

# The Dead Hand Harnessed

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF COMMUNITY TRUSTS

BY WALTER GREENOUGH



FOR centuries has the Dead Hand of the past reached out across the ideals and the ambition and the progress of the living to modify them. The right to control accumulations of property by the expressed wish of the accumulator, even after death, has been inherited with our common law. Much thought has been given to the problem of the Dead Hand, but always have its fingers of power continued on their majestic way legally hampering the future by the whims and the ignorance and the lack of imagination that all dead men are heir to, each in his generation.

Even in our own experiment in democracy is the Dead Hand all-powerful. Wills may be broken by the courts, but in the great majority of cases they are broken only in so far as new interpretations of the former wishes of the deceased are read into them. The right of the property-owner to make his will and dispose of his accumulation for long periods after death is almost unquestioned. The Dead Hand's control of the future in America is practically absolute.

Accepting this set of facts and realizing the impossibility of any material change therein, what then can be done to harness the power of the Dead Hand?

As rich America grows richer, what of the surplus? How is the average citizen to distribute his accumulation of wealth, after death, in such fashion that his family shall be provided for and the residuum of his estate be applied to pay back in some degree the obligation the deceased owed to the community in which he accumulated? Or how is the man, rich or poor, who feels this obligation to his community, to escape the bad features of Dead Hand control and plant even his gifts in life where they will grow into real flowers of community welfare?

Those of us who have no surplus to give away, or to bequeath when we die, laugh at the worry of him whose responsibilities include the giving away of money. We accept the set of facts in the old adage: "From shirt-sleeves to shirt-sleeves in three generations," as a companion of democracy and cheerfully go on our way seeking only to pass on the shirt-sleeves. To him, who has accumulated a surplus above his own needs the problem of distributing it wisely is very real. Ask the trust officer of any great financial institution. He knows how hard it is for the rich to die—contented.

The world-old story of the misdirection of the Dead Hand is one worthy of study. For centuries men have sought to endow the future, to build monuments for themselves that would endure. Nearly always have they made the mistake of trusting to their own finite judgment for determination of the kind of monument they would create out of their surplus. Instead of giving the following generation credit for advancing judgment, at death they have almost invariably stretched out the Dead Hand over the future—have indulged themselves in the belief that they might administer the future far more wisely than might posterity.

These men have counted not on the constant changes in view-point that come upon the world's peoples with each rising sun. They have not been content to let the "dead past bury its dead," but have insisted on thrusting the Dead Hand in front of the faces of the living as long as possible.

In England there are to-day some 60,000 bequests of property that are obsolete, the objects of endowment having become obsolete.

There is the story, for instance, of one, Joanna Southcote, who influenced many to believe she was to become, by immaculate conception, the mother of a new Messiah. One of her disciples was a rich

man. In his will he bequeathed a large sum in trust to perpetuate the teachings of the new Messiah. Joanna died childless and her "disciple's" bequest continues to be useless. That example is but typical of thousands, many of them in America—overendowed, underendowed, enmeshed in a legal network of obsolescence and misdirection.

That the charitable problems (using charity in the broad, legal sense of the term) of each generation can better be solved by the best minds of that generation than by the Dead Hand would seem to be obvious, but it has not been.

What, then, is to be done about the blighting influence of after-death control of property in rich America?

A few notable rich Americans already have regulated the Dead Hand individually. They have established national foundations so well endowed and so liberal as to objects that the mind cannot foresee conditions under which they might cease to function for the uplift of mankind. The Rockefeller, Sage, some of the Carnegie trusts, and others are of this broad character. But the problem persists not alone for the rich but for the man of relatively small accumulations and for him who has but a few scant dollars above the needs of himself and family, but who is possessed of the pride of citizenship which drives him to contribute even that small surplus in some wise way to repay his obligation to the community in which he lives. Must these men turn to the endowment of some individual or some institution, the purposes of which may be excellent at the present moment, but which may become obsolete within a dozen years?

And what of the vast need for assistance in the field of social and charitable endeavor that confronts us in ever-widening degree? Cannot the impulse of the public-spirited of the present day to be of continuing benefit to mankind in some fashion be transported into the continuing field of need all about us?

Visualize for a moment the American city of the present: so new, its face is as the mud-pie of a child of three; so wasteful that it must rebuild its own arteries almost before they begin to carry the blood of its commerce; so responsive to the

shifting winds of money-making that it must tolerate tenements and bill-boards touching elbows with its art-galleries and its million-dollar parks; so careless of the human element within it that its dead must be dug up and moved every little while to make room for its new palaces of pleasure or trade!

