

attention to a wonderful increase in the value of land of the late Andreas Tomfohrde, and decrease in the valuation of its buildings. The land had increased in 20 years from \$238,000 to \$695,100, while the buildings decreased in the same time about \$42,100. "This fortunate investor," the Mayor's letter explains, "is reported to have made no public bequests, yet he owed every dollar of this added value to the public." Following that pointed statement Mayor Fitzgerald's letter proceeds:

No intellectual or moral quality was displayed by him in acquiring it and no form of service was rendered. His only talent was to purchase and to keep. Meanwhile, the growth of population, the ever-swelling tides of travel and of trade, the expenditures of the public money on pavements, sidewalks, lights and fire and police protection, the building of a great court house on Pemberton square, in a word, all the multifold activities of the community at large increased and enhanced the value of his estate and would have enhanced it equally if its owner had been some absentee landlord instead of a restaurant keeper doing business on the premises. Of this huge unearned increment of value the owner returned each year about 1½ per cent in taxes. The inadequacy of this return does not require any special argument. Since ordinary processes of taxation fall in such cases, the question arises whether some method should not be devised for returning to the public, which creates it, a larger fraction of the increase of value. Under the present system, individuals are virtually permitted to tax the people; and too often, as in the instance cited, such individuals die without any fulfillment and perhaps without any recognition of their social obligation. The spectacle of unimproved buildings on land every inch of which has its appreciable value, is all too common in the older portions of Boston now dedicated to trade and commerce. In all such instances the natural relations are reversed. The community is not served but serves; the owner merely waits and profits by waiting. This practice should, as far as possible, be discouraged by law, in the interest not only of justice but of social progress.

And then Mayor Fitzgerald asks the Finance Commission—

to consider some plan by which a larger fraction of the increased value of land may go to the community, at least when this increase assumes abnormal proportions; and failing this, the owners may be compelled to maintain some minimum ratio of value between their land and the buildings erected upon it. While the subject is a difficult and abstruse one, conditions are becoming so acute that some form of relief would seem to be required.

+

But the commission has refused to comply with Mayor Fitzgerald's request for consideration, and indiscreetly they give reasons. The question raised "is one almost as old as society itself;" they could not spare the time for it consistently with their other duties, which "would make the assumption

of this task exceedingly difficult if not impossible;" and, moreover, they wouldn't do it anyhow because, to quote them—

the Commission believes it both a sound economic principle and a just governmental policy which takes from the mass of citizens only the amount necessary for the honest and economical administration of government, and leaves the remainder of the citizens' earnings to themselves, to be used in productive enterprises that promote the general welfare. The city's revenues are ample now for all legitimate needs, provided the city's business be conducted honestly and economically. To increase the revenues by further taxes would be to divert money from productive industry and to invite extravagance in municipal expenditures.

This means that in the opinion of that Commission the land values of Boston—not earnings of its landowners but the financial expression of its growth, the earnings of the city itself, should be left to the landowners. The only exaction this Finance Commission would make upon them would be contributions to public needs from incomes they do not earn, in the same proportion as taxes take the earnings of other citizens.

+

Whether Mayor Fitzgerald is a demagogue, as Boston folks say, we do not know. But his letter has no demagogic ring in it except to plutagogic ears. But regardless of his motives, demagogues are preferable to plutagogues, when the issue is drawn between them as clearly as it is now drawn in Boston between Mayor Fitzgerald and the Finance Commission.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

"THE BLIGHT OF BOURNE."

Portland, Ore., Sept. 23.

Oregon has more trees standing up straight than has any other State, and, unless the Portland Oregonian is violating the "pure fact" law, every tree in the State is full of Republicans who have fled in terror from Senator Jonathan Bourne. If you believe the Oregonian—and you don't if you live in Oregon—Bourne is the chief harvester for the Destroying Angel, the inventor and engineer of the original Besom of Destruction. Verily, it is a spectacle for lachrymose angels and joyous blue devils.

+

And what's it all about?

With yells of anguish the Oregonian is megaphoning from Mt. Wilson to Chetco, and from Point Adams to the barren sage plains of southern Malheur County, that Bourne is a blight upon the Republican party and that the party must be "saved from Bourne."

It isn't for nothing that the Scarlet Woman of Oregon journalism rails at Bourne two years before the election at which his successor will be named by the voters.

