

THE LAND QUESTION: A WOMAN'S SYMPOSIUM.

BY ESTELLA BACHMAN BROKAW, ALTONA A. CHAPMAN, SARAH MIFFLIN GAY, JULIA A. KELLOGG, FRANCES M. MILNE, LONA INGHAM ROBINSON, FRANCES E. RUSSELL, CATHERINE H. SPENCE, CHARLOTTE PERKINS STETSON, ELIZA STOWE TWITCHELL AND MRS. SIDNEY WEBB.

- I. THE FUNDAMENTAL REFORM. Estella Bachman Brokaw.
- II. SOCIALISM AND INDIVIDUALISM HARMONIZED. Alton A. Chapman.
- III. THE SOLUTION OF THE LABOR QUESTION. Sarah Mifflin Gay
- IV. POLITICAL ECONOMY BASED UPON JUSTICE. Julia A. Kellogg.
- V. INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING. Frances M. Milne.
- VI. THE CENTRIFUGAL REFORM. Lona Ingham Robinson.
- VII. A BROAD BASIS FOR PRACTICAL BROTHERHOOD. Frances E. Russell.
- VIII. RELATION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION TO THE LAND QUESTION. C. H. Spence.
- IX. LAND MUST BE FREE THAT WE MAY LIVE. Charlotte Perkins Stetson.
- X. RESPECT FOR GOD'S LAWS AND FOR ALL HIS CHILDREN. Eliza Stowe Twitchell.
- XI. A FABIAN ON THE LAND QUESTION. Beatrice Webb

I. THE FUNDAMENTAL REFORM.

As all human beings must live on and from the land, using that term in its economic sense, it clearly follows that the land question must be the fundamental question. There is much in a house besides the foundation; but without a firm and secure foundation the house is liable to fall at any time, and destroy those in or near it. So with nations: we see in them many wrongs which should be righted, many abuses to be corrected; yet in spite of the greatest efforts in numerous lines of reform work, our own people today practically form but two classes, the oppressor and the oppressed, as truly as did the people in old Egyptian days. We have abject poverty in the midst of abounding wealth. There are great armies of the unemployed; strikes and riots have become an almost daily occurrence. We boast of our wealth and learning, our culture and refinement, yet our nation is in many ways more uncivilized than the most barbarous of ancient peoples.

In a true state of society, poverty — the lack of actual necessities of life — will be unknown; multi-millionaires and tramps will be equally rare. Each citizen of the ideal republic will work for his living and have secure possession of all he earns. When all work and no man has the power to make others support him, a few hours' work each day will be more than sufficient to supply all bodily wants, and there will be leisure for due recreation and for cultivation of those physical, mental and spiritual gifts which in time will produce a race of perfectly developed men and women.

As no man can live without land, it follows that the man who owns the land owns the lives of his fellow-men. The most simple, practical and easily applied method that has yet been devised for freeing land and giving to all human beings equal rights and opportunities, is the plan known as the single tax. This is a tax on land values irrespective of improvements. This has so recently been fully explained in THE ARENA that I need not enter into details. To me it seems absolutely essential to true civilization and the welfare of our republic that the land question should be settled, and settled rightly, before we can hope to derive any permanent benefit from other reforms. The exclusive possession of a certain location is necessary in order that each may receive the full product of his labor; as nature gives no one the right to exclude another from any given location, the single tax, by requiring each one to pay to all the full annual value of the *privilege* of exclusive possession, secures equal freedom in the use of the earth— equality of access to land. When each pays to all the full value of the location he excludes them from (value of the privilege of excluding them), each gets from all the same in public service, and *retains* his full personal earnings. Under this plan there would be no profit in land *holding*, only in using it, so that there would be every incentive to *use*. When labor and land are free, with our ever growing knowledge of the forces of nature, wealth production would be so great that the getting of wealth would be easy for all, and so not wealth, but merit alone, could command esteem.

From this it follows that: —

(1) Restoring the land to the people through the application of the single tax will not instantly make men perfect, but it *will* give to each the opportunity to develop that which is highest and best in his nature. The tendency will be toward that which is good, and not evil, for when no superiority is recognized save the superiority of merit, each will strive so to live and work as to win the esteem of his fellows.

(2) The solution of the land question through the single tax will not make all other reforms unnecessary, but it *will make* it comparatively easy to introduce them; and it will enable us to distinguish readily between essential reforms and reforms that have seemed necessary only because of the unnatural conditions that grew out of the private appropriation of land values.

(3) The solution of the land question through the single tax will not at once make every man wealthy, but it *will* give to each the opportunity to earn all that he will. With each man free to work for himself and secure in the possession of his whole earnings, no one would work for another for less than he could make working for himself; hence employers would offer the fairest possible wages in order to secure workmen. This would gradually lead to higher wages and shorter hours of work, and the great labor problem would be permanently solved.

Thus it will be seen that, though the land question is not the only question needing solution, though the single tax is by no means the only reform needed, yet it is the most important one, in that it is the *foundation* on which we must depend for the security and permanency of all other reforms.

St. Louis, Mo.
ESTELLA BACHMAN BROKAW.

II. SOCIALISM AND INDIVIDUALISM HARMONIZED.

In Bellamy's "Looking Backward," which was the first reform book to fall into my hands, after my eyes were fairly opened to our real economic conditions, which offered any way out of the cruel dilemma, and which I welcomed with delight and still read with pleasure, he lays down the true and heavenly principle upon which society should undoubtedly be constructed, and which if carried out in the spirit as well as the letter would give us a veritable heaven upon earth; but if earth be not ready to receive it and will have none of it, what then? We must find some powerful lever to lift earth up within reach of these heavenly influences, so that it may lay hold of them and abide by them. What is most needed, it seems to me, is not additional imperfect human legislation — we have too much of that already — but rather some essential principle of equal justice which, like all the laws of nature, may be safely trusted to execute itself, *if given free play*, regardless of the ignorance or indifference of careless, blundering humanity.

Now the single tax is such a principle and such a law, which constitutes at once its practicability and its unfailing charm. Being at the same time both individualistic and socialistic, it ignores the claims of neither, but does equal, impartial justice both to the individual and to society. Those who approach it from the individualistic side are more apt to dwell upon that feature of it; those who, like myself, have approached it through socialism, find in its socialistic quality its greatest attraction. Being thus many-sided, it is adapted to all classes of minds. As an ethical principle it appeals with irresistible force to the moral nature, while the coldest and most shrewdly calculating can appreciate its financial soundness and expediency as a business measure. This explains its rapid growth and shows how many more chances it has for general acceptance and speedy realization than any other method of relief.

