

You will like the realistic story
of farm life entitled - - -

All on Account of His Wife.

This interesting story will be sent WITH-
OUT CHARGE TO READERS OF WHY?
upon request.

WRITE FOR IT TO-DAY.

It is warranted to be free from Single Tax or
any other philosophy, but is a reflection of actual
conditions as they now exist.

Chicago Telephone Supply Co.,

The Great Mail Order Factory.

ELKHART, INDIANA, U. S. A.

330 SPENCER
August, 1903

Why?

No Consecrated Absurdity
would have stood its ground
in this world if the man had
not silenced the objection of
the child. —Michelet

Issued Monthly
Frank Worth, Publisher
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

9128

Why?

PUBLICATION OFFICE, 634 S. TENTH STREET,
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—United States and
Canada, 25 cents a year. Foreign subscriptions,
40 cents a year.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—In request for change
of address please give both your old and new
address.

COMMUNICATIONS—Address communications
and make all remittances payable to:
Frank Verth, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Entered at the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, postoffice as
second-class matter.

Have You Read Them?

Bolton Hall's Fables and Parables are radical
and yet most simple. Their theme is the problems
of life.

"EVEN AS YOU AND I" is a little book now in its
fourth edition, and is now being republished in
England. A part of it is an account of Tolstoy's
philosophy drawn from his difficult work "Of
Life." This is called "True Life" and follows
thirty-three parables. Count Tolstoy wrote to
Mr. Hall: "I have received your book and have
read it. I think it is very good and renders in a
concise form quite truly the chief ideas of my
book. I hope that this new book in this new
form will be useful, in the sense in which I in-
tended it to be, to a larger public than the origi-
nal.

Bound in cloth, ornamental, $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{8}$ inches.
Price 50 cents.

"THINGS AS THEY ARE" is a larger book. The
chapters which compose the first part of it are
designed to show in a logical manner the pur-
pose and the order of life. The parables are
written to illustrate the principles shown in
these chapters. "Those," says Mr Hall, "who
cannot receive the essays are asked to read the
parables, those who cannot receive the parables
are asked to read the essays before passing on
their message."

Gilt tops, uniform with "Even as You and I."
Price \$1. Order from this office.

Single Tax Pamphlets

A SPECIAL OFFER.

While they last the following assortment of pamphlets aggregating 400 pages will be mailed postpaid

FOR 10 CENTS.

{ A Mysterious Disappearance—Lewis Freeland.
 { The Law of Social Progress—Wm. S. Rann.
 { The Study of Political Economy—Henry George.
 { The Effects of Material Progress.
 { A Single Tax View of Trusts—Louis F. Post.
 { Real and Fictitious Capital—Dictatorship.
 { An Entering Wedge—Henry Ware Allen.
 { A Conference—Anonymous.
 { Truths Seen by Contrast—Eliza Stowe Twitchell.
 { The True Light—Speed Mosby.
 { Taxation and the Workingman—Albert H. Jackson.
 { Anarchism—Robert Cumming.
 { A House Not Made with Hands—C. F. Shandrew.
 { The Modern Pilgrim's Progress—E. Cockill.

and the "The Story of My Dictatorship."

NOTE—The titles within a brace are contained in one pamphlet.

BOOKS BY HENRY GEORGE.

	Paper	Cloth
Progress and Poverty	50	
Social Problems	50	
A Perplexed Philosopher	50	
The Condition of Labor—The Land		
Question—Property in Land	50	
Protection or Free Trade?	50	
The Science of Political Economy		2.50

FRANK VIERTH, Publisher, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Why?

VOL. 6.

AUGUST, 1903.

No. 8.

Right to the Use of the Earth.

By Herbert Spencer.

The following was Chapter IX of Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics" in the original edition published in 1850, and in all subsequent editions up to May, 1892, when an expurgated edition was printed with this chapter and other references to the land question cut out. The matter is fully discussed by Henry George in "A Perplexed Philosopher."

