

responsibility, or prefer to seek other ends than riches. Consequently, the occupation of the *entrepreneur* will not be overcrowded.

It is probable that with the widespread intelligence resulting from a good universal education, business more and more will be conducted upon the co-operative plan. That is to say, those who do the work in the factory or store will own it.

This will be, not the co-operative commonwealth of the Socialist, but, on a larger scale and in greater perfection, the voluntary co-operation of the kind which had its inception in Rochdale, England. The workers and proprietor capitalists will be one and the same persons, receiving at once both wages and interest.

But long before that Utopia arrives, capitalists and laborers will work together in mutual good will—the lion will lie down with the lamb.

---

## SOME EARLY LAND REFORMERS

(For the Review)

By SAMUEL MILLIKEN

---

The following constitutes what may be termed "overflow matter" from the contribution of Mr. Milliken to the forthcoming Single Tax Year Book (quinquennial), on the "Forerunners of Henry George." It treats of men who were land reformers rather than Single Taxers, and therefore not to be classed as "forerunners" though many of our readers will be disposed to regard the conception of fundamental principles and the aims of these great men as more important than methods.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

GERRARD WINSTANLEY

The following few particulars concerning one of God's nobility are gathered from Beren's "The Digger Movement in the Days of the Commonwealth." They are no more than suggestive; a reviewer is embarrassed with riches of material and character.

Winstanley was born at Wigan, Lancashire, October 10th, 1609. He became a small trader in London, "but was beaten out of both estate and trade." The good will of friends helped him to a country life. He printed several theological pamphlets, exhibiting the Friends' doctrines of the "inner light" and "non-resistance."

He had visions of God's children in a Commonwealth, working together, eating together, none being Lords and Rulers over others; none giving hire, none taking hire, but all working together in love. "No man shall have any more land than he can labor himself, or have others to labor with him in love. . . ." "And let the common people that say the earth is *ours*, not *mine*, let them labor together, and eat bread together upon all the commons, mountains and hills."

Believing that the earth is the Lord's, for the use of the children of men without respect of persons, Winstanley led a few poor men to waste land on St. George's Hill in Surrey, and dug and sowed it with parsnips, carrots and beans. This was on April 1, 1649.

"Information" was lodged against them; it was proposed that a force of horse be sent against this "disorderly and tumultuous sort of people." But Captain Gladman, after interviewing Winstanley, laughed at the complaint, saying: "the business is not worth the writing, nor yet taking notice of," but that Winstanley and Everard would call upon Lord Fairfax to justify their proceedings." They stood before the General with their hats on; "and being demanded the reason thereof," they said, "Because he was but their fellow creature."

Fairfax with officers paid a return visit to the Diggers at St. George's Hill, and Winstanley "returned sober answers" to the General and his officers.

A few days later a certain John Taylor prefaced one of their pamphlets, personally testifying to the sweetness of spirit shown by the Diggers. He wrote: "Such as these shall be partakers of the promise—'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.'"

Winstanley was a pamphleteer propagandist of righteousness. On June 9, 1649, he addressed a letter to Fairfax and his Council of War with explanations of their course, together with searching questions addressed to lawyers and preachers; and on July 11, 1649, an appeal for protection addressed to the House of Commons, the Diggers having been arrested by certain Lords of Manors for trespass. The Diggers were not allowed to plead their own cause, although too poor to fee a lawyer. They thus concluded a long appeal to the Commons: "Set the Land free from oppression, and righteousness will be the Laws, Government and Strength of that People."

The appeal fell on deaf ears; the alleged Lord Protector of an alleged Commonwealth started next day on his expedition to Ireland, twice murdering prisoners in cold blood, and exuding Scripture texts. Cromwell was not a Commonwealth-man. He spoke contemptuously of the democrats known as Levellers, because they were known to shake hands with all the "scum and dirt of the nation." He asked: "...what was the purport of it, but to make the tenant as liberal a fortune as the landlord? Which, I think, if obtained, would not have lasted long."

