

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

The Importance of the Correct Point of View.

It has long been the boast of scientific students that the earnest worker will publish what he is satisfied is a right conclusion, based upon the evidence of carefully observed results obtained by experiment and calculation. He is not indifferent to the fact that the verdict may render obsolete pet theories and apparently thrust aside as useless the toil of years in former researches; but he is impelled, even at the risk of temporary estrangement from interested colleagues, to make known the truth.

Patient adherence to a revealed principle invariably opens up wider fields of opportunity for happiness and further progress. One-time unsolved problems solve themselves, and a new world may be discovered by looking for it from the right point of view, undeterred by vested ignorance.

So long as astronomers took the earth literally as their point of view they were confirmed in the delusion that it was flat, stationary and the centre of the universe. Copernicus, by means of careful observations and calculations, and by viewing the system from the outside, discovered discordance in the then current theory; but he only published towards the end of his life the conclusions which were to incur such hostility before general acceptance.

The complicated Ptolemaic system of astronomy was at that time generally unquestioned, and the new, simpler conception came to disturb the repose of professors who had devoted their lives to the understanding and elaboration of its intricacies. New ideas were not welcomed by organised so-called religionists, who were resentful of anything that might threaten the foundation of error sustaining their caricature of religion. Copernicus diplomatically dedicated his book to Pope Pius, who did not appreciate the

great honour, and the author unfortunately incurred thereby the hostility of the Protestant pope Luther, who said the new doctrine was impious, contrary to scriptural revelation.

Truth always finds friends. Hundreds of miles away, after some years, Galileo subscribed to the Copernican hypothesis that the sun, and not the earth, was the centre of the planetary system. For this and similar heresies he was brought before the bar of the Inquisition, and by threats was induced to recant and forced to declare that the earth was as flat as a pancake. "Yet it moves," said our hardy conscientious objector.

So also moves the tide of credence, which cannot be stemmed by papal bulls and other supposed infallible authority. Tycho Brahé, Kepler and Newton made discoveries in the laws of Nature which revolutionised the sciences. Columbus discovered the New World of America.

The works of Galileo and Copernicus were forbidden to all good Catholics, and were upon the Index for over two hundred and fifty years, or until the year 1836. For teaching the truths of natural science Bruno was burned alive and his ashes scattered to the four winds.

Said Archbishop Ireland: "The enemies of the Church have been inside the Church, not outside of it. The supreme blunders of churchmen have been in suppressing strong men—in thwarting individuality. All the good law and all the good order which the State or Church enjoys to-day may be traced back over some route to the words and deeds of men who rebelled against the kind of law and the kind of order which they found administered by its 'constituted guardians'; by men who dared to appeal from the 'keepers of divine truth' to divine truth itself—from the 'trustees of God' to God Himself."

So important is correct point of view.

All Men and Women conscientiously object to War.

It is possible to sympathise with an English bishop who said that the conscientious objectors to the taking of human life were wrong. He based his belief on the operation of the laws of Nature, for, said he: "Did we not live on a planet which rushed through space at ten miles a second, and yet we were retained upon its surface by the downward

pressure of 70 miles of atmosphere." Was it extraordinary that a vigorous recruiter of volunteers, disconcerted possibly that he lived upon such a planet as that, should plead, when conscripted at a later date, that he was now a conscientious objector?

The danger of the little knowledge is always made apparent in the divorce of reason and instinct. The modern Sadducees hold that in view of the fact that more people are obviously in the world than are wanted, and "human nature being what it is," the sexual atrocity which in many civilised countries is licensed and organised by the State should be tolerated.

The young man, introduced to the social aberrations of the West End, may conscientiously object to partake in the vile orgies attending the White Slave Traffic, and be subjected to a latitudinarian discourse upon the purifying effects of vice and the ennobling duty of sowing wild oats. Reasoning from a narrow point of view, even a Presbyterian Cabinet Minister may point out to the young man that his instinctive repugnance, if it became more generally obeyed, might lead to more serious consequences for society, which the organised perversion was designed to preserve.