1. Given a race of human beings having like claims to pursue the objects of their desires—given a world adapted to the gratification of those desires—a world into which such beings are similarly born, and it unavoidably follows that they have equal rights to the use of this world. For if each of them "has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other," then each of them is free to use the earth for the satisfaction of his wants, provided he allows all others the same liberty. And conversely, it is manifest that no one, or part of them, may use the earth in such a way as to prevent the rest from similarly using it, seeing that to do this is to assume

greater freedom than the rest, and consequently to break the law.

2. Equity, therefore, does not permit property in land. For if *one* portion of the earth's surface may justly become the possession of an individual, and may be held by him for his sole use and benefit, as a thing to which he has an exclusive right, then *other* portions of the earth's surface may be so held; and eventually the *whole* of the earth's surface may be so held; and our planet may thus lapse altogether into private hands. Observe now the dilemma to which this leads. Supposing the entire habitable globe to be so enclosed, it follows that, if the land owners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not land owners have no right at all to its surface. Hence, such can exist on the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers. Save by permission of the lords of the soil, they can have no room for the soles of their feet. Nay, should the others think fit to deny them a resting-place, these landless men might equitably be expelled from the earth altogether. If, then, 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 land owners, it is manifest that an exclusive possession of the soil necessitates an infringement of the law of equal freedom. For men who cannot “live and move and have their being” without the leave of others, cannot be equally free with those others.

3. Passing from the consideration of the possible to that of the actual, we find yet further reason to deny the rectitude of property in land. It can never be pretended that the existing titles to such property are legitimate. Should any one think so, let him look in the chronicles. Violence, fraud, the prerogative of force, the claims of superior cunning,—these are the sources to which those titles may be traced. The original deeds were written with the sword rather than with the pen; not lawyers, but soldiers, were the conveyancers; blows were the current coin given in payment; and for seals, blood was used in preference to wax. Could valid claims be thus constituted? Hardly. And if not not, what becomes of the pretensions of all subsequent holders of estates so obtained? Does sale or bequest generate a right where it did not previously exist? Would the original claimants be non-suited at the bar of reason, because the

thing stolen from them had changed hands? Certainly not. And if one act of transfer can give no title, can many? No. Though *nothing* be multiplied forever it will not produce *one*. Even the law recognizes this principle. An existing holder must, if called upon, substantiate the claims of those from whom he purchased or inherited his property; and any flaw in the original parchment, even though the property should have had a score of intermediate owners, quashes his right.

"But time," say some, "is a great legalizer. Immemorial possession must be taken to constitute a legitimate claim. That which has been held from age to age as private property, and has been bought and sold as such, must now be considered as irrevocably belonging to individuals." To which proposition a willing assent shall be given when its propounders can assign to it a definite meaning. To do this, however, they must find satisfactory answers to such questions as, How long does it take for what was originally *wrong* to grow into a *right*? At what rate per annum do invalid claims become valid? If a title gets perfect in a thousand years, how much more than perfect will it be in two thousand years?—and so forth.

For the solution of which they will require a new calculus.

Whether it may expedient to admit claims of a certain standing, is not the point. We have here nothing to do with considerations of conventional privilege or legislative convenience. We have simply to inquire what is the verdict given by pure equity in the matter. And this verdict enjoins a protest against every existing pretension to the individual possession of the soil; and dictates the assertion, that the right of mankind at large to the earth's surface is still valid; all deeds, customs, and laws notwithstanding.

4. Not only have present land tenures an indefensible origin, but it is impossible to discover any mode by which land can become private property. Cultivation is commonly considered to give a legitimate title. He who has reclaimed a tract of ground from its primitive wildness is supposed to have thereby made it his own. But if his right is disputed, by what system of logic can he vindicate it? Let us listen a moment to his pleadings.

"Hallo, you, sir," cries the cosmopolite to some backwoodsman, smoking at the door of his shanty, "by what authority do you take possession of these acres that you have cleared, round which

you have put up a snake fence and on which you have built this log house?"

"By what authority? I squatted here because there was no one to say nay—because I was as much at liberty to do so as any other man. Besides, now that I have cut down the wood, and plowed and cropped the ground, this farm is more mine than yours, or anybody's, and I mean to keep it."

