

INDIVIDUALISM AND SOCIALISM.

BY
GRANT ALLEN.

REPRINTED FROM "CONTEMPORARY REVIEW,"
OF MAY, 1889.

ONE PENNY.

PUBLISHED BY
"LAND VALUES" PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT,
13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW ;
2 DARLEY STREET, BRADFORD ;
376-377 STRAND, LONDON, W.C. ; and
20 TOTHILL STREET, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

Pamphlets on the Land Question.

Price—

One Penny each; 8d. per Dozen, postage extra;
5s. per 100 (carriage forward).

- The Crime of Poverty.** By HENRY GEORGE. (2d.)
- Thy Kingdom Come.** " "
- Thou Shalt not Steal.** " "
- Scotland and Scotsmen.** " "
- Land and People.** " "
- Moses.** " "
- Individualism and Socialism.** By GRANT ALLEN.
- Small Holdings and Land Values.**
- Rating Reform in Rural Districts.**
- The Labour Question.** (An abridgment of Henry George's "Condition of Labour.")
- An Open Letter to Mr. Andrew Carnegie.** By ARTHUR WITHY.
- Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the Land Values Taxation (Scotland) Bill, 1906.**
- A Syllabus of "Progress and Poverty."** By LOUIS F. POST.
- A Just Basis of Taxation.** By FREDERICK VERINDER.
- Land Values and Local Taxation.** By HIS HONOUR JUDGE O'CONNOR. K.C.
- Landlordism** Its origin and Growth. By JOHN WHEELWRIGHT.
- Land Values in Parliament** Reports of Speeches in the House of Commons
- The Land Tax** (Historical Survey of).
- Land for the Landless.** By THOMAS SPENCE (1775).
- The Taxation of Ground Values.** By THE RIGHT HON. JUSTICE J. FLETCHER MOULTON.
- To the Working People of all Countries.** By LEO TOLSTOY.
- The Taxation of Land Values.** By WM. R. LESTER, M.A.
- Mine Rents and Mineral Royalties.** By C. M. PERCY.
- Rates and the Housing Question in London** An Argument for the Rating of Site Values. By the Rt. Hon. CHARLES BOOTH.
- Specimen Set of Leaflets.** Post free 1d.
- The Land Question** What it involves, and how alone it can be settled By HENRY GEORGE. 3d.; post free 4d.

[Complete Set of all the above Publications, post free 2s.]

TO BE HAD OF

"LAND VALUES" PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT,

13 Dundas St., Glasgow; 2 Darley St., Bradford;

376-377 Strand, London. W.C.

INDIVIDUALISM AND SOCIALISM.

BEFORE me, on my table here in Florence, lies a paper or prospectus of a certain London association, curiously styling itself (I know not why) the Liberty and Property Defence League, which enumerates as one of its chief objects, among others not now immediately interesting, "the advocacy of Individualism as opposed to Socialism, irrespective of party politics." This prospectus, with its cheering promise, was sent me by some kind correspondent somewhere (who omitted to prepay it), presumably because he had heard me described by somebody else as an Individualist (which is quite true), and because he thereupon jumped at once to the illogical and practically erroneous conclusion that I must therefore be necessarily opposed to what calls itself Socialism (which is of course a profound mistake). And as this mistake appears to be widely spread throughout Great Britain at the present moment, where fine old crusted Toryism, tricked out as Individualism, in the borrowed feathers of Liberty and Property Defence Leagues, is prowling about the country generally, seeking what good but weak-kneed Liberals it may devour unawares, it may, perhaps, be worth while to discuss briefly the supposed opposition between Individualist and Socialist, and to show that on closer examination it melts away for all practical purposes into a phantom of language.

I will begin by plunging at once *in medias res* with the fundamental principle which Liberty and Property Defence Leagues and all their kind so studiously avoid recognising in any way; the principle that Individualism, in any true sense of the word, is only possible where all start fair, without any artificial handicapping whatsoever. A Liberty and Property Defence League which sets out with the indefensible principle that one man may own another as his private chattel, or may hold an inalienable lien over some portion of another man's time or labour, or the product of his labour, or may monopolise more than his own fair share of the common stock of raw material, or (what comes to the same thing)

of the earth's surface—is not Individualist at all, but simply rapacious, predatory, and lawless. Before you can defend liberty or property, you must be sure that the liberty *is* Liberty and that the property *is* Property: and this is just what these so-called Individualists, masquerading in other men's philosophical principles, borrowed with reservations from Mill and Spencer, wholly fail to do.

