

the latter. Should that seem just, however, a little less than one per cent. would be added (about .93).

	Pilgrim, Worcester.	Fourth, Hartford.	Tabernacle, Jersey City.	Plymouth, Milwaukee.	United States combined.
1887.....	18.54	20.83	16.81	14.79	8.99
1888.....	7.86	4.87	9.23	10.94	5.47
1889.....	3.83	10.75	9.19	5.73	5.95
1890.....	5.15	11.56	22.01	5.57	5.44
1891.....	12.38	9.34	3.84	8.44	5.83
1892.....	3.75	9.47	5.71	1.05	5.82
Totals.	51.51	66.82	66.79	46.52	37.50
Ann'l Av.	8.58	11.14	11.13	7.75	6.25

Had all the Congregational churches of the United States attained the same average of gain on confession during these six years, with the institutional churches, it would have increased their total by a hundred thousand converts.

In certain quarters of every city the institutional church has its place. It will not soon, possibly may never, become universal. Dives, in church as elsewhere, will fare sumptuously, and from his own hired pew will nod conscious or unconscious approval to conventional discourse.

It would seem, however, from the above statistics, that there is large room for work along this line; and when we consider the sad fact that the Congregational churches of America, by present methods, add, on the average, only about six per cent. yearly to their numbers by conversion, it is not difficult to see where the real danger of spiritual decadence lies. Already, for some years, the cry of young Germany has been, "Away from the Church! it will do nothing for us." It may be a selfish judgment; unjust, entirely, it is not. It is sympathy in the concrete that men need, and from the hand that gives they very quickly penetrate to the motive that inspires.

It is very much to be desired that Christians who look kindly upon this work shall not permit themselves to be prejudiced by the intense utterances of a few men who feel called to be agitators, and perhaps prophets of a revolution speedily to come. As a rule, these churches are showing much good sense in moving along lines of evolution and not revolution. We are bound, in all Christian charity, to accept as the true genius, spiritually, of this forward movement the aim enunciated by one of its most busy pastors: "Every one of these multiple agencies for helping men is held absolutely as a means to a spiritual end."

It is useless for churches in close contact with the masses to seek to salve their wrongs with the Christian's panacea that the evils of this world will be set right in the world to come. The unregenerate will tell us that, since the same God rules in either world, the certain misery of this casts a shadow on the possible happiness of that, and that, at any rate, they do not propose to wait for it.

The British Independent Labor Movement

By William Clarke

I use the word movement rather than party to describe the new force in British politics on purpose to avoid giving the impression that the Independent Labor party is conterminous or absolutely identical with the Labor movement in politics. But at the same time the Independent Labor party is the largest factor in this wide movement. I write about it because, by universal admission, it is now becoming the most critical deciding factor in English politics; and its action is likely to determine the result of that general election which cannot be delayed longer than the early spring of next year, and which may come any day.

The Independent Labor party was formally constituted at Bradford early in 1893, its second conference having been held early this year in Manchester. Its leading spirit is James Keir Hardie, the well-known Labor member of Parliament. In the House of Commons Mr. Hardie has undoubtedly been a failure, a fact entirely due to his obvious contempt and disgust for the House. He is rarely there, and when he does appear he acts by himself

in such an erratic way that no one can co-operate with him. All the same he is an able man of persistent determination, a singular elevation of character, and a religious spirit curious and rare among our hard, secularistic workmen. I have rarely heard a better speaker both as regards matter and tone and style, in all of which respects he is distinctly the superior of John Burns. And yet, owing, doubtless, to a very pretty knack at "log-rolling," Mr. Burns is a power in the House, while Mr. Hardie is almost unregarded. Keir Hardie is a miner by calling, and was for years Secretary of a large miners' union in Scotland; but he actually represents a large working-class constituency in East London, where his most active supporters are to be found among our excellent friends and untiring workers of Mansfield House, the Congregationalist "settlement" in that crowded region. Hardie is too much of an idealist, too little of a practical politician, to succeed in Parliament; but as a Labor leader he is deservedly popular, and his pale face, with thick hair and beard, and rather dreamy eyes, crowned with the workman's cap he always wears, is as well known as almost any face in England.