"Ay, so you all say. But I do not see how you have substantiated your claim. When you came here you found the land producing trees,—sugar maples, perhaps; or maybe it was covered with prairie grass and wild strawberries. Well, instead of these, you made it yield wheat or maize or tobacco. Now I want to understand how, by exterminating one set of plants, and making the soil bear another set in their place, you have constituted yourself lord of this soil for all succeeding time."

"Oh, those natural products which I destroyed were of little or no use; whereas I caused the earth to bring forth things good for food,—things that help to give life and happiness."

"Still, you have not shown why such a process makes the portion of earth you have so modified yours. What is it that you have done? You have turned over the soil to a few inches in depth with a

spade or a plow; you have scattered over this prepared surface a few seeds; and you have gathered the fruits which the sun, rain, and air helped the soil to produce. Just tell me, if you please, by what magic have these acts made you the sole owner of that vast mass of matter, having for its base the surface of your estate, and for its apex the center of the globe? all of which, it appears, you would monopolize to yourself and your descendants forever."

"Well, if it isn't mine, whose is it? I have dispossessed nobody. When I crossed the Mississippi yonder, I found nothing but the silent woods. If some one else had settled here and made this clearing he would have had as good a right to the location as I have. I have done nothing but what any other person was at liberty to do, had he come before me. While they were unreclaimed, these lands belonged to all men—as much to one as to another—and they are now mine simply because I was the first to discover and improve them."

"You say truly, when you say that 'while they were unreclaimed these lands belonged to all men.' And it is my duty to tell you that they belong to all men still; and that your 'improvements,' as you call them, cannot vitiate the claim of all men. You

may plow and harrow, and sow and reap, you may turn over the soil as often as you like; but all your manipulations will fail to make that soil yours, which was not yours to begin with. Let me put a case: Suppose now that in the course of your wanderings you come upon an empty house which, in spite of its dilapidated state, takes your fancy; suppose that, with the intention of making it your abode, you expend much time and trouble in repairing it,—that you paint and paper and whitewash, and, at considerable cost, bring it into a habitable state. Suppose, further, that some fatal day a stranger is announced, who turns out to be the heir to whom this house has been bequeathed, and that this professed heir is prepared with all the necessary proofs of his identity, what becomes of your improvements? Do they give you a title to the house? Do they quash the title of the original claimant?"

"No."

"Neither then do your pioneering operations give you a valid title to this land. Neither do they quash the title of its original claimants—the human race. The world is God's bequest to mankind. All men are joint heirs to it,—you among the number. And because you have taken up your residence on

a certain part of it, and have subdued, cultivated, beautified that part,—improved it as you say,—you are not, therefore warranted in appropriating it as entirely private property. At least, if you do so, you may at any moment be justly expelled by the lawful owner,—Society."

"Well, but you surely would not eject me without making some recompense for the great additional value I have given this tract by reducing what was a wilderness into fertile fields. You would not turn me adrift and deprive me of all the benefits of those years of toil it has cost me to bring this spot into its present state."

"Of course not; just as in the case of the house, you would have an equitable title to compensation from the proprietor for repairs and new fittings, so the community cannot justly take possession of this estate, without paying for all you have done to it. This extra worth which your labor has imparted to it is fairly yours, and although you have, without leave, busied yourself in bettering what belongs to the community, yet no doubt the community will duly discharge your claim. But admitting this is quite a different thing from recognizing your right to the land itself. It may be true that you are entitled to compensation for the im-

provements this enclosure has received at your hands; and, at the same time, it may be equally true that no act, form, proceeding, or ceremony can make this enclosure your private property."

5. It does indeed at first sight seem possible for the earth to become the exclusive possession of individuals by some process of equitable distribution. "Why," it may be asked, "should not men agree to a fair subdivision? If all are co-heirs, why may not the estate be equally apportioned, and each be afterward perfect master of his own share?"

To this question it may in the first place be replied that such a division is vetoed by the difficulty of fixing the values of respective tracts of land. Variations in productiveness, different degrees of accessibility, advantages of climate, proximity to the centers of civilization,—these, and other considerations remove the problem out of the sphere of mensuration into the region of impossibility.

