

lord of the manor, are soon found to be something which has not been from eternity, something which has crept in unawares, something which has swallowed up the rights and the lands which once belonged to the people.—Edward A. Freeman.

---

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

---

#### THE APPEAL OF THE PEERS.

Gilbert K. Chesterton in the London Daily News of  
January 15, 1910.

Would you call upon the people; in what ear shall it be told?

Call on God, whose name is pity, though our sins be very old.

Will you call on street and township? Who but you have made the smoke

Something heavier than a vapor, something sharper than a joke?

Who but you have taxed the townsmen of their tired and ugly tilth,

Who but you have made men forfeit for their right to live in filth?

Will you call on croft and village? On what village will you call,

That four centuries of your lordship has not left a tithe too small?

Hamlets breaking, homesteads drifting, peasants tramping, towns erased;

Lo! my Lords, we gave you England—and you give us back a waste.

Yea, a desert labeled England, where (you know, and well you know),

That the village Hampdens wither and the village idiots grow,

That the pride of grass grows mighty and the hope of man grows small.

Will you call on croft and village? Let the rabbits hear your call.

Will you call on crest and scutcheon? We might heed you, if we knew

Even one gutter-thief whose thousands cannot cut his way to you—

If there lived on earth one upstart from whose filthy face you shrank,

We would hear, my Lords, more gravely, of the grace and scorn of rank.

Now, if in your mob of merchants, usurers, idlers, cads, you keep

One that did have Norman fathers; let your Norman fathers sleep.

Let God's good grass blow above them where their pointed pennons blew,

They were thieves and thugs and smiters; they were better men than you.

Will you call on cross and altar? and in God's name where were you

When the crashing walls of convents let the Tudor axes through?

Tell us of your deeds, Crusaders! Waken Ariosto's muse!

How you stood the Church's champions when the Church had land to lose—

You, the Russells, with the ashes of a hundred altars shod,

You, the Howards, with your wallets bursting with the gold of God,

Will you call on cross and altar—will you name the holy name?

No, by heaven you shall not name it. Smite your very mouths for shame.

Would you call upon the people? Would you waken these things then?

Call on God, whose name is pity; do not ask too much of men.

+ + +

## SIX REASONS FOR TAXING LAND VALUES.

The Lord Advocate, the Right Hon. Alexander Ure, K. C., M. P., at the Alexandra Palace, London, June 28th, 1909, as Sent Out by the Land Values Publication Dept., 376-377 Strand, London, W. C., in Postal Card Form, With Portrait of Mr. Ure.

1. The land comes from the hands of the Creator, and does not owe its existence to man.

2. It is limited in quantity. You can no more add to the area of the country than you can add a cubit to your stature.

3. It is necessary for our existence; it is necessary for our production; it is necessary to us when we wish to exchange our products.

4. Land does not owe its value to anything which its owner chooses to spend upon it.

5. Land owes its value entirely to the presence and activity and expenditure of the community.

6. Land cannot be carried away, and cannot be concealed.

Yet they tell us that land is the same as any other commodity! What a terrible mess men get themselves into when they venture to make such an assertion! It is a hopelessly fallacious assertion. I say that possessing these characteristics land is a peculiar subject for special taxation.

+ + +

## BACK TO THE LAND.

David Lloyd George at Queen's Hall, London, December 31, 1909, As Reported in the London Chronicle.\*

Has it ever occurred to you why the House of Lords did not follow the advice of Lord Rosebery not to reject the Budget, but to put it into operation for a year? Now, I want you to follow that, as it is by no means a bad test of their sincerity. What did Lord Rosebery say—and he

\*Mr. Henry George, Jr., says of this speech: "This was the Chancellor's greatest speech yet."

is a perfectly sincere opponent of the Budget? Very few people like to pay if they can avoid it, and there can be no question as to the sincerity of Lord Rosebery's objection. (Cheers and laughter.) He said to them: "This is such a bad Bill that all you have to do is to pass it, and let it come into operation, and after a year's experience the people of this country will realize what a thoroughly pernicious thing it is; and that instead of entering upon a very doubtful contest." (A Voice: "Eh?") Those are his words, not mine. (Laughter.) Personally, I have not the slightest doubt about it. He said: "In a year's time your victory will be assured."

Why did they not adopt that staid counsel? Just follow. They might have said, "We took the high patriotic line. (Laughter.) We could not allow, even for the sake of party advantage, a bad Bill like this to come into operation, to destroy confidence and to destroy the trade and commerce of the country." If they had said so—(Laughter)—their record proves that at any rate they do not always follow that line. (Hear, hear.) They said the same thing about the Trades Disputes Bill and the Miners' Eight Hours' Bill, and Lord Lansdowne, their leader, their nominal leader—(Laughter and hisses)—I do not want you to waste your hisses on the wrong man—(Laughter)—Lord Lansdowne said about the Old Age Pensions Bill that it was a thoroughly mischievous measure. In spite of that they passed it, purely because they said it would not be to the interest of the House of Lords not to pass it. They are not above passing even a bad Bill if they think it is to the advantage of their party to do so.

