

South, who have emancipated themselves from the enslaving notions of "chivalry"; who have learned at least that clerks and farmers' boys are none the less men for their contempt of a country which retains any vestiges of the "code." It is such Southern men who have given their section its progress since 1865, and they should not despair of the Republic now. The shouting mobs of unthinking men, white and black, are in the supremacy now. The thinking white men of the South and the black men whom they have taught to think and act with them, and to know how absolutely incompatible are "chivalry" and common sense, the duello and modern business—these are the men whose persistent, never discouraged influence will finally rid the South of every form of single combat.

The Churches and the Poor.

ONE of the noteworthy features of recent years has been the earnestness with which the relations of the Christian Church, and particularly of the various Protestant sects, to the poor have been discussed in all their aspects, religious, sociological, and even political. The general subject involves problems under all these heads the elements of which are so incompletely understood that the answers can as yet only be guessed at; and on the other hand it, with its possible or probable answers, forms an essential element in other social problems, the solutions of which will be very seriously modified by the shape which is finally given to this one. There is room, then, for temperate discussion representing every shade of opinion and belief: layman or cleric, Christian, doubter, or indifferent—all have some reasons for interest in the general question.

The discussion has been more temperate than has always been the case with kindred questions. The general feeling, even of those who have not felt or professed any sympathy with the supernatural claims of Christianity, has been that it has relations to the problems of poverty which deserve as calm and careful consideration as any purely scientific subject could receive; and this, in most cases, has given the tone to their share of the discussion. The clerical element has apparently been willing to consider the question of human instrumentality, of plans and methods, as well as that of purpose, as fundamental to the question. And the lay element of the Church, apparently encouraged by the attitude of its habitual opponents and of its pastoral superiors, has entered the discussion and contributed largely to its interest and to the value of its results. Few discussions of the kind have been so free from the *odium theologicum*, and the tone and temper of the parties have served to make many points of Church policy clearer than they had ever been before.

It is possible, then, that a secular magazine may point out one element of the problem that deserves consideration, at least. The religious side, the merely ethical side, the economical side, the political side, of the subject have received each its share of consideration; and it seems to have been assumed that a solution which could fairly cover all these points would be complete. There is, however, one purely material side of the question, which touches or qualifies each of the others—in this country, at any rate—and constitutes a secondary influence; that is, what might be called the social geography which is involved.

The drift of Americans into city life, resulting thus far in an urban population of at least twenty-five per cent., is a familiar fact. It has carried most of the "poorer classes" into the cities and kept them and their children there, so that the relations of the Church to the poor have become in our time a question of Church policy in our cities. Any influence, then, natural or artificial, which affects the distribution of classes in our cities, must have its effect on the problem under consideration. One influence of this kind might be found in the influence which facilities of water transportation have had on the location of American cities. The brilliant person who first noticed that Providence had caused so many important rivers to flow past large cities could hardly have found so many cases in point anywhere else as in the United States. Of course, there are cases of the kind everywhere. But many of the English cities, for example, date from a time when there was comparatively little intercommunication, and the presence or absence of a water-way was of far less importance than in later times. American cities all date from a time when intercommunication had fairly begun, and their founders looked of necessity to water-ways as an element in their location. Even in the case of cities which have been founded or developed under the influence of the railroad, the superior cheapness of water transportation has compelled attention.

The American city may have been built along the line of a single river or lake-front, as in the case of Cincinnati or Chicago; or in the embrace of two rivers, as in the case of New York or Philadelphia; or bays may take the place of rivers, as in the case of Boston or San Francisco. In any of these cases the water limitation will modify the social geography and social development of the city so as to make it reflect the type characteristics of its prototype, London. The "West End" of the American city will not be of necessity in the same direction. It may be developed on a bluff, away from the water, or "up-town," or on its "Nob's Hill"; but in any case it makes the social distance very great and marked between this quarter of the city and that given over to the lower and even to the middle classes. There must be some such interval in any city, but it is much greater by reason of the immovable boundary than in a city which is free to expand in *any* direction. This is especially the case with those city locations which have rivers on two sides, New York City being the best example. The confluent streams compress the city to a point; and the wealthier class, as it enlarges and seeks more room for the establishment of its own neighborhood, is pushed "up-town" very much faster and farther than in cities in which a lateral expansion is possible. However much this tendency may be relieved by ferry and railway systems and by suburban development, it cannot but have its peculiar effect in widening the modern distance between rich and poor.