Let me illustrate my case by a short and palpably exaggerative parable. Once upon a time, in a certain island kingdom of the planet Mars, a number of prominent citizens, of Conservative tastes, shocked at the growing wave of Socialism, which was just then inundating the Martian world, determined to get up, on their own account, a Liberty and Property Defence League on the mundane pattern. So they invited to their deliberations a delegate from the parent body in London, who duly went over to assist the committee at their constitutive sittings. But to this English delegate's immense astonishment, it shortly appeared that the Liberty which the Martian society wished to defend was the immemorial liberty of the small hereditary red-haired caste to boil and eat a dozen each of the black-haired majority every year; while the Property whose interests they held so sacred was the immemorial right of each red-haired individual to levy a tax upon all ships passing through his own well-demarcated portion of the Martian seas, and to exact a toll of 90 per cent. upon all fish caught within its precincts. The London delegate, shocked at this discovery, pointed out with newly awakened warmth of sentiment that property, to be real, must be produced by the person who owns it, or must have been acquired by him from the original producer by free gift or fair barter; and that liberty meant the equal right of each individual to do as he liked, provided he did not in any way infringe the similar right of each other individual to do likewise. Upon which the Martian league, justly outraged by such revolutionary remarks, promptly expelled him as a Socialist, a Communist, and a public enemy.

Now, suppose we inquire how far the London League itself can lay any fair claim to be truly Individualist, and how far it shares in a minor degree these distorted ideas of the Martian society.

Individualism, I take it, is only logically and consistently possible if it starts with the postulate that all men must, to begin with, have free and equal access to the common gifts and energies of Nature—soil, water, air, sunshine; and to the common stock of raw material—stone, wood, coal, metal. Any other pretended basis for Individualism falls at once most feebly to the ground.

For if your citizen has no other right but the right of being turned out loose upon the desert sands, or driven from the fields and farms into the ocean by persons who have already monopolised all the soil, and allow him no resting-place for the sole of his foot, then it practically involves slavery and murder, and every other conceivable social monstrosity. Freedom of contract (as we know too well, alas! in the case of Ireland) is a mere verbal quibble for the landless man. To him, it means but the insult that is piled above injury. He must take the terms the monopolists and land-tabooers choose to impose upon him: and those useless and idle people, by virtue of their taboo, can deprive him, legally, of all the fruits of his own labour, except the narrowest possible margin sufficient for a human family to support life upon. If this is Individualism, then the Individualists of the old stock will have nothing to do with it. They have not so read their Mill on Liberty, and their Social Statics. They will leave it gladly with a cheerful countenance to its new godfathers and protectors, the Tories.

True Individualism, however, as understood by all the Individualist Fathers, means something very different from this. It doesn't begin halfway down the subject: it goes straight at once to the root of the whole matter. An Individualist is a man who recognises without stint the full, free, and equal right of every citizen to the unimpeded use of all his energies, activities, and faculties, provided only he does not thereby encroach upon the equal and correlative right of every other citizen. I add the last words in obedience to a time-honoured usage of language: but, as a matter of logic, the former clause itself includes the latter: for "full, free, and equal right" implies already the limitation stated in the second part of the stereotyped sentence.

In the world into which the British subject—we cannot yet say the British citizen—is actually born, however, no such right or principle as this has anywhere reached any general practical acknowledgment. On the contrary, the young citizen finds himself from the outset turned loose upon a world where almost every natural energy, and almost every kind of raw material, has been already appropriated and monopolised beforehand by a small and unhappily compact class of squatters and tabooers. Not one solitary square inch of English soil remains unclaimed on which he can legally lay his head, without paying tax and toll to somebody; in other words, without giving a part of his own labour, or the product of his labour, to one of the squatting and tabooing class, in exchange for their permission (which they can withhold

