

**A Lesson for Us.**

Collier's, January 23.—According to Mr. Thomas Dreier of Cambridge, Mass., when a man is found drunk in the streets of Copenhagen

he is placed in a cab, taken to the police station, examined by a doctor, and then sent home in the cab. Next morning the bill for the doctor and the cab is sent to the publican who served the victim with his last drink. This is all very well, but our smart lawyers would make short work of such a statute. They would prove: First, that the man was in a twilight state of illness; second, that he had had another drink later; third, that the barkeeper was trying to sober him; fourth, that the fine amounted to an unconstitutional confiscation of property; and fifth, that two commas were misplaced in the roundsman's report of the affair. That plan may work well in Copenhagen, but the United States is different.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

**THE TWILIGHT OF THE KINGS**

For The Public.

"This is the twilight of the kings."—New York World.

"This is the twilight of the kings," men say.

Too long, indeed, the will of one ordained,  
Because he thought that in himself there reigned  
Almighty God, to ope or close the way  
Of racial weal. But now a better day  
Close follows on a sun but lately waned,  
And short the night wherein the nations 'plained

There was no one to lead or give them stay.  
God's tabernacle is with humankind,

And every man may enter in to pray!  
Democracy has found a straighter way  
To truth than kings e'er shouted down the wind.  
Silent the cannon, melted pelf and crown,  
Behold "the Holy City coming down"!

RICHARD WARNER BORST.

**MEXICO.**

For The Public.

In a certain country the sheep had made war on the wolves. The dogs, tame though flesh-eating cousins of the wolves, had thrown in their strength and craft for the most part on the side of the sheep, and had put so much new courage into ram, ewe, and lambkin that victory was again and again on their side.

A few wolves and now and then even a sheep, having ventured into this country from other lands, came to grief. A very few were even slain. In all the neighboring communities of beasts the cry went up, "This killing and destruction is not to be borne! Let us rush in and stop it!" The more a given parliament was dominated by

wolves, the more surely this cry was raised and the more woful it became. Yet the valor of the sheep in the warring country, and of their dog allies, put caution also into the minds of their neighbors.

Then a wise plan was made. "We will appeal to the world-old simplicity and gentleness of sheep," declared these earnest lovers of quiet, "and will entreat them to lay their quarrel before a congress that we shall set up. Nothing shall be charged for our service and we will adjust everything about which there is dispute. So a proposal was made to the sheep. "We thank you," they answered, taking advice of their friends the dogs, "and we wish you had given thought to our troubles long ago when the wolves were eating us up. Yet since you did not, and since you have not yet settled the quarrel between sheep and wolves within your own borders, we fear to let you judge our case. We fear your congress might consider too much the vested right of wolves to have mutton. We will fight on, rather, till we have brought our foes to terms."

Some sheep and a few dogs in the neighbor countries approved this as wise; but all the wolves were agreed in declaring it both wickedness and folly.

E. H. BLICKFELDT.



## THE COMMUNITY'S DUTY TO THE POOR.

From a Private Letter by Frederic C. Howe, Commissioner of Immigration.

I am very glad to amplify what I said in Cleveland in reference to private organized charity. I do not believe in it; do not believe that organized society has any right to turn this most sacred of all functions over to any private agency. Even though it might have been justified fifty or a hundred years ago, it is no longer justified when industrial conditions make it impossible for the individual to control his work, own his tools, or create opportunity of any kind. Charity is a social, not an individual burden, and society itself should maintain all of its relief agencies. Certainly it should maintain the most sacred of all, the investigation, care and maintenance of those least able to care for themselves. It should substitute municipal relief for private relief.

Further than that, I think it is an arrogant assumption for the rich to pass upon the worthiness or unworthiness of the poor. If anyone is to perform this function it ought to be the poor themselves. Christ was very loath to judge; and the judgments registered by organized charity through paid employes do as much to destroy the self-respect of the poor and make them feel that they are charity patients as anything I know.

I am speaking just as strongly as I can about this, because I feel just as strongly as a man

could on this subject. I believe in a public police and health department, but I believe far more in a public relief department.