Though not allowed to speak at Kingston court, Winstanley filed a written answer which showed acquaintance with the law, but, as though ashamed to plead from law, he appealed to Reason and Equity. Therein, at least, he was in accord with Cromwell, who, later, "spoke somewhat against lawyers, and what a tortuous, ungodly jungle English law was!"

The writing was cast out. . . . "and all because I would not fee an attorney . . . and though our digging upon that Common hath done the Common good, yet this Jury brings in damages of £10 a man, and the charges of the

plaintiff in their Court, twenty-nine shillings and a penny: and this was the sentence and the passing of the execution upon us."

He tells of being boycotted, and of the cruel beating of cows driven from his house by the officers, "which grieved tender hearts to see. And yet these cows never were upon George's Hill, nor ever digged upon the ground."

Lack of space forbids fuller attention to Winstanley's beauty of character, thoughtfulness, patience in defeat. He compiled a set of laws for an Utopia. In his old age his health and means were both poor. He failed in his attempt to found a Commonwealth worthy of the name of his model, of whom he wrote: "FOR JESUS CHRIST, THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN, IS THE GREATEST, FIRST AND TRUEST LEVELLER THAT EVER WAS SPOKEN OF IN THE WORLD." So he wrote it—in caps; so he believed; so he lived.

Where he lived afterward, where he died, and when, no man knows. Perhaps men are wrong in thinking he failed; perhaps only they fail who do not attempt. It is written: "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord."

## DANIEL DEFOE

When Robinson Crusoe salvaged gold and silver from his wreck these gave him no joy, but provoked reflections. He cried: "O drug! What art thou good for? Thou art not worth to me—no, not the taking off the ground: one of these knives is worth all that heap. I have no use for thee; e'en remain where thou art, and go to the bottom, as a creature whose life is not worth saving!"

It was not the first time that calamity had taught a lesson in political economy.

Few readers know more of Daniel Defoe than that he wrote "Robinson Crusoe." Doubtless the enduring popularity of that work would surprise its author, could he return. Probably he considered that classic as of slight importance compared with more serious works.

Defoe was born at Cripplegate, London, in 1661, and died April 24, 1731, in the same parish in which he was born. He lived a strenuous life. At twenty-eight he was in King William's army. Later he became a busy political pamphleteer. Being bold and outspoken, he suffered in the pillory (1703), although a sympathetic mob stood by and drank his health. That punishment was followed by a year in Newgate. He was a prolific writer, an agitator with many ups and downs. He wrote of himself:

"No man has tasted differing fortunes more,  
And thirteen times I have been rich and poor."

One of his works bears the suggestive title: "Giving Alms no Charity, and Employing the Poor a Grievance to the Nation." It is described as "a masterly denunciation of indiscriminate charity and national workshops—a

kind of socialistic scheme propounded by Sir Henry Mackworth." This was dated 1704.

Defoe has been described as "versatile and voluminous," and as "taking a lively interest in concrete things;" also as being "an important authority for the condition of the industrial and commercial classes in the first part of the 18th century." Again, "although in no sense a scientific writer, he has sometimes placed economic truths in a singularly vivid light."

His essay on "Projects" advocates improvements in banks, highways, bankrupt laws, friendly societies and insane asylums.

In 1724, he published "A Tour Through the Whole Island of Great Britain," a sort of Baedeker. His proposal to utilize the New Forest in Hampshire entitles him to a place among practical land reformers.

The New Forest, west of Southampton, has been an extensive forest since the time of William I. (1079). About 60,000 acres (crown property) are still given over to picturesqueness, while poverty festers in London, two hours away. Defoe writes:

"From hence, in my way to the sea-side, I came to New-Forest, of which I have said something before, with relation to the great extent of ground, which lies waste, and had formerly a vast quantity of large timber upon it.

"This part of the country is a lasting monument of the tyranny and oppression of William I. who laid it open and waste for a forest, and for game; for which purpose he unpeopled the country, pulled down the houses, and the churches, of several parishes and towns, and of abundance of villages, turning the poor people out of their habitations and possessions, for the sake of his deer. . . .