if they choose) merely to go on existing upon the ground which was originally common to all alike, and has been unjustly seized upon (through what particular process matters little) by the ancestors or predecessors of the present monopolists. He cannot sleep without paying rent for the ground he sleeps on. He cannot labour without buying the raw material of his craft, directly or indirectly, from the lords of the soil, the encroachers on the native common rights of everybody. He cannot make anything of wood or stone: for the wood and the stone are already fully appropriated; he cannot eat of the fruits of the earth, for the earth itself, and all that grows upon it, is somebody else's. The very air, the water, and the sunlight are only his in the public highway: nay more, even there, for a single day alone. His one right, recognised by the law, is the right to walk along that highway till he reels with fatigue—for he must "keep moving;" and then he is liable, if he sleeps or faints in the open, to be brought up before the magistrates charged with the heinous crime and misdemeanour of being a vagabond, without visible means of support, who has paid no rent to the lords of the soil for a square yard of room on which to die comfortably.

The persons who uphold such an atrocious state of things as this are clearly not in any sense Individualists. The persons who thus (in the absurd and illogical language of our day) "own landed property"—a plain self-contradiction—are clearly aggressors upon the equal rights of others, impeding them in the free exercise of their energies and activities, and debarring them from their natural equal right of access to a fair share of the common stock of raw material. For such persons to describe themselves as Individualists, or to talk about the defence of Liberty and Property, is as absurd as for slaveholders to declaim about liberty or for brigands to prate about their sacred right to the ransoms of their prisoners. It is perfectly clear that they do not know, or will not learn, what Liberty is. I shall try to show a little later on that they do not know, or will not learn, the true nature of Property either.

But, for the moment, let us confine ourselves to Liberty alone. It is obvious to any one with a grain of logic in his composition, that the state of things described above contains within it the root element of slavery.

For slavery or serfdom is a state of society in which one man is compelled to give up the whole or a portion of his labour or its products to another person, not by free barter, but by brute force, and in return for no adequate or just remuneration. Now, in no state of slavery is it possible or conceivable that the slave or serf

should be deprived of quite everything: he must retain, or have returned to him (the distinction is immaterial), at least as much of the product of his toil as will suffice on the average to support himself, and in most cases his women and children. (I say in most cases to cover the specially hideous instance where, either because war makes up the loss, or because "it's cheaper to buy than to breed," the slave is systematically worked to death by the owner or landlord.) And the habit of paying rent agrees with it in this—that each member of the community has to give up the whole or a larger or smaller portion of the product of his labour to another person (called a landlord), at least in return for the right to live upon a few square yards of soil, and often also for the right of access to the raw material or producing energies of the earth's surface. In the case of non-capitalist prædial labour, the citizen must practically pay everything but the narrowest possible life-supporting margin. What we commonly call an Irish landlord, for example, is a person tabooing for his own benefit a certain portion of the soil of Ireland, and exacting from every other person who lives upon it, in return for permission to use the soil, a fixed amount of the product of his or her labour. If the other persons won't submit to this unjust exaction, they are turned out upon the highway to starve, and are liable if they camp out even there to be imprisoned in turn for having no settled place of residence.

A system based upon this fundamentally false idea that every man except a favoured few must pay tax and toll for the right to live, is obviously one which encloses within itself the root-principle of slavery. Whenever a Liberty Defence League is started to oppose it, I for one, as a consistent Individualist, will be happy to give in my name to the committee.

Furthermore, any person who so tabooes a portion of the soil (above his own fair share) is not an Individualist, because he is an encroacher upon the free activities of others. He impedes several of his fellow-citizens in their natural right of equal access to all the raw material and energies of Nature.

Again, as to Property. Property as conceived by the Individualist, means the product of man's own labour, exerted upon his fair share of the common stock of raw material. That common stock is not and cannot itself be Property: for nobody made it, and it belongs in equity to all of us equally. For instance, the county of Sutherland, or the river Thames, or the Bristol Channel, or Trafalgar Square, cannot be property: nor can a square mile of ocean, or the sunlight that falls on the 5th of August, or a mass of

coals in the bowels of the earth, or the stratum of air for five miles above sea level in the City of London. If any man lays a claim to any of these natural areas or energies as his by birth, inheritance, or purchase, he is clearly encroaching upon the common rights and liberties of us all. If, for example, he charges us a royalty for the privilege of extracting iron from his mine, or exacts rent from us for the privilege of building our chimneys into his stratum of air, or appropriates 70 per cent. of the fish caught in a certain space of ocean, or compels us to bolt our shutters and remain indoors on the 5th of August unless we consent to pay him ten pounds a head all round for the use of his sunlight, then he is obviously encroaching on our rights, and treating as Property by brute force what is not and cannot possibly ever be so.