Just as all men and women are conscientious objectors to prostitution, so they are to war; not less the courageous hundreds of thousands who voluntarily rushed, as they thought, to preserve the community in the Great War than the brave minority of ridiculed and wronged conscientious objectors whose instinct and reason combined in rebellion against the participation in physical and moral violence.

Men love to face ordinary dangers in work and play, but it is only when under the influence of temporary madness due to seeing things falsely that they appear to love war. Soldiers who have seen active service have none of the mean enmity exhibited by those whose "patriotism," Dr. Johnson said, was "the last refuge of the scoundrel."

The warriors of the *Iliad*, the Maccabees, the Covenanters and the contending armies of the American Civil War all desired peace and hated war as intensely as the Society of Friends. They were all pacifists fighting for a just peace.

Viewed narrowly, it may appear that War is a Biological Necessity; but from the broader point of view it is plainly

seen that men only resort to war, which they hate, because by doing so they imagine they will obtain something which they really desire, or avoid something which they fear worse than death. It is Freedom which is a Biological Necessity.

The Survival of the Fittest in Ideals.

There is a survival of the fittest in ideals as in species. The more truthful expression will survive, even though opposed by a world-wide organised superstition—even though a new civilisation require to be born from the ruins of an effete culture.

Pioneers need not be alarmed if they find themselves alone or in the great minority. The victory of the Truth is not determined either by the sword or the ballot-box, and we should not stand appalled if we hear it said: "Yes, I agree, but then everyone may not see from this point of view." God and one form a majority!

It is not meet that the truth should be proclaimed at unseasonable times: "pressing" only delays acceptance; but that is not to say that the correct point of view should be hidden—that our light should be put under a bushel. "Let no man think he is without influence."

Alternations in Human Credence.

The advancement of religion or creditable knowledge has not followed a smooth upward tendency during the historical period. Approximately just ideals have crumbled, to be replaced, as they have collapsed from time to time, by better approximations, which in turn have given place to others. The just ideal will be disclosed when the correct point of view is universally accepted, and it will fitly survive.

As regards the alternations in human progress of thought, it is interesting to note that while each peak in the curve of achievement shows superiority in certain branches of skill and knowledge characteristic of the period, and while in some respects the older civilisations have not as yet been surpassed, a general advance may be said to have taken place in the tide of human credence.

During the current epoch civilisation has been distinguished by the great advances made in the mathematical sciences, firstly in astronomy, which led to discoveries in

mechanics and chemistry. Advancement in one branch of knowledge makes possible progress in others. In biology the static tangle of theories of special creation has given place to a simplified system founded upon progression by evolution from lower forms of life. The dynamic mode of thought, exercised in biological speculations from the new point of view, has made return in astronomy and physical sciences generally and rescued them from formalism.

Now the close fellowship of the sciences is being further exemplified by the assistance which the apparently remote science of sociology is deriving from the advancement made in biology. The assistance is timely, for sociology and its handmaid, political economy, are only now emerging from the dark ages of superstition. It is not yet sufficiently recognised that society grows like a plant, and becomes blighted when freedom is denied the individuals composing it.

The Strong Men of History.

Copernicus, Newton and Darwin are as much the liberators of mankind as Moses and Lycurgus. The truly great men of history have not been the Herods, Alexanders and Napoleons, who led the way into greater darkness, but the conscientious objectors to slavish error, who formed a nucleus for the assimilation of enlightenment pointing the road to freedom.

The modern prophets, Hegel, Carlyle, Emerson, Ruskin, George, Tolstoy and a cloud of other witnesses, are only more definite than Isaiah, Micah, Confucius and other ancient teachers who lived upon an earlier platform of knowledge. The saying of the Psalmist, "The meek (e.g. the goodwilled) shall inherit the earth,"[†] is not less a biological truth because it was a conclusion based apparently upon insufficient knowledge of the survival of the fittest.

