

Gov. Peabody is primarily responsible has been in bad faith. His latest action certainly is. When Moyer applied to the Federal court for relief by habeas corpus, Peabody opposed him. But when the writ was allowed, Peabody put Moyer into civil custody before the writ could be served, so as to be able to reply to the Federal court, as he has now done, that Moyer is not in his custody. The purpose of this trifling with the court, was, of course, to prevent an inquiry into the lawless conduct of the State administration.

**SOCIALISM, ANARCHISM AND CONSERVATISM.**

A signed editorial which I recently contributed to The Public (p. 115) compared radicalism with conservatism, reaching the conclusion that true conservatives strive for the preservation of what they conceive to be good, while true radicals endeavor to overthrow what they conceive to be bad. Both were credited, therefore, with honestly pursuing the same ultimate object with reference to human society; namely, that stability which is not stagnation with that progress which is not mere change.

Let us now make a concrete application of that view of the complementary functions of radicalism and conservatism.

Radicalism indicates the results of its diagnosis of society disorders in the remedies it presents. These are known as anarchism and socialism. Both born of radicalism, they are so intimately associated in the vehement condemnation indiscriminately heaped upon them by alleged expounders of conservatism, that the mass of easily satisfied people look upon and obediently denounce the two as though they were indistinguishable twins, thus avoiding the troublesome duty of really considering them at all.

As a matter of fact, however, socialism and anarchism will have nothing to do with each other; they are as unlike as white and black, and as far apart as the poles. Socialism would subordinate the individual and extend the

powers of government; anarchism would entirely free the individual from government control. All government versus no government! Both radical propositions, to be sure, but absolutely opposed to each other. If one is all right the other is all wrong.

But if neither is all right, then it is likely that neither is all wrong—that there is an element of truth in each. And, as existing institutions recognize that the individual should be in some respects free from government control and in others subject to government control, it is easy to conclude, socialism and anarchy being both condemned either with or without a hearing, that existing institutions are about right. Which pleasing conclusion is so welcome and satisfactory to the average comfortably-circumstanced conservative, so-called, that he has little ear for cries of distress, little patience with warnings of disaster, little interest in what does not appear to bear directly upon his own well-being.

But between the extremes of socialism and anarchy there is dangerous sailing. Rocks of privilege and exploitation on the one hand, and of confusion and strife on the other, leave but a narrow course of safety; and the drift of insidious currents and storms of revolution are constantly threatening. Pessimism knows of these dangers and of the unhappy voyages and disastrous wrecks that have resulted, and looks forward with fear and hopelessness. Optimism has a constant faith that there are safe waters and that they are within reach. But it is an ignorant optimism that knows not of the dangers, and a false optimism that would not guard against them. How to effectively do this, how to provide a compass that will point true, is the problem that conservatism must solve, if it would retain leadership against the claims of radicalism; for uneasiness and discontent are increasing with a growing sense of injustice and they demand that something be done.

Conservatism, being disinclined to accept radical theories, and still less inclined to advocate radical measures, naturally looks for a "happy mean" between two extremes. Therefore, viewing with disfavor anarchism, or "no gov-

ernment," on the one hand, and thorough-going socialism, or "all government," on the other hand, it naturally expects to find the normal relation between the individual and society, a medium between these two extremes. But intelligent conservatism cannot be content with a haphazard median position. If, indeed, both extremes are wrong, then there must be a normal intermediate line, and such line must be laid down as a guide. In other words, the natural law relating to society must be found and followed.

To believe that man's social well-being is not subject to natural law, is as unscientific as to believe that the material world is not governed by such law; and to drift in ignorance of it is fully as dangerous in one case as the other. To contentedly accept the mass of misery under which mankind staggers as the natural effect of God's law, rather than as the consequence only of man's ignorant or willful infraction of it, is a form of paganism which must appeal to the normal mind as utterly inconsistent with the conception of a loving and just God. The truly reverent mind must cling to the thought that it is not God's fault, but man's. And there can be no higher duty than endeavoring to determine, and to get into harmony with, the natural law governing man in his social relations; for such law will govern as inevitably as the law of gravity, whether recognized or not.

Let us note some of the obvious symptoms of disease which conservatism can hardly fail to observe in spite of any so-called optimistic tendency to look only at the best side of the case, and a practical inability to clearly see the worst side from a remote point of view.

First, it will notice an existing concentration of wealth and wealth-power in the hands of a relatively small class that is already startling; and a rate of increasing concentration that is unprecedented in the history of the world.