True Property consists of the product of labour, and it can be owned only by the producer himself, or by the person to whom the producer himself has freely given, bartered, or bequeathed it. To have stolen or plundered it gives no real title. And it must be the product of labour exerted upon the labourer's fair share of the common stock of raw material, and no more : if he has filched or unjustly appropriated the raw material, if he has taken more than his due proportion if he has robbed another of the stuff from which he made it, his right in it is vitiated, and it is no longer Property in the Individualist sense of the term.

In the beginning of things, of course (to use a transparent but convenient fiction), no great difficulty was likely to arise about the question of this common stock of raw material. The hunter, for example, who deftly fashioned a flint hatchet out of a lump of shapeless stone, did not take largely enough from the general mass of raw flint then and there existing to make his draughts upon the common store worthy of notice. It was the labour expended upon the hatchet in the course of chipping, grinding, and polishing that gave it all its real value : and hence in this early stage, the question as to the right of access to raw material never assumed practical importance. From a very early time, accordingly, all sorts of encroachments were permitted by use and wont upon the common stock ; at first unimportant, later, under the military organisation, monopolist ; until at last in our own time and in civilised countries, almost every form of raw material has been appropriated and tabooed by somebody somewhere. That evil legacy of the feudal system the European race carries with it everywhere. Soil, with its crop-raising and stock-feeding potentialities ; moor, waste, bog, and woodland ; tree, bush, shrub, and herbage ; coal, iron, tin, and lead ; nay, even in many cases, streams, rivers, water-power,

and tides, have been converted by an evil use into what passes for Property by individuals ; so that all members of the community at large are mulcted of a portion of their own real Property (I am not using the phrase in its topsy-turvy, etymologically indefensible legal sense) in order to pay for access in some form or other to the false or pretended Property of other people in space, air, and raw material.

This, it can hardly be necessary to point out, constitutes a real aggression against Property, a partial admission of the principle of slavery—that nobody can even exist in England without paying rent, that is to say, without giving up to an irresponsible monopolist some portion of the product of his own labour, in order to purchase the bare right of existence, and the freedom to exercise his trade or calling.

Now, I am not a visionary or revolutionary land nationaliser. I don't for a moment mean to deny that this question of land, raw material, natural energies, is complicated on every hand by many and serious practical difficulties. I don't for a moment mean to deny that money-purchase and investment of capital have introduced into the question all sorts of intricacies impossible of disentanglement. I don't for a moment mean to deny that it is mixed up with innumerable conflicting real rights—that in Westminster, for instance, it is hard to decide how much of the wealth now existing on the soil belongs by rights to the capitalists and builders; how much to the journeymen labourers and bricklayers; how much to the prime common stock of the community or to its joint earnings (the "unearned increment"), and how little, if any, to the so-called freeholder, the gentleman known as the Duke of Westminster. I don't for a moment mean to suggest that an immediate or even a gradual resumption of all this wealth, nay, a redistribution of its component parts between the true proprietors, individually or collectively, is practically possible or practically desirable. You can't unravel great tangles of fact and justice offhand like that on abstract principles. But what I do mean to assert is that all this embroilment, this hopeless embroilment, has come about through the absence of the Individualist idea in politics : and that the main thing we Individualists have now to do is tentatively and gradually to bring about, as far as in us lies, such remedial measures (however slight) as may redress the grossest of these gross injustices, and may pave the way for putting us all back to some small extent on a platform where we can start fair in the race for life, without finding our Individuality encroached upon on every side by hampering monopolies.

And as Individualists don't like to see one man or set of men (say, for example, the Irish tenants) arbitrarily deprived of their own Property, the product of their labour, in order to provide for a set of idle people, who do and have done nothing on earth to serve them, I was glad when they said unto me, "We have got up a Liberty and Property Defence League," imagining as I did from the mere name of the Society than its object must be to defend Liberty from violent encroachment, and to safeguard Property against unjust aggression.

