

between various <sup>possible</sup> modes of common property (cf post chap 5) but he don't make any further use of this chief arguments

1. The difficulty of apportioning labor to shares of product - or shares to labor, - the measure of distribution
2. The destruct<sup>n</sup> of the pleasure involved in the sense of ownership (also private property as incentive to industry)
3. Destruct<sup>n</sup> of pleasure & virtue of liberality.
4. The disregard of the experience of ages.

"Industry will be increased as so to person will labor to improve his own private property"

he adds that the evils of litigation & expensing of the state had drawn such a distressing picture mere due to <sup>evils of</sup> human nature & not of property. "Can't make people moral by act of Parliament"

Re these arguments.

The second & third strike us as out of place but are characteristic of Aristotle & are true to human nature. - destroy pleasure wh we get from private ownership & pleasure we get from being generous "blesses him who gives & him who takes" & you destroy opportunities for the development of human character.

The first & the fourth are most fault<sup>less</sup> arg<sup>ts</sup> & may be called the common places of conservative criticism in our own time. They differ greatly in strength. The fourth is sheer outcry against resistance to change no conclusion arg<sup>t</sup> against a <sup>new</sup> proposal.

The first is the strongest ground for maintaining a more or less individualistic regime - the difficulty of distribut<sup>n</sup> on any other ~~of~~ regime. - & there

x