

by water. He also received a slice of land 100 yards deep, which was added to his garden free of cost, from land reclaimed from the river at the public expense.

KIND WAY WITH DUKES

When, in July, 1912, it was proposed that the Crown should take over its own leases in Whitehall Gardens and build Board of Trade offices there, the seventh Duke of Buccleuch was found protesting that the buildings would overlook the gardens of Montagu House and take away his privacy. This protest failed, but when the Government wanted to take over Montagu House for the Ministry of Labour and the Ministry of Munitions they paid the Duke of Buccleuch a rent of £5,000 a year.

On the basis of that rent, to buy the old house and the remainder of the lease may perhaps be defended as making the best of a bad bargain, but to talk about "sacrifices" in connection with the Dukes of Buccleuch and Montagu House would make a cat laugh.—*The "Star" (London), February 19th.*

HOLDING UP LAND

At a meeting of the Inverness Town Council, February 22nd, Mr. Smith Laing, town clerk depute, read several letters which had been written on behalf of the Council to proprietors stating what the intentions of the Council are with regard to cultivating land.

Discussing a case on the Hill, where the proprietor stated that he wished to retain the piece of ground himself, the clerk said—He is liable to be prosecuted unless he ploughs it.

Mr. W. C. Young: I think it is very hard lines that when the Council goes about looking for land which is put under grass, they should be met with the statement that parties wish to cultivate it themselves.

The Surveyor: In this particular case, when I put the question, "Would you have done anything unless we decided to plough it?" he said "No"!

It was agreed to take over the ground.

With regard to catering to the needs of the Harbour Ward, the convenor stated that there were 29 allotments being pegged off.

Mr. Young: How many applicants are there?

The Surveyor: Twenty-eight.

It was agreed to fence off the ground.

Speaking with regard to Lochalsh Road, the surveyor said that two portions of ground were available, and 140 yards of fencing were required.

It was eventually resolved to take in a larger piece of ground than was formerly decided on, and to take the necessary steps to have it properly fenced.—*The Highland News, February 23rd.*

When I talked at length one day with President Wilson on my visit to America in October, 1916, he remarked, half to himself, in surprise at my tale of war, "Why does all this horror come on the world? What causes it?" "Mr. President," I answered, "it is the King business."

I did not mean nominal kings as harmless as those of Spain and England. I was thinking of the powerful monarchs. A German Republic would never have embarked on this war; a German Congress would have thought twice before sending their own sons to death in a deliberate effort to enslave other peoples. In a free Germany teachers, ministers, and professors would not have taught the necessity of war. What German merchant in a free Germany would have thought that all the trade of the East, all the riches of Bagdad and Cairo and Mosul could compensate him for the death of his first-born or restore the blind eyes to the youngest son who now crouches, cowering, over the fire, awaiting death?—*J. W. Gerrard (formerly United States Ambassador at Berlin); the "Times," February 23rd.*

"CAN RADICALISM AND SOCIALISM UNITE?"

By CHARLES TREVELYAN, M.P.

We have much pleasure in reproducing from the *NATION* of February 2nd the following extracts from a letter by Mr. Charles Trevelyan, M.P., which has attracted much attention, as indicating a possible basis for co-operation between the Radical and Labour forces of the country. It is very probable that the new alignment of political parties will be such as Mr. Trevelyan suggests, and a party whose programme included the taxation of land values for the purpose of providing revenue and breaking up land monopoly would undoubtedly command an immense volume of sympathy throughout the country. Mr. Trevelyan says:—

The greatest series of events in British party politics for a generation have been the Labour Manifesto on War Aims, its adoption by a Representative Assembly of Labour, and the messages of Labour to President Wilson and the Russian Democracy. Hitherto the British Labour Party has played a secondary part as a force of discontent driving Governments into progressive courses. It has now become a directing force, stepping in to divert the world from ruin, where the old parties are impotent to shape a policy.

The Liberal Party to-day has no voice except through its leaders. But in this tremendous crisis they have been conspicuously unable either to prevent the world conflagration, to conduct the war successfully, or to prepare the way for an honourable democratic peace. In fact, they have failed to lead in action and in thought. What likelihood is there that they will lead effectively when the world has to be rebuilt on the ruins caused by the war?

Many Radicals are already openly joining the Labour Party. Others are hesitating, uncertain whether the reconstruction of the Labour Party means only a finer electioneering machine for registering discontent and class irritation in Parliament, or a much bigger thing—i.e., the force, which, utilising the best intellect of the country, will rally men of all classes to a broad policy of internationalism and economic revolution through law.

One contribution towards the fusion or co-operation is to ascertain whether on the greater outlines of national policy there is solid common ground between Radicalism and Labour. That I fully believe to be the case. It is for that reason that I try to put into shape what many Liberals and Radicals appear to be thinking in propositions which might be useful to compare with the principles now being laid down for the discussion of the Labour Party.

After referring to the policy of the Labour Party in regard to internationalism and the recovery of civil liberty, Mr. Trevelyan continues:—

On the basis of Internationalism and Liberty, there is good hope that the common men and women of our land will be able to challenge the worst features of our existing social and economic order.

(A) *The first challenge is to the private ownership of unearned wealth* which deprives the community of values created by itself, and is the chief cause of economic inequality.