Conceive of my surprise, then, when at the head of the list of officers of the League, I saw the name—of Mr. Joseph Arch? of Mr. Herbert Spencer? of Mr. William Morris? of Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace?—oh, dear no, none of these, I assure you, but of the Earl of Wemyss, in plain black and white Roman characters.

Now this gentlemen who is called Earl of Wemyss, but whose real name, I am given to understand, ought to be Charteris, sits as a member of a body known as the House of Lords—a body, which far from admitting the equal right of every citizen to unimpeded use of his own activities, actually lays claim to an inherited privilege of making laws irresponsibly of its own mere motion for the whole community. The mere existence of such a claim, or the mere membership of such a body, in itself of course militates utterly against the central and most vital conceptions of the individualistic creed. But that is not all: this body has further, as a matter of common notoriety, placed itself often in opposition to the free exercise of their will by the citizens generally, for example, to take a big case, it has always endeavoured to prevent the people from obtaining a vote, that is to say, an equal right of management in the common political affairs of the nation: and to take a small one, it has interposed, and continues to interpose, iniquitous barriers against the free union of such citizens as desire it with their deceased wives' sisters—an incredible piece of busybody meddlesomeness. To belong to such a body at all is therefore *ipso facto* an obvious offence against the first rules of Individualism. It is equivalent to a constant and standing assault upon the free and equal liberties of others.

Furthermore, when I come to inquire, I learn in addition that this person, whose real name is Charteris, but who permits himself to be styled the Earl of Wemyss, owns or claims to own (say rather to taboo) some 62,000 acres, more or less, of British soil. (I don't guarantee the exact correctness of the figures given: I am writing in Italy, away from most British sources of information, and I take the statement at random from the first book of reference

that comes to my hand : but a thousand acres or so, one way or the other, matter very little to the principle involved). Now, I don't think it probable that the gentleman in question farms all that enormous acreage himself. In any case, he is encroaching on the equal rights of others ; for if the soil of England were divided up fairly between us all, it is mathematically impossible that each man should get so much as 62,000 acres. Again, I learn from the same source that his rental is estimated at some £56,000 per annum. Now, that rental is so much money earned by others, or due to the prime producing value of the soil ; and therefore in neither case really belonging to Lord Wemyss in any way. If he rack-rents (which I don't for a moment mean to suggest he does), part of it is really the property of the tenants : if he takes merely what is currently though absurdly known as a "fair rent," then all of it is the income of all of us together, as representing the annual dividend of the undivided common stock of raw material. Thus, in two important particulars, Lord Wemyss shows himself to be really on the side of confiscation and slavery, not on the side of property and freedom.

And now, *soyons sérieux*. Of course, we Individualists are not so narrow-minded as to object to Lord Wemyss and Lord Bramwell and all the rest of the Leaguers standing up, if they like, tooth and nail, together, for their preposterous privileges. Let them, by all means, get up a Confiscation and Aristocracy Defence League. But when they begin to masquerade in borrowed feathers as Individualists, to trot about the country under other men's colours, the farce becomes absurd enough to demand exposure. The little doll they have dressed up to impose upon their admirers is not Individualism at all, when you come to look close at it : it is Privilege tricked out under false pretences.

With the Socialists, on the other hand, I do not for a moment deny that the thorough going Individualists of the old school—the logical Individualists who insist on basing their Individualism on a firm and solid bottom of principle—appear at first sight to have profound differences. In theory, I think, most Individualists are utterly opposed to much that the Socialists proclaim as their end and aim. We do not believe, for example—we of the old type—that one man ought to be taxed to pay for teaching another man's children. We do not believe that one man ought to be taxed to pay for another man's books, or beer, or preaching, or amusement. We do not believe that the State, that *deus ex machina* of current Socialistic writing and thinking, should take aught from any man for any purpose save for the most necessary public objects of

defence against external or internal enemies. Our ideal is the ideal of a world in which everybody should start fair at the outset, and every boat should stand thereafter by its own accidents.

