

LAW OF EQUITY—that we owe what of comity or security we enjoy.

Where, then, do we come in, in this great world-movement? As tax reformers? It is sheer nonsense, in the face of it. Our object is not to bring about a revolution in the method of taxation. Nor would our aims be correctly described if we called ourselves merely land reformers. Taxation of Land Values or Land Reform is a means only towards an end, but not the end itself. The end we aim at, the reform we are striving for, is the extension of the LAW OF EQUITY. We desire to establish THE REIGN OF JUSTICE between man and man; to secure to everyone the natural God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is what we stand for. That is the meaning of "Our Policy," which is printed in every issue of our Journal in the words of the founder of our movement:

We would simply take for the community *what belongs to the community*—the value that attaches to land by the growth of the community; leave sacredly to the individual *all that belongs to the individual!*

To secure these natural rights to every human soul, the MEANS TO LIFE—in other words, THE LAND—must be accessible to all. This is an *inevitable inference*; but still an inference only, and not our first or main proposition. Further, investigation has led to the conclusion that in a complex society this could be best secured by taking on behalf of the community that part of the value which attaches to land which has been created by the community. In short, the Single Tax, far from being the basic principle of our philosophy, or of the reform we stand for, is the last term of a long chain of reasoning. And this fact must not be lost sight of in our propaganda.

What we stand for is JUSTICE, EQUITY, the equal and inalienable RIGHT TO LIFE, LIBERTY, AND THE PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS. In this claim our position is impregnable; and this should be the slogan of our propaganda. It is not wise to talk to the people "economics" or "politics." We should talk to them about ETHICS, about first principles, the rights of man to life and liberty.

Only when asked how we proposed to inaugurate the reform need the Taxation of Land Values be proposed and defended as a suitable means of attaining the end aimed at. But it is a mistake to concentrate our attention on the means rather than on the broader principle we stand for.

We must stand for the broad principle which will make it possible to pull down the social barriers in the same way as we have pulled down the city walls, so that the imaginary visitor from the beyond shall have to ask not only: Where are your city walls? But also: Where are your poor?

"CONSCRIPT RENT."

Doctor's Novel Objection to Present Form of Military Service.

A novel form of objection to military service was the subject for a court-martial at Orford Barracks, Warrington, yesterday, when Dr. J. W. Greenwood, a well-known physician and surgeon of Slade Lane, Manchester, was charged with refusing to sign his record service paper.

Dr. Greenwood is a keen land and economic reformer, who went through the Boer War as a surgeon. With his knowledge of what soldiers have to go through, he holds that as men are conscripted so wealth should be conscripted.

At the court-martial the accused, who conducted his own case, pleaded "Guilty." He added, "I have no personal quarrel. I object to a compulsory army carried on by voluntary contributions. I demand that chief rents, site values, tithes, mineral royalties, &c., and all profits over and above the market rate of interest, be taken over by the Government, as men's bodies have been taken over."

Th decision of the Court will be promulgated in due course.—*Daily News*, September 14.

Our readers will be interested to know that Dr. Greenwood is an active member of the Manchester League. We understand that he has always contended in respect to the present war that the owners of this country should defray the financial cost of the war. "Our boys" give their lives to save the country—for the landowners. Dr. Greenwood says he will fight, but the landowners must pay.

A LABOUR CANDIDATE ON LAND VALUES TAXATION.

Mr. John Battle, the prospective Labour candidate for the Middleton and Prestwich division of Lancashire, addressing a public meeting in the Co-operative Hall, Middleton, September 16, said (we quote from the *Middleton Guardian*):

The land did belong to the people because it was created by no man and was a gift of God to all. If the land belonged to the people the Land Values belonged to the people, and they had a right to use those socially created values for their own purposes. They were short of money for local taxation. He held the view that their present system of raising local revenue was wrong. They taxed houses, the very last things in the life of the nation which ought to be taxed. If they wanted to punish a man for a smoky chimney they hauled him before the magistrates and fined him. And when the builder built a house, what did they do? Send the representative of the local authority, not to congratulate him because he had built a home for the community, but in order that they might assess the value of the property so that it could be rated for local purposes, so that the builder could be fined, and it was a fine not for the first time but an ever-increasing fine falling upon the homes of the people each and every year. If they wished to kill the cotton trade or any other industry, make it the subject and the means by which they raised their local revenue, and they would soon kill any industry. It was not any wonder private enterprise in building had died, and now the State had to come forward with public money. If the State was to provide public money, they ought to have public control and let the public authority do the building. But let them change their rating system. It was part of the policy of the Labour Party that their present system of rating should be absolutely abolished, and in its place they should have as one means of raising revenue a tax upon the site value of the land. This policy was too elaborate to outline at the close of a meeting, but as the campaign on behalf of the Labour Party continued many opportunities would be left to him to develop this programme. This was a question of first-rate importance—to tackle the land problem. The land was the source of all employment, the source of wealth, and it was only from the raw material drawn from the land that we lived and had our existence. The land should belong to the people, and they had a right, by taxation, to have these Land Values and use them for the people's needs. A successful system of taxation would drive the land more into use than it had ever been before. (Applause.)

SOME LIBERAL LAND REFORM.

The Yorkshire Executive of the League of Young Liberals has issued proposals for the consideration of its members. Fifth on the list comes a claim for "drastic reform of the land system, with the taxation of land values." What kind of drastic land reform is intended to be accompanied by the taxation of land values is not made clear. Proposals for State regulation of wages, hours, education, health, and child life—which in no way distinguish this programme from that of the Labour Party—are in strange company with the demand for "freedom of person, freedom of opinion, and freedom of trade."

The Young Liberal movement has been described as a half-way house from Liberalism to Socialism. These proposals would seem to indicate that their sponsors are more than half-way on the road away from the old ideals of Liberalism.