The Secretary of the Independent Labor party is Tom Mann, also an idealist, and a fine, warm nature. Mr. Mann has injured his career and prospects by his uncertainty as to the field he was intended for. At one time he headed the Dockers' Union, which he resigned to become candidate for the secretariate of our largest trade-union, the Amalgamated Engineers. He was unsuccessful, and was then induced to become Secretary of the London Reform Union, a useful body created to push the so-called "London Progressive Programme." Then Mr. Mann was very nearly induced to take orders in the Anglican Church, his fervent religious nature having commended him to those who thought that the presence of such a man in the Church would be an immense leverage for that body in its appeal to the working classes. But Mr. Mann thought better of it (very wisely, as I think), joined the Independent Labor party, and was elected its Secretary. His time is mainly employed in traveling about the country, looking after the branches of the party, and in working up his own candidature; for Mr. Mann is Labor candidate in the Colne Valley division of Yorkshire, a large mixed, but mainly industrial, constituency, where he is opposing a capitalist Liberal of a type peculiarly obnoxious to the working classes. Mann is thirty-eight years old, is well read, a fluent speaker, a highly skilled workman, and an untiring organizer.

I can refer to only two other personalities in the Independent Labor party—John Lister and Robert Blatchford. Mr. Lister is a "gentleman" of a good old Catholic family, and he resides in an old hall near to the busy manufacturing town of Halifax. A good speaker, an honest and generous man respected by all who know him, still comparatively young, and unmarried, Mr. Lister devotes all his time and energy to the Labor cause. He is a Labor candidate at Halifax, where, even if he be not successful, he will bring about the defeat of one of the Liberal representatives, an insignificant young Whig whom the Liberal party was unwise enough to foist on the constituency. I do not suppose that any of my American readers ever heard of Robert Blatchford, yet he is one of the best-known men in England. His articles, under the *nom de plume* of "Nunquam," appeared for a long time in the columns of the Manchester "Sunday Chronicle," a paper with an enormous circulation, and were literally devoured by tens of thousands all over the North of England. Here was Socialism preached every Sunday in the industrial districts, in language so racy, fresh, pungent, that I do not recall anything like it in English journalism. Mannerism there was, but it was the mannerism of original power; one felt that there was a Man behind it, and a man who had toiled and suffered. "Nunquam" for some reason fell out with the "Sunday Chronicle," and started a paper of his own, the "Clarion," which is widely read all over the North and Midland districts of England. There are many other active men in the party, such as Ben Tillett, the dockers' leader; Pete Curran, an Irish workman of remark-

able power; Fred Hammill, who may possibly bring about John Morley's defeat at Newcastle; but the real leaders of the Independent Labor party are the four I have named.

As for its programme, the party has carefully eschewed the word Socialist, but as carefully adopted a Socialist creed. In a word, it is for all measures which have for their object the placing of the land and other necessary instruments of industrial production under the control and ownership of the people. But the central point about the party is that every one of its members is required to separate himself totally from the existing Liberal and Conservative parties; he cannot be a member of their clubs or caucuses, nor can he at any time vote for their candidates. It is significant to note that in Bradford, where the movement is strongest, the ablest and best known of the younger local Radicals has just separated himself in this way from the Liberal party, and has taken his influence, which is not small, and his money, which happens not to be small either, into the camp of Independent Labor. At this moment, I am informed by the most experienced Liberal organizer in the North of England, the Independent Labor party can dominate the political situation in Manchester, Bradford, Newcastle, Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield, Oldham, Bolton, Burnley, a portion of Hull, and a part of Sheffield. I give this statement, not on my own authority, but on his, and I know none better. So strong is the movement in Manchester that the editor of the Manchester "Guardian," the most powerful Liberal organ, perhaps, in England, refused recently to run for Parliament against an Independent Labor candidate, on the ground that he really agreed with him in politics, and that if Independent Labor was not recognized, it would be all up with the Liberal party.

And at length the Liberal party is slowly, very slowly, beginning to realize this capital fact in the political situation. Indeed, it is the one subject which is now engrossing attention. With a section of the Irish actively hostile and the other section not too trusting of the intentions of Lord Rosebery, with the standard of revolt raised in Wales, with Mr. Labouchere and numbers of Radicals not too friendly to a Cabinet presided over by a peer and a Rothschild's son-in-law, with a tiny and precarious Parliamentary majority, a serious revolt of Labor would smash the Liberal party and put it in opposition till the end of the century. Lord Rosebery's recent visit to Manchester was understood to have for its object a *modus vivendi* by which Liberalism and Labor should form a working alliance. If that was so, his lordship made a dismal failure. It was a poor, weak, I might say paltry speech; utterly unworthy of the subject or the occasion; and its sole effect has been to strengthen the determination and straighten the backbone of the Labor party.

