

lem—we've had the Darius Green experience. It is time to enter upon the Orville Wright stage,—patient attention to expose the good government—right ideas that govern the association of human beings in society.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### DREAM OF THE HIVE-DWELLER.

For The Public.

A Voice came out of the night  
Like song of Spirit free;  
And thro' the gloom  
Of the tenement room  
A breath of the wind-swept sea:  
"Come away to the pristine light  
Of the surging opal wave;  
O pent soul, roam  
O'er the white sea foam,  
From the Brick Hive's living grave.  
"Renew thy childhood's dream  
Where swift-winged sea-gulls nest;  
Where fadeless flowers  
Weave fairy bowers  
O'er balmy isles of rest;  
"Where choirs in swaying trees,  
With feathered magic throats,  
Vibrate the perfumed breeze  
With wild harmonious notes;  
"Fair lily, violet, rose,  
Like verdant censers swing,  
Cool, dewy water-grasses bring  
The fevered mind repose;  
"Where never more shall rule  
Greed's gold-mad drunken band,  
Or Vice promote a thriving school  
To prostitute the land.  
"Come, fly from the tumult din,  
Where Mammon's chariots pour;  
The child's young soul  
Shall lose its goal  
Mid the Million City's roar.  
"Fly, fly from the murk and doom  
Of the musty air-shaft damp,  
Where Spirit doth consume  
Like flame in a shattered lamp.  
"Come away, come away!  
From the hellish slums you've trod.  
In Nature's shrine  
Is Life's new wine—  
Thy primal gift from God."

JOSEPH FITZPATRICK.

\* \* \*

#### HOW HARDLY SHALL A RICH MAN.

Bolton Hall in the Independent.

The Kingdom of Hell is like a wealthy boy who wished to cut a fishing rod for himself, so

as to catch the minnows, but he was prevented lest he should wound his hands, because he was a millionaire's baby. But his father bought him a costly fishing rod.

Again, he wanted to feed the elephant, which was considered too menial for so rich a child, but instead he could only subscribe to the Zoological Garden Fund. The elephant was only "an Individual Case."

When the boy grew older he wished to work at something useful, but his papa said it was not necessary, and that he should Enjoy Life. So his papa gave him money, and bought him an automobile, and started him on the road.

The road was smooth and down grade all the way.

His father did not know that the road led down to Hell.

\* \* \*

#### THE CAUSE OF CITY SLUMS.

From the Bulletin of the Committee on Congestion of  
Population in New York of August 23, 1909.

It is a vital necessity that land should be kept cheap in all American cities if they are to enforce the standards of light, space and privacy which are required to conserve the health of their citizens.

This problem is going to increase the difficulty because of the gambling instinct, sometimes called "real estate speculation."

Foreign countries have appreciated the need for restricting the use of land by the government, and have taken remarkable measures to ensure cheap land; while the history of real estate development in every American city is a marked indictment of our present failure to recognize this principle.

There is in fact a vicious needless circle being worked out in practically every American city. It is generally conceded that the presence of a large population on a limited area creates a demand for land. In response to this demand for land it increases in value. The increase in value demands that land should earn more, and so it is used more intensively,—that is, more people are crowded on to it. As a result of this crowding, the land acquires even a greater value and more people are crowded upon it.

\* \* \*

#### ECONOMIC PHILOSOPHY OF AN "EGREGIOUS LAND PRE- EMPTER."

Passages from the Address of William Kent at All  
Souls' Church, Chicago, October 10, 1909.

It seems to me that we must follow the drift, take the elements at hand into consideration and cast aside as unprofitable the attempt to grasp abstract perfection in reasoning. We must, however, have a working hypothesis, and each man

must have his own. All I can do is to state how things look to me.

First of all, the world is getting what we call "better" for men; in working toward better conditions we are going with the tide, whether we call it the trend of things or the purpose of the Almighty. I believe the growing spirit of democracy is back of this development, and is a larger part of this development.