The sound and fury of the militant evolutionists signify nothing. Their pretentious supermen and warlords in shining armour have shown themselves to be mere human scarecrows bursting with puffed ego. In incoherent autobiographies they crave for the sympathies of their fellows and a balm for wounded pride—objects for pity where they do not inspire disgust.

[†] Psalm xxxvii. 11.

They have shown, however, how minds preoccupied with the mirage of imperialism fail to unlearn the superstition that Might is Right. Blind themselves, they either deny the existence of Justice or conjure a blindfolded personification armed with a Sword, whose real name is Might without Mercy.

Either Justice is Right or Might is Right. If the latter, there can be no peace, only Silence and Desolation. The basis of Peace and Survival is Justice, therefore Justice is Right.

The Principle of Equity.

It has been contended by some legal and scientific authorities, with much show of reason, that natural rights do not exist. Such a contention is not in accordance with the fact that we exist because natural rights exist. They are, in fact, as real as instinct or intelligence, and mere verbiage cannot argue them away.

There are two alternatives, as we have seen—either might is right, in which case we may only fight and devour each other to extinction, or else justice is right and human existence is possible by agreement to live peaceably together on equal terms. It is from this fact of existence that we derive our principle of equalness, or "Equity." Equality of opportunity to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is our inalienable right, and any infringement of the law of freedom interferes with the survival of the fittest—tyrants live as dangerously as their victims.

Herbert Spencer (before he fell a sacrifice to mind polarisation) demonstrated that natural rights included a frank recognition that every man or woman is the one true owner of his or her own body and mind; that each person must be free to employ his faculties, or the product or gain of his faculties, according to his own choice and to the best advantage for himself. He considered that this freedom was limited only by the like freedom of others.

"If the assumption that land can be held as property involves that the whole globe may become the private domain of a part of its inhabitants, and if, by consequence, the rest of its inhabitants can then exercise their faculties—can then exist even—only by consent of the landowners,

it is manifest that an exclusive possession of the soil necessitates an infringement of the law of freedom. For men who cannot live and move and have their being without the leave of others cannot be equally free with those others." (Herbert Spencer.)

Equity, therefore, does not permit private property in land, and this contention has never been, and can never be disproved.

"Every generation of men has the same free right to make its own arrangements, and to carry into effect the principles it knows or believes to be true, quite independently of the arrangements that have been made by anterior generations. The earth and all it contains belongs, for the time being, to every existing generation. The disposition of the earth, as the great storehouse from which man must derive his sustenance and support, is not to be determined by the laws, customs, arrangements, kings' gifts, or prescriptive rights of any past generation of men, but by the judgment and reason of the existing generation, ordering all arrangements according to the rules of equity, which are always valid and always binding." (Patrick Edward Dove.)

Time, which may be a great legaliser, cannot convert a wrong into a right. Time has only intensified the *continuing wrong* of private property in land; and it is worthy of remark that while the enactments with reference to crimes against the person have always been considered alterable, those with reference to property have continued, making reasonable actions legal crimes.

Those profiting in injustice, who place Property before Humanity, and the lawyers, who venerate the law and care nothing for Equity, know they stand upon dangerous ground. Said an honest lawyer: "It is well if the mass of mankind will obey the laws when made without scrutinising too nicely into the reasons for making them." (Blackstone.)

The Spencerian Limit.

As a corollary to his demonstration of natural rights, Mr. Spencer held that some restraint might be necessary for those cases "where persons employ their faculties to interfere by force or fraud with others in equal use of their faculties."

The Law of Rent.

Belief in the private ownership of land is a comparatively modern form of error. To the nomadic mind, no matter how degenerate in credulously imagining that man may own his fellows as he may sheep, land was never regarded as the subject of more than temporary possession, as pasture for flocks and herds.