"I cannot omit mentioning here a proposal made some years ago to the Lord Treasurer Godolphin, for re-peopling this forest; which I can be more particular in than any other man, because I had the honour to draw up the scheme, and argue it before that noble Lord, and some others, who were principally concerned, at that time, in bringing over, or rather providing for, when they were come over, the poor inhabitants of the Palatinate; a thing in itself commendable; but, as it was managed, made of no benefit to England, and miserable to those poor people.

"Some persons being ordered by the noble Lord above-mentioned, to consider of measures how those people should be provided for, without injury to the public, New Forest in Hampshire was singled out to be the place for them.

"Here it was proposed to draw a great square line, containing 4000 acres of land, marking out two large highways or roads through the centre, crossing both ways; so that there should be 1000 acres in each division, exclusive of the land contained in the said cross-roads.

"Then to single out 20 men, and their families, who should be recommended as honest industrious people, expert in husbandry, or at least capable

of being instructed in it. To each of these should be parcelled, but in equal distributions, 200 acres of this land; so that the whole 4000 acres should be distributed to the said 20 families; for which they should have no rent to pay, and be liable to no taxes, but such as would provide for their own sick or poor, repairing their own roads, etc. This exemption to continue for 20 years, and then pay each £50 a year to the Crown.

“To each of these families it was proposed to advance £200 in ready money, as a stock to set them to work, and to hire and pay labourers to inclose, clear, and cure the land; which, it was supposed, the first year, could not be so much to their advantage, as following years; allowing them timber out of the forest to build themselves houses and barns, sheds and offices, as they should have occasion; also for carts, wagons, ploughs, harrows, and the like necessary implements.

“These 20 families would, by the consequence of their own settlements, employ and maintain such a proportion of their own people, that the whole number of Palatines would have been provided for, had they been many more than they were; and that without being any burden, or injury to, the people of England; on the contrary, they would have been an advantage, and an addition of wealth and strength, to the nation, and to the country, in particular, where they should be thus seated.

“Two things would have been answered by the execution of this scheme; viz.:

(1) That the annual rent to be received for all those lands, after 20 years, would abundantly pay the public for the first disbursements.

(2) More money than would have done this, was thrown away upon them here, to keep them in suspense, and afterwards starve them; sending them a-begging all over the nation, and shipping them off to perish in other countries.

“The spot where the design was laid out, was near Lindhurst, in the road from Romsey to Lymington.”

#### CAREW REYNELL

Public spirit is the rarest virtue. It is a pleasure to write of men who have shown it; this man made a special plea for it. Reynell was born at Rivershill, Hampshire, in 1636. He was a student at Oxford and later at the Middle Temple, but in 1655 he was sent to Exeter Jail on a charge of complicity in the Penruddock rising at Salisbury on behalf of Charles II. He was pardoned because of his youth, and spent some time in travel and economic study. His memorial is a little book, “The True English Interest: or an Account of the Chief National Improvements; in Some Political Observations, Demonstrating an Infallible Advance of this Nation to Infinite Wealth and Greatness, Trade and Populacy, with Employment and Preferment for all Persons.” (London, 1674). He died at Shoreditch in 1690.

Reynell's proposals for England's good are comprised in ninety-two octavo pages of large type. The book has thirty-one chapters, some containing fewer than twenty lines, a tabloid work on political economy. The preface is in very large type, "that he may run that readeth it." He writes: "though we are a nation pretty substantial, it's easy for us to be ten times richer, and that in the third part of an Age, if we will set aside some portion of our time and money, for public actions, and such contrivances, that may be for the general good. . . . What perfection should we arrive to if. . . . great and rich persons would set about the work, and private persons would get public spirits, to labour after things so beneficial, not only to the nation in general, but to every man in particular. . . . All of us both Country and City should be endeavouring, how they may do good in their generation, and be beneficial to the public."