Now, if we accept a belief in progressive democracy and in equalization of opportunity, which goes with it, it is easy for us to learn the tune, but extremely difficult to supply the words. In the attempt, we find honest confusion, resulting in endless discussion.

We read that men are entitled to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." This sounds obvious, but if the state says to the soldier, "You shall go and get killed for the state," or to the murderer, "You shall hang as an example," it would appear that even life is not an inalienable privilege. As to liberty, every man is told what he may or may not do, and the doctrine of unrestrained liberty is anarchy and impossible. As to the pursuit of happiness, we must at times turn aside from the chase of that butterfly, lest we make a false step through the glass of our neighbor's hot-bed.

Freedom and slavery are of course relative terms. That amendment to the Constitution providing against "involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime," brings the question of how much of the world's work is voluntary, and how much involuntary work should be demanded for any specific breach of law or etiquette. Different times and climes have varied much in their estimates, and the newer ideals of penology are overthrowing all traditions. All of us in confessing to being miserable offenders are eligible candidates for the chain gang.

Pardon me for this array of platitudes. I merely wish to explain my own difficulties in endeavoring to provide a working scheme for just one person.

My ideal is that all of us together should aid in the task of making it easier for the average man to provide for himself and his family those necessities without which life cannot be sustained, so that with this foundation under him he may then obtain the opportunity for that breadth and depth of life that springs from the cultivation of the mind, and that happiness that comes from sympathy with and love for other men. This task must largely consist in tearing down those privileges that compel one man to divide his product unfairly with another. I cannot conceive that such developments can come except under democracy. A living democracy must show its life in its growth, not in radicalism of theory, for the utopia-makers have already pushed theory far beyond the possibilities of human nature as we know

it. The growth must come in constructive application of principles that are just, because they do not discriminate between men. "The Lord is no respecter of persons."

Taking up the questions of Privilege and Interference, we at once find two radically different points of view.

From the legal standpoint, all questioning of what are known as "vested rights," all radical attacks on what has been, constitute interference. Under this construction those vested rights, which have, for good or bad reasons, grown up among men, are sacred institutions, matters of course, and not to be defined by as malodorous a term as "special privilege."

From the popular point of view "special privilege" is a grant whereby a man or an association of men are put in position to extort from other men. From this standpoint the "interference" occurred at the time of the grant, and what the legal-minded call interference is merely an attempt to get back to a former status.

If we look back to the origin of these privileges, we shall often find that they were granted for a social purpose. The feudal war-lord was the protector of his clan in a time when war and pillage were the rule. Often we find that the privileges were taken by the strong, either by legislation or crude power, just because might made right. The commonest form of abused privileges is seen as those that have outlasted their usefulness and outgrown their cradle. A tariff based on war taxes is an example.

Roosevelt was considered by the people as the enemy of special privilege and his policies constructive and conservative. On the other hand, the vested interests considered him not only an unmitigated nuisance, but a man disregardful of right or law, the leader of busybodies and a "disturber of traffic."

Thus these policies were constructive or destructive, just as we happen to look at them. As a matter of fact, they are both—what is left of them—just as clearing land of trees for the purpose of raising corn is destructive of trees and productive of corn. It is a matter open for discussion whether in any given case there is more destruction or construction, the public welfare being considered. It happens that our people are nearly unanimous as to what they think of the sum total of those mooted policies.

To revert to what we consider needful for the growth of a democratic community, we find some things without which life cannot be sustained, and which therefore should be obtained at a minimum of effort.

Men must have light, air, water and an opportunity to get to the land for subsistence. The private, uncontrolled, perpetual ownership of land is a privilege that cuts across all these necessities. In farm lands, increasing values tend to give the

tenant farmer less of the product of his labor. In city real estate, increasing values not only increase rentals and drive the needy into smaller quarters, but also force the erection of buildings with the minimum provision for light and air. I do not believe that society has ever more radically interfered with men than by permitting an individual to fence off land and call it his own forever. Good public policy must shift up and down, between the ridiculous extreme now regarded as sacred, and the other extreme which would permit one man to invade his neighbor's turnip patch. The fox-hunting squire claims both privileges, and allows his tenant neither.