#### The Worst That Could Happen.

I will give you another consideration. The worst that could happen to this country if the Budget were passed would be that ten millions of money would be extracted out of the pockets of the rich for the purpose of paying for Dreadnoughts and old age pensions. (Cheers.) I think this country could stand that for twelve months at any rate without being utterly ruined. (Laughter and cheers.)

My third reason for believing that that was not their motive was this: If trade had gone from bad to worse since the introduction of the Budget, then the Lords might have said, "We must put an end to it. We cannot stand this any longer in the interest of the country, and therefore we must throw it out, whatever the consequences may be."

But that was not the case. From the moment the Budget was introduced trade improved. Our foreign trade went up month by month, I think by something like ten millions. Unemployment went down steadily from the month of April something like 2 per cent. From April down to November the traffic on our railways improved.

Moreover, there is every indication that we are in for better times, and so far from the Budget having shaken confidence, destroyed credit, and injured the trade and industry of the country, things have improved, and I think we can say will improve for at least twelve months.

#### Peers' Fears of Land Valuation.

Therefore I dismiss that as an explanation of their reason. What was it then? (A Voice: "The land taxes.") I will give you two. The gentleman there has anticipated me with the first. The first reason undoubtedly was this—that in the course of the next twelve months, before they would get any opportunity of calling upon the country to express their opinion on the Budget, great progress would have been made with the land valuation. (Cheers.)

Now I want you to consider what that would have revealed. (A Voice: "Good-bye to Tariff Reform," and laughter.) It would have revealed startling results. It would have shown at any rate the extent to which the great ground landlords of this country have escaped their fair share of the burden of taxation. Lands rated at a few scores of pounds a year, or at the outside a few hundreds, are described as agricultural land, and get half their rates paid out of the taxes of the country. The official valuation would have proved that lands of that kind are worth scores and hundreds of thousands of pounds.

What would that have meant? The tradesmen of the country, the business people of the country, who are now being crushed by the heavy burden of local taxation, would have turned round and said: "Where is our share of all this?" The working men of the country, whose rents now are in many cases almost impossible of payment owing partly to the price of the land on which their houses are built, and partly to the heavy rates, like the tradespeople, business people, and commercial elements of the country, would have insisted on the great ground landlords paying upon the real value of their land.

By throwing out the Bill the Lords for the time being have avoided that catastrophe—(laughter)—and naturally they are anxious about the future, and want to talk about something else. . . .

#### The Land System.

Now we come to business. (Cheers.) We make less out of our land than any country in Europe. Why? It is the land system. It discourages expenditure of capital. It does not give security to capital.

The first essential condition in fully developing the resources of this country is to give absolute security to the man who spends money upon developing. (Cheers.) We are spending money on scientific education in agriculture. In the Development Bill, as I pointed out to you, I have set aside a good many hundred thousand more for the

purpose. It is essential. But what is the good of teaching them scientific agriculture? It all means money. It means spending more money, and you will not get them to spend money until they have absolute security that they will get back every penny of that money with all the profit that it makes. (Cheers.)

The farmer is not to blame. The laborer is not to blame. They are all working hard. They are facing great anxieties. They are doing their best within the limitations imposed upon them.

What is to blame is our land system. (Hear, hear.) Our idea as to land is fundamentally wrong, and I will tell you why. The idea which is fostered by a certain section of people is that the land of this country was created for the benefit, for the enjoyment—(A Voice: "Of dukes," and laughter),—for the amusement, for the amenity of a small class of superior persons. (Laughter.)

The land of this country was given for the rearing of a strong, healthy, happy race of men, women and children upon it. (Cheers.) . . .

#### Overcrowding in Towns.

Why is there all this overcrowding in towns? Why is it that you get two men running after one job? It is because you have got a flood of people who have been flowing steadily from the villages and the rural districts into the towns to find work that they ought to have found at home.

I will give you one of my experiences in the last few days. I visited my old home. (Cheers.) I went round the old village and over the old fields, and what struck me was the number of old cottages I remembered which were in ruins—cottages which used to be full of bright children playing about, many of them my old schoolmates, people not rich, not prosperous, but living in healthy abundance. Nobody starved there. They had plenty of good, healthy food. They reared strong, healthy children there, and I remember them inhabited by men, women, and children of that type. What are those cottages now? Mere heaps of stones, with the brambles and nettles covering them.