Further than this, we are, so far as I know, the only civilized people who sanction the idea that one class should be endowed officially with the right to look after another class. Foreign autocratic countries perform all their relief through public agencies.

I will even go farther. In my opinion private organized charity is an obstacle in the way of justice. If we had no such organizations men would think of fundamental reforms; they would think of ways and means to abolish the causes of poverty, rather than the consequences of it. I know of many instances where organized charity opposed practical movements, like motherhood pensions, minimum wages, and housing reforms. Why? It seems rather hard to say it, but I believe it was because the class which administers charity is the class responsible for poverty. It is responsible through the unjust economic conditions which this class perpetuates. And it is the very halo which organized charity throws around itself that makes it doubly difficult for us to penetrate to the real cause of industrial injustice and put an end to it.

There is nothing radical in what I am saying. Practically all of the poor feel this way; they all feel that their self-respect is undermined every time they have to go to a charity organization society, and they only go to them as a last resort. And we have no right to require this of them. You, I, or anyone else maimed, injured and distressed by the injustice of present-day conditions have a right to go to our fellows, to the city, to the community, and demand that the community itself shall bear the costs of the community's own wrongs or of industry's wrongs, for the wreckage of society today is social; it is no longer personal.

In speaking thus directly, it is with no criticism of any individuals, or any lack of respect for individual men who are engaged in organized charity. It is the system that I protest against, just as I protest against the system which permits bankers whom I respect to organize monopolies, or individual railroad men to exploit the community. As individuals I have respect for them, but I do not believe in the institutions which they, in an impersonal way, use for the exploitation of society.



## THE REGULATORS AND THE LIBERATORS.

Abstract of Address Before the Woman's Single Tax Club of Washington, D. C., December 7, 1914.  
By William D. Mackenzie.

In his recent book entitled, "Forty Years of It"—one of the most charming autobiographies ever

written—Brand Whitlock describes some of his experiences while mayor of Toledo. He tells us how his life was made burdensome by certain industrious groups of reformers who were forever invoking the policeman's club to keep other people in "the strait and narrow way" of virtue and propriety. They belonged to the Grand Army of regulators who firmly believe that all wrong-doing can be cured by passing and enforcing laws. Their historical prototypes were the English Puritans who frowned on all forms of amusement, and the Scotch Calvinists who deemed it a crime to whistle or take a walk on "the Sawbath."

The regulator is still "on the job." We begin by regulating the children. They need judicious control and restraint, but over-regulation is injurious. We have all heard of the mother whose orders were to "find out what Johnny is doing, and tell him to quit it." When the little ones become old enough, we sentence them to go to school, where they are required to sit in a straight-backed seat and keep perfectly still for several hours at a time. Inside of Johnnie and Susie are certain natural impulses which prompt them to run and jump, to talk and shout and laugh. But the school regulator says, "No, you must keep quiet now and learn your lessons."

Mrs. Marietta L. Johnson, through her wonderful Organic School in Fairhope, Alabama, is showing us the better way. She understands Nature's method of education through pleasureable self-activity, and she provides an environment which answers to the organic needs of the children. Her pioneer work is of immense importance, and it deserves more financial support than it has so far received. The old-fashioned school develops both slaves and rebels. The new Organic School will give us healthy, free-minded young men and women—fit citizens for a free republic.

Here in Washington, which ought to be the model city of the nation, we are afflicted with what are known as alley slums, and we have developed a special group of social workers who are trying to abolish the slums, or to alleviate their conditions. Here, as in other cities, the unfortunate slum dwellers are preached at, and given a generous supply of advice about health, temperance, and thrift. It is assumed that they live in the slums either because they like it or because they are wicked and indolent. In point of fact, they are too poor to live in less crowded and miserable quarters. Their wages are too low, and their tenure of employment too uncertain. What they need is less charity and regulation and more justice and opportunity.

For about forty years past, our social workers have been trying to secure legislation for the elimination of these inhabited alleys. Congress has at last been persuaded to enact a law which prohibits the occupation of these alley dwellings after 1918. But this law is only the beginning of the