

THE RIGHT TO THE USE OF THE EARTH

By

Herbert Spencer 1820 - 1903


In 1851 Spencer's first book, *Social Statics, or the Conditions Essential to Human Happiness* appeared. ('Social Statics' -- the term was borrowed from Auguste Comte -- deals with the conditions of social order, and was preliminary to a study of human progress and evolution -- i.e., 'social dynamics.')

In this work, Spencer presents an account of the development of human freedom and a defense of individual liberties, based on a (Lamarckian-style) evolutionary theory.

Chapter Nine of this book has been selected as it deals with the implications of our present land tenure system

*Social Statics is now out of print but is still available in some libraries including
The Arthur Dowe Library in Sydney and
Prosper Australia library in Melbourne*

This extract reprinted by:
The Association for Good Government
Secretary Ron Johnson on (02) 6259 5981
Canberra. ACT.



An extract from
SOCIAL STATICS by HERBERT SPENCER

FIRST PUBLISHED 1850

Social Statics was Herbert Spencer's first book

1. Given a race of 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 the 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 all others are allowed 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 maybe 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 that if the landowners have a valid right to its surface, all who are not landowners have no right at all to its surface. Hence, such can exist on the earth by sufferance only. They are all trespassers. Save by the 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 beheld as property, involves that the whole globe may become the private domain of a part of its inhabitants; and if, by consequence, the rest of its inhabitants can then exercise their faculties – can then exist even – only by consent of the landowners, it is manifest, that an exclusive possession of the soil necessitates an infringement of the law of 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 anyone think so, let them 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, what becomes of the pretensions of all subsequent holders of estates so obtained? Does sale or bequest generate a right where it previously did not exist? Would the original claimants be nonsuited 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 intermediate owners, quashes his right.

“But Time,” say some, “is a great legaliser. 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 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 a *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 be 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 the present land tenures an indefensible origin, but it is impossible to discover any mode in 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.

“Hello, you Sir,” cries the cosmopolite to some backwoods-man, 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 have squatted here because there was no one here 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 ploughed 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 yet see how you have substantiated your claim. When you came here you found the land producing trees – sugar-maples perhaps; or may be 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 as lord of this soil for all succeeding time.”

“Oh, those natural products which I have 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 plough; 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 sole owner of that vast mass of matter, having for its base the surface of your estate, and for its apex the centre 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 silent woods. If someone 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. Whilst they were un-reclaimed, 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 may truly, when you say that ‘whilst they were un-reclaimed 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 plough 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 to a habitable state. Suppose further, that on 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 valid 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

amongst 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 surely you 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 that you have done to it. This extra worth which your labour 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 improvements 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 we agree to a fair subdivision? If all are co-heirs, why may not the estate be equally apportioned and each be afterwards 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 centre of civilization- these and other such considerations, remove the problem out of the sphere of mere 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 is to be done with those 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 born next year? And what will be the fate of those whose

fathers sell their estates and squanders 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 privileges 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 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 favourite style of thinking with some. There are people who hate anything in the shape of exact conclusions; and these are of them. Accordingly to such, the right is never in either extreme, but always half way between the extremes. They are continually trying to reconcile *Yes* and *No*. *Ifs* and *buts*, and *excepts*, are their delight. They have so great a 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 as 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 several predicaments already pointed out. If they *have* such a right, then is that right absolute, 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 Mac Dhail, the

Duke of Atholl 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 his 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 to make fit. If they have such a right then is there truth in that tenet of the ultra Tory school, that the landowners are the only legitimate rulers of a country – that the people at large remain in it only by the landowners’ permission, and ought consequently to submit too the landowners’ rule and respect whatever institutions the landowners 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 possessions of their nominal owners. Moreover, we daily deny landlordism by our legislation. Is a canal, a railway, 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 the public are free to resume as much of the earths surface as they think fit, or the titles of the landowners 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, berries, and game? Or are we to be left to the management of Messrs. Fourrier, Owen, Louis, Blane, and 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 them 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 the 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 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 might be inclosed, occupied and cultivated, in entire subordination to the law of equal freedom.

9. No doubt great difficulties 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 landowners 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 it 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 practice elsewhere followed of sacrificing a hecatomb of human victims at the burial of a chief, shows this: and probably cannibals consider the slaughter of those whom “the fortune of war” has made their prisoners perfectly justifiable. It was once also universally supposed that slavery was 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 are 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 yet listened; and men may learn, that to deprive others of their rights to the use of the earth, is to commit a crime inferior only to wickedness to the crime of taking away their lives or personal liberties.

10. Briefly reviewing the argument, we see that the right of each man to the use of the earth, limited only by the like rights of his fellow men, is immediately deductible from the law of equal freedom. We see that the maintenance of this right necessarily forbids private property in land. On examination all existing titles to such property turn out to be invalid; those founded on reclamation inclusive. It appears that not even an equal apportionment of the earth amongst its inhabitants could generate a legitimate proprietorship. We find that if pushed to its ultimate consequences, a claim to exclusive possession of the soil involves a land-owning despotism. We further find that such a claim is constantly denied by the enactments of our legislature. And we find lastly that the theory of the co-heirship of all people to the soil is consistent with the highest civilization; and that, however difficult it may be to embody that theory in fact, Equity sternly commands it to be done.