Fifty or a hundred years ago cow-paths wound through the very centre of this miraculous pin-point on our maps, where to-day the process of bringing enough milk to wet the lips of the city's anæmic children involves the efforts of an army of workers and a cost of millions monthly.

This same mushroom of a city flaunts a top-side layer of wealth and extravagance that puts to shame the dreams of a Midas, and beneath harbors substrata of poverty and suffering that bring us up shuddering when even part truths come to light.

Criminals and crime are housed next door to convents and courts of justice. Treasure-houses stand across the street from tin-cup flower-boxes on filthy window-ledges.

And over all this, with vagaries almost beyond belief, stretches the Dead Hand, enforcing the whims and the ignorance and the lack of foresight of generations passed. Often is the Dead Hand directly responsible for the treasure-house and the tenement, standing side by side in the modern city. By virtue of words written into the will of one long dead may my house be a palace and your own a shed.

The Dead Hand—as powerful over us to-day, and over our sons and daughters of to-morrow, as is our whole system of jurisprudence!

How then, shall it be harnesssed?

As is the case with all things great, the simplicity of the answer is the most startling thing about it.

Combine the surplus wealth of to-day for the correction of the maladjustments of to-morrow. Call the vehicle for this for the moment the Community Trust. And let the wise minds of to-morrow, endowed with the income from the surplus wealth of to-day, determine as need may arise the best ways to spend that income.

The late Frederick H. Goff, president of the Cleveland Trust Company, originating the general idea of this new regulator of

the Dead Hand in Cleveland in January, 1914, describes it as follows:

"It (the Community Trust) is a fund created by the union of many gifts—many different estates or parts of estates—held in trust; contributed by the people of Cleveland and managed by them for the benefit of the City of Cleveland."

How simple—and yet how pregnant with ambition, how stirring in appeal to human imagination, how limitless in possibility!

Mr. Goff's description of the Cleveland idea goes on:

"The Cleveland Foundation will provide an income—

"For assisting educational and charitable institutions;

"For promoting education and scientific research;

"For the care of the sick, aged, and helpless;

"For the improvement of living conditions;

"For providing facilities for recreation;

"For any other educational or charitable purpose which will best make for the mental, moral, and physical improvement of the people of the City.

"In short, it provides a plan of organization sufficiently flexible to meet conditions that cannot be anticipated at the present time. The income from the fund will be available at all times for the most pressing civic needs—even a part of the principal may be used in great extremity."

Mr. Goff's catechism, designed to popularize the Cleveland plan, goes on to ask:

"Does the Cleveland Foundation interest only men of wealth?"

"On the contrary," it answers; "it appeals to men and women of moderate means whose surplus (after caring for children and relatives) would not be great enough to endow a chair or a charity or accomplish any other notable purpose. By the combining of many small funds a large income is provided with which work of real significance to the community may be accomplished. . . . It makes its appeal to possessors of wealth, large or small. . . . Men of great wealth have in the past created private foundations, but now a way has been provided by which even greater foundations may be created out of the contributions of many citizens.

It is an educational and charitable enterprise by the people of Cleveland, for the people of Cleveland."

Thus, in brief, was the vision of the Community Trust explained. That was a little more than half a dozen years ago. Cleveland's Community Trust is said to have pledged to it now in excess of \$100,000,000 in wills. To-day the Community Trust idea has grown beyond the experimental stage. Yet, in its application, will it forever be experimental. That is its strength. It cannot be closed subject-matter. Generations to come will have it for study. It may be, if men are wise in its administration in future years, as continuing in character as the development of the human race. Just now it is being applied only to cities of considerable population. Eventually it may come to be a regulator of the Dead Hand in many smaller units of population and government.

Already, within rather narrow boundaries, the idea has been discussed thoroughly and much experimentation has been attempted. In a few cities actual gifts in life and bequests in wills have become available for use by the trusts, and valuable work along several lines of charitable endeavor has been accomplished.

The field for its future functioning, it would seem, is as wide as the field of future life in centres of population. Ideas of executives already functioning under such trusts are not in uniformity as to the purposes to which income should be put. No standard plan of operation has been adopted, and therein again is evident the vast strength of the idea. Different trusts already are functioning in different ways, their character being guided or modified by local differences in needs as well as differences in interpretations of purpose. Some two or three cities have available considerable funds for actual development, and there is a great human story in the operation of each one of them.