When the patriarchal slave-owner proceeded on slave-raids, his ambition did not at first extend to the ownership of land, although he quickly discovered that the most effective way to obtain slaves was to assume ownership of it where and when land had become the subject of ownership in the philosophy of those living upon it. The mere claim to land-ownership is of no value, unless others desire access to it and are willing to accept the terms of the so-called owner.

Security of tenure is necessary for the purposes of agriculture, and the claim of the first comer to possession without dues or compensation is universally conceded, so long as other land as good is available. It is no offence to occupy a vacated site and refuse to restore it upon the return of the former occupant if some considerable time has elapsed.

Some land is more desirable than other land, it may be because of its advantageous position or because of its greater fertility. Upon this superior land the application of human labour gives a better return than an equal amount of labour applied to inferior land of the same area.

When all the desirable sites have been occupied, it is plain that those cultivating the less desirable are at a disadvantage as compared with those in possession of the better land. The same considerations apply when the land is used for other purposes than agriculture, as, for example, building, quarrying, mining and manufacturing. Since all have equal rights to possession of the earth, before the occupants of the more desirable sites can consider their tenure secure against all others they must devise some means of equalising opportunity in their neighbourhood.

The difference between the returns for equal amounts of labour upon the respective sites, area for area, provides a measure for creating an equalising fund. This equalising

fund becomes apparent in the free competition for sites as population makes its appearance and increases as population increases. It is manifest in the form of land-value rent, land beyond the margin of cultivation paying no rent, because there is no competition for it.

To afford everyone equal opportunity to the land for use it is only necessary to collect the fund of economic rent and return it in equal portions to every member of the community.

Public Services of Monopolistic Nature should belong to the Public.

The ownership of public monopolies, in the hands of one or of an exclusive set of persons, carries with it the power to tax, exploit or otherwise to oppress others. Experience shows that in the long run such power is invariably put to a wrong use, the beneficial regulation of natural competition being destroyed by legislative concession, which cannot be equitably adjusted by Governmental control.

In land-value rent, which of right belongs to the whole community, no one individual having a greater title to it than another, we have, as the result of the operation of the law of equity, a fund ready at hand for the provision of social necessities of a monopolistic nature.

Such social necessities are the common roads, irrigation systems, water supplies and other circulatory services, which, decided by general unanimity, it is desirable that the whole community should be the owners and free users. In highly civilised communities the circulatory services may include postal facilities, telegraphs and telephones, railways and transport in shipping; but, notwithstanding the desirability of communal ownership in such cases, it would be an infringement of the law of freedom if any individual or group of individuals were debarred from possessing their own private roads, message-carrying arrangements, railways and docks, so long as they paid over to the public the full economic rent for the land they occupied and did not interfere in any way with the equal opportunity of their fellows.

To be in accord with the law of equity, each individual of the community should have not only equal opportunity with every other individual or group of individuals, but

even with the community itself. This proviso is necessary not only for the satisfaction of justice, but also to ensure that improvements, which are invariably made by strong individuals, should not be rendered still-born. Community undertakings benefit by emulation just as smaller undertakings do, nor should they be allowed to grow into State monopolies, which impose indirect taxation upon the community.

The Distinction between Wealth and the Source of Wealth.

It is in not clearly distinguishing between wealth, which is the product of labour, and the source from which all wealth is drawn that many earnest thinkers have fallen into confusion. Individuals may exchange with each other and with the community as a whole all forms of wealth, including roads, telegraphs and telephones, and railways; but they may not traffic with the earth itself, the source or "mother solution" of man, from which he crystallises.

Neither individuals nor the State or community can own the earth in the intimate sense that they may own improvements upon its surface or wealth in any form the product of human labour, all of which eventually decomposes back into the source from whence it comes. All that the community is entitled to take at first-hand is land-value rent, where and when it appears, to ensure everyone equal opportunity to the earth for use.

