

While at home, if they saw a strange man at dusk or early morning, they would start up, and bark, and show fight, as if they took man for their proper enemy. But coming to taste the blood of swine and deer, and often eating the flesh, at length they learned to like flesh better than barley cakes; and, as they got their fill when any game was taken, and otherwise went hungry, the dogs soon became eager to hunt. They would chase any game they could see, and likewise could after a fashion follow the scent of a trail. Thus from shepherd dogs they developed to be hunters of a sort, though broken late to this work and always a little slow.

"When winter came on, as nothing presented itself for the two men to do, either by going to the city or to some village, they occupied themselves in enclosing the huts a little more carefully; they also built the yard fence stronger, and cleared for tillage the whole tract occupied. Hunting, too, was easier in winter than in summer. Tracks are plainer in the soft, wet ground; while snow makes them perfectly clear, furnishing a path right up to the game, so that the hunter has no trouble in tracking it. The game, too, is then more slow to stir, and lets the hunter approach. It is possible at times to take hares still on their forms; and deer similarly.

"In this manner our parents came to remain there, and they did not require any other means of support. In time they married us, their sons, each to the other's daughter. Both fathers died about a year ago. They delighted to tell the many years they had lived; yet in body they were strong and hale and hearty to the last. Of the mothers mine is still living.

"One of us has never in his life gone up to the city, although now fifty years old. I myself have been there twice only, the first time as a lad with my father, when we kept the herd. Once later a man came here demanding tax money—as though we had money—and he ordered me to go along with him to the city. We had no silver; and so I took my oath, protesting that I would have given it, if I had it. We gave the man the best entertainment in our power, and presented him with two deerskins. However, I went with him to the city; for he said it was necessary for one of us to go and explain matters.

"There I saw, as on the previous occasion, no end of big houses, and a great wall around the town, with huge square structures rising out of it" (he meant the towers), "and a lot of ships lying at anchor in water still as a pond" (referring to the artificial harbour). "There is nothing like that," he interjected, "where you put in, and in consequence we have the numerous wrecks. I noticed all this," he went on, "and also a great crowd of people gathered in one place and making an awful hubbub and noise. They seemed to be engaged in a general fight.

"The man brought me before certain officials and said with a grin: 'This is the fellow you sent me for. He hasn't got anything—except his long hair, and a hut of stout logs.'"

(To be concluded next week.)

* * *

HEART OF THE CONSERVATION PROBLEM .

Principal Parts of an Article by Wm. Preston Hill
M. D., Ph. D., Originally Published in the Mirror
of St. Louis, September 15, 1910, Under
the Title of "Private Property and
Public Welfare."

From the earliest period of man's existence up on this planet up to the middle of the Nineteenth century the problem that confronted the world was one of production. Namely: to produce enough to satisfy the material wants of all its inhabitants. This problem may be regarded now as practically solved. Every country today produces, or with the knowledge and power at their command could produce, wealth sufficient to satisfy the needs of all its people. The only pressing question, therefore, that confronts the present generation is that of distribution. The issue has shifted from a material to a moral and ethical problem.

The question is: Shall the mastery we have acquired over the forces of nature and the marvelous discoveries developed by modern science conduce to the welfare and needs of all the people, or shall they be the property of a few?

All the evils that seem to accompany advancing civilization—unrequited toil, involuntary idleness, undeserved and helpless poverty, with their train of misery, vice and crime—can be traced to the unjust and unequal distribution of wealth. This problem has its roots deeply enmeshed in the laws of property which have hitherto prevailed in all civilized countries.

I am in favor of private property. I recognize that private property is unquestionably the basis of civilization. I am convinced that the desire for property is one of the elements of human nature; and that a system affording opportunity for its exercise must ever be retained in organized societies. I realize that to attack private property is to undermine civilization itself. I believe that a still greater development of civilization in the future can only come from a still fuller recognition and development of the true rights of property.

But what is the fundamental basis of this right?

It rests on the fact that every man is entitled to the ownership of himself; that the powers of his mind and body are his as against all the world, and that from this ownership of himself by himself springs his right to the ownership of the ma-

terial things to which he has imparted a part of himself, to-wit: the energy of his own mind and body. This is the true basis of private property.

When I say, therefore, that I am opposed to human slavery because I am in favor of private property, I am not uttering a contradiction.

I have pointed out that private property rests on the ownership of man by himself; but slavery is the ownership of one man by another. A slave therefore could not constitute real property or wealth in their true sense.

The ownership of a slave is simply a privilege created by law, and when the law creates this privilege it is not upholding or defending the true rights of property. It is committing an assault upon them.

We find, therefore, when we analyze this problem, that the law may create and recognize certain forms of spurious property which are an assault upon the natural rights of its citizens instead of a defense of them.

Any so-called property created by law comes under this category because the law is an inanimate thing which cannot exert energy and therefore cannot create any real property or wealth. Only beings endowed with life can put forth energy-in production. The only thing the law can accomplish in its relation to property is to take away the wealth from some persons who have produced it and give it to others. It can transfer the title and thus the ownership of wealth and that is all.