But what has Bourne done? The indictment as prepared by the Oregonian is to this effect: He treasonably refuses to obey the orders of the corporation machine; he obstinately insists that the people have the right to elect their United States Senators by popular vote; he maliciously advocates the Initiative and Referendum, the Recall, the Direct Primary law and the Corrupt Practices act of Oregon; he is responsible for the bill, to be voted on in November, for an amendment to the primary law under which every party voter will have an opportunity to record his choice for the Presidential candidate of his party, nominate the Presidential electors of his party, and select the delegates to his party's national convention. All of which disturbs the peace and threatens the prosperity of Standpatters. Equally heinous is Bourne's rebellious refusal to worship the Gilded Ass of the Post Office Department.

Therefore, to "save the party," the Oregonian carries a banner with this strange device: "Delenda est Bourne."

+

And what is the Oregonian's antidote for this dreadful "blight of Bourne"?

It's as simple as tiddle-de-winks. All these things that Bourne advocates are ruinous to the Republican party, says the Oregonian; therefore, smash the Direct Primary law, uproot the Initiative and Referendum, repeal the Corrupt Practices act, abolish "Statement No. 1"—which is a promise voluntarily made by a candidate for the legislature that he will vote for the candidate for United States Senator who receives the largest number of popular votes—and thus restore the grand old auction-block method of electing Senators, which gives to the Senator-elect a certificate of Lorimer purity, with a W. A. Clark halo if he wants something ornamental.

That's the Oregonian's plan for saving the party from Bourne. And the plan will work if it is tried. For there are at least two patriotic plutes in Portland who would attend the auction with pleasure, ambition, and wads.

But suppose the voters don't wish to save themselves from Bourne in that way? Well, as the Oregonian sees it, that's what makes the situation as dark as the inside of a cow and as cheerless as a cold buckwheat cake.

+

But wasn't the Oregonian formerly in favor of the Direct Primary law and the Initiative and Referendum, and of the "Statement No. 1" section of the Primary Law.

Yes, but that was before it saw how they would work out in practice. For many years the Oregonian had been the Mount Sinai of Republicanism in Oregon, and no man could get a Moses license unless he came down from the Oregonian office with its brand upon his tongue. The Direct Primary law, as the Oregonian saw it, would copper-rivet that condition; would make newspaper opinion and endorsements supreme in Oregon politics—and on account of its Associated Press monopoly the Oregonian

is the only morning paper of general circulation in the State; so the Direct Primary law would make that paper the political dictator of Oregon. Being dictator, it would look over the field of candidates for its favor, pick a favorite for the Senate, and—of course the voters would be only too glad to confirm the ancient adage, "Vox populi, vox Dei."

That was the dream.

But it didn't work out that way. The voters had opinions and favorites of their own, which made the aforesaid political Mount Sinai look like an anthill in the Rocky Mountains, when the votes were counted. And that wasn't all. With the campaign pamphlets on candidates and measures, sent out under the law from the Secretary of State's office, the voter can read for himself and make up his own mind—instead of having his opinion molded and his ballot marked by the Oregonian. Thus, the fact that the Oregonian is opposed to a candidate or a measure may not show results in the election returns.

Now, imagine the feelings of a dictator suddenly deposed and reduced to a condition of harmless vituperation by a law that he has endorsed, and you will understand why the shrunken Mt. Sinai is in active eruption.

Or, if you don't understand that comparison, think of the tomcat that carefully examines the new rocker, decides that it may remain in the house, and then gets its tail mashed when the master sits in it.

+

However, as far as Bourne is concerned, that isn't the worst of it.

With the Initiative and Referendum and other "hysterical measures"—as a Hitchcock machinist would say—the voters of Oregon have rudely challenged the vested right of Big Business to control politics and legislation in this State; Bourne has contumaciously enlisted as one of the people, and the time that he might give to the service of the "Beast" is largely devoted to spreading the doctrine that the people should rule, that they are capable of managing their own government, and that control of the government by any political machine is dangerous to the people and to their government—a doctrine that is making "Buttermilk" Charley Fairbanks turn over in his refrigerator, and threatens to send Lodge's temperature up to the freezing point.

And what's Bourne doing?

Just what he has been doing. And he's getting ready to do more of the same kind; more work for popular government.

If he's worrying, no one knows it; he's working for the spread of the Oregon method rather than for re-election, believing that the cause of popular government is more important than an office for himself. Whether he shall be re-elected or retired to private life is a question for the voters to decide, as he looks at it; and that question is of less importance to him than having the Oregon method adopted in other States.

Now, what are you going to do with a United States Senator who would rather discuss methods of putting the Oregon method into operation in Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, Illinois, Iowa and Wisconsin than talk about his own chances of re-election?