It is perhaps doubtful whether the actual Labor vote in Parliament will be increased by the next general election. The Labor candidates I have named and others will be more likely, perhaps, to keep Liberals out than to get in themselves, though I do look for the success of Mr. Tillet at Bradford, Mr. Lister at Halifax, and Mr. Curran at Barrow. The importance of the movement is twofold. It means the break-up of the complex force called Liberalism, and therefore indirectly aids the Conservative cause for the time being. Indeed, though I hesitate to predict confidently, I do not see how the Liberals can carry the next election. They cannot gain in Ireland, they may lose through divisions in Wales, they will certainly lose in Scotland, they stand to lose nearly a score of seats in the industrial parts of England, and it is estimated they will lose five seats in London. Where the corresponding gains are coming from I do not see. This collapse of the Liberal party, however, is coincident with the conscious adoption of the Socialist idea as a working practical political force—for this is what the Labor movement in politics means. Some of his not very judicious supporters said that Lord Rosebery would be able to cope with this new situation. As a matter of fact, he has not hitherto shown himself able to do so: things look distinctly worse for the Liberals than under Mr. Gladstone's premiership.

London, England.

The Poorest of the Poor

By Jno. Gilmer Speed

Whether or not there can be two standards by which to measure the value of money, there can be no doubt in the world that both wealth and poverty each have many standards. Both are great or small according to the necessities of the class to which the rich man and poor man belong, and in some measure to the personal characteristics and habits of the individuals. Once in New England I was driving with an old farmer, and some of the men of the neighborhood came under criticism. Speaking of a prominent man in the village, I asked, "He is a man of means?"

"Well, sir," the old farmer replied; "he ain't got much money, but he's mighty rich."

"He has a great deal of land, then?" I asked.

"No, sir, he ain't got much land, neither, but still he is mighty rich."

The old farmer, with a pleased smile, observed my puzzled look for a moment, and then explained:

"You see, sir, he ain't got much money, and he ain't got much land, but still he is rich, because he never went to bed owing any man a cent in all his life. He lives as well as he wants to live, and he pays as he goes; he don't owe nothing, and he ain't afraid of nobody; he tells every man the truth, and does his duty by himself, his family, and his neighbors; his word is as good as a bond, and every man, woman, and child in the town looks up to and respects him. No, sir, he ain't got much money, and he ain't got much land, but still he is a mighty rich man, because he's got all he needs and all he wants."

I assented to the old farmer's deductions, for I thought them entirely correct. When a man has all he needs and all he wants he is certainly rich, and when he lacks these things he is certainly poor. Now, the poor man's possessions—defining riches and poverty in this way—may be double those of the rich man, and the correctness of the definition still be good. I have an illustration in point. I know a man who lives with his family in a country village. His income is, without doubt, larger than that of any man in the township, and still he is in all probability more harassed by want of money than any man in the neighborhood. He requires so many things that he always spends something more than he makes, and therefore he is always in debt, always importuned by his creditors. Now, according to the idea of the old New England farmer, my friend is really poorer than the artisans and gardeners and laborers who work for him. And I know that this gentleman counts himself among the poorest of the poor. Whether this be so or not is what I shall briefly discuss in this paper.

The incompetents, the paupers who cannot live without the assistance of the charitable, are outside the range of the discussion. They have been overcome by poverty, and have pitifully sunk below the level of the poor. The very poor man is one who, notwithstanding hard work, finds it difficult to supply himself and his family with the necessities of life. The necessities of life—ah, there's the rub! What is an absolute necessity for one man would be a wasteful luxury for another; so the amount of a man's income is by no means a measure of his wealth or poverty. The laborer who earns one dollar and a quarter a day needs certain things, and without the money in hand he can get none of them. He rents his rooms, he feeds and clothes his family, he takes his amusements, on the basis of his wage; and the great majority of laborers in this country are not only contented but happy in their lot. The artisan who makes two dollars and a half a day lives just a trifle better than the laborer, and his excess of wage enables him, as a rule, to lay by something for the rainy day. The more skilled mechanic who receives three or four dollars a day lives a trifle better than the artisan, and, when he is thrifty and blessed with a careful wife, is pretty sure to save a tidy bit every year. Now, these are all poor people according to the ordinary standard, but they are all self-supporting, self-respecting, and do not belong to the class defined as the poorest of the poor. Singularly enough, however,