To make this perfectly clear, let us suppose a community of a million people living exactly as we live today in any large city of this country. Let us suppose that a census has just been taken which has shown the property at present recognized by law to be as follows:

Land values	\$300,000,000
Buildings and improvements ...	200,000,000
Personal property	300,000,000

Now let us suppose for the sake of this argument that 700,000 of those people conspire against the other 300,000 to reduce them to slavery, and that there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent it, and that they succeed in accomplishing their purpose. In addition, then, to the property above enumerated you would have another species of property, the value of a slave, averaging about \$1,000. If the census enumerator made his return after that change he would for those 300,000 slaves be compelled to add another item of \$300,000,000,

Let me now ask the question, Has the real wealth of that community been increased by that apparent increase in property? Evidently not. On the contrary, their real productive power would have been diminished rather than increased by that change, because a slave never invented or produced anything, or worked at all, except under

coercion. Even the ancient Greek poet, Homer, said, "The day that makes a man a slave takes half his worth away." Here then we have the creation of \$300,000,000 of apparent property which has diminished the real wealth of the community.

What then does the value of a slave consist of?

It consists of a special privilege created by law which permits the owner to appropriate to his own use any wealth which the slave may create in the future. In my illustration the value of that privilege was put at \$1,000. It had nothing to do with any work already done by the slave, nor with any intrinsic value in him. If related entirely to the future production of the slave.

The law, then, when it made a slave, did not create any value. It simply transferred the title to the wealth which the slave might produce in the future, from him to his master. This slave value, therefore, was in the nature of a mortgage on the future production of the slave which the slave had to make good with his labor.

Other property which owes its existence to law, and not to labor, comes under the same category.

A land title, for instance, is simply a special privilege created by law. If we analyze it we shall find that it is very similar in its nature to the ownership of a slave. The value of land, like the value of the slave, consists in the power of the owner to appropriate to himself the future production of other men who must use that land or have dealings with the people who do use it.

The value of land, therefore, like that of slaves, is entirely a future value. It is in the nature of a mortgage on the future production of the producers of wealth who must use that land directly or indirectly in the course of their daily pursuits. The law, therefore, when it grants this privilege is simply transferring the title to a part of the future production of the community, from those who produce it to the land owner.

There is no need to refute the fallacy that no one will improve land unless they own it in perpetual fee. The greatest improvements, amounting to millions of dollars, have always been made on leased land. We can accomplish the same result by recognizing only the title of occupation and use, subject always to the superior right of the community.

Now let us apply this proposition to the question of the conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Pinchot in his Minneapolis speech said, "Conservation has captured the nation. It is a moral issue and the heart of it is this: For whose benefit shall our natural resources be conserved, for the benefit of all the people or for the benefit of a few?"

Take for illustration the Alaska coal lands. Certain big capitalists have tried to secure a title to these lands from the government for a song which would make them the absolute owners for-

ever. Why do they want this unlimited and unconditional title? Do they want it merely to work those coal veins? Certainly not! What they want is the power to keep everybody else from working those veins. They want the exclusive right and the power that goes with such a title. To-wit: the power to transfer to themselves the future production of the workers of that locality and of all the people who will have to use that coal in the future.

Such a grant, of course, would make them enormously rich at the expense of the future workers of Alaska and of the United States. But such a grant is an outrage upon the American people and an assault upon the true rights of property.

The complete effect of private property in land is not felt until *all* the natural resources have passed into private ownership. In other words, until the monopoly is complete. As long as some natural opportunities are open to the people they still have the choice of working for themselves, and this prevents them from being squeezed down to starvation wages; and it also prevents the land that has already passed into private ownership from becoming as valuable as it does after the monopoly is complete.

For this reason the great Italian economist, Dr. Achille Loria, has classed communities into free or slave communities according to whether the land has been completely monopolized or not. He has demonstrated that where all the natural opportunities have been completely monopolized, such communities take on all the aspects and ethics of a slave society. This shows us what we shall come to in this country when all our natural resources have been monopolized, which is rapidly being accomplished.

Some years ago we were startled by the news of the eruption of the volcano Mt. Pelee, in the Island of Martinique, and the destruction of St. Pierre, its principal city. This was a great calamity and a traveler visiting the island some years later expected to find a scene of desolation and waste. But to his amazement he found that the island was more prosperous than it had been for generations. Wages had greatly advanced and industry was active as never before. He inquired the reason of this strange phenomenon from some resident friends and was told the following: Nearly all the rich land owners of the island lived in St. Pierre, and most of them, including all their relatives, had been annihilated by the eruption. Furthermore, the records of land titles and of mortgages and debts had also been completely destroyed. To be sure, many of the laboring class had also been killed, but the remainder of them went out upon the land to work, free from the obligations which weighed down their predecessors.