And the consequent social geography of the American city must have its influence on the problems involved in the relations of the Church to the poor. How, for example, are the rich and the poor to meet together in the same house of worship when circumstances have driven their habitual residences much more than a Sabbath-day's journey apart? Is it quite fair to say that it is the architecture, the upholstery, the millinery, of a "fashionable up-town church" which keeps the

poor out of it? or to assume that a "free-pew system" is all that is needed to bring the poor into it? The building might be as barren of architectural effects as the early colonial churches; the pews might be bare boards, and open to all the world; the members might limit their wardrobes to the dress of Sisters of Charity; but the poor would not come in. Even the region in which the building is placed is almost a *terra incognita* to the poor; they live many squares to the southward, or off on the East or the West side; the public opinion of the up-town church, on such a subject as that of spending Sunday at Coney Island or up the Hudson, has no interest or importance to them; and many of them have personal objections even to the substituted relationship of the mission church. If the rich will not go to the mission church, and the poor will not go to the up-town church, how is the widening chasm be-

tween the two classes to be closed or bridged? That is the problem which is one of the results of the modern development of cities, particularly in our own country.

Our purpose is not to suggest any solution of the problem, only to ask attention to the cumulative natural forces which tend to make it continually more difficult of solution for the future. Hardly any question of our times better deserves attention. One need not even be a believer in Christianity to appreciate its gravity; it is only necessary that he should appreciate the part which Christianity has hitherto played, merely as a social force, in Germanic development. The segregation of the people into classes is always a peril in a democracy; will it be made less noxious by the failure of a social force which for so many centuries has been preaching the equality of man?

OPEN LETTERS.

The G. A. R. as seen from the Inside.

IN 1874 a Massachusetts soldier, General Charles Devens, addressing the National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic as its fourth Commander-in-Chief, spoke warmly of the plans and aims of the new order, and his words, though intended only for the hour when they were spoken, served as an outline for the future of the fraternity of veterans. He said that if old schoolmates and classmates delight to keep up the happy ties of former days, surely that affection which unites men who have suffered together must be no ordinary one. Soldiers cannot be insensible to the merits of comrades who stood with them in the ranks of war, and upon whose fidelity and courage their own lives often depended, and it would prove a grateful duty to do justice to the memory of those who have fallen, and to guard the welfare of the living, also. Whatever the public may do, he continued, either through general or State laws, for the survivors who become dependent, there must still remain many cases calling for individual assistance from private hands, and the associated veterans, while strengthening and brightening the friendship that began in the ranks, would support those private charities of which the distressed and broken might be in need.

The views of General Devens were the popular ones at that time among those who adhered to the association, but the movement was just emerging from the experimental stage, and the veterans generally considered its future as uncertain. At the present date the Grand Army has probably reached its highest limit in point of numbers and influence, and its record has been made chiefly within the last fifteen or sixteen years. The six thousand posts that now constitute it are so many local clubs devoted to those deeds of friendliness outlined by General Devens, and which are symbolized in the well-known motto, Fraternity, Charity, Loyalty. The posts of the Grand Army owe their existence entirely to the impulse of the veterans who maintain them, and are located almost wholly in the northern belt of States extending to, and across, the Missouri River, and on the Pacific coast. In the older communities, and more especially, perhaps, in the great

cities, liberal provisions for relief have been called out by the numerous cases of destitution, while the multitude of social attractions in these localities have inclined the veterans to sociability in their gatherings, and works of charity and fraternal enjoyments now distinguish the order in the East. In the newer communities the question of relief is regulated by the urgency of the need and the means that are at command to meet it; but there fraternity has the deeper meaning, and it becomes on occasions another mystic tie, showing its power alike in public and commercial circles, and in social life. Loyalty is a factor that admits of no variableness, since every one who claims the privilege of the order, or receives any of its benefits, must have been a Union soldier, or must be known to have a dependent relation to one who wore the blue.

The G. A. R. organization is shaped after the plan of an enthusiast, Dr. B. F. Stephenson, who organized the first local society, or post, at Decatur, Illinois, in 1866. Dr. Stephenson had been a surgeon in the Western army, and having while yet in the service conceived the idea of forming an association of old comrades when the war should end, he began the agitation in 1865 by correspondence with his former camp associates. As a result of this agitation a ritual was prepared from models taken from the Masons and the Odd Fellows, and Post No. 1, Department of Illinois, was instituted. Although it was intended by the founders to make the movement a national one, the causes which led to the rapid growth of the order throughout the North were quite outside of those that were operating from the little center at Decatur, Illinois. By 1866, in several States the Union veterans had already formed associations for mutual benefit. Kansas had a "Veteran Brotherhood"; Wisconsin, several independent Soldiers' and Sailors' leagues; Massachusetts, a "Grand Union Army and Navy Veterans'" association, and a "Soldiers' and Sailors' Union"; New York, a "Soldiers' and Sailors' Union"; Pennsylvania, an association called the "Boys in Blue," and Connecticut, a "United Service Club." The avowed object of all these societies was the advancement of the true interests of the soldier; in other words, the accomplishment of a work of brother-