

#### A TWENTIETH CENTURY INTERNATIONAL CATECHISM LESSON.

What is the first duty of a nation? To glorify itself and serve itself forever, and by any means which may not bring it in conflict with a more powerful nation.

What are Christian nations? Nations with large armies and navies.

What is a treaty? A solemn agreement between two or more nations, which the weaker are in honor bound to obey.

What is arbitration? A means of settling disputes between nations so equally matched that one is afraid to go to war and the other does not dare to.

What is benevolent assimilation? The process of adapting the resources of the weak to the benefit of the strong. It is practiced by lions and tigers towards lambs and deer, and by Christian nations (see def.) towards barbarous and semi-civilized peoples. Also sometimes known as the spread of civilization. The most efficient and generally used instruments for this beneficent process are missionaries, rum and rifles.

What are rules of war? Certain humane regulations which are binding on all civilized nations not engaged in actual warfare.

When is a rebellious province entitled to recognition as an independent nationality? Within 15 minutes from the breaking out of the rebellion, provided it is situated on an isthmus and the mother country is lacking an efficient army and navy.—Edwin J. Webster, in *Life*.

#### THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

Editorial in the *London New Age*, of Mar. 17.

Some recent bye-elections have been significant, and some divisions in the House of Commons on the Fiscal question have been remarkable, but nothing in our recent political history surpasses, or even equals, in importance the fact that in a Tory House of Commons a Bill embodying the principle that land values are a proper subject of rating apart from buildings and improvements has been carried by a majority of sixty-seven. It is true that the proposal is limited to municipal areas, but it is certain that its application must quickly be extended to the whole country. It is a great triumph for those who have given the best years of their lives to the education of public opinion upon the question, and common justice demands that one man should be named in this connection as deserving above all others

honorably mention in this campaign—Mr. John Ferguson, of Glasgow. Mr. Ferguson has been an ardent land reformer for half a century. When Henry George came to this country he found a warm supporter in Mr. Ferguson, and from that day to this Mr. Ferguson has been unwearied in his endeavors to persuade the Glasgow Corporation to adopt the principle of the taxation of land values and give the municipalities of the country a strong lead. The cause has been so well served by Mr. Ferguson and those of like mind that the measure presented to the House of Commons on Friday last, by Mr. Trevelyan, had the hearty support of no fewer than two hundred of the principal rating authorities of the United Kingdom.

A very remarkable feature of the movement in favor of this Bill is that it is supported by many Conservatives, both in and out of the House of Commons. Mr. Rutherford, for example, the second-order of the motion on Friday, is one of the Unionist members for the City of Liverpool, and has filled with distinction the office of Lord Mayor. His speech embodied the reasons which have led many Conservatives to support this measure. Mr. Rutherford declared that the Bill simply involved a rearrangement of existing taxation, and that is true. The new arrangement provides that land values shall be separately rated, and that unoccupied land or land not fully used shall be rated on its selling value, rather than on its letting value. He pointed out that during recent years the local burdens and the debts of our great cities and urban districts had grown to an enormous extent, and declared that it was simply just that unoccupied land, which daily grew in value, should no longer be allowed to escape taxation, but should be made to contribute its fair proportion to the local revenue.

That there is urgent need of new sources of revenue no one will dispute. The present Government has looked in another direction—that of taxing industry and the people's food, but has not so far dared to make a definite proposal. It never will. The fact that it has sympathized with Mr. Chamberlain's proposals, however, has no doubt given a great impetus to the movement of which this Bill is the definite expression, and we may take it now that, the principle of the taxation of land values having been approved in the present House of Commons by so large a majority, the country will look more and more steadfastly in this direction for the additional revenue of which it stands in such sore need. And gradually the con-

viction will gain ground that the taxation of land values will not only provide additional revenue, but will accomplish this purpose without laying any burden on industry or placing any limit on the food supply.

It is not necessary to discuss the details of Mr. Trevelyan's very moderate Bill. We shall probably never hear of it again. Its introduction has served its purpose. We may be sure the municipalities will persist in their endeavors to have its principle embodied in legislation, and when a Liberal Government comes into power that end will be attained. What we have to keep clearly in mind is the supreme advantage of the adoption of the principle. It is not merely that additional revenue will be provided. It is that the land monopolists, who keep land out of use in order that they may take advantage of the added value accruing to their land by reason of the improvements made in the vicinity at other people's expense, will be compelled to put their land to its most effective use. Land now idle, or only partially used—as, for example, when a lot of tumble-down buildings occupies an area that might be put to much better service—will be forced into use, will be available for all sorts of building and other purposes at much more reasonable prices than at present. The Housing problem exists because under present conditions land at reasonable prices is not available. The moment that condition is reversed, the Housing difficulty will tend to disappear. When land is available at reasonable prices, the building of houses will at once proceed. Labor will be in more active demand, and wages will tend to rise. The checking of land monopoly means, therefore, larger opportunity for labor, and that again means a more equitable distribution of wealth. It is the economic effect of the taxation of land values that constitutes its supreme advantage to the community. But clearly, that advantage cannot be adequately realized by a merely partial application of the principle such as Mr. Trevelyan's Bill proposes. As municipal development now adds value to land adjacent to municipal areas, so increased municipal development will mean increased value, and land owners adjacent to towns will reap a rich harvest. Under the operation of the principle the municipal areas will soon find their population increased and the necessity for extending their boundaries urgent. Then the adjacent land will be greatly enhanced in value, and the expansion of towns will not be easily affected. That is why the principle

ought to be made of universal application at once. That it should be applied even in a small degree, however, is something gained.

