

wheat and corn crop prospects, as though that could change conditions in New York, where the danger is. He reiterates the often repeated talk about "auto-madness and extravagances"—bad enough no doubt but nothing to compare in evil results with the never-ending schemes for the issue and sale of stocks and bonds that represent more "hot air" than tangible property and by which the unwary often do not get even an automobile for their money.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.

+ + +

SPANISH WRITERS ON PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND.

San Fernando (Cadiz), Spain.

As Henry George has said in his incomparable "Progress and Poverty": "It was the energy of ancient freedom that, the moment it had gained unity, made Spain the mightiest power of the world only to fall to the lowest depth of weakness when tyranny succeeded liberty." (Book X, Chapter 5.)

In those times of freedom the people had municipal ownership of the lands known as "bienes de propios," the rent of which was used as public revenue; they had "dehesas boyales," for free pasture; the "ejidos" for free threshing of corn; the "baldios" to distribute periodically among the peasants. Of all these institutions there still remain vestiges which have been preserved from time immemorial.

The "antecedents" referred to in *The Public* of May 6 (p. 429) by Dr. C. L. Logan, are as follows:

In 1526 the philosopher Juan Luis de Vives (born in Valencia, Spain, in 1492) published his book "De Subventione Pauperum," in which he argues that land has been and must be common property. He conceived of the city as a living organism and said: "Neither in a Christian city nor in a heathen city where man lives under human law should it ever be suffered that while one set of men have plenty and spend thousands to gratify vanity—for mausoleums, towers, palaces, banquets and the like—that the chastity of a girl should be imperilled for want of a little money, or the health and life of a good man ruined because he could not support his family." He teaches that "he who will eat must work," but with the condition that "he who will work may find opportunity open forever."

The same teachings may be found in "De Rege et Regis Institutione," a book published in 1599, and written by Father Juan de Mariana, who was born in Talavera in 1536.

We may also mention Pedro de Valencia, born in Cordoba in 1554; Gonzalo de Cellorigo, 1600; and Lope de Dera, 1618; all of whom proposed such measures as to fix a maximum limit of extension for agricultural land, to prohibit sub-letting, and the like.

In 1785, Antonio Xavier Peros Lopez, born in Sevilla in 1736, published his book, "Principles of the Essential Order of Nature" (Principios del Orden Esencial en la Naturalera), in which he asserts that "each man has an inalienable right to occupy enough land from which to earn a livelihood." These are his words: "It is impossible under natural order that one or several persons should in justice appropriate large tracts of land, leaving thousands landless—without a square inch of land which, I say, the Cre-

ator intended for all men and without which they can not live."

By this time Rafael de Floranes, born in Santander in 1743, had already written many books and pamphlets devoted to historical research, and had found that private property in land was introduced into Spain by the Romans. To this fact he attributed all evils, and the loss of peace and happiness which for centuries the Spanish people had enjoyed: "For the loss of men may be restored by the coming generations, but the quietness and tranquillity that of old the Spaniards enjoyed, and lost through the introduction of the strange system of private ownership of land—this is without remedy and is growing worse. Civilization is poisoned at the core and there is no remedy save death."

Francisco Martinez Marina (1813-1820), in his book, "Teoria de las Cortes," attributed the origin of poverty and all social disease to the unjust distribution of the products of land. He proposed to the House of Representatives the following remedies: (1) to bring into use all land by the state's renting it—without compensating the landlords who keep land out of use; (2) to prohibit the holding of great estates or "latifundiae."

Last of all comes the Spanish Wallace—the economist of Spain who, forty years before Wallace, advocated the nationalization of land after compensation—Senor Alvaro Flores Estrada. He is mentioned in the "History of Political Economy in Europe" by Adolph Blanqui, principal of the Trade School in Paris in 1837, as author of a notable book, "Curso de Economia Política," published in 1828. He was elected to membership in the French "Academy of Moral and Political Science" in succession to Frederic Bastiat in 1851. Seven editions of this book, "Curso de Economia Política," have been published: the first in London in 1828, the second in Paris in 1831, and five others in Madrid from 1835 to 1852. It was translated into French by L. Galibert in 1833.

Senor Estrada was a follower of Adam Smith and looked upon labor as the only origin of property. He wholly condemned private property in land, and to it attributed the poverty of the people. He referred to the teachings of Moses, Lycurgus, Licinius, and the Gracchi, as historical examples.

We may quote his own words: "Private property in land is against nature and is condemned both by natural law, and by its results." "The few having appropriated the land, the many can not work." "The working people do not have the full earnings of their labor and fellow men live in perpetual war with each other." "The source of the evils of poverty and war is the degrading poverty of the laborer who is legally deprived of the right to what he produces." "When understood, legal rights are a privilege by means of which the idle enjoy the fruits of the work of the people. The laws which uphold this private ownership of land are an offense to reason and the moral law." He concludes with the same remedy as Wallace: abolition with compensation, and for the state to assume the ownership of land and to rent it to the highest bidders.