That Nationalists and other socialists doubt the efficacy of the single tax to provide work for *all* men arises from the fact that they do not clearly grasp all that is implied in the economic term "land," and fail to realize the far-reaching effect of a tax on land *value*. Nature has already provided work for all men, by implanting in each certain imperative wants that can only be satisfied by labor of some sort, and the degree to which these may be met will depend upon man's freedom of access not only to land, but to *valuable* land; and land becomes valuable just in proportion as it carries with it the power of free and effective *cooperation* of man with his fellow-man. Not only "In union there is strength," but in union of productive forces there is *value* — land value — which has no existence without it. So here we get a glimpse of the socialism of the single tax.

Competition is, in truth, a selfish principle; but given free play, it forms the most effective check to that other selfish principle, *monopoly*. The trouble is, we are not living under free competition today, but under a fettered, forced and wholly *unnatural* competition.

It is equally idle to inveigh against cooperation, as if it did not already exist, or were dependent upon legislation for its continuance, since it is inseparable from even the lowest form of civilization. Only the hermit or the most primitive savage is or can be an absolute individualist, economically speaking. For the first step from savagery to civilization is by

cooperation, and the measure of man's civilization is the measure of his cooperation, and *vice versa*; so that in the highest forms of civilization we find the most complete interdependence of man and man. But as the most highly organized society is made up, after all, of individual members, so, on the other hand, a full-orbed human life, with the fullest satisfaction of its varied wants (as well as the accomplishment of any public reform), is possible only by incorporation and cooperation with society as a whole.

The single tax philosophy is based upon the principle that as society is but the greater man, its rights, privileges and duties are derived only from those of the individual unit, upon which they are based and of which they are the extension; wherefore a wrong done to one of the least of these is done at the peril of the whole social body, justice to the community being incompatible with injustice to the individual.

When it is claimed for the single tax that it would enable the laborer to get on the land and work for himself, nine people out of ten think only of *farm land* and of the conditions under which small farming is carried on today, and straightway imagine the poor laborer leading a comparatively isolated life of coarse drudgery, cut off from many of the benefits and refinements of civilization, and more or less limited to his individual resources for the supply of his wants, thereby getting but a scanty return for much hard toil. But such people forget that *valuable land* being the costliest to hold out of use under the single tax, would be the first to be freed from the grasp of mere speculative ownership — that the opportunities offered by the high-priced city lot or the valuable copper and coal mines and timber forests would be available to all who desired to utilize them, even earlier than would the broad farming lands that lie more remote from the centres of effective cooperation.

In hundreds of manufacturing towns today the crying need is for neat, commodious, low-priced houses for the working classes. The land is there in abundance and convenient of access, builders are there who have both the skill and the will to erect such houses; but the landlord is there, too, and without his consent nothing can be done, and in the majority of cases nothing is done. So mill operatives continue to live in crowded, unwholesome tenements, while carpenters and masons remain idle, and dealers in building materials complain of dull times.

Coal barons could no longer fix the price of coal to suit themselves, when heavy taxes would make it ruinous to hold coal fields idle; they must either increase their output, thereby employing more labor, or yield up their unused or half-used opportunities to eager rivals whose brisk competition would speedily bring prices down to the normal level. Hundreds of copper miners are idle because the heavy royalties which must be paid to the *owners* for permission to work the mines, make it impossible to produce at a living profit.

All this and much more the single tax would permanently cure. Hundreds of instances in all departments of human effort could be adduced to show how the single tax would liberate enterprise and set all the wheels of industry in motion. For it must be remembered that it is *opportunity to satisfy wants* which the single tax furnishes for all by giving to all *equal access to the natural source of supply* — not *work*, merely, which none of us particularly desire and which we are all seeking to avoid through labor-saving devices.

It is an error to suppose that society is an artificial product, to be governed by artificial or man-made laws. The social organism is as much the creation of God as is the individual human body, to which it so closely and beautifully corresponds; the laws of its well-being are incorporated into its very structure and can be as safely trusted to execute themselves as the laws of gravitation or chemical attraction. What we need to do, it seems to me, is *not* to attempt to legislate ourselves into the kingdom of heaven by our own devices, but rather, diligently to seek after those eternal laws of justice and equity that God has already enacted, and take heed that no statute of ours shall hamper their free and effective operation. The single tax, being in the nature of such an effort, seems to me the shortest and by far the surest way out of our social and economic difficulties.

Baltimore, Md.
ALTON A. A. CHAPMAN.

III. THE SOLUTION OF THE LABOR QUESTION.

In determining our duty as members of society it is not necessary to speculate on the destiny of man either here or hereafter. Where and how individual and social perfection may be attained are questions, however important and absorbing, which may be set aside in trying to solve the pressing problems of the hour. Those remain unchanged from age to age. These change with every generation, and demand immediate answers.

What is the great question of our generation? With one voice the civilized nations cry, "The labor question." Our Sphinx asks us how to secure the economic freedom of mankind. Not to answer is to be destroyed.

The land question and the labor question are the same. On the union of land and labor the life of man depends. Divorce them and man perishes. Labor wastes away without material on which to work; land lies useless till labor scratches its surface, burrows in its depths and dips in its waters. Every restriction upon this union is disastrous in proportion to its degree. Is it perfect now? Let the striking miners, mortgaged farmers, bankrupts, unemployed artisans and laborers, the clerks out of a place and professional men waiting for clients, bear witness that it is not.

But how, it will be asked, will the untrammelled union of land and labor solve the "labor problem"? Before trying to show this let us present two definitions: —

1. Land, in political economy, means all natural resources.
2. Labor means all human effort.

It has been said that man comes into the world with a mouth and a pair of hands to fill it. He goes to nature's storehouse, the land, and helps himself. The same may be said of all other animals. But there is a difference; man is the only unsatisfied animal. When he has food enough, he wants shelter, then clothes. He is not long satisfied with raw meat, a cave and a skin round his

loins. In time he wears silk, lives in a palace and eats peacocks'tongues. And where does he go to get these things? To the same old storehouse, ever overflowing, inexhaustible. Men no longer go directly to the storehouse each for himself; the raw material of one set of men is the finished product of those one degree nearer the primal industries; all bear the same relation to the earth; all depend upon it for life; all have equal right; to it.

We see, then, that as man's desires increase, his hands and brain are still able to gratify them. Nor does nature refuse the material on which to work. How comes it, then, that with increase of productive power, with transportation so perfected that famine from scarcity is unknown, the mass of civilized men live as the savage lives, from hand to mouth always, and die, often, as the savage never dies, from starvation, with plenty round the corner?

It is because man himself has made laws which prevent labor, which creates all wealth, from reaching land, the material from which all wealth is created. Not that all men would, under conditions which ensure perfect union of land and labor, become farmers or miners, fishers or lumbermen; but enough would do so to give employment to those who prefer to work in what we may call the secondary industries. For society is a seamless network of demand and supply. Every man in working to satisfy his own desires, sets others to work, and the prosperity of each ensures the well-being of all.

