

above named, they have been working along false lines, having hold of "the wrong end of the stick," in that they hold this leprosy bacillus to be the *cause*, instead of the *product* of the disease, their work will prove to have been futile and will do harm instead of good.

The germ theory as at present prevailing is about the worst of all the blundering notions ever entertained by the medical profession; it has led, and is still leading us on wrong lines and, in practice doing a vast deal to counteract all the benefits from improved general and personal sanitation. Never, until we find water running naturally uphill, will it come to pass that adding filth to filth will tend even in the most remote degree to prevent or "cure" any of the filth-diseases. The laws of health and life will never be reversed to favor the "business" of the serum manufacturers, and ere long the medical profession will cease to play into the hands of these companies, for the people will in time get their eyes open and refuse to submit their bodies to the debauch of serum inoculations.

In view of the foregoing exposé of the "anti-toxin" plague, and of the evi-

dence of not only the uselessness, but of the pestiferous results of vaccination in the best vaccinated and re-vaccinated nation in the world, Japan, as shown in the article on this topic in the September issue of *The Twentieth Century*, all of which applies to the results in this country, only in less degree owing to the active efforts of anti-vaccinationists and anti anti-toxinists, what is the natural and proper attitude of all well-informed and conscientious physicians towards the proposed "Medical Trust"? If in face of the most absolute and complete evidence of the vast misery conferred upon the people by means of universal blood-poisoning with vaccine virus, a practice condemned by every scientific statistician in this country and Europe who has studied the statistics of small-pox and vaccination, the great proportion of medical practitioners still favor and practise the treatment, and seek by every means to compel the poor-devil laity to submit to it by compulsory laws, what disasters might we not expect from giving them practical control of all matters relating to general and personal sanitation?

---

## SOCIALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM

By Hon. Lucius F. C. Garvin

**I**T has recently and truly been said that, "to hold a just balance between the socialistic and the individualistic ideal is indeed a problem to try the souls of statesmen."

At the present time the drift of public sentiment appears to be towards Socialism; particularly strong seems the tide among clergymen.

But whatever the real trend of thought may be, it is well to consider definitely and dispassionately in what direction we ought to go. To drift is objectionable, since movement from the truth is to lose time in a slow and painful retracing of our steps.

In discussing this question fundamen-

tally it will become necessary to take a long look ahead.

State Socialism means that the government, by which is meant organized society, should own and operate all great industries. Not only the sewerage, the post-office and the public schools, already in the hands of the government, but anything else of like nature, together with farming, mining, manufacturing, merchandising and commerce. In a word, all enterprises conducted upon a large scale are to be government functions.

This attitude is understood easily, is proclaimed definitely by avowed Socialists, and does not seem to be denied, as the ultimate outcome, by Christian So-

cialists and others who are inclined to the doctrine.

I do not intend to review the staple arguments against such absorption by the State of private enterprises, the survival of the lazy, the stupidity of the many, the impossibility of an artificial adjustment of supply to demand, etc. In fact, I lay little emphasis upon these forbodings, which might or might not materialize. The rejection of Socialism is not contingent upon the correctness of our prognosis as to its effects, but, rather, upon the folly of bandoning the present individualistic *régime* unless and until it is shown to be erroneous and unsuccessful.

In order to determine whether Socialism should be substituted for Individualism, it is first necessary to have clearly in mind what the individualistic idea is.

Unlike Socialism in this respect, the meaning of Individualism is not clearly defined. Its supporters do agree that such pursuits as agriculture, manufactures, trading and mining should be carried on by private parties, whilst the government itself, including not only the legislative, judicial and executive departments, but police, sanitation and highways, must be looked after by public officials. Sanitation in thickly settled communities usually is held to include both sewage removal and water supplies.

But in order to determine definitely what functions ought to be exercised by the individual and what by organized society, the State, some rule for guidance must be formed. Why, for instance, must sewerage be attended to by public authorities? The answer is, not only that every dwelling must have it, but that in the nature of the case it is a monopoly and calls for the use of the public highways. When such functions are performed by private corporations they require franchises, are called semi-public or quasi-public, and involve the exercise by the State of the sovereign power of eminent domain. May it not be laid down as a principle, that when the land of any citizen is taken from him forcibly by the State, it should be returned by

the State and not handed over to other citizens?

Evidently the characteristics of public utilities differentiate them wholly from business which, like the store of the factory, are competitive and need no special government authorization. By using the above definition, it is easy to classify nearly all occupations as either public or private, as socialistic or individualistic.

To the public evidently belong all franchises for transportation, communication or transmission, namely: rail-railroads, canals, pipe-lines, telegraph lines, street railways, gas plants, electric companies, water companies, telephones, and, eventually, heat and power and cold when transmitted along or across highways. These include the carrying of passengers, freight, express packages, the mail, together with stations, power-houses, express-offices, post-offices and everything which pertains directly to such businesses. They also include city wharves, which are nothing but an extension of the highways.

Up to the present time many public functions remain in private hands. Bridges and turnpikes, with some exceptions, have been transferred from private to public ownership. Waterworks largely are taken over, and, outside of the United States particularly, the other public-service corporations are being supplanted gradually by public authority. It is only a question of time when special privileges of this character shall have been removed entirely from private control and ownership, and that consummation will accord with the theory of the Individualists as well as with that of the Socialists.