Approximately fifty such trusts in American cities now have been created and are awaiting funds with which to set to work on this newest phase of broad municipal relief.

The money-making phase of the idea is so small a part of it that it becomes prac-

tically negligible. In a summary of more than forty such trusts it has developed that the highest known charge contemplated by any trust company for administration of such trust funds, including investment and reinvestment of the principal involved, is approximately 5 per cent of the annual income, and in many instances the contemplated charges are considerably below this figure.

In each of the cities adopting the general idea its organization has been modified to meet the view-point and the needs of those adopting it. In general the trust company, bank, or trust companies or banks entering into the agreement of trust have based their resolution of creation of the trust on the Cleveland instrument. This was a resolution, adopted by the board of directors of the Cleveland Trust Company, January 2, 1914, in part as follows:

"With a view to securing greater uniformity of purpose, powers and duties of administration in the management and control of property given, devised and bequeathed for charitable purposes, the board of directors of the Cleveland Trust Company agrees to accept of such gifts, devises and bequests as trustee for the uses, purposes and with the powers and duties hereinafter set forth, all property so held to be known as constituting *The Cleveland Foundation*, and to be administered, managed and dealt with, save as hereinafter provided, as a single trust. From the time the donor or testator provides that such income shall be available for use of such foundation, such income less proper charges and expenses, shall be annually devoted perpetually to charitable purposes, unless principal is distributed as hereinafter provided. Without limiting in any way the charitable purposes for which such income may be used, it shall be available for assisting charitable and educational institutions whether supported by private donations or public taxation, for promoting education, scientific research, for care of the sick, aged, or helpless, to improve living conditions or to provide recreation for all classes, and for such other charitable purposes as will best make for the mental, moral, and physical improvement of the inhabitants of the City of Cleveland as

now or hereafter constituted, regardless of race, color, or creed, according to the discretion of a majority in number of a committee to be constituted as herein-after provided. . . .

"The committee to distribute said income shall be residents of Cleveland, men or women interested in welfare work, possessing a knowledge of the civic, educational, physical and moral needs of the community, preferably but one, and in no event to exceed two members of said committee to belong to the same religious sect or denomination, those holding or seeking political office to be disqualified from serving. Said committee shall be selected as follows:

"Two by directors of the Cleveland Trust Company, preferably to be designated from their own number.

"One by the mayor or chief executive officer of the City of Cleveland.

"One by the senior or presiding judge of the court for the time being having jurisdiction of the settlement of estates in Cuyahoga County.

"One by the senior or presiding judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, or of the court that may hereafter exercise the jurisdiction of said court in Cuyahoga County."

A Cleveland newspaper, soon after the foundation idea was made public there, and accenting perhaps far too strongly the wealthy man's part in the Community Trust idea, said these trenchant things about it:

"With great force a giant of industry or commerce builds up a big fortune. The exercise of doing it gives him strength to handle it. But when he dies the fortune usually passes to weak children—the weaker for having had too much money when young—and they proceed to waste it or have it taken from them. Much of it, so to speak, goes into the sewer. That is to say, it is spent in dissipation or fool speculation or flaunted in extravagant selfishness—all to the detriment of both the heirs and the community.

"What a sorry monument for a strong man to leave behind him!

"It is almost as unwise for the man of wealth to endow a charity. He doesn't



know how soon the charity may become obsolete and his money serve only to pension useless hangers-on. His dead hand tries to guide the future, and that is something that no dead hand can do.

"It looks as if F. H. Goff, with his Community Trust idea, has scored a bull's-eye. Under it, the surplus money, instead of draining into the sewer, runs into a safe catch-basin, and is made available for public purposes, with representatives of the public having a continuously freshened say as to how it is to be used.

"Obviously that is better than having it spoil heirs or galvanize dead or dying charities or pile up power in the hands of entrenched trustees suffering from fatty degeneration of the soul.

"It means that the money gathered in Cleveland by a few will be in a little while gotten back into the public service of Cleveland.

"It means that the children of Cleveland's rich may be saved from the hospital or the gutter.

"It means a continuous education of the wealthy in their public obligation."

Another Cleveland paper said at the time:

"And the usual outlet for generous benefactions which are sure to do good instead of harm—libraries, art galleries, colleges, and philanthropic institutions—do not appeal strongly to some of the rich men who have fought their way up from the bottom of the human heap. They want the money they have accumulated to help directly and in a big way the heavily handicapped people who form the 'submerged tenth' of the population.