In political economy wealth means the whole product of labor; that is, everything we use after labor has removed it from its natural state, from a pail of water to a book. What is poverty? The absence of wealth. And since all wealth is created by the application of labor to land, it follows that all adults who are not sick or idiotic may get it if they have access to land.

In primitive communities access to land is easy. The land is free to all in nomadic tribes. When men begin to cultivate the soil there is enough for all; each may have a piece without infringing upon the right of his neighbor. The Jews tried to establish an equitable land tenure by the institution of the jubilee. The Teutonic *mark*, Swiss *allmend*, Servian and Russian village communities, the commons of England and the doctrine of eminent domain embodied in our law, all are imperfect recognitions of the principle that the earth belongs to the race. But in a civilization where the pressure of population and the increased power of production are as great, and exchange as easy as in ours, a more perfect recognition is necessary if we would advance, nay, if we would not retrograde — a recognition in law of the right of all to the earth, which shall also secure to each the permanent possession which the stability of our improvements makes necessary.

Nature herself has provided the means by which we can establish this principle, namely, economic rent. Economic rent is the value which attaches to land by reason of the pressure of population, and exactly measures the demand for land of varying quality and situation, being great in cities and small in rural communities. It is, in fact, a site value, and if it were treated in law as a common fund, which in fact it is, and were made to bear the common expenses of the people, not only would the right of all to the earth be secured, but all unused land would be opened to settlement, the owners of occupied land would be forced to put it to its best use, and taxation could be abolished. This would enormously increase wealth and would justly distribute it, since he who made it would keep it. And this change could be brought about with very little

friction, by simply abolishing all other taxes gradually and increasing that on land values till the whole of the annual rental value was taken.

This is what is known as the single tax, and it is the practical solution of the land question. Therefore the land question means to me the single tax, and the single tax is, in my opinion, the longest step we can take toward social and individual perfection here and now.

SARAH MIFFLIN GAY.

West New Brighton, N. Y.

IV. POLITICAL ECONOMY BASED UPON JUSTICE.

The land question is to me the question which if answered aright will give us a political economy based upon justice.

Generosity without justice ever misses its mark. It is the devil appearing as an angel of light. Chase it to its last hidings, and we shall see that that which is given returns in kind to the giver, while the receiver obtains a word of promise to the ear which is broken to the heart. In the application of Tolstoi's epigram, now famous, "We are willing to do everything for the poor except get off their backs," *justice* is the getting off their backs, *generosity* is the everything else. Of course the better we keep up their strength the more able are they to hold us.

Yet the true single taxer scorns the idea that the single tax is for the poor as poor. No! it is for man as man, bestowing upon every one the highest gift — opportunity to live honest, cleanly, self-dependent lives, neither entangled on the one side in a mesh of oppression which the heart abhors, nor on the other crowded by necessity to do what the mind disallows.

The earth belonging equally to all, and being the sole source of human subsistence, if we allow certain men to hold it as their own regardless of the rights and needs of the rest of humanity, is not this a stupendous injustice? And can an injustice of such proportions go on without producing at some epoch results commensurate with its greatness?

"The mills of the gods grind slowly,
But they grind exceeding small."

And is it not today that the grist is in condition to be delivered? Are we not living at the very period which is the culmination of this wrong? The inequality of material possessions is now surely being recognized as having arrived at a point where something must be done about it. The rich and benevolent say, "Give," the poor and reckless say, "Take," and other classes propose other remedies.

In the progress of human development many things evil in themselves play a good part. But when the abuse in these becomes greater than the use, their existence is drawing to a close. Such is the case with poverty. In the past it has had a noble *role*. It has built up strong, faithful, self-denying, sturdy characters. But now we see a change. Men and women as conscientious, God-

fearing and intelligent as the ancestors from whom we are proud to have descended, are embittered and resentful over their desperate struggle for existence; and multitudes of weaker mould, to whose ill-regulated passions the limitations of poverty have been heretofore a healthful restraint, no longer submit patiently to this check. All these are feeling that they are somehow wronged. The reason they feel so is because it *is* so. The conditions *are* unjust. It is the *truth* which is lighting up their minds. The light may uncover many tilings undesirable there, but it is the light nevertheless, and it is not going to be extinguished.

We hear great talk nowadays about protecting the rights of property, and about creating a demand for labor. In the former the single tax is in its stronghold. This is its very device. The community must be protected in its right to hold the communal property, which is the rental value of land that has a rental value. The individual who desires a field of labor must be protected in his right to use any land that no one else wants to use, and that is not paying a rent into the public treasury; and all men who lay up wealth for themselves, having first paid the community its share of the "natural opportunity" they are using, must have their wealth protected to its last farthing by the strong arm of the law.

As to creating a demand for labor, we say that a terrific demand already exists. Men want the common necessities of life. They are demanding in stentorian tones that there shall be labor to produce them, and are begging in piteous accents that they themselves may be allowed to do this labor. The artisans want food; the farmers want clothes; all want shelter and fuel. In a simple state of society each set of persons would work for the others, and neither gold nor silver would be necessary as a medium of exchange. Some hieroglyphics scrawled on a bit of birch bark would answer the purpose. But now that we have built up a complex and intricate civilization by means of which we promise to supply all men's higher wants, and in which every man is so locked that he cannot act alone, we have somehow gotten off our base. We are, as it were, "hoist with our own petard." We starve, we freeze, we commit suicide, we kill our little children, we become insane, we drown our senses in liquor; and, worse than all, in our frenzied fear of not getting our share of the work and pay available, we turn against our hungry brothers and force them to idleness, though idleness mean starvation.

Yet the whole, round earth is still at our disposal, an exhaustless reservoir of opportunity for labor and supply of products; the sun shines upon it as fervently as at the beginning; the laws of nature are in all their pristine freshness, and our knowledge of them is such that the output of products of all kinds must be limited by business calculations or it would outrun our needs. We are in the condition of a family that has packed an immense van with great care for convenience on a long journey: tents on top, then food, and so on in the order of their necessities. By some mishap the van has capsized; the top things are at the bottom, the bottom things on top. Everything is there, but nothing wanted can be gotten at. The situation would be endlessly comic were it not overwhelmingly tragic. The squatters up town in New York, with their cabbages and goats, who cling to their rocks year after year till the blasters are fairly upon them, could teach us better. Supposing we should put up a notice on all vacant land, "Squatting allowed here," how long would poverty last, think you?