What are you going to do with a Senator who says, regardless of what may happen two years hence: "Vote against every candidate who wants to break down the Initiative and Referendum and the Primary Law, even if he's your brother or my brother." That is, if you were an Oregon voter, with an opportunity to vote for or against Bourne, how would you vote? Don't hurry; there are two years to think about it.

W. G. EGGLESTON.

* * *

LAND VALUE TAXATION IN SPAIN.

Chicago, October 4.

I am indebted to an energetic single tax friend, Mr. Antonio Albendin, of San Fernando, Spain, for a copy of the radical Spanish daily, "El Herald de Madrid," of Sept. 7, which reports a bill presented to the city council of Madrid by Mr. Quejido, a Socialist member, in which it is proposed that all revenue be raised by a graduated tax on land values, the scale to run from one per cent of the value of land worth 60 cents per square foot, up to three per cent on land worth \$5.00 per square foot. Revaluation is required every five years, to be made by the land-lord, under oath, and value to be based on what the owner would ask if the city needed the land for public purposes. If the owner persists in undervaluation the city is to raise it to correspond to that of adjacent land.

In support of his measure, Mr. Quejido argues that its application would be the greatest progressive step ever taken by the city of Madrid. He figures that the city would derive a revenue of over \$4,400,000, on an average tax rate of 2 per cent; and by taking the burdens of taxation from industry and increasing opportunity for production, it would enable the city to experience an era of prosperity beyond all precedent.

C. L. LOGAN.

INCIDENTAL SUGGESTIONS

REPUBLICS IN ANCIENT INDIA.

Hartford, Conn.

It is customary to speak of Asia as a land of despotism and absolute monarchies, where political freedom and popular self rule have never been known, and where the genius and habits of the people have nothing in common with self-government. These ideas are put forth as a justification of British rule in India. We are told that the Indian people do not want to govern themselves, and could not if they tried to. But the facts seem to teach the opposite.

1. As everybody with any knowledge of affairs in the Orient is aware, there has arisen a powerful popular movement in India which is stirring the land from one end to the other, called the New Nationalist Movement. Its object is constitutional government and home rule. Its leaders point to Canada, Australia and South Africa, and say: "Those peoples have home rule. We desire the same. It is our right. We can govern ourselves better than any

foreign nation, ignorant of our civilization, our customs and our needs, can govern us. Give us parliamentary institutions and home rule."

2. In the past, India has been able to govern herself. Great and civilized nations with highly organized governments existed in India while Europe was yet barbarian; and since Europe emerged from barbarism some of the most important kingdoms and empires of the world and some of the greatest and most enlightened rulers have appeared in India.

3. Nor is India's ability to rule herself confined to the past. This is seen by the fact that the very best governments in India today, those which are doing most to promote education and the welfare of the people, and which are most in line with the progressive governments of Europe and America, are not carried on by the British there, but are those which we find in such self-ruling Native States as Baroda and Mysore.

4. Perhaps no people in the world have had larger training in what is fundamental in self-rule, namely, local self-government, than the people of India. This is seen in their remarkable "village communities," which have come down from very early times and which are virtual little republics or democracies. It is often pointed out that the most important preparation which our own New England had for republican institutions was that which it obtained through its town governments and town meetings, those little democratic institutions which for generations before the establishment of our national government had been teaching the people to govern themselves. Much the same kind of education in self-government which came to New England through its town meetings, India has been receiving for two or three thousand years through her village communities. This is the reason why the people of India are so law-abiding and so easy to govern. Thus instead of the Indian peoples being fundamentally unfit for anything but despotism, they are in some respects among the best prepared for self-rule of any of the peoples of the world.

5. But what I want particularly to call attention to, is the fact that India was one of the first lands in the world, if not the very first, to develop distinct and full republics. If any one wishes to find a concise statement of the grounds for this claim I refer him to an article in the "Modern Review" of Calcutta, India, for August, 1910, written by Professor Ramananda Chatterjee, editor of the Review. The article is entitled "Republics in Ancient India." Space does not permit me to quote from it in detail; but I will cite a single paragraph which fairly well sums up the conclusions reached:

"Republics existed in India at least as early as the days of Buddha and Mahavira (sixth century before Christ) and as late as Samudra Gupta (fourth century after Christ). They were situated in the extensive tract of country stretching from the Punjab in the west to Behar in the east, and from Nepal in the north to the southern borders of the Central Provinces. So the republican form of government in ancient India had a duration of at least one thousand years. We know of no other country, ancient