It is possible to live happily without such luxuries as roads, railways and the telephone; but without free access to the land, which in its economic meaning includes all natural resources, such as the air, sea and sunshine, it is impossible to exist as healthy and free creatures. Just as human beings who belong to themselves may not be bought and sold, so may we not buy and sell the earth to which we are all equally entitled. "Men talk of selling land," says Carlyle, "but the notion of selling for certain bits of metal the land of the World-Creator is a ridiculous impossibility! Who can or could sell it to us?"

The Effacement of Old Meanings.

To have the "freehold" of land in England did not originally, and does not now, mean the absolute ownership

of land, but its literal meaning, to hold, conditional upon the rendering of military services and/or the payment of dues in money, labour or kind. Freeholders are tenants of the "crown" or community, the king being a trustee merely. "Copyhold" is the base tenancy of a peasant or serf by copy or custom to a lord of the manor or other crown tenant. Contrary to popular belief, serfs were not chattels to be bought and sold, but were attached to the manor, and could not move to another district without the lord's permission.

"Land tenure" meant the tenancy and not the ownership of land, and "rent" was not the property of individuals, as it is now claimed, but the revenue due to the crown, as in fact it is. No crown tenant can give a better title to the land he holds in relinquishing it than that given to him by his predecessor.

Let us open the Books of the Law and examine this title.

The Law of the Land.

"The first thing the student has to do is to get rid of the idea of absolute ownership. Such an idea is quite unknown in English law. No man in law is absolute owner of his lands. He only owns an estate in them." (Williams, *Real Property*, 12th ed., p. 17.)

"All lands or tenements in England in the hands of subjects are holden mediately, or immediately, of the king. For in the law of England we have not any subjects' land which is not so holden." (Coke, *Institutes*, p. 488.)

"It being a received and now undeniable principle in law that all lands in England are holden mediately or immediately of the king." (Blackstone, *Commentaries*, vol. ii. p. 106.)

But while the principle of equity with regard to land tenure has always existed, the just method of carrying out the principle has never been established, and for the very good reason—it was not known precisely. The nature of rent was not discovered before the time of Adam Smith and Ricardo, who explained from what source it was derived. Ricardo demonstrated that the rent of land is a specific, not an arbitrary quantity, and represents a return to ownership over and above the return which is sufficient to induce use.

To take, therefore, for public purposes, by way of taxation, a part or the whole of this premium in no way affects the incentive to use of land or diminishes the return to which the user of the land is entitled; in no way diminishes the amount of land there is to use or makes it more difficult to obtain it for use. "A tax on rent falls wholly on the landlord. There are no means by which he can shift the burden upon anyone else. It does not affect the value or price of agricultural produce, for this is determined by the cost of production in the most unfavourable circumstances, and in those circumstances, as we have so often demonstrated, no rent is paid. A tax on rent, therefore, has no effect other than its obvious one. It merely takes so much from the landlord and transfers it to the State." (John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, Book V, ch. iii., sect. 2.)

The conception of economic rent—that is, rent fixed by free, unrestricted competition for sites among would-be users—is probably not new except in its modern scientific form; but in early practice, the general absence of money as a medium of exchange and as a measure very likely discouraged accurate assessments. Favouritism crept into the feudal system, with its usual disastrous results. Instead of rent or revenue based upon the value of the holding, there was an assessment made arbitrarily, which eventually deteriorated into an assessment according to the indefinite basis of ability to pay.

Jealousy and discontent always attend a system where tenants are not given equal opportunity, and where personal bias in picking and choosing is possible. An income tax necessitates governmental control, and ability to pay in time becomes inability to pay more. Landholders became so saddled with burdens that finally they revolted against their overlord or king. It was the reaction due to this rebellion which favoured the growth of the idea of dominium as opposed to usufruct.

Landholders in time and upon occasion gradually changed the incidence of taxation, and imposed their load of feudal obligations upon the landless toilers by means of a complicated penal system of rates and taxes. It is in this way that we have drifted, landed and landless alike, into our present lamentable condition.