A true political economy will confer security of subsistence at the bottom of society and an outlet for all human energies at the top. The nearest we have had to this, when poverty was at its

minimum and labor at its maximum, was during a few years just before and after our Civil War. Are we to say, then, that the condition most favorable to the abolition of poverty is the combination of a civil war, an immense national debt, gold at a high premium and a large number of unusual taxes? No! there is a better way.

The prophet of old found not the presence of the Lord in the wind, the earthquake or the fire, but in the still, small voice. So we shall not find our deliverance in tempestuous conditions nor in the measures announced to us with great flourish of trumpet in our present political campaigns. But when all else has been tried and has failed, then, in the subsequent hush of disappointment and despair, we shall be able to hear the still, small voice of the Master saying, "Consider the lilies of the field." And if we heed the admonition and consider with faith, with insight and with courage, the lilies will lead us out of the darkness into a bright and shining light. And political economy will no longer be the "dismal science," but she shall be called the joyous science, and all men will resort to her temple to do her honor.

JULIA A. KELLOGG.

East Orange, N. J.

V. INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM AND SOCIAL WELL-BEING.

If I were asked to epitomize what the single tax means to me, I should say, "Individual freedom and social well-being." The *laissez-faire* of today has secured neither. The dream of nationalism promises the last, but even its most strenuous advocates will not claim that it does not hedge in the first with very serious limitations. Artificial limitations create artificial wrongs; and I think any one who closely scrutinizes Mr. Bellamy's proposed Utopia will discover many such.

The imperative need of existence to material and spiritual beings as we are, is to possess untrammelled our natural right of access to the gifts of the Creator common to all, and to stand in just relations to our fellows. These are conditions which can be fulfilled as completely in the most simple and primitive mode of life, as in the most highly developed. It is not great invention, not even high literary culture, which makes a people free; but the spirit which recognizes, as a practical truth, the *equality* of man. "For man is man, and who is more?"

Does it not weary you, sometimes, this "wondrous, wondrous age" — where there is so much progress and so little liberty? All these achievements in which we triumph so vainly, have they not exalted us to heaven like the ancient city, only that we might be cast down to hell? Have they added one iota, so far, to the real sum of human happiness? Have they not, on the contrary, added most grievously to the sum of human misery? It does not seem to me that the world at present is morally ready for these things. That they have a present existence among us does not prove it; they may have been necessary as a tremendous physical and intellectual force to drive us on to a realization and acceptance of ultimate truth; and one beneficent result of our acceptance of the great truth of the equal right of all men to the use of the earth — in other words, the adoption of the single tax, "unlimited" — might be, and I think would be, to call us back for a time to simpler modes of life that should draw us closer to one another in kindly human fellowship and service.

It might purify our souls by a newly awakened sense of the grandeur of this physical universe, so that it should be possible for us to contemplate the marvel of a Niagara without computing the water power it could furnish to manufacturing enterprise; and so that we could feel our spirits thrilled by the memories of Gethsemane, without planning to run an electric railroad to the Mount of Olives!

The steam plough, for instance, will no longer be such a *desideratum*, when fields of a thousand acres — in whose cultivation now the tiller merely bears the part of an adjunct to machinery — are transformed into ten or twenty smiling farmsteads, abodes of self-respecting industry and domestic peace. The multiform and complex so-called modern improvements of the monstrous sixteen and twenty story buildings of our modern Chicago, will be simplified to the rational requirements of health and comfort, when the blight of our modern city itself has been swept away. We shall not be so anxious to "put a girdle round the earth in forty minutes," when we have awakened from the nightmare activity of nineteenth century civilization, and realize that the morning and the evening make the day. The insanity of greed, the terror of want, which have fevered heart and brain, and made us doubt anything outside of material circumstance, will be healed when we have placed ourselves in true relationship to nature's laws. Life will not be merely what we get out of it in sordid gain or restless excitement: it will be the supreme gift of the Creator, to be used worthily to noble ends. Man will call a halt in his present mad rush after material achievement, and pause to understand himself, and renovate his being by contact and communion with that nature whose forces he now regards merely as a mechanism to do his will. The sense of reverence, purified from superstition, will reawaken, and the controlling spirit of brotherhood glorify human intercourse. The beauty and the value of existence will dawn upon the human mind with a sense of awe and joy we know not now.

In that coming era, the immense aggregations of capital in a few hands, which we see today, will not only be impossible, but will no longer be desired by any man breathing the atmosphere of a world fulfilling normal conditions. And, released from its long bondage, individual aspiration and industry will at last have its true scope; while "association in equality" will secure to each community all the blessings of human progress. Then, and then only, will man's inventive genius fulfil the beneficent purpose it was intended to serve, instead of being the weapon of the powerful against the weak — as we see it today; for we shall then be capable of using all material advancement as a means and not an end, and shall regard with horror any gain which involves a brother's loss.

It is such a future that the single tax, in its fulness, prophesies to me: a country in which neither millionaire nor pauper shall be found from sea to sea; a race of men and women whose lives of grand simplicity shall shame the dwarfed humanity of today which shows belittled beside its own inventions. "It is a cause worth living for, and worth dying for," says a letter which came to me not long ago from one who is battling in the vanguard of the fight in far-off Australia. Aye! is it not?

FRANCES M. MILNE.

San Luis Obispo, Cal.

VI. THE CENTRIFUGAL REFORM.

The discovery that water will rise as high as its source, made useless the cumbersome Roman aqueducts; likewise the values invisible flowing to land, are on the way to their source, the public, and when no longer sluiced off by landlordism will fill public treasuries without the need of painfully drawing on the direct products of labor; then much of our creaking and groaning governmental machinery will drop away. This putting land out of the reach of speculators by taking their profits for public expenses, and throwing it into use by untaxing all products of toil, goes to the root of all present maladies and restores the true relation of man to the earth. It "sets the poor on work," as the English say, not for masters but for themselves. And to draw our unemployed off into fields and mines, would remove unnatural pressure from all other vocations. This vent, this safety valve of individual freedom of opportunity, is not only essential now, but it will be far more imperative to cooperative industry in the future.

Matter, both animate and inanimate, civilization, both religious and political, are ever governed by two opposing forces — the centripetal, the organizing and centralizing; the centrifugal or disintegrating, dissenting. To conceive man as under the permanent control of but one of these forces is absurd. A bird could as well fly with one wing. Even the two old parties originally stood, after a fashion, for these two methods. The trouble with Plato's "Republic," with Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward," lies in the fact that they take no account of the centrifugal force, the dissenting party. There is no earthly place for it to go to. Monarchy always tried to suppress it — and failed; and socialism, born of the same centralizing power, will likewise fail if it attempt control of all industries, both indoors and out.