He was saddened by the sight of so many lusty, unemployed poor, as well as of many decayed gentry that want bread while "so many forests lie, unimproved which would maintain them all, and might be so managed as to bring to his Majesty. a good revenue also. I wish some great persons would make it their business to look after such great things. In the meantime I have thrown in my mite, and endeavored to show the chief improvements, and have reduced them to a narrow room. . . . hoping it may work a good effect, on some able persons who may be instrumental to the public good, when they see the manner of bringing it about thus contracted under their eye and to their use, and behold so many advantages that may be made and yet lie unregarded."

All honor to this public-spirited man for throwing in his mite! Like many of us, he wishes that "some great persons would make it their business." But "great persons" are generally busy about trifles, and so it is written "God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty."

Reynell is honored here, not because of his soundness in political economy, for with purest intentions, he was mercantilist, protectionist, subsidist; nor because he advocated a tax on land, for he says (chapter 25): "Taxes were better raised any way than from the Land," but because he saw the sad waste of England's land, and proposed a remedy. He says, "that poor people are the very stock and seed of the kingdom; that they should be encouraged; and were it not for these poor, honest people, we should be almost desolate. . . . There is great complaint of many people flocking out beyond Sea to Plantations, why is it not prevented. . . . it cannot be done by force. . . . it must be done by raising of employments. . . ."

"And if we did set up manufactures, and inclose the forests, we should populate as much; we having several forests bigger than the Barbadoes. And great Estates should not be desired to leave children but so much as to help industry. Why should not ingenious persons, by public establishment, be allowed forty or fifty acres to a family, out of these lands, which

are now more charges than benefit? How brave a provision this would be for ruined families, and improvement to the riches, populacy and grandeur of the Nation. Who can blame people to go beyond seas, when they cannot live here; it is mere need and force that drives them out of the Kingdom. And it is a sign of great ingenuity that they will go, and strive to live anywhere. England is not half peopled, and yet we find not employment for those we have. Therefore judge you how it would increase people and employments, if the forests were inclosed, and how many people lie wanting now, that this would help and relieve."

## JOHN WOOLMAN

"John Woolman's Journal" is one of the books that President Elliot, of Harvard, placed on his much discussed five-foot-shelf. And long ago Charles Lamb counseled those who would know what true peace and quiet mean: "Get the writings of John Woolman by heart; and love the early Quakers." John Woolman was born at Northampton, New Jersey, near Philadelphia in August, 1720. At the age of 22 he became oppressed and afflicted by the prevalence of slavery. The vile institution had corrupted even the society of friends; it was not so much as questioned. But to Woolman it appeared "as a dark gloominess overhanging the land." Many thousands of miles he traveled, "bearing loving testimony" against the practice. He was a man of extreme conscientiousness, yet of extreme sweetness of disposition. Feeling a "concern" to visit friends in England, he traveled as far as York. There he died of smallpox, in October, 1772. He rests in the Friends' burying ground in that city. In concluding an introduction to the "Journal of John Woolman," Whittier wrote: "I have been awed and solemnized by the presence of a serene and beautiful spirit redeemed of the Lord from all unselfishness, and I have been made thankful for the ability to recognize and the disposition to love him." An English friend said: "He lived very near the Fountain."

One of his last papers was: "A word of Caution and Remembrance to the Rich." It is a loving testimony against inequality in landed possessions; he shows that it produces the effects of slavery, and is the more dangerous because misunderstood. "Thus oppression in the extreme appears terrible; but oppression in more refined appearances remains to be oppression, and when the smallest degree of it is cherished it grows stronger and more extensive."

"To labor for a perfect redemption from this spirit of oppression is the great business of the whole family of Christ Jesus in this world."

While he acknowledged that the true intent of the Divine law might be honored in various ways, he does not appear to have seen beyond the Mosaic laws. He says: "He alone is the true proprietor. 'The world,' saith he, 'is mine and the fulness thereof.' The inspired lawgiver directed that such

of the Israelites as sold their inheritance should sell it for a term only, and that they and their children should again enjoy it in the year of jubilee, settled on every fiftieth year. 'The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine, saith the Lord, for ye are strangers and sojourners with me.' This was designed to prevent the rich from oppressing the poor by too much engrossing the land; and our blessed Redeemer said: 'Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.'"