I made inquiries, and I asked a man who, I knew, had been writing up a history of that little village—I said: "How many are there of these little cottages in the whole parish?"—there are only about 200 or 300 of them altogether—and he replied: "Curiously enough I have been investigating this myself, and I find that within living memory seventy-two cottages have disappeared."

What has happened to the people? The people have gone—some perhaps to America—most of them to Liverpool, to London, to Birmingham. They and their descendants are helping to glut the labor market in the conflict for work. It would have been far better for them, far better for

their children, if they were working on the old fields at home.

But I tell you another fact which I discovered, and it is by no means an irrelevant one. I find that whilst the cottages have gone out, the population had gone down—the cotters had gone away. But game preservation in that parish had more than quadrupled. (Cries of "Shame.")

They said it was the poverty of the district sent them away—it was the foreign competition sent them away. (Laughter.) I saw no Germans there. (Renewed laughter.) I don't think I saw any German goods there, anyway. Foreign competition drove them away? Not at all; not at all. It was not the poverty of the district. It is the richest as it is without doubt the most beautiful land in the world. (Cheers.)

Well, now, what was it? You must remember this, and I am not putting it as a point of prejudice, but as a point which is of growing importance—

Four or five times the amount of game preservation which I remember in my young days there.

Now, a gamekeeper would rather not have too many cottagers spread about the estate. Some of them occasionally go out at nights. (Laughter.) That is, an occasional partridge, or hare, or pheasant may find its way into the cotters' soup. So game preservation never encourages the development of these small holdings. But it is not simply that. Landlords say: "We cannot afford to build cottages. It does not pay. We only get one or two per cent on them."

That, I think, is a very short-sighted policy. The landlord gets more; he gets more rent, and there is more labor, and especially contented labor on the property. Half the money spent in game preservation in that village during that period would not have merely built those seventy-two cottages better, more commodious, and more airy, but it would have built double the number.

I say this: the land of England was not made for the partridges, but for the peasants of England. (Prolonged cheers.)

Every other country in the world is paying attention to this. They are encouraging these little cotters. They are doing their best for them, and we have got to do the same thing, otherwise the proportion of unemployment will grow, not from foreign tariffs, but from the home landlords. (Cheers.)

#### Why Houses Don't Increase.

One other consideration of the land question which I want to put to you. The building trade, I am told, is very depressed. So it is in every other part of the world. But one reason why it is more depressed here than it ought to be. You go to any village in the country and ask: How is it you do not build here, there are very eligible

sites? Do they say it is because of the Germans? (Loud laughter.) No. It is the home-grown product, and they will tell you who he is. They will say, "Look over at that mansion there. You cannot get land here. If you do get land, it is always in the spot where you don't want it, and when you get that you never get enough of it, and when you get that which is not enough, you pay ten times as much for it as it is worth." That stops building. (Hear, hear.) You see towns crammed and crushed in. They are not allowed to spread out at all. There is something unseen, an influence sinister, which seems crushing them in with a bear's hug. Now you have got to clip their claws. (Loud cheers.)

It is not merely the towns. Go to little villages. (Hear, hear.) Occasionally you get men there who have saved a little money and would like to build. They cannot build. Why? It is with the greatest difficulty in the world that they get a plot of ground, and if they do they will only just get enough, without any gardens around it, and look at the price they pay. You find that the land is probably worth about £1 an acre. I think it is fair that if you cut a piece out of a farm, you pay more than £1 an acre for it. You must pay for the disfigurement—(laughter)—at 100 per cent. Double it—that is £2 an acre.

What will you find? You will find the little plot of ground in the village where land is or rather ought to be cheap, charged at twenty, thirty, forty or even fifty times its value. That kills building. (Hear, hear.) Take another case, of which I have had some experience as a solicitor. (Laughter.) Not a bad thing for you to get a lawyer on your side. (Renewed laughter.) He knows so many of the tricks of the other side.

Acting for tradesmen and business men, you go to any town and you say to the tradesmen, "You seem to be doing very well here, but you seem to have very little room. Why do you not open out? "Open out," he says, "where am I going to open out? I cannot build in the clouds, and if I did I should be charged ground rent." (Loud laughter.) Because, by the laws of England, you can charge a ground rent if you build right up to Mars. He is the owner up to the heavens. (Laughter.)

The tradesman cannot get land for the purpose of extension, and he cannot alter any of the premises on his land without consent. If he wants to put in a new window, he must get the consent of the landlord. The landlord graciously gives his consent for a consideration. If the tradesman wants a few square yards at the back, the landlord knows perfectly well it is the only place he can build on. He cannot cart his business away on a costermonger's barrow and plant it in the next street. The landlord knows it, and takes advantage of it.

What is the result? The tradesman leaves matters to the last moment. He does not build unless he is forced to, and when he does a good share of the money he would have put into the building goes towards paying the landlord, who does not utilise it for employment.