The key to the new order is just taxation. A debt of five or six thousand millions will, if not disposed of, require the doubling of our pre-war taxation, and leave no margin for new social expenditure. The debt ought therefore to be wiped off by the generation that made it. No sources of revenue are sufficient except a very large tax on land values and a levy on capital. The first of

these measures would at once place at the disposal of the State a large part of the communally created values. The levy on capital might result in the State acquiring a proportion of the land, and part of the capital in many industrial concerns.

By this process the poor man, the wage-earner, and the man of a limited income would enjoy a greater, not a less immunity from taxation. Only thus and by maintaining complete freedom for imports, it may be possible to support the period of high prices which will necessarily follow the war.

(b) *The Second Challenge is to the Land Monopoly*, which not only preserves communal values in private hands, but endows private individuals with the power of dictating the use of land, and so of commanding the lives and fortunes of their fellow-countrymen.

The breaking of the land monopoly must be a conscious aim of the policy. Land must pay to rates and taxes according to its real value, so that no owner can afford to refuse the use of his land either in town or country. Nor must the user of land be any longer burdened by taxes on houses and improvements, which are just as vicious as taxes on foodstuffs. The land may gradually pass to the community; but when it does so it must be after the land monopoly has ceased and when the prices of land have been reduced to a minimum by every acre being put to its best use. The landlords must not be bought out in the old style on the basis of the present inflated and unsocial values.

If land becomes easily available for all men and all industries the danger of unemployment will be infinitely less. We can then face as a manageable problem the provision of a full subsistence allowance for the temporarily unemployed and all the measures which will result from the break-up of the present poor-law system.

(c) *The Third Challenge is conveyed in the Demand that the workers in the industries of the country have a predominant right to decide the conditions under which they work, and to enjoy the results of their labour.*

To secure these ends, the war control of the nation over railways, mines, and shipping will have to be maintained and developed into state ownership. Where private employment continues, employers will have to admit the workers to a full share in the settlement of hours, wages, and general conditions. A national minimum of wages and conditions will have to be established by law in all industries. Hours of labour will have to be rigorously restricted.

There are other supremely important questions, such as education and housing. But it is useless to talk of a million new houses if the land monopoly continues, or of democratic education up to the university, if our revenue has to go to pay the interest of war-debt, or the manufacture of armaments.

The chief note of the new policy must be thoroughness. For the time of compromise, of the slow and patient evolution to a better social condition, has passed with the war. No reversion to pre-war programmes of a 25s. minimum wage and a moderate taxation of urban sites and educational facilities will satisfy the new demands. Our lives have been spoilt by compromise, because we tolerated armament firms and secret diplomacy and the rule of wealth. The world-war has revealed the real meaning of our social system. As imperialism, militarism, and irresponsible wealth are everywhere trying to crush democracy to-day, so democracy must treat these forces without mercy. The root of all evil is economic privilege. The personal problem which faces so many of us is that we cannot waste the rest of our lives in half-measures against it. Where

shall we find that political combination which will offer us resource in its strategy, coherence in its policy, and fearlessness in its proposals?

THE FUNDAMENTAL REFORM

Mr. Charles Trevelyan has done a public service by the letter which appeared in the *NATION* of February 2nd. under the title "Can Radicalism and Socialism Unite?" He has there set forth succinctly and with convincing logic the position which confronts that great body of the electorate which has always called itself Liberal. Before the war the ægis of Liberalism covered almost every class of reformer. Enthusiasts of many varied types acknowledged some kind of allegiance to a powerful political organisation, or at least they realised that the Liberal Party as a party was the only one on which reliance could be placed to stem reaction and further the cause of progress. Before the war, in spite of grievous disappointments, reformers, and in particular the Land Values group, had no alternative but to maintain a connection with the Liberal Party. To sever all ties with it was to go out into the wilderness and abandon hope of early legislative action. No doubt even in early 1914 some were looking to the Labour Party, but in those days the Labour leaders with all their ability and influence were not within measurable distance of challenging the Liberals and the Conservatives as the ruling parties in the House of Commons. Therefore up to 1914 the hope of the supporters of the taxation of Land Values, as far as practical politics were concerned, lay in a more enlightened, vigorous and straightforward leadership for the Liberal Party.

Now the position is entirely changed. We have a Labour Party which is the only party in the State with a constructive policy. We have a Labour Party that is broadening the basis of its appeal to the country from a narrow class to a universal brotherhood of workers by hand or brain. We have a Labour Party that will be prepared when the next General Election comes in six months or less to challenge the supremacy of the older caucuses. Under these circumstances, as Mr. Trevelyan says, "Many Radicals are already openly joining the Labour Party. Others are hesitating, uncertain whether the reconstruction of the Labour Party means only a finer electioneering machine for registering discontent and class irritation in Parliament or a much bigger thing—i.e., the force which, utilising the best intellect of the country, will rally men of all classes to a broad policy of internationalism and economic revolution through law." It is to the realisation of this latter hope that all our energies should be bent; we must strive for the formation of an organisation that will unite all the forces of democracy throughout the country and carry them on to a triumphant period not of re-construction of the old rotten fabric of the State, but of construction of a new and immeasurably better community.

Before the war the evils to be combated were colossal enough to demand the concentration of all our energies. After the war, as Mr. Outhwaite has told us so impressively in his recent book, the difficulties will be so intensified that all the statesmanship at our command will be needed if the revolution that is bound to come is to be peaceful, and is not to degenerate into a riot of anarchy. But the difficulties ahead must not make us pessimists; they must only make us proportion our efforts to the task to be undertaken; and the programme which Mr. Trevelyan has sketched points out the only true line of action. He