

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 landlord, 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