But, waiving this, let us inquire, who are to be the allottees? Shall adult males, and all who have reached twenty-one on a specified day be the fortunate individuals? If so, what becomes of all who come of age on the morrow? Is it proposed that each man, woman, and child shall have a section? If so, what becomes of all who are to be

born next year? And what will be the fate of those whose fathers sell their estates and squander the proceeds? These portionless ones must constitute a class already described as having no right to a resting-place on earth—as living by the sufferance of their fellow men—as being practically serfs. And the existence of such a class is wholly at variance with the law of equal freedom.

Until, therefore, we can produce a valid commission authorizing us to make this distribution,—until it can be proved that God has given one charter of privilege to one generation, and another to the next,—until we can demonstrate that men born after a certain date are doomed to slavery, we must consider that no such an allotment is permissible.

6. Probably some will regard the difficulties inseparable from individual ownership of the soil, as caused by pushing to excess a doctrine applicable only within rational limits. This is a very favorite style of thinking with some. There are people who hate anything in the shape of exact conclusions; and these are of them. According to such, the right is never in either extreme, but always halfway between the extremes. They are continually trying to reconcile *yes* and *no*. *If*s and *but*s and *excepts* are their delight. They have so great faith

in "the judicious mean" that they would scarcely believe an oracle if it uttered a full-length principle. Were you to inquire of them whether the earth turns on its axis from east to west or from west to east, you might almost expect the reply: "A little of both," or "Not exactly either." It is doubtful whether they would assent to the axiom that the whole is greater than its part, without making some qualification. They have a passion for compromises. To meet their taste, truth must always be spiced with a little error. They cannot conceive of a pure, definite, entire and unlimited law. And hence, in discussions like the present, they are constantly petitioning for limitations—always wishing to abate, and modify, and moderate—ever protesting against doctrines being pursued to their ultimate consequences.

But it behooves such to recollect that ethical truth is as exact and peremptory as physical truth; and that in this matter of land tenure the verdict of morality must be distinctly *yea* or *nay*. Either men *have* a right to make the soil private property or they *have not*. There is no medium. We must choose one of the two positions. There can be no half-and-half opinion. In the nature of things the fact must be either one way or the other.

If men *have not* such a right, we are at once delivered from the severe predicaments already pointed out. If they *have* such a right, then is that right absolutely sacred, not on any pretence to be violated. If they *have* such a right, then is his Grace of Leeds justified in warning off tourists from Ben Muich-Dhui, the Duke of Athol in closing Glen Tilt, the Duke of Buccleugh in denying sites to the Free Church, and the Duke of Sutherland in banishing the Highlanders to make room for sheep walks. If they *have* such a right, then it would be proper for the sole proprietor of any kingdom—a Jersey or Guernsey, for example—to impose just what regulations he might choose on its inhabitants,—to tell them that they should not live on his property unless they professed a certain religion, spoke a particular language, paid him a specified reverence, adopted an authorized dress, and conformed to all other conditions he might see fit to make. If they *have* such a right, then is there truth in that tenet of the ultra tory school, that the land owners are the only legitimate rulers of the country—that the people at large remain in it only by the land owners' permission, and ought consequently to submit to the land owners' rule, and respect whatever institutions the land owners set up. There is no escape

from these inferences. They are necessary corollaries to the theory that the earth can become individual property. And they can only be repudiated by denying that theory.

7. After all, nobody does implicitly believe in landlordism. We hear of estates being held under the king—that is, the state; or of their being kept in trust for the public benefit; and not that they are the inalienable possession of their nominal owners. Moreover, we daily deny landlordism by our legislation. Is a canal, a railroad, or a turnpike road to be made, we do not scruple to seize just as many acres as may be requisite, allowing the holders compensation for the capital invested. We do not wait for consent. An act of Parliament supersedes the authority of title deeds, and serves proprietors with notices to quit, whether they will or not. Either this is equitable or it is not. Either the public is free to resume as much of the earth's surface as they think fit, or the titles of the land owners must be considered absolute, and all national works must be postponed until lords and squires please to part with the requisite slices of their estates. If we decide that the claims of individual ownership must give way, then we imply that the right of the nation at large to the soil is supreme—

that the right of private possession only exists by general consent—that general consent being withdrawn it ceases—or, in other words, that it is no right at all.