But in the practical world, the world that men live in, ideals are not easily realised. The Socialist ideal and the Individualist ideal are both little more than phantoms or imaginary goals, towards which, by vague and uncertain ways, we are each, as we think, manfully striving. What is common to us both is a strong sense of the injustice and wickedness of the existing system. What we both hate is inequality and wrong. What we both aim at is a more equitable distribution of the goods of life among those who do most to produce and defend them. While our abstract principles seem to differ in some places as wide as the poles, our practical judgment upon most moot points comes as a rule pretty close to identity. The great question, in short, for every one of us at the present crisis, is simply this—Are we on God's side or are we on the Devil's? Are we for keeping up and obstinately defending these prime injustices, or are we for mitigating, modifying, and, if possible, abolishing them?

Moreover, the so-called Socialist is often found on strict examination to be a Socialist, after all, in name only. Feeling deeply the goad of these fundamental wrongs under which the proletariat at present smarts, he accepts at once the Socialistic solution as being the first and easiest then and there offered him. But when one presses him hard as to the separate clauses and items of his creed, one finds generally that what he lays stress upon is the injustice itself, not the supposed Socialistic cure; and that in instinct and spirit he is Individualist at bottom. I do not, myself, believe that true Socialism has, or ever had, any large following among the people in England. I believe the solid, somewhat selfish English mind really runs in quite another groove, and looks upon the world in quite another fashion. And I am perfectly sure that if it came to the pinch, anything like true Socialistic measures would rouse the fiercest opposition and indignation of nine out of ten *soi-disant* Socialists.

But the question is not going to come to the pinch at all, either now or at any time. In spite of Lord Wemyss and his alarmist friends, we are not in the slightest danger in England to-day of a Socialist revolution. There is no hope of anything so satisfactory. In the real revolutions actually in progress, the so-called Socialists and the real Individualists can work in harness side by side most amicably. Do we want to allow the Irish people a voice in the management of their own affairs? Every Socialist

is with us to a man. Do we want to make the harpies who monopolise so large a portion of the soil disgorge some small fraction or their unholy plunder for public purposes? Every Socialist will join us in that just struggle. Do we want to equalise all forms of religious thought before the eye of the law, to depose the overfed hierarchy of a particular creed from the official position it has so grossly abused, and to restore to the people in its entirety the ecclesiastical wealth now arrogated to itself by a special faction? Every Socialist will rally with us gladly to that righteous crusade. In short, wherever there is a real abuse to be attacked, a monopoly to be assailed, a wrong to be righted, our cause and the Socialists' is one and the same. It is only when we come to imaginary reconstructive schemes for the remote future that we part company; and even then the difference between us is far slighter than most Socialists would themselves believe beforehand.

For reconstructive schemes—platforms—Utopias—are all of them more or less ideal and fanciful. When once we have got rid of certain grand fundamental injustices (which will take us a few hundred years more yet, at a modest computation), we and the Socialists may begin to quarrel between ourselves about the details and minutiae of our new commonwealth. But as long as we are both engaged in fighting a common foe—the monopolists and the privileged—we can afford to fight shoulder to shoulder. I quite admit that we old-fashioned Individualists are utterly opposed to board schools, to free libraries, to heavy municipal expenditure, to the taxation of some for the benefit of others. In principle, these things are all utterly unjustifiable. If we could only once start all fair, their injustice would at once be obvious to every taxpayer, Mr. Hyndman himself, I doubt not, included. But in practice they amount to little more than the rough justice of the unscientific Socialist: they mainly take from those who benefit too much by the common stock of raw material to give to those who benefit too little. It is of no use preaching abstract principles of political economy to starving souls who see that another is unjustly absorbing the lion's share of the wealth they themselves have created. What we have got to do meanwhile is to wink at, and if possible to minimise, these infractions of principle, while we strive with the aid of all our allies to break down the vastly greater evil of the monopolies which alone give to such infractions a rude semblance of popular justice. In proportion as we get rid of the real inequalities, so-called Socialists, I firmly believe, will themselves begin to resist any aggression on the part of the State upon their own individuality. Seeing very well where the machine

works wrong, they don't exactly know as yet how to right it. But as fast as each joint gets eased and reset, they will learn quickly enough how to prevent in future all needless tampering with it.