**Land, the Source of Wealth, is, and always has been,
a National Possession.**

The king betrayed his trust when he made grants or gifts of lands to favourites, who either paid no rent to the crown or a mere acknowledgment. The rent of land cannot be alienated from the crown, and any short-sighted appeal on the part of holders for "compensation," because an impression has gained ground that they are absolute owners, can be met by the demand of equity that arrears of rent of land held, whether used or unused, shall be paid over to the community by so-called landowners who have been collecting it.

Not only is it morally wrong to propose that those who now suffer because the community has lapsed into superstition should pay "compensation" to the persons profiting by injustice, so converting landlords into bondlords, but land cannot be bought back—cannot be "nationalised" by purchase. The land is, and always has been, a national possession; therefore it is only necessary to assert the Common Right, and proclaim that upon an Appointed Day the Crown shall collect for the People the Economic Rent, which is the outward and visible measure of its Communal Value.

From that day no man, woman or child shall be landless in the community, because all shall be possessors of the national inheritance. It is contrary to self-interest for anyone to pay rent for land which it is intended shall not be put to its best use. In any case, the full economic rent is all that the community is entitled in justice to demand. It is the basis of a Co-operative Commonwealth, because it gives everyone equal opportunity to the source of wealth.

In subscribing their rent to the Common Fund for the land which they hold, users have access to the earth on equal terms with those who propose to use land on the margin of cultivation—that is, land no one else is in competition for, so paying no rent. Thus the Rule of the Land gives security of tenure and perfect liberty of action to all citizens, and consequently inaugurates the State in which injustice and poverty, hatred and war can diminish, because man will be enabled to redeem himself and stand upright. It is the Road to Freedom.

"The ultimate purpose of the State is not to rule men, to keep them in fear, to subject them to the will of others, but, on the contrary, to allow each as far as possible to live in security—that is, to preserve for each his natural right to live without harm to himself or to his neighbour. No, I repeat, the object of the State is not to transform reasonable beings into animals or automata; its object is to enable the citizens to develop in security their bodies and minds, freely to employ their reason. The true end of the State, therefore, is liberty." (Spinoza.)

What is Slavery?

Slavery is tangential—an indirect consequence of man's intelligence—the result of experimental error committed in a desire to establish a social system which will secure freedom for the community in surroundings which have been rapidly altered during the present biological epoch by man himself, owing to far-reaching advances made in applied knowledge, as, for example, in agriculture. It is not due to the acquirement of inherent parasitism in human nature, but results simply from social drift in a wrong direction, taken in the innocent belief that the direction is a short circuit to a peaceful settlement.

Economic captivity may be of two sorts: equivalent to being tied up, or of being imprisoned in an enclosed space. The former is represented by chattel slavery, while the latter is represented by the barriers of land monopoly. It is a lesson of history, however, that once in an enclosure it is comparatively easy to make one man bond to another or to the State, and herein we find the psychological reason for the reluctance to the abolition of landlordism by those who regard the State as a deity to be worshipped or a devil to be propitiated. Unconsciously, they feel that their little arrangements of dominance over their fellows are in peril when the unreal barrier is threatened.

Slavery is the Cause of "Overgrown Populations."

It is slavery which is responsible for "overpopulation," caused sometimes intensively by the imperialists in their "forced migrations" of "subject races" into native reservations, and sometimes by the landlords in carrying out

"land clearances." A little reflection will serve to convince the reader that if all the land of a country were "owned" by one man who exercised his "rights," ten persons would constitute "overpopulation." The landless inhabitants would be compelled to accept a one-sided bargain, and crave for permission to struggle miserably for existence. Herein lies the origin of Niggardly Production.

Actually the great majority of the peoples of the world are landless, and the few persons who claim the earth as theirs are able, by withholding part of it, to bring an elastic, steady pressure to bear upon the remainder. Whether the population is increasing, is stationary or is shrinking, a condition of artificial "overpopulation" is perpetuated, and there is thus rendered available a reservoir of unemployed labourers, whose fierce competition for jobs brings the wages of all who labour down to an iron standard of living. No labourer, whether he is known as a hand or a brain worker, escapes the consequences of this handicap. Idle land means idle men, and the presence of idle men is the basis of wage slavery.