8. "But to what does this doctrine, that men are equally entitled to the use of the earth, lead? Must we return to the times of unenclosed wilds, and subsist on roots, herbs, berries, and game? Or are we to be left to the management of Messrs. Fourier, Owen, Louis Blanc & Co.?"

Neither. Such a doctrine is consistent with the highest state of civilization, may be carried out without involving a community of goods, and need cause no very-serious revolution in existing arrangements. The change required would simply be a change of landlords. Separate ownerships would merge into the joint stock ownership of the public. Instead of being in the possession of individuals, the country would be held by the great corporate body,—Society. Instead of leasing his acres from an isolated proprietor, the farmer would lease from the nation. Instead of paying his rent to the agent of Sir John or his Grace, he would pay it to an agent or deputy agent of the community. Stewards would be public officials instead of private ones, and tenancy the only land tenure.

A state of things so ordered would be in perfect harmony with the moral law. Under it all men would be equally landlords; all men would be alike free to become tenants. A, B, C, and the rest might compete for a vacant farm, as now, and one of them might take that farm, without in any way violating the principles of pure equity. All would be equally free to bid; all would be equally free to refrain. And when the farm had been let to A, B, or C, all parties would have done that which they willed—the one in choosing to pay a given sum to his fellow men for the use of certain lands, the others in refusing to pay that sum. Clearly, therefore, on such a system, the earth may be enclosed, occupied, and cultivated in entire subordination to the law of equal freedom.

9. No doubt great difficulty must attend the resumption, by mankind at large, of their rights to the soil. The question of compensation to existing proprietors is a complicated one—one that perhaps cannot be settled in a strictly equitable manner. Had we to deal with the parties who originally robbed the human race of its heritage, we might make short work of the matter. But, unfortunately, most of our present land owners are men who have either mediately or immediately—either by their

own acts, or by the acts of their ancestors—given for their estates equivalents of honestly earned wealth, believing that they were investing their savings in a legitimate manner. To justly estimate and liquidate the claims of such is one of the most intricate problems society will one day have to solve. But with this perplexity and our extrication from it, abstract morality has no concern. Men having got themselves into the dilemma by disobedience to the law, must get out of as well as they can; and with as little injury to the landed class as may be.

Meanwhile, we shall do well to recollect that there are others besides the landed class to be considered. In our tender regard for the vested interests of the few, let us not forget that the rights of the many are in abeyance, and must remain so as long as the earth is monopolized by individuals. Let us remember, too, that the injustice thus inflicted on the mass of mankind is an injustice of the gravest nature. The fact that it is not so regarded proves nothing. In early phases of civilization even homicide is thought lightly of. The suttees of India, together with the the practice elsewhere of sacrificing a hecatomb of human victims at the burial of a chief, show this, and probably cannibals

consider the slaughter of those whom "the fortunes of war" has made their prisoners perfectly justifiable. It was once also universally supposed that slavery was a natural and quite legitimate institution—a condition into which some were born, and to which they ought to submit as to a divine ordination; nay, indeed a great proportion of mankind hold this opinion still. A higher social development, however, has generated in us a better faith, and we now, to a considerable extent, recognize the claims of humanity. But our civilization is only partial. It may by and by be perceived that equity utters dictates to which we have not listened, and men may then learn that to deprive others of their rights to the use of the earth is to commit a crime inferior only in wickedness to the crime of taking away their lives or personal liberties.

He who has no clear, inherent right to live somewhere has no right to live at all.—Horace Greeley:

Those who make private property of the gift of God (land) pretend in vain to be innocent. For in thus retaining the substance of the poor they are the murderers of those who die every day for the want of it.—St. Gregory the Great.

How the Single Tax Would Equalize Right to Land.

"Progress and Poverty," Book viii, Chap. ii.

We should satisfy the law of justice, we should meet all economic requirements, by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements.