The most difficult question for the Individualist is the public-school system, which possesses none of the characteristics of a natural monopoly. In order to be consistent it seems necessary to declare against the public schools. But their abandonment should follow, and not precede, the abolition of all private monopoly. When, in consequence of the destruction of all special privilege, every self-supporting family has a sufficient income to edu-

cate fully all the children, then, and then only, need the schools become private. It will still be necessary for the State by law to guarantee an education to every child, but the number of children in any community to be educated by public charity, like adult paupers, would be few indeed. Under these changed conditions the variety of instruction offered would be far greater than is now possible in the public schools. Moreover the question is now academic, and can be dealt with practically only by a later generation.

Whilst, with our light, public education is classed as socialistic, it must be admitted that in progress of time some things, originally wholly private, become a public charge. The supply to families of water and light are illustrations of past changes; and future changes will include a like distribution of heat, cold and power.

Another industry not easily classified is the ownership and operation of mines and quarries, where the material to be unearthed is very limited in quantity and without an effective competitor. Such limitation has been claimed for the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania, as distinguished from bituminous coal, which is very widely distributed in nature. My opinion is that mining monopoly, like all monopoly of isolated tracts of land, may be dealt with effectively by taxation, without public ownership.

Another possible monopoly, which has come into existence largely since the application of electricity to industry, is the water-power. Thus, within the radius of one hundred and fifty miles of Chicago there are few water-powers capable of furnishing that city with electricity. In so far as any such power is needed for transmission, it falls under our definition of a natural monopoly and should not be in the hands of a private corporation.

The argument thus far advanced in support of the thesis held alike by Socialists and Individualists is presumptive only. Very many, possibly a majority of those who have given attention to the question, still claim that public utilities, such as railways of all kinds, are best

under private administration, but regulated and controlled by law. Of this contention it may be said that, after a monopoly has once been granted to private parties, its effective regulation and control by government is impossible. Pandora's box has been opened and the escaped Troubles cannot again be captured, so long as the monopoly exists. This too is an assertion, and will not be held as a conclusive answer.

Taking a look ahead, however, the demonstration of our position clearly appears. When all public revenue is derived from social earnings, registered as they are in land values, then it will be unprofitable for any government to permit the payment of a fee for public services. Then, to make a charge to individuals for fares, or freights, or expressage, or mail, or water rates, or telegrams, or telephone, or heat, or power, or cold, when transmitted through the highways, or for any other public service, will be, for the government, money out of pocket. Just as the owner of a skyscraper cannot afford to charge his tenants a cent when they or their patrons use the elevator, for the reason that loss from the falling off in room rents would exceed the return for the rides; so governments when they derive revenue for site values, as do now the owners of office buildings, will as a matter of economy put an end to the fee system in payment of public services. All such extortions will disappear, just as toll-gates went when bridges and turnpikes became part of the public highway.

Nature provides every government with a salary which makes unnecessary and wrong the taking for public purpose any part of individual earnings. No tax should ever be laid upon a product of labor.

The state of Rhode Island, as estimated from the United States census, has land values, exclusive of all improvements whatsoever, amounting to about \$300,000,000. At six per cent. this fund will provide an annual income of \$18,000,000. The taxes now derived from these land values somewhat exceed \$3,000,000, leaving \$15,000,000 of these society earnings to go to private indi-

viduals who have done no more to create them than have other citizens.

Let earnings go to the earner. Let the state of Rhode Island use its salary of \$18,000,000 in the service of the public, and leave to individuals and corporations every dollar which they have earned to be expended as each sees fit.

My conclusion, therefore, is, that the

present drift to Socialism is a mistake; that public ownership and operation should not be applied to mills, factories, stores, mines, farms or quarries; that the earnings of each individual, and whatsoever earnings of others he gets in free exchange, should be his against all the world.

---

## GOVERNMENT—TRIBAL, FEUDAL, INDIVIDUALISTIC AND SOCIALISTIC

By Rev. Edgar F. Blanchard

**T**HERE are four principles upon which society can be organized and which determine the general character of the social order and of organized institutions. One is the patriarchal which makes the tribe or clan the unit; another is the feudal which makes the institution the object of chief importance; another is the individualistic which places the supreme emphasis upon the liberty of man; and the fourth is the socialistic or fraternal which makes the common good the basis. These different principles governing man's relation with man represent different stages or periods of the world's progress. As this progress is continuous and the transition from one period to another is gradually realized, it is impossible to give definite dates to them. However, these periods can be designated as the patriarchal extending from the very dawn of human history to the earliest monarchies; the feudal extending from the early monarchies to the Reformation of the sixteenth century; the individualistic extending from the Reformation to the twentieth century; and the socialistic or fraternal from the twentieth century on.

The patriarchal plan was the natural order for primitive society, when the family government met the needs of society at large. Under primitive conditions the chief could well be the lawgiver, judge, and priest. The patriarchal

system is still continued by a few unprogressive races.

As the clans grew in size and importance, the simple patriarchal order gradually developed into the feudal regime which gave the monarch greatly increased power. During the second period which followed the patriarchal age, the dominating world-principle was feudal, and institutions arising under the influence of this principle were feudal in both spirit and organized character. The ancient monarchies, Russia and the Catholic Church are examples.

In feudal institutions the few arbitrarily control the masses; and with few exceptions, as when the ruler is especially considerate toward his subjects, their welfare is slightly considered. The chief purpose (with few exceptions) is to advance the institution (or sometimes to satisfy the selfish whim of the ruler) regardless of what this may mean to the subjects. Accordingly under a feudal regime, whether it be a civil government or a church, the masses are usually oppressed; their interests are sacrificed. Hence the large slave population of the ancient monarchies, the poverty-stricken condition of great numbers in Russia, and the ignorance and poverty in Catholic lands. Russia and the Roman Catholic Church are the two most notable examples of the spirit of the past, and both are vainly endeavoring to resist the progressive spirit of the world. Russia