It would be miraculous indeed if there were an adequate supply of the requisites of life in view of the debauching system of landlordism, which depends for its success upon the limitation of such services and commodities.

The short supply encourages speculation and profiteering, which results in the creation of usurious capitalists, who lend to the necessitous labourers the proceeds of wage slavery. The competition of the capitalists leads to the growth of combines and trusts, "communities of interest" in privy conspiracy against the public generally.

Super-taxes and excess profits duties, far from remedying the maladjustment of wealth, only intensify it, because, by further shortening the already short supply, the profiteers can pass their taxes and more on to the consumer in higher prices. All consumers are not producers, and the proportion that are have to keep the others and pay their taxes also. The idle-rich loafers, the unemployed poor, those engaged in useless occupations, the swarm of bureaucrats, the army and the navy necessary to prevent a turbulent society from lapsing immediately into indiscriminate anarchy—all are

supported upon the backs of the wealth producers. All taxes are paid by industry.

Penalising taxation of incomes, houses, machinery and other commodities only makes the increasing number of the poor poorer and the decreasing number of the rich richer. Carried to the extreme, such a policy would eventuate in the abolition of wealth, not the abolition of poverty. The limitation of profits by law is as futile as the limitation of wages or the fixation of rent and prices of articles by governmental control. There should be no *excess* profits!

What is necessary is the elimination of the loafer by rendering the earth accessible to all upon equal terms. When this is accomplished the labourer will be wealthy, as he was intended by Nature to be. Parasitism will disappear from among men with the emancipation of the labourer, who, free from landlordism, will be independent of the moneylender or so-called capitalist; free co-operation will then replace wage-slavery. This is the true Socialist State in foundation: impulsion, not compulsion.

False Prophets and Devil Worship.

There is no essential difference between the absolutism of the minority and the tyranny of the majority—the one is as evil as the other. The imperialists, protectionists, State-Socialists and other bureaucrats who would compel the individual, though unwilling, to work or to kill for a Frankenstein monster called the State, are all identical in this, that while they frequently speak and write of freedom and justice, they do not really understand either. Unable to think in the New World while yet living in the Old, they are like the foolish monkey who, thinking himself wiser than his caged brethren, opined that the cage in which they were all imprisoned, and in which they behaved atrociously, was necessary along with the keepers to prevent them all from insurging into barbarism!

All our public misfortunes and the greater part of our private discomforts are attributable to the false Socialism which teaches that the State is entitled to confiscate forcibly human life and the reward of human endeavour. In place of freedom, the priests of Baal believe that a man does not belong to himself—that he has no natural right to keep,

to give away, or to exchange freely for the labour products and services of others his own services and labour products.

Here is the ideal of vain imagination, the "Aristocracy of Intellect's" State, the antithesis of Spinoza's sane conception :

"The State? What is that? Well! now open your ears, for now I deliver my sentence on the death of peoples.

"The State is called the coldest of all cold monsters. And coldly it lieth; and this lie creepeth out of its mouth: 'I, the State, am the people.'

"It is a lie! Creators they were who created the peoples and hung one belief and one love over them; thus they served life.

"Destroyers they are who lay traps for many, calling them the State; they hung a sword and a hundred desires over them.

"Whatever a people is left, it understandeth not the State, but hateth it as the evil eye and a sin against customs and rights.

"This sign I show unto you: every people speaketh its own tongue of good and evil—not understood by its neighbour. Every people hath found out for itself its own language in customs and rights.

"But the State is a liar in all tongues of good or evil; whatever it saith, it lieth; whatever it hath, it hath stolen.

"False is everything in it; with stolen teeth it biteth, the biting one. False are even its intestines.