PETER STUYVESANT

That parasite of civilization, the land-speculator, was early in evidence in New Netherlands (New York). Peter Stuyvesant and his fellow-burghers are entitled to a place in this paper because they devised a defence against the pest. A brief sketch from Chambers' says: "Peter Stuyvesant, Governor of New York, was born in Holland in 1602, became governor of Curacoa, lost a leg in the attack on St. Martin, and in 1646 was appointed Captain-General of the New Netherlands. He proved a vigorous but arbitrary ruler, a rigid Sabbatarian, and an indignant opponent of political and religious freedom. Yet he did much for the commercial prosperity of the city, which received its name, New Amsterdam, in 1653, and which he would fain have held against the English in 1664, when it became New York. He afterwards lived at his farm, the 'Great Bouwerie,' whose name survives in one of the older streets of the city which soon covered it; and there he died, August 1682. He was buried in the vaults of St. Mark's Church.

In the year following Stuyvesant's arrival the following proclamation was issued (July 25, 1647):

"As we have seen and remarked the . . . neglecting the cultivation of granted lots . . . Likewise we warn all and everybody, who may heretofore have been granted lots, that they must erect on their lots good and convenient houses within nine months according to order, or in default thereof such unimproved lots shall fall back to the Patroon or Landlord, to be given by him, to such as he pleases."

Of Peter Stuyvesant the poet sang:

"When Peter, the Headstrong, of stubbornest will,  
Was sent out from Holland, commissioned to fill  
In New Netherland's province a governor's chair,  
The people all knew by his obstinate air  
And the stamp of his foot and the shake of his head  
That he meant to be minded in all that he said."

Evidently landlordism was too respectable for immediate disturbance' for on December 15, 1648 we find a similar proclamation; "allowing to



the present proprietors such satisfaction as the surveyors in their discretion may deem adequate." The burghers proclaimed this "for the last time."

Evidently the speculators were not alarmed even by this warning. How many placards and proclamations were afterward put forth, the writer cannot say, but ten years later,—“Thursday, 17th January, 1658. In the City Hall. . . . This date the following placards are published from the City Hall of this City, after the usual ringing of the bell, relative to the taxing of or building on vacant lots: (Records of New Amsterdam, Fernow, Vol. 2, p. 301).

“The Director General and Council of New Netherland seeing and remarking by daily experience, that the former ordinance and placards are not observed according to the good tenor thereof, but that notwithstanding the frequent renewal thereof many spacious and large lots, even in the best and most convenient part of the City, lie and remain unbuilt on, and are retained by the possessing owners either for greater profit or for pleasure, and others are thereby prevented from building for the population of the City, the increase of trade and consumption as well as ornament, whereunto many new comers would be encouraged in case they could get a lot on suitable sites for a reasonable price conformably to the above-standing placards: to the neglect if not contempt of which principally redound the retaining and keeping of so large and spacious lots either for profit or pleasure because no pains, penalties nor fines followed the previously enacted Placards, and the possessing owners are occupying and keeping the lots many years without charge, for greater profit, or using them as orchards and gardens, whereby building and population are retarded and consequently the increase of trade and consumption and the prosperity of this City contrary to the City's interest and the meaning to that effect of the Lords Directors of the Privileged West India Company, the Lords and Patroons of this Province as first grantors and distributors of the lots, to build thereon for the ornament, population, increase of inhabitants, trade, consumption and prosperity of the same; as is expressed in the granted ground briefs, with additional stipulation and submission to such burthens as may be enacted by the above mentioned Lords or their agents.

“To acquit themselves of this duty, therefore, the Director General and Council have lately by their sworn surveyor in the presence of the Burgomasters of this City, taken a new survey of all the vacant lots, whilst laying out the new streets, and discovered several hundred lots within the walls of this City on which no buildings whatever were erected.