Thus we should secure, in a more complex state of society, the same equality of rights that in a ruder state were secured by equal partitions of the soil, and by giving the use of land to whoever could procure the most from it, we should secure the greatest production.

Such a plan, instead of being a wild, impracticable vagary, has (with the exception that he suggests compensation to the present holders of land—undoubtedly a careless concession which he upon reflection would reconsider) been indorsed by no less eminent a thinker than Herbert Spencer.

But such a plan, though perfectly feasible,

does not seem to me the best. Or rather I propose to accomplish the same thing in a simpler, easier, and quieter way, than that of formally confiscating all the land and formally letting it out to the highest bidders.

To do that would involve a needless shock to present customs and habits of thought—which is to be avoided.

To do that would involve a needless extension of governmental machinery—which is to be avoided.

It is an axiom of statesmanship, which the successful founders of tyranny have understood and acted upon—that great changes can best be brought about under old forms. We, who would be free men, should heed the same truth. It is the natural method. When nature would make a higher type, she takes a lower one and develops it. This, also, is the law of social growth. Let us work by it. With the current we may glide fast and far. Against it, it is hard pulling and slow progress.

I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land. The first would be unjust; the second, needless. Let the individuals who now hold it still retain, if they want to, possession of what they are pleased to call *their* land.

Let them continue to call it *their* land. Let

them buy and sell, and bequeath and devise it. We may safely leave them the shell, if we take the kernel. *It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent.*

Nor to take rent for public uses is it necessary that the State should bother with the letting of lands, and assume the chances of favoritism, collusion, and corruption this might involve. It is not necessary that any new machinery should be created. The machinery already exists. Instead of extending it, all we have to do is to simplify and reduce it. By leaving to land owners a percentage of rent which would probably be much less than the cost and loss involved in attempting to rent lands through State agency, and by making use of this existing machinery, we may, without jar or shock, assert the the common right to land by taking rent for public uses.

We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes in our modes of taxation to take it all.

What I, therefore propose, as the simple yet sovereign remedy, which will raise wages, increase the earnings of capital, extirpate pauperism, abolish poverty, give remunerative employment to whoever wishes it, afford free scope to human powers, lessen

crime, elevate morals, and taste, and intelligence, purify government and carry civilization to yet nobler heights, is—to appropriate rent by taxation.

In this way the State may become the universal landlord without calling herself so, and without assuming a single new function. In form, the ownership of land would remain just as now. No owner of land need be dispossessed, and no restriction need be placed upon the amount of land any one could hold. For rent being taken by the State in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood, or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property, and every member of the community would participate in the advantages of its ownership.

"THE BURDENS OF LOCAL TAXATION AND WHO BEARS THEM." By Lawson Purdy. Bound, 25 cents; paper, 10 cents. Address Lawson Purdy, 52 Williams St., New York.

"The Burdens of Local Taxation and Who Bears Them," by Mr. Lawson Purdy, is one of the very best discussions of the subject in a few pages that I have ever seen.—PROF. EDWARD W. BEMIS.

Milo R. Malbie, Secretary Committee on City Affairs, Reform Club, New York, said: "Mr. Lawson Purdy's work for a more scientific system of taxation is well and favorably known in New York City and State. His article . . . ought to be of considerable assistance in clearing the atmosphere and in persuading every citizen to study carefully how far taxes are shifted and upon whom the burden finally falls."

What's the Use?

Is the name of a magazine worth reading. Sample copy 5 cents.
Published at EAST AURORA, N. Y.

For any Book on Earth,

Old or New,

Write to

H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter,
CONNEAUT, OHIO.

Iowa Stamp and Stencil Co.,

—manufacturers of—

RUBBER and STEEL STAMPS, STENCILS,
Brass Dies and Checks, Seals, Key Checks,
Badges, Check Perforators, etc.

Good work, lowest prices. Catalogue for stamp.

1231 S. Fifth St.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

"The Shortest Road to the Single Tax."

Made up from the writings of Henry George and
Thomas G. Shearman. Only 10 cents.

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING CO.,
508 Schiller Bldg. Chicago, Ill.