Second, that notwithstanding the multiplication of the productive power of the average workman of to-day, owing to marvelous discoveries and improvements in

the means of production, he is still compelled to work as hard as ever for practically a bare subsistence; that instead of increased leisure for himself, even his children are forced in increasing numbers and at a critical stage of development, into mills and factories, for long hours and a meager compensation.

Third, that the opportunity to thus work has come to be looked upon quite generally, even by dispirited workmen, as a privilege to be thankful for, and the possible loss of a secured position as an ever-present danger. And this notwithstanding limitless natural opportunities to labor, and a demand for labor products so meagerly supplied that the mass of workers, or would-be-workers, are in constant need often of even the necessities of life.

Can it be reasonably questioned that there are limitless natural opportunities for man to produce, by labor, whatever is necessary to the satisfying of his needs and desires? It is impossible really to believe that nature is at fault so long as its bounties, even as they are now imperfectly known to man's intelligence, have been little more than touched. It has been estimated that a single State of these United States would afford more than ample opportunity for the maintenance of their entire population. The productive power of the average worker, even with the crude facilities of a hundred years ago, was so far in excess of his cost of maintenance, that every addition to the force of workers was gladly welcomed as being obviously beneficial to the country. The fact that this welcome is by no means general now, notwithstanding the greatly increased productive powers of workers, is merely another symptom of the diseased condition of the social system. Nature is bountiful beyond human comprehension; to lay the blame upon her, is so unreasonable as to amount to a cowardly and impious shifting of it.

But with nature offering boundless opportunities, and the mass of mankind capable of producing far more than is needed for their material well-being, why is it that they are practically forced to make the securing of a comfortable existence the main object of

their lives? Why are poverty and the fear of poverty and their complements, wealth-power and inordinate greed, the dominant motives of action? To complacently assume that the material condition of individuals fairly measures their deserts, to close the eyes to obvious facts that disprove it, and the ears to all pleas and demands for consideration and remedy, both reason and the records of history clearly show is to invite disaster, and genuine conservatism must concede at least fair if not sympathetic consideration of the problem.

It is the main purpose of this paper to impress the need of earnestly and honestly studying the problem, not merely as an abstract question, but as one that is pressing for solution both because of present suffering and a threatening crisis; to show that an inert conservatism which now contemptuously ignores unpleasant facts and disquieting propositions of reform should be aroused into an active force that can be effective in preserving the good that has been attained by overthrowing the rapidly growing evil that threatens it. But the subject would be very inadequately presented without following further the lines of conservative investigation suggested.

It has been submitted that it is incumbent on conservatism, in condemning the remedies proposed by the antagonistic branches of radicalism, to point out a logical median line between thorough-going individualism (anarchism) and thorough-going socialism. A position that cannot be defined is too weak to command the respect of positive, logical minds. Herbert Spencer's definition is that each individual "has freedom to do all that he wills, provided that he infringes not the equal freedom of any other"; and the limitation of governmental power implied in this, and which is not accepted by socialism, is one that logical conservatives must accept. This narrows the question to "What powers must be exercised by government to secure to each individual this equal freedom to do as he wills?"

That the equal freedom of all men to labor and produce as they

will can only be secured to the weaker or less aggressive members of society by government, is denied by anarchism but it is accepted by conservatism. This, indeed, is the main purpose of government, for if equal right to labor and produce be not secured to each individual, he will be wronged to the extent that he is deprived of it. If denied him utterly he could not exist except by charity; if limited by the exactions of tribute he will be to that extent robbed of the fruits of his labor as certainly as if they were taken from him by burglary. It is the proper function of government to protect him from both forms of robbery. If government fails to do this it is inefficient. If it uses its powers directly or indirectly to further one or other, it is to that extent not beneficent but harmful; it establishes injustice instead of justice.

It behooves conservatism to consider how far existing governments fail of their beneficent purpose. To note carefully the main symptoms of disease and to search for adequate causes in the governmental regulation of society; bearing in mind that no errors or wrong-doing in administration, but only deep-seated defect in existing governmental systems can explain evil results that are world-wide. Let conservatism note that the one essential to man's physical well-being is that he shall have freedom to labor and produce as he wills, and see whether or not government regulations secure to him this freedom; whether or not they permit or enforce such restriction of it as to explain the abnormal social conditions existing throughout the world. Let it note that this is a world's problem, not a local issue.

In New York city a reassessment of real estate values was recently completed under Mayor Low's administration in which the figures were in round numbers as follows:

Total of assessed real estate .....	\$4,797,000,000
Total of improvement values .....	1,100,000,000
Total of land values.....	3,697,000,000
Total of exempted real estate, public and religious, land and improvements,	\$26,000,000

What do these monstrous land-value figures mean?