For the propagation of this doctrine of land nationalization, he published in 1839 a pamphlet under the title, "La Cuestion Social" and an article in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* on "Private Property in Land."

Estrada was not confined to the advocacy of the nationalization of land in his writings only; he brought the question into politics as well. For when the lands of the Church were to be sold by the Government, he advised that the state take possession of these lands, and rent to the highest bidders. He proposed this plan to the House of Representatives in 1836, but it met with severe defeat—with only 15 votes in favor of the measure. This defeat banished him from politics, and he never was able to re-enter.

I am inclined to think that the cause of all these failures was the same as of the failure of the French physiocrats—they saw only a part of the truth, applying their theory only to agricultural lands, leaving urban or city lands untouched.

For the materials of this brief sketch I am indebted to the book "Colectivismo Agrario," by Joachim Costa, Madrid, 1898. Under this misleading title the author gives a brief summary of the teachings of Henry George, Alvaro Flores Estrada, and Alfred R. Wallace, followed by an account of the Spanish laws and customs as proof of the soundness of these theories. But he also speaks merely from the agricultural point of view.

Finally I must mention that the leader of the Spanish Federal Republican party, the late Senor Francisco Pi y Margall, introduced into the party platform on June 22, 1894, the nationalization of land.

ANTONIO ALBENDIN.

NEWS NARRATIVE

To use the reference figures of this Department for observing continuous news narratives:

Observe the reference figures in any article; turn back to the page they indicate and find there the next preceding article, on the same subject; observe the reference figures in that article, and turn back as before, continue until you come to the earliest article on the subject; then retrace your course through the indicated pages, reading each article in chronological order, and you will have a continuous news narrative of the subject from its historical beginnings to date.

Week ending Tuesday, August 23, 1910.

Voting at Direct Primaries.

At the primaries in California on the 16th the recent Insurgent victory in Kansas (p. 755) was repeated with unmistakable emphasis. Wherever the Insurgent Republicans made a stiff fight they appear to have won. William Kent (Insurgent) whose nomination The Public editorially urged (pp. 434, 651), defeated Congressman McKinlay (Standpat) in the Second or Sacramento district by a sweeping majority, the details of which are not yet at hand. Congressman Hayes (Insurgent) was easily renominated in the Fifth over Davison (Standpat). W. D. Stephens (Insurgent) defeated Congressman McLacklan (Standpat) by a large but indefinitely reported majority in the Seventh or Los Angeles district. Congressman Smith (Standpat) is variously reported to have been renominated, and defeated, in the Eighth or San Bernardino district. In the Fourth or San Francisco district Congress-

man Kahn (Standpat) was renominated unopposed. For Governor, Hiram W. Johnson (Insurgent), whose platform is "down with the machine and put the man above the dollar," was renominated over Chas. F. Curry (Independent Republican) by some 40,000 plurality, and over both Curry and Alden Anderson (Standpat), who ran low third and lost every county, by a clear majority. At the headquarters of the Lincoln-Roosevelt League in San Francisco it was claimed on the 18th that not only would the Insurgents have nine-tenths of the delegates to the State convention which will adopt the party platform, but that they will control both branches of the legislature which will elect a successor to United States Senator Flint. They explained that notwithstanding a close advisory vote for United States Senator, the result of which the official count must determine, John D. Work, their candidate for the party indorsement, has evidently won by a wide margin.

+

The Democrats nominated for Governor at the same primaries, Theodore Bell (vol. xi, p. 323), who had no opposition; and Walter Macarthur, democratic Democrat (p. 650) was nominated in the San Francisco district to contest the election with Julius Kahn (Standpat Republican), of whom the regular news dispatches report that he will have a hard fight for re-election against Macarthur.

+

In Nebraska, also on the 16th, the Republicans nominated A. L. Sutton (Insurgent) for Congress from the Second or Omaha district. Congressman Norris (Insurgent) was renominated without opposition in the Fifth district, and John F. Boyd (Insurgent) defeated Congressman Brian (Standpat) in the Third. Senator Burkett (Standpat) was renominated; and Aldrich (county option) defeated Cady for Governor.

+

Mayor Dahlman of Omaha appears to have received a majority of about 2,000 for the Democratic nomination for Governor over Gov. Shallenberger, who, however, is nominated by the Populists. G. M. Hitchcock, of the Omaha World-Herald, was nominated as Democratic candidate for U. S. Senator over R. L. Metcalfe of Bryan's Commoner, by a large majority.

+ +

Roosevelt's Return to Politics.

Since his return from abroad, ex-President Roosevelt (pp. 636, 637, 661, 674, 685, 723, 769) has been cautious about identifying himself with either the Insurgent or the Standpat wing of the Republican party; but on the 16th the Standpat managers of the party in the State of New York took action which is regarded in political circles as a declaration of political war against him.