

8 FEB 1906

*NY Times Feb 8 1906*  
**THE SOCIALISTS.**  
**Bolton Hall Vouches for Henry George,**  
**Jr.'s, Individualism.**

*To the Editor of The New York Times:*

THE TIMES does a valuable service by its usual fairness and has thereby acquired so strong an influence with the more advanced part of the community that any carelessness, especially in its editorial columns, should be quickly and prominently corrected.

Your editorial of Feb. 5 on Mr. George's book, "The Menace of Privilege," implies that Mr. George is a Socialist. It says: "He accepts without examination the stock phrases of socialistic discussion, falls a victim to them, and repeats them."

It is well known that Henry George was the staunchest defender of individualism as opposed to Socialism, or even governmental operation, as the slightest examination of "Progress and Poverty" will show, and his son follows his doctrine in this book.

But the article goes on to say: "Because the press does not accept the nostrums of Socialism, because it will not prescribe such remedies as the abolition of private ownership of land, and taking from the courts the right to enjoin arson and murder," &c. This paragraph implies what it does not venture to say.

Prof. Giddings in that review of "The Menace of Privilege" which called out the editorial expressly says: "Mr. George, in a word, is neither a Socialist nor an Anarchist, but a true Jeffersonian Republican, thoroughly believing in both private property and public property, and, above all, in individual enterprise."

For the rest of the implied accusation, no one knows better than THE TIMES that the courts never had the right to enjoin arson and murder. They have assumed that right, setting themselves above and beyond the criminal law which the Legislature designed for the prevention or punishment of such crimes.

But however this may be, the implication that the Georges, son or father, condone arson and murder is unworthy of your columns.

BOLTON HALL.

New York, Feb. 8, 1906.

The instant you call a Socialist a Socialist he begins with both hands and much utterance to tear off the label. It is the one gleam of fun in an otherwise disheartening situation. It all depends upon whether the public must accept from the Socialists the definitions they prefer to use, or whether it may make its own choice of terms that fit the case. An agitator may pay to individualism the tribute of lip service, but when he advocates the turning over to the State or to the city business functions hitherto performed by individuals he reaches Socialism, and we see no reason why he should not be candid enough to admit it. The public is not so blind that it cannot see where all these things tend. If the Socialists dislike the name they ought to quit preaching the doctrine. So, too, a short and easy way to escape the "implication" of condoning arson and murder is to quit condoning them.—Editor TIMES.