The fact is, nationalisation of raw material, whenever it comes, or if ever it comes (say about the date of the Greek Kalends), will give the Socialist practically everything for which he is now so blindly fighting. (I prefer the somewhat cumbrous term "nationalisation of raw material" to the more concise and customary "land-nationalisation," because the latter phrase has a tendency to confine the view to the agricultural value of the soil only; whereas the word land really includes as well rock, coal, metal, water-ways, water-power, natural scenery, and the actual *emplacement* of all our cities, towns, and villages. And how great is the economic value of natural scenery alone one may recognise, not only if one looks at Torquay, Cannes, Aix-les-Bains and Carlsbad, but also if one remembers that a single squatter family at Niagara made a large fortune by admitting the public through a turnstile, at a dollar a-head, to view the Falls, which its ancestors, I suppose, must originally have created.) Well, nationalisation of this sort practically amounts to the realisation in another form of the Socialist programme. Only, the Socialists fail to see just yet that this is the justest and most practicable method of attaining his aims. By-and-by, precisely in proportion as we arrive nearer and nearer the goal—as we remove every disability and smooth down every injustice—will the honest, hard-working, intelligent Socialist, the cream of the producers, begin to object to any State interference with his own fair earnings, for the benefit of the idle, the dissolute, or the incapable. In those days, it is not improbable, the incompetent and helpless descendants of do-nothing squatter or robber families will fare hardly at the hands of the quondam Socialist leaders.

But even nationalisation of raw material itself is not at present a practical end: it is an ideal alone, a remote and perhaps unattainable ideal, towards which we can but slowly and tentatively approximate through hard fighting and by most gradual stages. If in the present generation we can only succeed in taxing ground-rents with an adequate tax, we shall have done our utmost in that direction. How foolish then, how quixotic how pedantic, how provincial to separate ourselves, in working towards practical and realisable aims, from those who are otherwise our best allies, because forsooth we differ, or think we differ, on some abstract points, which may possibly come to have practical significance some time about the twenty-fifth century! "We are all Socialists

now," says the finger-post politician; so much the better then, say all sensible Individualists among us. The slight encroachments made by taxation upon the earnings of the individual—earnings already vitiated from the very outset by the unequal distribution of raw material—are as nothing compared with the steps taken towards a more equitable division of natural goods. For the capitalist himself, that great bugbear of Socialism (with whom we as Individualists have no personal quarrel), hangs in the last resort to the skirts of the squatter monopolist: without the inequality of wealth produced by monopoly, he would be rendered so insignificant as to be practically innocuous. If we could all be pure Individualists on an even basis at once, if we could get rid of all the artificial monopolies, the hereditary inequalities, the land-grabbing and coal-taxing, the ground-rents and tithes—then indeed we might have fair ground to complain of the slightest infringement of our personal liberty. But as long as all these greater evils and injustices remain unredressed, how absurd to make a noisy fuss about small contributions for the public good, which mainly fall upon the broad shoulders of those already too rich, through these very monopolies and unjust privileges! Individualism is only a tenable creed if it is thorough-going and consistent, if it bases itself upon first principles: to pretend to Individualism while upholding all the worst encroachments upon individuality in the shape of robbery from the common stock, with its consequent restriction of individual liberty to the right of starving in the public highway, is a sham and a delusion.

"The term 'Socialism' is used so loosely that it is hard to attach to it a definite meaning. I myself am classed as a Socialist by those who denounce Socialism, while those who profess themselves Socialists declare me not to be one. For my own part, realising as I do the correlative truth of both principles, I can no more call myself an individualist or a Socialist than one who considers the forces by which the planets are held to their orbits could call himself a centrifugalist or a centripetalist. The German Socialism of the school of Marx (of which the leading representative in England is Mr. H. M. Hyndman, and the best exposition in America has been given by Mr. Laurence Gronlund), seems to me a high-purposed but incoherent mixture of truth and fallacy, the defects of which may be summed up in its want of radicalism—that is to say, of going to the root."—HENRY GEORGE ("Protection or Free Trade.")

A BOOK FOR THE TIMES.

If you want to understand—
THE LAND QUESTION;

If you want to know—
WHY WAGES ARE LOW AND RENTS ARE HIGH;

If you want to understand both
INDIVIDUALISM AND SOCIALISM;

If you want to know—
THE CAUSE OF POVERTY AND THE REMEDY;

Read—

The Story of **My Dictatorship:**

A Plea for Freedom and Equality of Opportunity.

Green Paper Covers, 6d. net; Red Cloth, 1/- net.

Of all Booksellers and Railway Bookstalls.