Since man's right to land is prior to that of the state, absolute monopoly of all lands by the state is as illogical as any other monopoly. Hence there is not only a distinction, but a wide difference, between state ownership and control of land, and state appropriation of such land values as arise from the presence of people and must be used for public improvements. Only free individual access to land will keep cooperation pure and uncorrupted; therefore socialists must leave room in their schemes for the widest individualism, or fermentation and explosion will result.

Both of our old parties, as now corrupted, stand together for federal rights, military power and paternalism. It is the centripetal force applied to the centralization of wealth. A new party which embodies the same principle cannot gain permanence, even though it aim at equitable distribution. That is the trouble with the People's Party. It must come to stand for the centrifugal or opposite force, the undoing of too much organization, for equal individual rights, for freedom, or make way for another. The coming party will stand for these things; they are embodied in the land question. And should the correlative party represent order, federation and nationalized industry pure and simple and not compromise to catch votes, the two would so balance as ultimately to permit as much cooperation as is compatible with freedom and as much freedom as could exist with order. Hence these two mutually repellent laws, shown in socialism and individualism, in cooperation and freedom to live without cooperating, are but two extremes of the same thing — progress.

But when justice shall take on finer distinctions, extension of our logic will bring us to see that man owes to man not only the material advantages of nature (above the poorest in use) which he

appropriates, but the immaterial and far greater advantages of nature which may be stored in his own brain; and that the exceptional endowments of his mind are not more for his sole profit than the rich bed of coal on his farm.

The land question means restoration of political balance by the return of that force now most in demand, the breaking of that "invisible and horrid enchantment" that withholds man from the soil. It means the stopping of the leak in the ship instead of pumping the water out of one compartment into another. It means life with all the joys of which socialists dream, unmenaced by the dangers they seem not to suspect.

Moreover, the justice which the single tax would usher in is of that obvious and individual kind that it appeals to all honest people who understand it. Even selfishness (that wants not to get something for nothing) is attracted and ready to help; and a flame that brightens by burning its own smoke is better than one whose smoke smothers it out. A reform which need not wait for the church to regenerate mankind is seriously near success; make way for it. A reform which will complete the circuit between labor and wealth, not by an added tangle of wires but by simple natural law without wires at all, is the one now upon us.

LONA INGHAM ROBINSON.

Des Moines, Iowa.

VII. A BROAD BASIS FOR PRACTICAL BROTHERHOOD.

"Man was meant for the brotherhood of his race, which alone is wide enough to allow of his unlimited individual expansion." So said the elder Henry James in 1867. The boundless ideal suggested in this statement has been my study, more or less, during the succeeding years.

In harmony with this ideal — indeed an absolutely necessary part of it — is the principle of justice involved in the land question— that all mankind have equal rights to the use of the earth. A simple, practicable method for gradually establishing our equal rights to land under existing civilization, has been presented and now goes by the name of the "single tax." The associated use of economic rent by taking it for a nation's revenue is really the *nationalization of ground rent*. It is the logical beginning of all true nationalism — a nationalism which need compel no one into its ranks, since it would leave open a way of escape (to such land as would be free from economic rent) for those who could not endure even the "socialization" of rent, or the single tax.

The land question is to the whole social problem what the question of physical health is to the ideal of complete manhood.

I like John Stuart Mill's last statement of the "social problem of the future": "How to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership of the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labor."

The land, the source of all material things, does not include the whole of our Creator's bounty. There is also the human mind with its wonderful possibilities. Among these is its practically

unlimited power of increasing production by assisting labor in its application to land — variously manifested, now as invention or discovery of law, now as organization or specialization of industry.

Mr. Louis F. Post has just said, speaking of the wealth accumulation of the race, "It is not wealth but the knowledge how to produce wealth that we have been accumulating all these centuries." Here is an "increment" which is certainly "unearned" by any individual. Since it implies organization and use of mechanical powers and inventions, and superintendence by comparatively few at the same time, it is evident that there can never be an equal opportunity for all to acquire wealth, even with equal access to land, until we also — "we, the people" — unitedly engage in production, or cooperate as a nation so as to distribute impartially among all, the aid of this unearned increment of "knowledge how to produce wealth," this store of race experience; or until we secure, as Mill says, "an equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labor."

In a primitive state of society, or where each keeps the entire result of his toil or exchanges it for the products of his neighbors, each may receive the "full earnings of his labor"; but under conditions of organized industry, using the latest inventions and discoveries, the exact product of each can no more be determined than the exact amount of economic rent due to the character and genius of each citizen. I am not satisfied with the measure of wages for "the least of these my brethren" offered by the political economy of either Mr. George or Mr. Mallock.* Political economy has not said its best word so long as it offers no proposition for the impartial distribution of the "benefits of combined labor," or the "rent of ability."

* Political economy, as reported by Mr. George, teaches that "The return which labor can secure from such natural opportunities as are free to it must fix the wages which labor everywhere gets." It does not seem to me that the pay of wage-workers is likely to be much or permanently increased by the operation of this law under the single tax. Improved machinery constantly tends to "eliminate the man" both on the farm and in the shop. There is already under cultivation more than enough land to supply all the food needed, if properly cultivated. With increasing competition in our own and foreign countries, the man who would go alone "back to the land" for relief, could make only a bare living by hard work, and would have no money to pay for Mr. Garland's books or Mr. Herne's art.

Mr. Mallock insists that under "combined labor," with modern power and machinery, each workman is justly entitled to only as much of the total product as he would earn if working alone at the same business.

The benefits of combined labor are found not only in greater quantity and better quality of material things, but in great saving of time, in opportunity for culture and enjoyment of individual taste, in freedom for the higher nature from the constant pressure of the struggle for existence. How may this great increase of leisure, culture, freedom, be made equally accessible to all?

In the application of labor to land for the production of things we need, the full benefits of steam, electricity, irrigation and the scientific disposition of sewage, cannot be realized by individuals

working alone; nor can the great undeserved losses from drought, storm, fire, flood, frost and pestilence be avoided or equalized.

The belief grows that the best safeguard against extensive strikes and against robbery of the people by corporations, is to nationalize the railroads and the mines. Whatever industries can become monopolies, or unite in pools and trusts for the taxation of the whole people to create a few millionaires, could as easily be managed by the general administration (under strict civil service regulations) for, the benefit of the whole people. As Henry George has said in speaking of national ownership and control of "natural monopolies," "Government could thus gradually pass into an administrative agency of the great cooperative association — society."

The "single tax" — or the restoration of economic rent to its creator, the public — is not a panacea. To work for it as such, and to disregard the "money question" of today, is to leave a possibility that a public revenue derived wholly from land values may leak out of the public treasury in extensive streams of interest on bonds, into the pockets of bondholders; or that by neglect of national industrial organization for the benefit of all, that revenue may be used largely as salaries for an increasing horde of public officials necessary to "keep the peace" between capital and labor.