Whether under a bygone punitive system a man had his eyes put out or loses the light in a congested tenement; whether he has his air supply shut off by a noose or lack of ventilation, he can well claim interference. In a similar sense, if, though willing to work, he is unable to obtain food or shelter in an abounding world, some one or something is surely interfering.

In the same way we can describe certain forms of privilege. If society takes upon itself the right to lock up or strangle a man, it assumes a privilege. If society permits men to form undying associations to transact business and confers the right to an evasion of the utmost personal liability for debt, a privilege is granted; and when the right of eminent domain is conferred, there is privilege granted which confers a remarkably clear right to interfere with other men. When a community confers upon a person or a group the use of public property, so that he or they enjoy the necessarily monopolistic right to furnish such things as artificial light, transportation, transmission of freight or of information, it has granted a privilege. And in so far as these privileges cover matters of common necessity, and in so far as people are compelled to pay to the grantees such rates as the grantees may require, society has delegated its own greatest sovereign privilege to individual agencies—the right to tax. It is quite obvious that, starting from this end of the scale, we are not confused in our description of privilege and interference.

But if we begin with undue respect for tradition and consider land tenure as a matter of course, tenure uncontrolled and going to our "heirs and assigns forever," we easily follow along to uncontrolled grants to railroads, to municipal utility corporations, to water-power, to tariff and to subsidies, without considering them privileges; while every attempt toward regulation seems clearly an interference with vested rights or natural rights or plain rights, and the picture is reversed.

I make no claim to being a scholar in the vague science of economics, but it seems to me that the mother of the whole brood of privilege is the individual and practically uncontrolled and perpet-

ual tenure of land. As far as our country is concerned, we inherited this idea from England, where through centuries the sanctity of land owning was upheld and buttressed by land-owning lords, squires and judges—a privilege now for the first time being manfully assailed in England.

You will recall that in the days of Washington and Jefferson we shed some of the fond theories of the old country, but this remains with us, and for obvious practical reasons. A continent lay at our feet—there was too much land for anybody and everybody—and furthermore, it had to be chopped out and grubbed out and fought out. It took strong arms and strong hearts to subdue the wilderness, and those who did the task were entitled to great reward. But in land owning, the need of such encouragement is past, and there must be a change of status, if we are to have justice. High-priced land in cities results in congestion, in deprivation of light and air, and in some way or other, society has to make good every dollar received without an equivalent of service by the speculative or investing land owner.

There is a ranch in Mexico of upwards of ten million acres. The people living on that ranch cannot move off it, cannot buy an acre, and can lawfully do nothing but live at the pleasure of the owner, and starve if that should ever be his wish.

All of us have known useful people who have worked their hearts out in buying and paying for land upon which they must live at a price much of which represents speculative profits to non-producers.

And yet in the days of our pioneers such tenure seemed but a compensation for hardship and for risk. The fallacy lay in underestimating the duration of eternity as expressed in the declaration respecting "heirs and assigns forever."

This brings us to a most important factor in all economic discussion, *the element of risk*.

From betting to interest on money, from capital's demand for participation in profit to insurance rates, the factor of risk is always considered. It is strange that it is more neglected in the matter of wages than in any other computation. It would be too long a story to attempt a statement of why the soldier and the employe in a dangerous vocation are not rewarded for the chances they take. It would seem that life is cheaper than property.

Not only does economic theory justify large reward for large risk, but our sporting tendency applauds the man who conquers adversity and defies chance.

When we see how different forms of privilege are used to deprive men of the fruit of their labor, we are apt to cry-out for the installation of rights and the abolition of privilege. But no sure line can be drawn. There is no three-foot rule nor measuring tape, nor any process of trigonometrical

triangulation whereby we may distinguish privilege from right, except relatively.