"The Cleveland Foundation will enable the rich man to do this. That is what it is for. Those who best know the character of Cleveland's men of wealth cannot fail to be convinced that the foundation, in twenty-five years, will have at its disposal \$50,000,000 or more."

The Cleveland idea, after all, has been rather slow to filter into the public consciousness in any great degree, except in one or two cities where it has actually been in active operation. Doubtless, this is due, as has been pointed out by Colonel Leonard Ayres, of the Cleveland Foundation, Frank J. Parsons, of the New York

Community Trust, Henry H. Hornbrook, of the Indianapolis Foundation, and others who have studied it, somewhat to the fact that a great problem confronts the new Community Trust in the development of such virile publicity as will catch and hold the attention of the giving public through the usually long period of years in which the trust has no funds with which to function in a news-making way.

Mr. Goff sensed this condition early in the history of the Cleveland Foundation, and straightway set about doing something to bring his foundation to the attention of the public in a continuing manner. Endowment by himself and other friends of the idea for programmes of research activity by the Cleveland Foundation resulted in definite things being accomplished in Cleveland in the name of its new foundation. These researches are matters of public record now, and they did much good locally in Cleveland. Their main object, however, was the popularization of the Community Trust idea, and this was accomplished in large measure.

Boston was more fortunate than Cleveland—or, for that matter, than any other reported foundation—in early acquisition of funds. Actual endowment of community helpfulness, under foundation funds, became possible in the Bay State some five years ago, after gifts totalling near \$4,500,000 were made to the Permanent Charity Fund, organized in Boston by Charles E. Rogerson, president of the Boston Safe Deposit and Trust Company. The story of the Boston experience in the Community Trust field is almost an old one now, and its problems of publicity, therefore, have not been so acute as those of other cities. Approximately \$200,000 annually has been spent for some years there in direct alleviative and corrective channels, and in a recent year some eighty-nine established charitable agencies were assisted materially from the fund.

In many other cities of the country, however, the idea of the Community Trust has been gathered up and grafted onto local financial roots without much general attention being attracted to it. Banking circles know of it and in a few

cities it has received some general publicity and some funds have become available, usually in small amounts. The people in general know little about its vast possibilities for the future.

This situation was true in Indianapolis, Ind., up to a short year ago; but recent events there show that after all the latent strength of the idea may be very pronounced in America.

In January, 1916, Evans Woollen, president of the Fletcher Savings and Trust Company, of Indianapolis, succeeded in organizing the Indianapolis Foundation, under one of the most cogent resolutions of creation that exist throughout the forty or fifty cities wherein the idea has been adopted.

Under the Indianapolis resolution it was:

"Resolved, That the Fletcher Savings and Trust Company of Indianapolis, the Indiana Trust Company of Indianapolis and the Union Trust Company of Indianapolis undertake each for itself that as trustee it will within the scope of this resolution accept and administer gifts and bequests which shall constitute The Indianapolis Foundation;

"That the income from The Indianapolis Foundation be disbursed by said companies on the written order of a board of trustees for such charitable uses as will in its judgment promote the welfare of persons now or hereafter residing in Indianapolis, Indiana;

"That such board, not more than two of whom shall be affiliated with the same religious body, serve without compensation and be composed of six persons appointed two each by the Mayor of Indianapolis, by the judge of the Marion Circuit Court, and by the judge of the United States District Court for the District of Indiana or the court exercising in said city the chancery jurisdiction now exercised by said District Court;

"That the appointments be for six years and until successors qualify except that first appointments be by the Mayor one for one year and one for four years, by the State judge one for two years and one for five years, by the federal judge one for three years and one for six years;

"That on the failure for thirty days of the Mayor or a judge to make an appoint-

ment said companies acting jointly make the appointments;

"That in ordering the disbursement of such income the board of trustees, acting with the approval of at least four members, have full discretion except in so far as limited by a donor or testator, and except that if a court of last resort adjudge the limitation herein above as to charitable uses too broad it shall order the disbursement a third for the relief of the needy poor and the improvement of living conditions in Indianapolis, a third for the care of the sick or aged in said city, and a third for education and philanthropic research in said city;

"That an annual statement be published showing the amount of property held from each donor or testator, and in detail the disbursement of the income."

The three financial institutions adopting the Indianapolis resolution are the strongest in the trust company field in Indiana, but belong to widely varying influences.

Several features of this resolution now are attracting wide attention among the students of the Community Trust in America, since the Indianapolis Foundation has just been made the beneficiary of upward of \$2,000,000 in two wills and one gift in life, and the funds have come to it solely because of the complete answer its organization gave to the problem of the Dead Hand.