Prof. Alfred Russel Wallace has lately suggested a danger which had occurred to lesser minds — that extensive land holding might, even under the "single tax," be profitable to the extent of greater land monopoly than we have ever known, if there is no limit to the amount of land one man or syndicate may control by paying the tax for the sake of controlling the industries upon it and the people engaged in them. This danger is not lessened by the fact that immense aggregations of wealth are already buying up our waterfalls to furnish the cheapest possible electric power. Is it, then, within the range of *possibility* that a single great combination, or oligarchy of wealth, might gain possession of most of the land (so much depends upon assessors!) and of the best machinery and cheapest power for wealth production, and then of the means of transportation — is such a fatal combination *possible*, even under the "single tax," *if advance be sought on that line alone?*

The land question means to me, a broad basis for practical brotherhood. Equality in our relation to the earth is the necessary foundation for all equality of human rights. Till this is established all other rights are insecure. Let us aim at the fullest equality of human opportunity; but we must guard every point and neglect no duties, while we work and grow toward our best ideal of freedom and fellowship.

FRANCES E. RUSSELL.

St. Paul, Minn.

VIII. RELATION OF EQUITABLE REPRESENTATION TO THE LAND QUESTION.

In my ten months' travelling and lecturing through the United States I have noted the one-sidedness of parties with sorrow and alarm. The duel in the uninominal district or ward, supported by the machine with wealth at the back of it, prevents America from obtaining the

services of her wisest and her best. But not only is this narrowness of view seen in the alternately dominant parties — the Republican and the Democratic; — the various outside parties, the reform elements which ought to be the saving salt of the republic, are so engrossed with one object that they rarely take any wide, deep view of human society. In the words of Scripture, they would heal the wounds of the daughter of our people slightly, and expect health from a single nostrum.

Although the land question is really the largest of all, its solution, whether on the line of the single tax, as advocated by Henry George, or on that of land nationalization, would not and could not remedy all the evils under which we groan, or give that equality of opportunity to all which its advocates promise. The more rapid, too, the advance of the land movement, the more dangers are ahead. Under present methods of election and under the spoils system, the United States, federal, state and municipal, has a system theoretically and practically the worst in the civilized world for wise and pure administration of public funds.

Ardent single taxers think if the land monopoly were killed, and the whole public revenue were derived from land values created by the public, all wrongs would right themselves automatically. If in a mild way single taxers advocate proportional representation, it is rather as a means of obtaining their main object sooner than for its intrinsic value. Their ablest champions would enter Congress and state legislatures in greater numbers, and would be bolder in speech, if they had not to clothe themselves in the hide of the Democrat and pronounce his shibboleth. Some of them have wondered at my devotion to such an insignificant reform, when I might have turned my energies into the land question instead.

But I may have some doubts as to the desirability of drawing all revenue from land values, while I have no doubts whatever as to the justice and the wisdom of making representative bodies the true mirrors of the people represented. When the people equitably represented demand single tax, they ought to have it, and if they continue to be equitably represented, they will retain it if it is good, and modify it if it is faulty. Equitable representation is the key not to one reform only, but to all reform. Where party is pitted against party, a victory won is never safe from reversal or corruption, the latter the more dangerous of the two.

The socialists and nationalists (and here we may include the great majority of the People's party) think land reform is not enough, but would also nationalize capital and means of production. During their campaign how many spies will enter their camp, the strongest in profession, the bitterest in accusation of monopoly, crafty enough to deceive the very elect, and, taking the lead, to sell them to the enemy. Even if victory crowned the nationalists, up to the present stage of social development, the righteous themselves might find it hard to withstand the temptations of power and place, and experience has shown to all reformers in America that traitors have betrayed them when they are weak, and traitors may exploit them when they are strong. The only safe-guard lies in equitable methods of election, honest, capable and experienced men have a reasonable chance of being placed in power, and kept in power.

Another large body of outsiders, the Prohibitionists, have taken no hold of the land question at all. They are so blind as not to see that under present economic conditions, universal temperance would lower wages, and raise rent both for land and houses, and would add to the hoards of

parasitic money misnamed capital. They are contented to increase their numbers, and throw away their votes in the hope that one or other of the contending parties will bid for their solid vote as a means of obtaining or retaining ascendancy, and will concede all or part of the Prohibition demands. Prohibitionists look askance at single tax because it would allow free trade in liquor, and distrust socialism because it is pressed so much by people without religion. Some few of the more enlightened see the justice of what I call effective voting, but the main body think the crumbs thrown from either of the two parties will do more for their cause than what they can independently attain through the ballot.

The woman suffragists in America are singularly non-political. The vast majority demand the suffrage in order to promote temperance and social purity, and all of them think that the addition of women's votes would bring in men of better character than now. Only a few have grasped the land question, and those who do, seem to me to have grasped also the question of effective voting with a clearness and an enthusiasm beyond those of men. They see that without a provision for the representation of intelligent minorities of women as well as of men, the giving of the vote to women would be an illusory benefit.

No one would think from reading the ordinary daily newspaper that America is honey-combed with land reform. But if we entered the newspaper offices, we would find that three fourths of the writers, reporters, printers and employees are on that side. The proprietors dictate the policy, and *the public are not enlightened as they should be.** The enfranchisement of genuine public opinion by means of effective voting would astonish the world, and it would also educate the world, which is of more importance.

C. H. SPENCE.

Adelaide, South Australia.

* Italicized by an American.

IX. LAND MUST BE FREE THAT WE MAY LIVE.

A change of vast importance is taking place in the human world today. This change marks a stage in the development of our race from its past condition of individual consciousness to its future condition of social consciousness. The race — as a race — is just being born. This great change is marked in centuries past by the exhibition of race consciousness in individual men who were ahead of their times and suffered accordingly; and marked in the century present by the kindling sense of common interest — race consciousness, which draws all hearts together in unity; not only on lines of class feeling, national feeling, professional feeling, but in great swelling waves of interclass, interprofessional, international, *human* feeling, as wide as the world.

One of the symptoms marking this change is the special enthusiasm on what is called the land question. Among the many distressing conditions of a transition stage such as mankind is now passing through, and with the necessarily localized range of interests in most minds, it is natural

that the evils most immediately pressing should arouse most attention, and that their cure should seem to cure all things. Thus many thousands of reformers — and reformers are those more advanced cells in the body politic most keenly alive to the inadequacy of present conditions, and most painfully eager for new and better ones — many thousands of these are convinced that the liquor question is the crucial one, and that could we eliminate alcohol from our problem all would be easy. In the land question the physical basic necessity of land seems to give it a metaphysical basic necessity as well, and the ground is taken that if the monopoly of land could be forever prevented the rest of our desired economic changes would surely follow.