“In order that all these lots may, agreeably to the good intentions of the Directors aforesaid and conformably with the published placards, be as soon as possible built on, and the disorders proceeding from the

possession of such large and spacious lots for profit or pleasure solely, without any incumbrance may be averted, and that those inclined to build may be accommodated with lots at a moderate price, the Director General and Council in amplification of their former placards, command that all the vacant lots which were lately surveyed and laid out by the surveyor of the Director General and Council be appraised and assessed immediately after the posting and publication of this Placard, first and foremost by the owners and possessors themselves, so that they may not have any reasons afterwards for complaint that such lots have been undervalued; and that the owners shall, as long as they hold the lots or a lot or keep these without any decent buildings, have to pay for these annually the fifteenth penny in two installments, one half on the first of May and the other half before the Fair in this City—the proceeds to be applied to the fortifications of this City and their repair. And the Burgomasters are commanded and authorized as soon as this Placard shall be published to summon, without delay or respect of persons, all the proprietors of such lots before them at the City Hall, to make the valuation to be then recorded by their secretary in a proper manner. They shall then authorize their Treasurer to receive the amount of this tax and in case of refusal or opposition to fine the obstinate; to appraise the lots according to their value and situation, on condition that it shall be left to the option of the proprietors and possessors to retain the lots as valued by the Burgomasters on payment as stipulated of the 15th penny thereof, or otherwise to surrender them at the valuation to the Burgomasters for the City's benefit. In like manner it is left to the choice of the Burgomasters to accept for the City such lots as have been appraised by the proprietors and to convey them at the same price to other persons who may be ready and inclined to build, if the owners cannot or will not build in conformity to these placards, or to leave the lots to the proprietors, until they or others shall construct buildings thereon when this tax, laid on vacant lots shall cease. And for the further promotion of population by concentration, prospering, strengthening, and improving this City the Director General and Council do further order that no houses shall henceforward be erected near the City walls and gates without the City's jurisdiction, until all the lots within the City shall have been occupied and proper buildings erected thereupon."

What taxation, if any, was laid on land generally the writer is not informed, but here was a penalty placed on neglect, whereas the city of New York today penalizes improvement. To tax a man more for improving land than for neglecting it doesn't sound right, but it must be, for . . . . .

Alas, for the best laid plans of mice and Dutchmen! Mrs. Van Rensselaer, an authority on early New York, says: "it was not enforced."

We find the Burghers, six months later, June 13, 1658, singing small as follows;

"The Secretary is ordered to give directions.....to give an order to the officer to warn everyone to settle their vacant lots as an ornament to the place."

That order was issued 258 years ago; the writer is not advised that the ornamentation of the vacant lots of New York has as yet been completed.

---

## SINGLE TAX IN A NUT SHELL

(For the Review)

By **BENJ. F. LINDAS**

(Continued)

It is, of course, possible to imagine a time when the planet will have become so clogged with human beings that those who are then on the earth will have difficulty in finding elbow-room, but that, if a problem at all, is one for the very distant future. Today the surface of the earth has scarcely been touched. If each individual had but a portion of his share such a thing as want would be unknown. Today millions of men in Europe have been drawn from productive work, millions of others are engaged in manufacturing munitions of war, which, of course, can fill no natural human want, yet there has been scarcely any diminution in the production of the necessities of life.

Possibly no more conclusive answer can be found than the following from the *Greenfield Bulletin*, of Pittsburgh:

"If we divide the State of Illinois in equal parts, one part to every human being on earth, each one will have 50x100 feet of ground, or enough on which to live. This is not so small as it appears, for if we provide for the family unit as people really live, instead of the individual unit, we get a plot of ground for each family 50x500 feet. Allowing that this is not enough for the family and the goat and the cat, we will give every human being an allotment ten times that size. The human race could then inhabit the eight States of Illinois, Arkansas, Florida, Iowa, Arizona, Michigan and Nevada, or one-eighth of the United States. By dividing all the United States every human being would have about eight times as much land as he would need. To allow still more liberally on account of mountains and other areas that man knows not yet how to use, let us throw in Canada for good measure. By an equal division of Canada and the United States among