We readily understand that it is the capitalized value of the present or prospective income derivable from the bare land so assessed. Assuming that it is capitalized on a four per cent. basis this indicates a net income of \$147,000,000 annually from this bare land, irrespective of the improvements upon it. Let us consider from what source this immense annual payment is drawn, where it goes to, and why.

That it is paid by the users of the land to the legal owners is clear, and that it must be withdrawn from the proceeds of the business carried on by the user is equally so. That it goes to the legal owner is due to governmental regulations which compel it. This payment in no degree relieves the user of the land from the payment, directly and indirectly, of taxes for expenses of government, but it is merely an additional payment which government compels him to make, not for public use, but for the private use of the legal owner. If the legal owner has just claim to it, then government is merely exercising its proper functions; otherwise not. Let us consider his claim.

The improvement value is a labor product, the legal title to which is based upon the equitable right of the laborer to the fruit of his toil and the free transfer of it. It is equitably as well as legally private property.

Land value is now being clearly and generally recognized as having an entirely different basis. It is not a labor product at all but a monopoly value. It is measured not by labor cost but by demand for use; and this demand is created by population. It is, therefore, a value created by society, and not by individuals. With this fact clearly recognized it must be admitted that it is equitably public property and not private property.

This equitable right has, however, been practically set aside by the granting of legal titles by government, giving individuals exclusive control of specified portions of land, subject only to the payment of duly levied taxes thereon. Taxes have been universally so levied upon these portions of land

as to absorb only a fraction of their annual value for use, thus allowing the legal owner to collect full payment and to retain the bulk of it for his individual use. The capitalization of this retained payment approximately determines the assessed land values as quoted above for New York city, and the selling price if so transferred. The present titles have thus been mainly acquired by substantial payments to preceding holders who carry back to original government grants more or less remote. The effect of these titles has been and is to confiscate to private use the main portion of values created by society and equitably belonging to the public.

What is the natural effect of this legal confiscation of public values to private use? It is obviously a present burden of \$147,000,000 annually on the industry of New York city; and it is a corresponding burden upon industry everywhere. The recipients, as such, give nothing in return; it is a pure bounty to them. But the disarrangement of normal conditions resulting is worse in its effects than this great burden. The equal freedom of all men to labor and produce as they will is so far from being secured by such governmental regulations, that access to natural opportunities for labor (among the most important of which are those created under natural law by the close association of men in communities) can only be had by the payment of tribute to individuals. Exploitation and speculation are substituted for free competition and honest enterprise. The disease thus diagnosed adequately accounts not only for the symptoms noted but for many others.

Booker T. Washington tells a story about a slave who one day appeared in a red velvet waistcoat, and straightway was seized and taken before the master to whom it, and he, belonged. Well, Jerome managed to prove that he had not stolen the waistcoat. Calhoun Hamilton stole it and Jerome had bought it from Calhoun for a small sum. "Now, Jerome," the master said, "I admit you're not a thief, but you're a receiver of stolen goods, and that's just as bad." "No, no, sir," said Jerome, "No, no, that is not just as bad by

no means." "Why isn't it just as bad?" asked the master. "Because you wouldn't receive stolen goods yourself, sir, if it was bad." "How do you mean? Me a receiver of stolen goods? Explain yourself," the master commanded. "Well, sir," said Jerome, "you bought and paid for me the same as I bought and paid for that red waistcoat. Well, wasn't I stolen the same as the waistcoat was? Wasn't I stolen out of Africa?"

It is very unlikely that the master saw it so, but the fact is now generally recognized that the master's title to the slave was not made good by the fact that he had bought and paid for him; the slave's title to himself was always the only good title in equity, and it was liable at any time to be made good legally. The selling price of the slave was based upon the legal power of the master to appropriate to his own use a portion of the fruit of the slave's labor which equitably belonged to the slave himself. The only remedy for chattel slavery was to free the slave from this legalized extortion. The proposition that the selling price of land is just as clearly based upon the legal power of the owner to appropriate to his own use a portion of the fruits of others' labor, which equitably belongs to and should be used for the public; and that the only remedy for such tribute slavery is to free society from this legalized extortion, is now demanding consideration. Whether conservatism will be aroused to the necessity of considering it and of providing a conservative but real remedy; or whether it shall be left perhaps to develop another catastrophe such as wiped out chattel slavery, is a question that conservatives, however reluctantly, must apparently take part in deciding.

WALTER G. STEWART.

#### EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

##### INDIA.

Delhi, Ind., April 2.—India, containing one-sixth of the population of the world, should be interesting to us because of its similarity in relationship to our Philippines, and especially because our imperialists at home point with pride to England's rule here.

Let it not be assumed that England rules without criticism and protest. For the last 19 years the most intellec-