

possessions by trick or by main force, or, being wearied out by ill usage, they are forced to sell them; by which means those miserable people, both men and women, married and unmarried, old and young, with their poor but numerous families (since country business requires many hands), are forced to change their seats, not knowing whither to go; and they must sell, almost for nothing, their household stuff, which could not bring them much money, even though they might stay for a buyer. When that little money is at an end (for it will soon be spent), what is left for them to do but either to steal, and so be hanged (God knows how justly!) or to go about and beg! And if they do this, they are put in prison as idle vagabonds, while they would willingly work, but can find none that will hire them; for there is no more occasion for country labor, to which they have been bred, when there is no arable ground left. One shepherd can look after a flock, which will stock an extent of ground that would require many hands if it were to be ploughed and reaped.

* * *

LANDLORDISM'S BOGEY-MAN.

Answer by the London Daily Chronicle of January 22, to the "Poor Widow" Argument Against Land Value Taxation.

The principle of our proposal will not be contested; its application to large estates, and to land kept vacant while its value rises, will be welcomed. But an outcry is raised on behalf of the small freeholder and the small farmer—not by themselves, but by others who are curiously solicitous of their interests while thinking of their own. The great vested interests always lurk in the background and put the small people in the front. But the intelligent small freeholder or farmer who follows our discussion closely, and understands what the effect of the new taxation must be, will see that in the end he has nothing to lose, but if he is a producer or a house, as well as a land, owner everything to gain.

The truth is that these "small" cases—which do not all involve individual hardship—are put forward with a very definite purpose. That purpose is to divert public attention from the great landowners themselves. Behind the widow's ground rent are the vast incomes of the great ground landlords of London and other towns, swollen by generations of absorption of "unearned" increment. Behind the small owner's plot of land are the huge deer forests of Scotland and the grouse moors of Yorkshire; the rural estates from which the population is being slowly driven by the refusal of cottages and small holdings; and the enormous mineral wealth of Wales and the northern counties. Many of the wonderful natural opportunities of our land are

not utilized to anything like their full extent, simply because it does not suit the pleasure or profit of their owners. To these the taxation of land values will come as a much-needed spur to the performance of duties which they are in honor bound to render to the nation, in return for the splendid privileges they enjoy. We have to look beyond the "fighting line" and remember that England's future prosperity largely depends on the best use being made of English land.

It cannot be too often reiterated that the proposal to which we are committed, modest though it be, is very far-reaching. It involves a complete change in our system of taxing real property. We say that taxation according to use is wrong, and that actual market value is the proper basis of charge. And for nearly two months there has been no effective attempt to controvert that proposition by argument.

Some correspondents point out that a tax on the value of land would inflict hardship on certain interested individuals.

Was there ever a change of taxation that did not inflict hardship on individuals? Every year, as Budget day approaches, there is a growing anxiety in our markets, and much searching of heart in the great centers of wealth, as to possible changes in taxation. The tea duty has been altered several times during recent years. At each raising of the duty merchants with small stocks and large orders have suffered. At each reduction the owners of large duty-paid stock have felt the pinch. So with sugar—and coal. No Chancellor of the Exchequer can possibly accept individual hardship as a real reason against a change of taxation. No doubt there is a duty laid upon him to make changes in such a way as to minimize these hardships as far as possible. But, once admit them as a valid argument against a new tax, and there is no ground on which alterations in taxation can be justified. The adoption of this line of defense against our proposal is significant in a high degree. It means—and can only mean—that on the broad ground of national welfare there is no answer to our policy. As we have said, most of the cases of hardship submitted to us relate to "small" people. The "small" freeholder, the "small" investor, the poor widow who derives a scanty income from ground rents, the city clerk, who invests his "small" savings in a plot of land—these and others of the same character are the cases advanced to prejudice the application of a just and sound principle to the taxation of real property. To read the harrowing details and lugubrious comments of some of our correspondents might lead a stranger to imagine that England was a country of "small" owners and "small" investors, and that such people as ducal landowners and millionaires belonged to an antediluvian species, occasionally met with on the opposite shore of the Atlantic. As the

"Great Landlord Bird" says in one of F. C. G.'s recent cartoons, "It's no use coming here, Mr. Lloyd George; I'm extinct!"