"Confusion of languages of good and evil—this sign I show unto you as the sign of the State. Verily, this sign pointeth to the will unto death! Verily, it waveth hands unto the preachers of death!

"Far too many are born: for the superfluous the State was invented.

"Behold, behold, how it allureth them, the much too many! How it devoureth, cheweth and masticateth them!" (Nietzsche.)

So long as the superstition exists that the earth can be the subject of ownership in the same sense that services

and commodities can be, there is no escape from lying diplomacy, slavery and violence. So long as the prison of superstition remains, "the much too many" will struggle blindly in the dark recesses—ever getting further away from freedom and happiness.

It is for this reason that "nationalising" the land by purchase, or by division among small landlords, as, for example, by way of the Code Napoleon, is foredoomed to disaster. The former policy substitutes the landlord State, which is not the people, in place of several lords, while the latter creates a numerous breed of egotistical proprietors everywhere advocating the limitation of families—"the will unto death." Neither policy abolishes landlordism, which is always attended with the doctrine of Passive Obedience and the Divine Right of the State.

Beware of false prophets, "the preachers of death!"

Slavery is Man's Original Sin.

Owing to the tendency in individuals to diversify, impelled by the pursuit of happiness in an environment which has a different phase for every human creature, men and women vary in physical strength, in stature, in mental capacity and quality and in tastes. Even were it advisable, it is impossible for any superman of the "Aristocracy of Intellect" to control, to organise or to coerce for the ultimate good the multifarious activities of a community of which they form part—no matter how important they may think themselves. Their intentions may be benevolent, "the path to hell is paved with good intentions." Political relations are not those of benevolence, but of equity. Justice comes before benevolence.

Benevolence lies beyond politics, and because it can regulate nothing and enforce nothing, inevitably brings about instability and anarchy when it is put in the place of Justice. The reign of Justice must precede the reign of Benevolence, the Golden Rule must be conformed with as regards man and his environment. It is necessary firstly to determine what is due to the individual, and separately to the community, and then the duties and the pleasures of compassion and love will be revealed harmoniously to mankind.

What ninety-nine persons in a hundred might deem a benefit, the hundredth might account a gratuitous abuse. Charity becomes a monstrosity when those wishing to be free are constrained by it. If the individual has no rights there is no possibility of brotherhood, love or happiness in co-operation in the guild or in the family.

The broken-spirited competitors, knocked out in the race of Restricted Opportunity, eagerly clutch for the doles of prison fare supplied by a stony-hearted State charity organisation. Like the man who, having had his house burnt down, would abolish fire, they catch at the cry, "Competition is the law of death; co-operation is the law of life." Does it not depend upon the kind of competition and the kind of co-operation?

It is natural competition which makes our games so enjoyable, but this happiness is not possible when opportunity is made unequal or men are made "equal" by compulsory communism or wage-slavery.

The competition of three men for two meals or the competition of two men for one job is not beneficial, because it means a life-and-death struggle for them; but the competition of more than one employer for one co-operator "waveth no hands unto the preachers of death." Natural competition is beneficial for the individual and the community, but the unnatural competition in the economic enclosure of land monopoly benefits no one.

Competition and co-operation have each their place in Nature's plan. The world would be a drab and unprogressive abode if either were absent. Happiness attends free competition and the free choice of the individual—the impulsion towards co-operation of free men; but misery is the concomitant of slavery or forced co-operation and necessitous acceptance. Men are not equal, and leadership in co-operative service is essential, but not slave-ownership.

Freedom is the Law of Life; Slavery is the Law of Death.

Justice is the Basis of Peace and Reconstruction.

The Land was provided by Nature for the Whole People, therefore anyone holding land should pay its Rent to the

People. In this establishment of the Divine Right of the People do we find the Road to Freedom.

It is in consequence of the failure to observe the logical limitation of what is due justly to the community, and separately to the individual, that, to the intense bewilderment of Power and Might, there is made manifest the "foul buffoonery" of Physical and Moral Violence.