In my study of this question it does not seem to me that the advocates of the single tax theory prove either that our distresses are all due to land monopoly, or that a tax on land values only would finally prevent such monopoly. That it would for the time being cheapen land, relieve the congested districts, and bring about a temporary amelioration of our troubles I believe, but not to ultimate safety.

The single taxer holds fast to two great principles, — one the permanence and value of private property; the other that every man should be free to become richer than his neighbors if he has the ability. Yet these principles — and they are closely allied — lie at the root of our social disorders, and while they are accepted the evil we have now will remain with us. Monopoly in land is bad enough in itself; but to prevent it would not prevent other monopolies producing the same ill results. We must remember that relative freedom of land, as now found, does not show a proportionate improvement in all economic conditions.

That the land is common to us all and should be so maintained seems to the advanced thinker a self-evident proposition; but there follows this: Land should be free to all because from it come the necessities of life — it must be free that we may live. The necessities of life are, however, only obtainable to us today by means of organized labor, machinery and capital; therefore these things should be held in common and free to all, precisely as the land. Of what avail is free land with monopoly in capital, machinery and labor?

Free land is not enough. In earliest days
When man, the babe, from out the earth's bare breast
Drew for himself his simple sustenance,
Then freedom and his effort were enough.
The world to which a man is born today
Is a constructed, human, man-built world.
As the first savage needed the free wood,
We need the road, the ship, the bridge, the house,
The government, society and church —
These are the basis of our life today —
As much necessities to modern man
As was the forest to his ancestor.
To say to the newborn, "Take here your land;
In primal freedom settle where ye will,
And work your own salvation in the world,"
Is but to put the last come upon earth

Back with the dim forerunners of his race,
To climb the race's stairway in one life!
Allied society owes to the young —
The new men come to carry on the world —
Account for all the past, the deeds, the keys,
Full access to the riches of the earth.
Why? That these new ones may not be compelled
Each for himself to do our work again;
But reach their manhood even with today,
And gain to-morrow sooner. To go on —
To start from where we are and go ahead —
That *iz* true progress, true humanity.

CHARLOTTE PERKINS STETSON.

Oakland, Cal.

X. RESPECT FOR GOD'S LAWS AND FOR ALL HIS CHILDREN.

Standing upon Eagle Rock, on Orange Mountain, New Jersey, the beholder sees spread out before him a vast plain so thickly dotted with cities as to seem one great metropolis. At his feet lie Orange and Newark; beyond, and on either side, Elizabeth and Paterson; while away in the distance gleam Hoboken, Jersey City, New York and Brooklyn. Once realize that this picture is teeming, throbbing, with varied, complex, individual life, and there lies within compass of human vision, mingled with the scene, the cause and the solution of the mightiest problem that confronts civilization today — the sphinx of the nineteenth century.

The keenest instinct of mankind is the preservation of life; and so the first exclamation of the beholder is apt to be, "How do all these people manage to live upon this small area of land?" The superficial answer is: "Most of them are supported by capital. Great is capital! Let us control her!" Because the land is covered with buildings, the part it plays in manufacture and commerce seems unimportant. But look again: Winding amid the whole, run roads of iron rails; rivers are made highways; and, on the distant ocean, heavily laden ships pass and repass. Steam has so closely united these people with every land and clime, that, while living upon this centre of exchange, they are, nevertheless, able to subsist from Mother Earth, drawing from distant lands such materials as best suit their varied needs. Some are engaged in supplying the raw materials from earth's storehouse; some turn these products into finished wealth, which others carry to distant lands.

It is the multitudinous and ever increasing *wants* of these people, and of those with whom they are exchanging the results of their labor, that *furnishes employment* for all. Were it not for the use of steam and electricity, these millions could not live upon this narrow tract of land; for such complex subdivisions of labor would be impossible, and land could not be put to this its highest use. Here, land has become, as it were, a fulcrum, upon which long levers rest, sweeping the earth with their exchanges; its value being proportionate to the extent of its commerce. To live upon this land and yet own no share in it, is, for both labor and capital, to be compelled to lift

great weights without a fulcrum; and to own neither capital nor land is for labor to become a slave, a mere pin or cog in a wheel of capital, dependent upon it; forced to use or employ it upon its own terms; compelled to give it more labor value than is returned in wages; in short, to yield to its behests, however arbitrary. Labor is an Archimedes, and with somewhere to place its lever, it can move the world; without a fulcrum, it is defenceless — a javelin or scimitar compels its surrender.

Upon what, then, do the life, liberty and happiness of these people depend? Upon capital? Yes, in a subordinate degree; but, primarily, upon land — *this* land, spread out here before us, and the demands of the market; for a thousand feet of this land, at this centre of power, may aid labor more than a thousand acres, at the end of one of the levers. Or, to state it more broadly, the life, liberty and happiness of all men depend upon land, and the universal wants of mankind; for while many are employed, by capital, in supplying, from land, the wants of others, they are — by selling their labor — supplying their own.

Land is, therefore, the prime necessity of every human being; yet, of those living here, over ninety per cent own none. Look again, more closely: Beneath nearly every factory, home, store or office, there runs, as it were, a network of grooves, much like the automatic cash distributors in the great retail stores. Into these are placed from at least one fifth to one fourth the earnings of labor and capital, and instantly the balls carrying this sum start on their journey to deposit ground rent safely in the pockets of the few who own the land, and who, by virtue of the possession of this fulcrum — by owning this labor-saving power — are, themselves, rendered exempt from labor. Nearly the whole civilized world is now covered with this network of grooves. From vast western prairies — from land so lately free — roll the results of hard toil into capacious pockets, in the East, in London, Berlin and Paris, to pay for the use of American soil. This sum is often called interest on mortgages, but it pays for the annual use of land. Where land possesses such labor-saving power, the competition for its use is so fierce that rents are pressed up, and wages and profits are forced down to their lowest margin, till the lowest wage-earner, even in good times, can make but a bare living. Large capitalists undersell the small ones; competition becomes so keen that rings and combinations are formed to keep up prices; trades unions are organized, and strikes are ordered, to keep up wages. The people, meanwhile, seeing these two forces arrayed against each other, denounce competition as the cause of all the trouble, failing to see that it is but an effect; the real cause being that which *produces* low profits and wages, viz., high rents.

In a struggle between capital and labor, labor is usually beaten; for capital can wait, does not eat; besides, capital is generally combined with either some land power, franchise or patent monopoly, sufficient to render it imperious. Labor can never become its own master, until it ceases to demand higher wages, and begins to demand its rights — its right to the use of the earth. Think of it! 90% of the people of our land own no share in it!