Now, we cannot let the small owners off. That is impossible. All the big estates would immediately be divided and sub-divided in such a way as to escape the tax, and its yield would be reduced to an enormous extent. It might be possible to graduate the tax, but not at first. Moreover, if it is a good thing to limit, by means of a tax, the power over industry possessed by the great landowner, it is an equally good thing to limit the similar power possessed by the small landowner. But what is too often forgotten by our adversaries is that the ownership of land necessarily involves the ownership also of a certain amount of wealth produced by industry—houses and buildings of all kinds, machinery and other appliances necessary to the use and enjoyment of land. Our proposal for the alteration in the system of taxing real property, as we have throughout insisted, has a twofold aspect. The taxation of land according to its market value must be accompanied by the exemption of the products of industry. And so, while land values will be reduced, industry values will benefit—in whatever hands they may be.

+ + +

MAHMOUD AND KASAJAS.

Mahmoud the Great on a journey went;
His thoughts were on war and conquest bent.
Kasajas followed him, musing too,
But what his thoughts were, no man knew.
The Sultan spoke: "My wise Vizier,
Marvelous things of thee I hear.
Say, is it true, as men declare,
That thou knowest the speech of the birds of the air?"

Kasajas answered, "Sire, 'tis truth,
A dervish taught me the art in youth.
Whatever by birds is said or sung
I comprehend like my mother tongue."
Two screech-owls sat on a plane-tree bare;
With notes discordant they filled the air.
The Sultan pointed: "Tell me, pray,
What is it those birds of evil say?"
Kasajas listened: "Oh, sire, I fear
To tell thee plainly the thing I hear.
Those hateful screech-owls talk of thee!"
"Verily! What can they say of me?
Tell me the truth, and have no fear;
The truth is best for a monarch's ear."
"Thy servant, sire, obeys thy words.
This is the talk of those evil birds:
'I am content,' said the elder one,
'Unto thy daughter to wed my son,
If twenty villages, ruined all,
To her for her dowry portion fall.'
'Three times twenty such instead
Shall be her portion,' the other said.
'Long may Allah, the kind and good,
Preserve the life of the great Mahmud!
Wherever he rides, there will be no lack

Of ruined villages in his track!"
The Sultan's dreams were dark that night.
When came the dawn of the morning light,
He rose from a couch where he found no ease,
And sent an embassy of peace.

—Alice Stone Blackwell.

+ + +

LABOR INJUNCTIONS.

A Review by Edwin C. Pierce in the Providence (R.I.)
Sunday Journal of November 29, 1908.

The Denver platform contained three essential declarations on the subject of labor injunctions. One declared in favor of jury trial in cases of indirect contempt. The platform also declared that there should be no abridgment of the right of wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of wages and the improvement of labor conditions, to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

The real controversy was over the question of the grounds on which injunctions should be issued in industrial disputes. The Denver platform declared "injunctions should not be issued in any cases in which injunctions would not issue if no industrial dispute were involved." Mr. Taft criticised this plank of the Denver platform as loosely drawn and of uncertain meaning. I think his criticism was well founded. Mr. Bryan and the Democratic party would have been far stronger if the Denver platform had frankly recognized that the real question is whether the boycott, primary or secondary, is to be legalized, and had endorsed the principle of the Pearre Anti-Injunction bill.

Mr. Taft was frank in his carefully wrought out acceptance speech, but I think he took untenable ground. He undertook to say what the rights of labor are in industrial disputes and what labor cannot lawfully do. He was only quoting the substance of judge-made law, the opinions of judges, and he ignored altogether the impressive dissenting opinions which have been given.

It is not for Mr. Taft to lay down a bill of rights on the subject of labor. That remains for Congress and State legislatures to do, as the British Parliament has already done. Mr. Taft, however, expressly sanctioned the primary boycott as legal, saying that labor unions have a right "to withdraw themselves and their associates from dealings with or giving custom to those with whom we are in controversy." He drew the line at the secondary boycott, declaring that unions have not the right to injure their employer's business "by carrying on what is sometimes known as a secondary boycott against his customers or those with whom he deals in business." He was frank in declaring bluntly against the secondary boycott, although gravely in error when he said the principle that the secondary boy-