have full warrant to monopolize the oil-bearing soil? If the one thing is wrong, surely the other and larger is wrong also. If it is wrong, it is against morals. If it is against morals, it is the duty of teachers of morals to condemn and denounce. Some do, but how can the many, when the Nobles of Privilege are the chief patrons of the church and have an overmastering influence?

#### A LESSON IN PROTECTION.

For The Public.

If the American people are not entirely devoid of all sense of humor, then 180 Broadway will soon become as widely known as 26 Broadway. But, whereas 26 Broadway, New York, has long been an object of hatred, has embodied the very quintessence of trust wickedness, No. 180, on the same street, should personify the American spirit, the determination of the American citizen to emulate his forefathers and revolt against trust extortion.

The colossal building, 26 Broadway, which houses the numerous subsidiary companies and departments which make up the Standard Oil company, typifies the ramifications, the strength, and the arrogance of the oil trust. The massive building seems to breathe defiance to the American people. A defiance and a warning. A defiance of all law and all restraint. A warning that whoever dares match his puny strength with that of the trust will be crushed by its remorseless despotism.

Equally does 180 Broadway personify the individual spirit, that spirit that has made America what it is, the spirit of individual determination, the spirit to do and dare, the determination to live and thrive despite the attempt of a trust to annihilate whoever will not submit to its dictation. For much as some are prone to extol bigness, it is not the great aggregations of capital that have put this country to the fore among the nations, but rather individual self-reliance, individual initiative, individual determination to achieve, no matter what the obstacles.

And the greatest evil of the trusts, in my opinion, is not their gigantic robberies, colossal as they are, but the closing up of opportunity to individual effort which inevitably results from the existence of these combinations, with their monopolistic power, to crush competition. And so I say that 180 Broadway personifies the real American spirit.

But you may ask, in what manner, in what particular, does 180 Broadway typify the American spirit? If there are any who do not already know it, I would say that 26 Broadway is a gigantic granite building, 14 stories high, 125 feet wide, some 250 feet deep, running through to that haven of stockbrokers, New street, and is used exclusively by the Standard Oil company. 180 Broadway, on the other hand, is a modest 25-foot building. It seems to stand as a protest against

the policy of concentration going on all around it, as it is going on all over the United States, under which a constantly smaller number of people are absorbing most of the wealth produced. On the street level there is nothing to distinguish it from a score of other store fronts, as the store window, like most modern stores, is a large pane of plate glass.

But the contrast is striking in another particular. The imposing granite structure, which is the home of the greediest and most ruthless of all trusts, the Standard Oil company, that band of financial pirates dubbed by Lawson as the "system," while impressive in its massiveness, yet lacks the attractive element. 180 Broadway, on the other hand, while itself an unimposing building, yet possesses a distinct attractive power. While none but the agents and satellites of the monopoly, and those compelled to do its bidding, ascend the steps at 26 Broadway, hundreds of the city's population eagerly enter the other, while scores of people are ever congregated in front of the store. Why this contrast? it may be asked. The answer is simple. Where 26 Broadway is the home of "addition, division and silence," and all who enter must swear eternal fealty and secrecy, 180 can only thrive through publicity and open and above-board dealing. The oil trust has fear and necessity for its servants; all who do business with it had better keep mum as to what they learn; but the other building derives its popularity because it is the head center of a contest against monopoly.

Its power to attract lies in the fact that behind that large plate glass window is spread out the conclusive proof of the falsity of the claim that the "system" miscalled "protection" really benefits the worker, in whose interest it is said to be established.

In that store window is displayed, in case upon case, the indisputable proof that human beings cannot be trusted with unrestrained power; that such power will almost certainly be used solely for their own aggrandizement and enrichment, and not for the benefit of those in whose interest it is claimed to be conferred, and for whom those entrusted with the power are supposed to merely act as agents.

That these agents are vociferous in asserting that they ask for the power to tax simply that they may convey the benefit to others, does not alter the case. The power to tax being