One of the interesting features is that providing for a "multiple trusteeship," of the funds of the foundation. Many of the trusts now organized and awaiting funds have been built upon the "single trusteeship" plan and in nearly every instance where this has been done, at least some of the public-spiritedness in the Community Trust idea has been lost. New York, sensing this situation, included approximately a score of her great financial institutions in the trusteeship of the New York Community Trust, organized in 1920. Such cities as St. Louis and Louisville have been considering this problem, although they have trusts already organized and awaiting funds.

Another feature in the Indianapolis resolution that has been commented on favorably not only by students of the Community Trust, but by actual donors

of money to the Indianapolis Foundation, is the complete separation of the financial institutions, acting as trustees of the funds, from the board of citizens that will, through coming years, expend the incomes from the funds. It is easy to see how each of these improvements on the original idea of the Community Trust will work toward community harmony with respect to the general goal of the trust.

And, perhaps because of such unusually attractive features in the Indianapolis plan, the last dozen months of its history hold a story like a fairy-tale.

In December, 1921, it was discovered that Alphonse P. Pettis, a rich, retired merchant, then living in Nice, France, had made a gift in life to the Indianapolis Foundation, totalling considerably more than \$300,000. This gift was announced to the people of the City of Indianapolis in the newspapers of Christmas Eve and Christmas Day, 1921, as a gigantic Christmas gift to Indianapolis. Favorable comment was so general and so wide-spread in Indiana that in at least one smaller city in the State, the Community Trust idea immediately took root, and preparations were made to install a similar organization there.

The story of the Pettis gift, and its impelling motive, was remarkable. *The man never had been a legal resident of Indianapolis!*

Born in another State and growing to manhood in Massachusetts, where phases of the dry-goods trade interested him, he came to Indianapolis with associates shortly after the Civil War and purchased a little dry-goods store on what to-day is Washington Street, the centre of the Indianapolis business district. Through several changes in management and part ownership, Mr. Pettis's holdings in the store became considerable, and in 1890—thirty-one years before his gift to the city—he sold out his entire holdings in the business, retaining some interest in real estate, and withdrew thereafter from any but the most casual acquaintance with the life of Indianapolis.

In his mind, however, persisted through the years a sense of obligation to the city in which he had amassed much of his fortune and wherein growing real-estate

values had helped make him rich. Eventually, perhaps about 1916, he told Mr. George Gay (president of the Pettis Dry Goods Company, in Indianapolis, which is the successor to Mr. Pettis's business) that he intended making some sort of gift to the civil city of Indianapolis out of gratitude to the city and out of the sense of responsibility he felt toward its people.

Mr. Gay had heard the promise of the Indianapolis Foundation. He knew the character of the men who constituted its board of six trustees—citizens of the highest type. He wrote Mr. Pettis of the new idea—the Indianapolis Foundation. It fitted into Mr. Pettis's scheme of proposed philanthropy exactly. Very shortly thereafter the former merchant (he was more than ninety years old when the gift was announced) made the remarkable provision for the Indianapolis Foundation in a distribution of the bulk of his estate.

That gift made possible publicity in Indianapolis that undoubtedly has crystallized ambition in many citizens to leave money to build up the future of the Indianapolis Foundation.

For example, a life-insurance agent who has specialized in large policies, immediately devised an advertising plan for his own business, under which he reports that he already has in prospect several large bequests to the Indianapolis Foundation, through life-insurance policies, to be taken out and carried through life by the donors, the beneficiary of the policies to be the foundation.

Whether this publicity was directly responsible for either of the other two large sums which were left the Indianapolis Foundation within nine months following the Pettis gift, is problematical. But the two other large sums have just become available and the story—so much of it as is known—of the motives impelling these bequests also is of deep interest to students of the Community Trust idea.

Within a few months after the Pettis gift was announced, James E. Roberts, a retired, wealthy citizen of Indianapolis, died. Under the terms of his will almost a million dollars is to become the property of the Indianapolis Foundation, the greater part of the sum in the immediate future.

This man, as it happened, sought a prominent attorney in Indianapolis to revise his will—prior to the Pettis gift to the foundation. He, too, had felt the impulse to leave a large part of his wealth in some manner to the city in which he had lived and accumulated. His mind had centred more or less on a certain field of charitable endeavor, which he had determined to endow. The attorney in question had studied the Indianapolis Foundation and knew its meaning. He told his client of the possibilities. Mr. Roberts had his will rewritten in order to make therein the generous provision for the Indianapolis Foundation.