Concentrated within the radius of this small circle is a vivid illustration of what the land question means to me, for here is realized the sum of all paradoxes: too much wealth, and too much poverty; too many people, and, within touch of all, too much land, but held out of use by the high price demanded. Here genius, art, science and invention find birth, religion and philanthropy their best fruitage; but here, also, is portrayed a Dantean Inferno, with living human beings for

pictures of crime, despair, hate, hunger and want, so sickening that even pale death seems friendly and agreeable; in the park rides fashion — a flower of this complex stalk — full of beauty, fragrance and art, yet with a worm gnawing at its heart. Is there not a gigantic falsehood somewhere? Woe unto them who call evil, good, and wrong, right; who mistake custom and human law for eternal principles of equity! The right of the veriest girl baby, bom in a fifth-story tenement, to her share of God's earth, upon which He has placed her — the right to her share of the annual value which her presence in society creates, is a right as sacred as her life itself; but because this right is not respected, it has come to pass that her life is looked upon as a mere breath of idle wind, and her presence in society as an intrusion.

The land question? Does it not mean a respect for God's laws, and for all His children — a vision of clear seeing and right doing? When the land question is rightly understood, capital and labor will see that their interests are one, and will no longer hate and fight each other, while both are being robbed by a common enemy.

The land question? Is it not the labor question? And does that mean more to woman than to man? Yes, if possible; since every burden, disaster or wrong, rests with more crushing weight upon the weakest; since woman's heart was made for sympathy, its depths must be stirred beyond that of man's, at wrong and injustice, everywhere; and her clear vision must see in this question a moral one — a question of human rights; one in which the slavery and wrongs of her sex are so bound up with her brother's, that his wrongs are her wrongs, and his rights her rights. Such questions as women competing with men for employment, shorter hours of labor, equal pay for equal work, are but phases of the great land question; when analyzed, they mean that laborers are competing with each other for a right to the use of the earth, or earth's products — for food, clothing and shelter — in short, for land, or what land produces. Settle this question, and labor, everywhere, will receive its full reward. .

Wollaston Heights, Mass.
ELIZA STOWE TWITCHELL.

XI. A FABIAN ON THE LAND QUESTION.

I confess that I am unable to understand why women should be supposed to hold any different views on the land question from those of men. But as I have been asked to state my opinions, as a member of the Fabian Society,* I hasten to do so.

* See " Fabian Essays in Socialism," price one shilling. Fabian Society, 2*6 Strand, London, England.

The Fabians, both men and women, have always shown the greatest sympathy with, and given the most cordial assistance to, every phase of land reform, which makes for an extension of the collective control over the prime necessity for human existence.

The fundamental basis of our association, adopted in its present form in 1886, declares its aim to be "the reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general

benefit." And the basis, moreover, goes on specifically to declare that "The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land, and the consequent individual appropriation, in the form of rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of superior soils and sites."

Fabians, therefore, are staunch land reformers. But not every panacea that comes forward under the name of land reform has their support. They are persistent opponents of all attempts to increase the number of individual owners of land, whether great or small, or in any way to strengthen the position of those who already exist. They therefore resist all schemes of peasant proprietorship, leasehold enfranchisement, or the ownership by the artisan of his own cottage. On the other hand, they are found actively promoting every kind of movement for increasing ownership by public authorities, such as the acquisition of land by parish councils to be let on hire as allotments, or the building of cottages, artisans' dwellings and common lodging houses by the municipality or parish itself.

But the land question necessarily takes a different form in each country. In England, with its dwindling agricultural interest, its great mineral wealth, and its ever-growing cities, the land question is fundamentally a rent question. Our annual tribute to the landlords amounts to at least 200 millions of pounds sterling, or ten times the charge of the national debt. From London alone, the landlords draw an annual tribute of 40 millions sterling, and receive, besides, a yearly New Year's gift, in the shape of "unearned increment" of capital value, amounting on an average to over 4 millions sterling. These facts explain why Mr. Henry George's campaign roused such enthusiastic support in England and Scotland, and started, as I have described in "The History of Trade Unionism,"* a fundamental revolution in English political thought, which is rapidly changing the face, both of Liberalism and Conservatism. Sir William Harcourt's budget, with its drastic increase of land taxation, is only one sign among many, of the hold which the idea of the nationalization of rent has taken.

* Longmans, Groan & Company, London and New York.

But though we are all friends of Mr. Henry George, we are not single taxers. First, because there are more ways than one of getting at the landlords. Income tax, local rates, death duties, stamps on transfers, compulsory purchase for public uses, betterment, confiscation of future unearned increment, taxation of mining royalties — we intend to advance along all these lines, according as opportunity offers.* Secondly, Mr. George's able application of Ricardo's "law of rent" applies, as all economists would admit, to many other things besides land.f We want to absorb, either by taxation or by collective administration, all forms of monopoly tribute upon industry. Railways, telegraphs, tramways, docks, water works, gas works, and many other essentially public services are today made the means of extracting from the actual workers by hand or by brain, a tribute not inferior to that taken by the lords of the soil itself, today, in hundreds of city and country councils, the English worker is progressing towards the collective ownership of these means of civilized existence. Unfortunately, many followers of Mr. Henry George stand aloof, and refuse to lend a hand in this municipal socialism which has already carried the fame of the London County Council into all land<.J

• See Fabian Tract No. 39, "A Democratic Budget."

t This is fully explained In Fabian Tract No. 7, "Capital and Land," price one penny. The Fabian Society, 276 Strand, \A»U\O\|.

t See the " Fabian Municipal Programme," and Its Tract No. 12, "Practicable Land Nationalization."

To sum up, the land question means to me the diversion of several hundred millions of pounds sterling every year in my country alone, from individual to collective ownership and control. This would imply, instead of individual private luxury, an enormous extension of the public provision of improved dwellings, sanitation, means of healthful recreation, education from the *creche* to the university, and everything that goes to make up efficient citizenship, for the first time secured to all alike, whether men or women, rich or poor. And this, great as it is, forms but a part of a wider ideal. By appropriate social arrangements, I believe, to use the words of John Bright, which are no less applicable to the United States than to England,—

that ignorance and suffering might be lessened to an incalculable extent, and that many an Eden, beautiful in flowers and rich in fruits, might be raised up in the waste wilderness which spreads before us. But no class can do that. The class which has hitherto ruled in this country has failed miserably. It revels in power and wealth, while at its feet, a terrible peril for its future, lies the multitude which it has neglected. If a class has failed, let us try the nation. That is our faith, that is our purpose, that is our cry — let us try the nation. This it is which has called together these countless numbers of the people to demand a change; and as I think of it, and of these gatherings, sublime in their vastness and in their resolution, I think I see, as it were, above the hilltops of time, the glimmerings of the dawn of a better and nobler day for the country and the people that I love so well.

BEATRICE WEBB