Most men have a certain amount they can spend on building and no more. A man may have £1,000 to spend on a house or shop, but if he has to pay three, four, or five hundred pounds for the land he has less for the building, and if he has less for the building less material is required, there is less employment for the workman, and everybody suffers for this greedy ground landlord. (Loud cheers.)

#### Why Capital Goes Abroad.

They are all talking about capital going abroad. But look at it! Tens and scores of millions going every year! Capital must go somewhere. Capital must have elbow room, and if it does not get room here, it must go somewhere where it can get it. If they do not allow British money to be spent on British land and British soil, the capitalist must get a return for his money, and so he invests it in the Argentine or somewhere else.

You make British soil as profitable to the British capitalist as the soil of the Argentine, and British capital will not run away.

Experience proves that the capitalist prefers the home investment. That is something he sees with his own eyes. If you are in for a gamble you prefer something you cannot see, because you depend upon faith. (Laughter.) A man naturally prefers something he knows and sees, and the land is something he can see. There is no land under the sun that repays capital more than the land of England. It is the richest under the sun. That is why the Saxons took it away from us—(cheers and laughter)—and left us the hills. I would not exchange.

What would happen if you had a rational land system? The people would flock to the land exactly as they have been flocking to seek a job anywhere in the great commercial and industrial centres. The people prefer the land in every country. A man will take less for laboring on the soil, and he is right. He gets something from the land that no gold can ever pay him for. He draws a strength, a hope, a security from that which he cannot get anywhere else. Send him back to the land. That is where you want the men now who are seeking their work, as it were, in charity. That is the policy which will settle unemployment.

I want the workmen of this country to build their hopes not on the mists and myths of Protection—(cheers)—but on the solid foundation of the land of Britain.

What are these Protectionist visions and

dreams?—(A voice: "Humbug")—and the great things that would come through taxing food?

#### The Protectionist Heaven.

I was passing, the other day, on my way to one of my boroughs, when I saw one of the most beautiful skies. The whole firmament of heaven was just paved with a fine white wool, and if you looked towards the west there was a solid bank of gold of the richest hue; and you might have imagined that at the first shower the whole country would have been covered with enough wool to clothe the inhabitants for the rest of their time, and enough gold to keep us above want for the rest of our days.

All that would have happened if it had fallen would have been that we would all have got a good drenching. (Laughter.) That is nothing but vapor. That is the Protectionist heaven. (Cheers.) Aye, it's the Protectionist heaven paved with food and raiment, and riches golden in hue. But it is nothing but vapor, which if it once comes down on this land will drench it in hunger.

We have tried it before. What did it bring? It brought famine to hundreds and thousands of our people. It is bringing black bread to Germany. Why should we try it here? Let us rather get back to the free, unfettered, unshackled, cultivation of the land of England.

The land makes no promises to the tiller that it does not fulfill; it excites no hopes in the springtime that it does not realize at harvest. The land is the bountiful mother that gives to the children of men sustenance, security, and rest. (Loud Cheers.)

\* \* \*

The most impudent hypocrite of all is the great proprietor who, being a principal cause of the misery which he affects to deprecate, would be disgusted and furious if he were to be shown in his true colors, and so trusts in ignorance and sophistry when

he laments the condition of the poor, but secretly and steadily adds to their burdens.—Professor Thorold Rogers.

---

## BOOKS

---

### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

**Readings on American Federal Government.** Edited by Paul S. Reinsch, Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. Author of "World Politics," "Colonial Government," "American Legislatures," etc. Published by Ginn and Company. Boston, New York, Chicago and London.

A collection of materials for the study of American Government suggested to its editor by his own experience in studying the processes of American government with his university class. It consists of selections from articles and statements written by representative men, forming altogether a body of information designed to be useful to any one—whether student or general reader—interested in understanding somewhat in detail the manner in which public affairs are actually managed.

An idea of the character of the editor's work may be gathered from a brief reference to some of his selections. To explain the inauguration of the President, the description, by Frederic Harrison, of President McKinley's inauguration in 1900, has been taken from Mr. Harrison's "Impressions of America" in the Nineteenth Century Magazine; while the Presidential powers are outlined in Congressional speeches by Senator Rayner, Representative Towne, Senator Bacon and Senator Spooner, and in ex-President Cleveland's article in McClure's, on the Debs strike in Chicago. In this manner the editor has covered such subjects—in addition to the President, his powers and his relation to Congress—as the Senate, Congressional conference committees, rules of the House, finan-

---

## Public Service.

You have a friend with whom you have had earnest discussion on political, social or economic subjects?

You have his viewpoint which though different from yours shows him to be a sincere student.

You can do him no greater service than to make him a PUBLIC subscriber.

And you will be surprised to find how easy this may be done.

The difficulty is only to get you to think of it when you see him.

Daniel Kiefer