A few months latter—in August, 1922—Delavan Smith, publisher of the *Indianapolis News*, died and left the residuum of his estate (variously estimated now at between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000) to the Indianapolis Foundation. Mr. Smith was a bachelor with no close relatives. For more than a score of years he had operated one of the powerful newspapers in the Central West, but never had lived in Indianapolis for any length of time. His residence had been at Lake Forest, Ill. His will was a remarkable document. Besides acknowledging his responsibility to the city through his generous bequest to the foundation, he made numerous other bequests to civic interests, as well as generous provision for relatives, friends, and every employee of the newspaper, who had been connected with it for a certain period.

Each of the three sums that have been given the Indianapolis Foundation has been left "without strings." Mr. Smith's bequest was worded in such a way that if the trustees of the foundation see fit they may devote the income to certain lines of charitable endeavor, but there is no definite restriction to their judgment in changing these lines in future years. The other two gifts came completely devoid of suggestion as to particular uses to which they should be put, and the trustees of this Community Trust, therefore, find the trust suddenly possessed of upward of \$2,000,000, the income from which is to be disbursed, under the resolution "for such charitable uses as will promote the welfare of persons now or hereafter residing in Indianapolis, Indiana."

The opportunity thus given for this Indiana Community Trust to blaze a trail in community uplift, and in the harnessing of the Dead Hand, is challenging in its completeness.

Already the trustees have undertaken a hurried survey of what other Community Trusts, with funds to expend, are doing. They are going into the new adventure in philanthropy very carefully, very studiously, and very seriously. And, meanwhile, students of social conditions in the Indiana city are very grateful, for they see perhaps complete readjustment of present-day philanthropy, at least where it is overlapping, inefficient, and wasteful.

Thus, by the experience of Indianapolis, is shown how deeply the roots of the Community Trust idea may already have gone into the structure of American philanthropy. These three donors and testators, drawn from three entirely separate fields of life and activity, have, within a short nine months, placed the breath of life in the Indianapolis Foundation. Theretofore it had been but the idea. It had been known that some few wills had been written in its favor, but its advocates were looking ahead many years for its actual functioning in philanthropy. Since the gifts have been announced at least one very rich man has signified his interest in this same foundation, and will, in all probability, leave a part of his estate as an addition to the fund. Thus have the good fairies smiled upon Indianapolis and the Community Trust idea!

The Indianapolis situation, perhaps, is more or less accidental. But the accidents could not have happened had not the organization been established. And there are other cities in America, such as Cleveland, Boston, Buffalo, Dayton, Chicago, Milwaukee, and Youngstown, Ohio, where funds already are being distributed, some in greater and some in lesser amount. All are free from the clutches of the Dead Hand. And dozens of inquiries are being broadcasted concerning this new feature in American cities' futures. From coast to coast the trusts have been planted by far-seeing business men and philanthropists, who realize that to-day's solution of the problems of to-morrow is not practicable any longer.

The Trust Company Division of the



American Bankers Association, with Frank J. Parsons, of New York, heading the special committee, is very deeply interested in the whole problem, and eventually probably will organize all of the similar trusts in the country into a more or less compact group for the interchange of ideas and the working out of general and specific problems that are constantly arising in the study of the field.

Is it not possible that the Community

Trust, the product of the long look ahead—apparently the harness for the Dead Hand—is destined to become, in very truth, the Lamp of Aladdin for the American city (or State) of to-morrow, sorting out its weaknesses, aiding its wise charities, studying causes and remedies of community defects, applying the accumulated wealth of the past, through the wisdom of the future, to the uplifting of each new generation?



## Love Songs

BY SARA TEASDALE

### I

#### THE BELOVED

It is enough of honor for one lifetime  
To have known you better than the rest have known,  
The shadows and the colors of your voice,  
Your will, immutable and still as stone;

The wild heart so lonely and so gay,  
The sad laughter and the pride of pride,  
The tenderness, the depth of tenderness  
Rich as the earth and wide as heaven is wide.

### II

#### LAND'S END

THE shores of the world are ours, the solitary  
Beaches that bear no fruit, nor any flowers,  
Only the pale sea-grass that the wind harries  
Hours on unbroken hours.

No one will envy us these empty reaches  
At the world's end, and none will care that we  
Leave our lost footprints where the sand forever  
Takes the unchanging passion of the sea.