Here is Theodore Roosevelt, who works for equality of opportunity, who is hated by many socialists, because he pushes ahead toward abolishing the handicaps of life and therefore postpones the great day when the "proletariat shall rise and destroy capitalism." Which words, full of sound and fury, signify nothing, because no one knows who is a proletariat or where we can draw a distinction between hideous capital and less noxious forms of private property. The words merely convey the idea that some one will shoot up some one else, with unknown results.

Roosevelt knows and feels that his course represents true conservatism as well as conservation, and the things he has done to curb greedy individualism, which is a form of anarchism, are socialistic; and yet so great is the pioneer spirit in Theodore Roosevelt, so greatly does he admire the results of this unrestrained individualism in its pioneer phases, that he sees nothing but the excrescences of socialism, and fails to name his own policies aright. Victor Berger of Milwaukee calls himself a socialist, and yet believes in the family as the unit of society, which belief necessitates a certain amount of private capital, if the parents are to hold the family together.

Theodore Roosevelt and Victor Berger would be nearly agreed, if they could drop their terminology and discuss what is for the benefit of the average man and of society.

Privilege may be right and necessary at one time and in one place, and oppressive and wrong in another. Every regulation of human conduct is interference, and the interference most bitterly complained of by the strong and greedy is the interference with their so-called right to monopolize necessities of life, so as to extort from other men an undue portion of the results of toil. They are really resenting interference with their own interference.

It further seems clear to me that so-called "vested rights" are only relative, and being conferred by society, supposedly for the benefit of society, they are properly revocable by society when they work against the general welfare. I fully expect to live to see a time when a Supreme Court will decide that all grants in perpetuity are impudent, abhorrent and contrary to public policy and therefore illegal, under some clause or other of our tortured constitution.

Both interference and privilege are exercised and permitted for the good of society. Any other theory is hostile to democracy and untenable.

That both are abused goes without saying, and that the abuses must be clearly understood and bravely fought down is also clear—else democracy must perish.

The end of the story is this: The public welfare demands altruism as its primal requisite.

Greed is the worst enemy of society. Our highest ethical ideals are the white corpuscles which must fight the disease germs in the social body; their most vigorous principle is unselfishness.

There can be no such thing as selfish honesty or honest selfishness, the terms are fundamentally antagonistic. The attempt to find more enlightened forms of selfishness is futile, because it is based on the hypothesis that selfishness is the motive power of the world. From far back of Socrates and down to Ferrer, the doctrine of selfishness is refuted by the willingness of men to make the ultimate sacrifice for their ideals.

For the life of the race altruism is vitally essential; for the worthy and comfortable life of the individual it is no less essential. Culture is dead without it, and without it life is blank.

Through the maze of doubt we find that the science of economics has greater need of experiencing religion (real religion) than real religion has of getting down to what is sometimes called "horse" or "common" sense. If we do not "love one another," if we are not patient with each other, we shall be guilty of economic waste in failing to co-operate. If we oppress each other, society has to pay the bill. If we hate each other, we shall commit the awful waste of preparing for war and going to war.

We have traveled a weary round of paradox and of uncertainty, yet of such paradox and uncertainty is constituted the world in which we live. The best we can do is to face it all with open mind, always remembering the other fellow, who, as part of society, is a part of ourselves. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," is not only idealism, but is a statement of the only condition under which life is possible to a sizable soul.

From this end of the scale must we start our reasoning, and in view of this must we seek to adapt our theories of economics. In the teachings of Jesus there is infinitely more irrefutable political economy than in all the turgid library that has been produced in the attempt to create a system of human relationship based on mathematical tables and the doctrine of selfishness.

\* \* \*

In attacking private ownership in land Leo Tolstoy, like Henry George and Henry George's predecessors, labors under the hopeless disadvantage of elaborating an argument in the validity of which every one acquiesces but whose conclusions hardly any one is willing to see enforced. The present order is a great iniquity. The present game is a bunco game. We all know it and most of us are clamoring for a change of rules which will give us a better show in the taking of tricks. But only when the majority are convinced that their last personal chance of a look-in is gone will they seriously consider abolishing the game and inaugurating a new one.—Life of Jan. 10, 1907.