The destructive forces of nature which had wrought such havoc and confusion in the island had also destroyed the parasites who had been

absorbing the greater part of the fruits of their labor. The volcanic forces which had exploded the mountain had also lifted the burden of special privilege from their backs and they stood forth free men once more to satisfy their wants by their own labor as nature intended.

Of course, if the same system of land tenure were retained it would in time produce the same results and create other landlords and other tenants and the same accompanying extremes of riches and poverty.

But the point that this illustration makes clear, is that the only real wealth that had been destroyed were the buildings and implements and the personal property therein contained. The destruction of land titles and landlords had not destroyed any real wealth—the land was still there and just as productive. When they were annihilated the only thing that had been destroyed was the power that some men possessed to appropriate the labor of others without returning them any equivalent and the price that that privilege could sell for in the market.

What we call a land value, therefore, does not constitute any real wealth or property. The price of land only represents the wealth the owner is able to absorb from all those who produce it, either with head or hands, by reason of his law-created privilege.

When this selling price is reduced by taxation, or wiped out by the repeal of the privilege, no real value is destroyed. The only change effected would be that the producers would retain for themselves that portion of their own production which had been previously absorbed by the land-owners. The title to their future production would be transferred back to themselves, and with it all the value represented by the selling price of land.

There is one respect in which land ownership differs from slave ownership. A slave had to be maintained whether he worked or not and therefore there was a loss when he was idle. Furthermore, he did not increase in value. But land may be held idle for speculation and increase in value so as to show a profit to its owner. This feature of land ownership is the most injurious of all because it hinders, delays and prevents production.

Now what is the remedy?

It is very simple. Abolish all those spurious forms of property created by law which are nothing more than licenses for some men to rob their fellows. Establish the principle in our constitutions that human rights and property rights shall be forever identical, inseparable and indivisible; that we will recognize no property rights except those which spring from human rights.

Let us retain, as some of our politicians are at this late day advocating, the national ownership of our natural resources—to-wit: our forests, water powers, mineral deposits, etc.—and develop them

by leases with royalty to the government. Let us adapt our taxing system so as to bring about as nearly as possible an equality of opportunity for all the people.

The great French Convention said that every disorder of society can be traced to some fundamental neglect, denial or contempt of human rights. This is true and explains the troubles in our social organism today. Under the guise of law we have been denying the true rights of property and of men. When we cease doing this, then justice and law will, for the first time, mean the same thing and we shall have ushered in the higher civilization of the future.



Jolly American Tourists Approaching the New York Custom House.



(Portion of a cartoon by John T. McCutcheon, in the Chicago Tribune of September 23, 1910. Republished here by courteous permission of the Tribune.)

vision, and the duty of creating a government of our industrial action to correspond to them."

The "Interview" which follows the well-told story of Lincoln's immortal "idea," is somewhat obscure in its method of reasoning, and the reader feels inclined to ask a great many questions which the "Reporter" (who grinds out his interrogations like a machine) utterly fails to press. When we have been carried through the author's interpretation of some of the striking parables related in the Gospel of St. Matthew, we lay hold of the purpose of the book in demonstrating what the human race is born to attain, namely, "the idea of the Unity of the Action of the Universe." Very possibly, if Mr. Church had sent out to the reviewer his previous work, "The Enigma of Life," there would have been great light shed on the problem which he deals with in "An Interview," which appears, after all, to be unconcluded. The main satisfaction which we derive from it is that we are all destined, soon or late, to come into the conception of the power that carries on the action of the universe and to work in perfect unity with it.

A. L. M.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- Socialistic Fallacies, by Yves Guyot. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York. Price \$1.50 net.
- John Brown, 1800-1859: A Biography, Fifty Years After. By Oswald Garrison Villard. Published by Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston and New York, 1910.
- Great Cities in America; Their Problems and Their Government. By Delos F. Wilcox. Published by the Macmillan Co., New York, 1910. Price, \$1.25 net.
- The life and Times of Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, by Arthur Howard Noll and A. Philip McMahon, published by A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, 1910. Price, \$1.00 net.

PAMPHLETS

Direct Legislation.

"Direct legislation," a 20 page pamphlet published by the Direct Legislation League of the State of Washington (4144 14th Avenue N. E., Seattle), is a well conceived and well executed presentation of this subject in brief form. "Shall our Legislature control the people or shall the people control the Legislature?" is a motto of the pamphlet as it is the touchstone of any man's democracy: The principle of direct legislation is rightly declared by the pamphlet in these words: "The legislature should advise and lead, but when that body misleads, we must have the power to stop it." Better terms than "advise" or "lead," and "misleads" would be "represent" and "misrepresents." The answers to questions are excellent; for example: "Objection—The laws are too complicated for the people to under-

BOOKS

AN UNDEVELOPED IDEA.

An Interview. By Daniel W. Church, Chicago. The Berlin Carey Co. Price \$1.

This book opens with a simple and interesting sketch of the life and mission of Abraham Lincoln, who left us "the heritage of his idea and his