WHOLESALE AND POST FREE AT PUBLISHED PRICE

FROM

"LAND VALUES" PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT,

13 Dundas Street, Glasgow; 2 Darley Street, Bradford;

AND

376-377 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.





Books every Student of the Land Question Should Read.

- Progress and Poverty.** An enquiry into the cause of Industrial Depressions, and of increase of Want with increase of Wealth. The Remedy. By HENRY GEORGE. 8vo., cloth, 1s. 6d.; paper covers, 1s.
- Social Problems.** By the same. Cloth, 1s. 6d.; paper covers, 1s.
- Protection or Free Trade.** An Examination of the Tariff Question, with especial regard to the interests of Labour. By the same. Cloth, 1s. 6d. The League's special edition, paper covers, 6d.; post free 9d.
- The Condition of Labour.** Reply to the Pope's Encyclical on Labour. By the same. New Edition. Cloth, 1s.; paper covers, 6d.
- A Perplexed Philosopher.** Being an Examination of Mr. HERBERT SPENCER'S various utterances on the Land Question. By the same. Cloth, 1s. 6d.; paper covers, 1s.
- [The five above Books, in red cloth. Post free 5s. 6d.]
- The Science of Political Economy.** By HENRY GEORGE. Library Edition, 6s.
- The Life of Henry George.** By his Son. Library Edition, 6s
- The Menace of Privilege.** By HENRY GEORGE, Jr. Library Edition. 6s.
- Democracy versus Socialism.** By MAX HIRSCH. Library (10s.) Edition, 5s. 6d. post free.
- The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth.** Being an account of the Land Reform Movement of 1649-1652. By L. H. BERENS. Post free 7s. 6d.
- Six Centuries of Work and Wages.** The History of English Labour. By J. E. THOROLD ROGERS. Special offer at 5s. per copy, post free.
- Toward the Light.** By L. H. BERENS. Post free 2s. 6d.
- "The ablest and most effective work in support of the Taxation of Land Values that has appeared since the death of HENRY GEORGE."—*The Public* (Chicago, U.S.A.)
- The Story of my Dictatorship.** A Digest of the Land Question. Cloth, 1s. post free. Special Edition, post free 6d.
- Fields, Factories, and Workshops** By PRINCE KROPOTKIN. New Edition. Paper covers, 6d.; cloth, 1s.
- The Land and the Community.** By the Rev. S. W. THACKERAY, M.A. Cloth, 3s. 6d. nett; post free 3s. 9d.
- Japanese Notions of European Political Economy.** Post free 6d.
- A Great Iniquity.** By LEO TOLSTOY, with portrait. Green cover Post free 5d.
- The Peer and the Prophet.** (Property in Land: A Passage-at-Arms between Henry George and the Duke of Argyll). 6d.
- The Single Tax.** (Lecture Outlines with Charts). By LOUIS F. POST. 1s.

TO BE HAD OF

"LAND VALUES" PUBLICATION DEPARTMENT,
13 Dundas St., Glasgow; 2 Darley St., Bradford;
376-377 Strand, London, W.C.

ALL who are interested in the subject of this pamphlet are invited to
join the

English League for the Taxation of Land Values,

376-377 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

OR THE

Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values,

13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW.

Membership of either League is open to all who approve of its object and pay
an Annual Subscription of One Shilling or more to its Funds.

Any Club or other Society desirous of becoming affiliated to either League
may do so on payment of an Annual Subscription of not less than
Five Shillings.

The Monthly Paper of the Leagues, "LAND VALUES," is posted to every
Member who pays an Annual Subscription of 2s. 6d. or more to
the League Funds.

"LAND VALUES."

A Monthly Journal devoted to the cause of the Taxation of Land Values
at Home and Abroad.

"We would simply take for the community what belongs to the
community—the value that attaches to land by the growth of the
community; leave sacred to the individual all that belongs to the
individual."—HENRY GEORGE.

MONTHLY, ONE PENNY (by post, 1½d.)

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, post free, 1/6.

Published on the first of each month at the Offices of THE ENGLISH
LEAGUE FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES, 376 & 377 Strand, London,
W.C., and of THE SCOTTISH LEAGUE FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES,
13 Dundas Street, Glasgow; to be obtained at the Meetings of the Leagues
and from Newsagents