#### JOHN TURNER ON "SIGNS OF THE TIMES."

John Turner, the English trade unionist and anarchist, gave a lecture in Cooper Union, New York, March 24, 1904, on "Signs of the Times." Mr. Turner, it will be remembered, was arrested last October by Federal officers while delivering a lecture on "Trade Unionism and the General Strike," and Secretary Cortelyou ordered him to be deported for "disbelieving" in government. The Circuit Court having dismissed a writ of habeas corpus, he appealed, and was detained on Ellis Island, in a 9x6-foot cage in the basement for nineteen weeks. Then the Supreme Court ordered his release on bail pending a decision on his appeal, which will be argued before the Supreme Court April 4th by Clarence S. Darrow and Edgar L. Masters.

Affidavits submitted to the court with the application for bail showed Mr. Turner to be highly respected by his fellow unionists in Britain, that he had never been molested by the English police or excluded from continental countries, that his family was deprived of support by his imprisonment, and that the food allowed him was so insufficient that sympathizers were compelled to send him money in order that he should have enough to eat.

Portions of Mr. Turner's Cooper Union address follow.

The claim that the tendencies of the times are all towards greater individuality will to many probably sound strange. We are so in the habit of hearing that the individual is being absorbed by society—that there is less and less opportunity for the development of individuals—that the economic situation crushes out all desire for personal liberty and initiative, that one is almost inclined to believe it. But while the position of vast masses of the population of all civilized countries is still deplorable, and intelligent interest in life and its activities is almost a blank, yet there is undoubtedly a strong current of self-assertion running through every phase of human activity.

Never before in history was the average individual as independent as now. The last half century has seen a complete break-up of old ideas in every direction, and each person has been left free to accept or reject the new. The common conception of the universe, and man's place in nature, has been entirely revolutionized by the theory of evolution. It is quite impossible that the old checks upon conduct can continue. Everywhere men and women with free ideas are reducing their thoughts into practice and slowly modifying social life. Many things that half a century since would

have shocked all the conventions, are now accepted as a matter of course.

In the realm of art and literature, this spirit has naturally found expression. Old traditions have been abandoned, new schools and styles adopted; in fact every artist is now expected to express himself along new lines to obtain recognition. And especially in literature does this hold good. Conservative as are the English as a people, it does one good to compare the relative boldness of writers of to-day with the insipid stuff poured forth in the early Victorian era. Only the genius and sympathy of Dickens makes his subjects readable at the present time. Compare the deeper and broader views of life from such men as Meredith, Hardy, Grant, Allen, or George Bernard Shaw with the puny ideas of the period named. One cannot help feeling that progress has been made, and that a stronger note is being struck.

Perhaps, however, it is the growing independence of women, particularly here in America, that stands out as something accomplished of the character making for stronger individuality. The larger half of humanity has begun to assert itself. And to all lovers of liberty what an encouragement it is. For while women were willing to remain slaves, there was little hope for the men. Just reflect what advances have been made in the matter of women's enfranchisement, the holding of property by married women, facility for divorce, as proof of how far society has advanced on this question during the last half century. And when one knows that these are but the first feeble and timid steps it is indeed encouraging to those who feel that the old family traditions—with the woman and children absolutely subordinate to the man—were the very nursery of slavery in social life.

And as always happens this new spirit has found expression in the modern drama. Ibsen, Sudermann, and in a milder manner as becomes the people for whom he writes, G. B. Shaw, have expounded the feelings of women for a free, full, individual life. We are only on the threshold of this new development, but we may rest assured there will be no going back. There may be considerable suffering caused in its working out—that is inevitable with every new departure—but freedom once tested can never be resigned. The woman of the future will assert herself more and more, and men will learn to respect her strength.

Speaking of women reminds one that

even children to-day are expected to have some individuality. It is not so long since children were considered to be entirely without social rights of any kind. The parents, especially the father, were supposed to be their sole arbiters. The cruelties inflicted were supposed to have divine sanction. Absolute subjection to parents in everything was considered the correct thing in the home, and cruel punishments at school were believed to be both right and necessary. To-day, cruelty to children has become so repugnant to the social conscience that the law has reflected the change of idea and now retaliates by punishing parents for excessive cruelty. In some cases it will even take the children from their care altogether. Teachers are now hardly considered competent for the profession if they cannot bring out the best in the child without corporal punishment. And so each child is now enabled to develop more and more its own individuality. With women and children living a larger and freer life the race is bound to be benefited. After all, men and women are only children grown big, and it will be very difficult to enslave the children of the future, brought up in the atmosphere of freedom.

There has been one field of human activity—a horrible, a fearful one—where all questions of individuality were supposed to be abandoned, like hope on entering the gates of the inferno. It is the military profession—the art of war! Even here, where discipline in the past has crushed out all individuality, where organization and initiative came from above, where to obey was the only virtue, yes, even here individuality is becoming a necessity. Overwhelming numbers and wealth can of course still win victories, but the recent Boer war taught the proud English ruling class that a number of relatively free men, with little or no military training, but possessed of great initiative and individuality, could hold in check a vastly superior horde of hired and disciplined soldiers who dared not act without orders. And already the government, quick to learn the lesson, is trying to solve the problem of how to preserve discipline, and grant a larger measure of individuality and initiative to the private soldier at the same time. Anyway, the soldier of the future will have to be thought of as an individual; the general and his staff will no longer be the whole show. So we see individuality asserting itself in the most unsuspected quarters. And soldiers with initiative are a double-