

and are being drained into the cities. With few exceptions he accepted the arguments of our opponents.

What conclusion is to be drawn from all this? We cannot undertake another campaign in California for a score of years, either by total or so-called "step-by-step" measures with the slightest hope of success. Past failures, of which I have spoken serve to confirm this belief. And the like situation, as I see it, prevails in every other State in the Union. The same forces and the same misrepresentations which have triumphed here will prevail elsewhere in like endeavors and this will, there, as here, hold for twenty years to come.

Does this mean that we are to remain hopeless and inert? I do not so believe, but it does mean that we have a lot more thinking to do as to the methods.

First, of course, methods of education in economics are to be cultivated.

Next we must develop popular government. Legislatures will be managed by adverse influences for a generation to come, perhaps several generations. The Initiative and Referendum must be materially revised and extended to new states. In California, for instance, it has become practically unworkable.

More importantly, we must study a new approach. I am sure that at some point the citadel of privilege will be found vulnerable. What that point may be I am not wise enough to say today. Want of success in our endeavors proves we have not yet struck the weakest spot.

It may well be that we should attack the great landed estates in city and country. The man who holds 10,000 acres imperfectly cultivated in the country or \$50,000 in land in the cities with only slum dwellings has few sympathizers.

Again there is a natural human feeling that every man is entitled to enough land to live upon and sustain his family. Shall we avail ourselves of this? Would this be departing in any degree from our basic principle of equality in human rights if we were to declare that thus much land every man shall enjoy without paying taxes to the state? Would this not be a true homestead exemption? It is interesting to remember that Lycurgus divided the lands of Sparta into equal holdings—with each man entitled to his own and with no right to transmit by inheritance.

It seems to me quite possible that on some such presentation our theories will offer a new appeal. Then at any rate it would not be said that we sought to take from a man the land on which his house rested. Only the pure land speculator would be left out in the cold.

The popularity of homestead exemption should suggest something to us. To extend its protection to assault from the State as well as to the grasp of creditors has much in its favor. This kind of proposition no householder would fear. Secure in the friendship of the home owner, our further advance should be repaid.

## Land and Landless

THE following interesting information about land ownership throughout the world appeared in the December, 1939, issue of *Progress*, a Georgeist journal published at Melbourne, Australia:

"In Great Britain when the last survey was made some 40,000 people—one-tenth of 1 per cent—owned nearly three-quarters of the country. Some 44 millions owned no land whatever. In Scotland 96.4 per cent owned no land. Twenty-five landowners claim to own one-third of Scotland. In Wales recently the Marquis of Bute (Scotch) sold 117,000 acres, including half the City of Cardiff for £40,000,000. In Australia 85 per cent of the people are landless. In Italy more than two-thirds of the land is owned by less than 4 per cent of the landowners. One-half of one per cent possess 47 per cent of all the cultivated land. 40,000,000 own no land whatever. In Hungary one-third owns no land. The Esterhazy Estate of 223,287 acres includes 159 villages. In Poland 70 per cent are peasants in appalling conditions. One aristocrat owned 340,000 acres. In Czechoslovakia a land reform administration was appointed to function. Germany has crushed that advance. In Spain before the recent struggle 1 per cent owned 51.5 per cent of the land. 65 per cent owned only 2.2 per cent. Franco supported by Germany and Italy fought to retain these conditions. In Mexico in 1910 2 per cent owned 70 per cent of the land. In the United States 16 people own 47,800,000 acres of timber lands. In Manhattan (New York) 1 per cent own about 85 per cent of the island, valued at 4,022,000,000 dollars (1937). In the United States 75 per cent do not own their own farms. Denmark shows progress. In Denmark only 5 per cent of the farms are held by tenants. The Georgean Movement is strong there. Until interfered with by Japan it was growing in China. In Japan half the arable land is owned by about 1½ per cent of the total population. 22,000,000 try to exist on about one acre per household. The density of population is only half that of England. In Nanking, China, 12,000 delegates were to meet last September to discuss the policy of collecting economic rent and the abolition of taxation. The publication office of their paper was destroyed by the Japanese."

IF I am asked, what system of political philosophy I substituted for that which, as a philosophy, I had abandoned, I answer, "No system: only a conviction that the true system was something much more complex and many-sided than I had previously had any idea of, and that its office was to supply, not a set of model institutions, but principles from which the institutions suitable to any given circumstances might be deduced."

—"Autobiography," by JOHN STUART MILL.