

part in the controversy, and in his letters to the Times was able to prove conclusively that the Cecil family did receive a share of the plunder of the monasteries. He added that the story of the Cecil fortunes is not singular, it is typical; the share of the appropriation that went to the founder of the Cecil family was small compared with that secured by the founders of other noble families. But we are not interested in these ancient frauds except in so far as they are responsible for modern privileges. The robbery did not cease with the appropriation of these lands. It is not a thing that is past and done with. Day by day the robbery continues in the exaction of rent for the use of land, in the never-ending toll upon the day-to-day industry of the country. Mr. Lloyd George, in the debate on the second reading of the bill on the 16th of May, spoke of tithes being the property of the nation, and on that ground defended the proposal to take them from the Church without compensation. But what is true of tithes is true of the rent of land everywhere; the rent of land is the property of the nation. If the people can resume tithes and are morally justified in doing so, are they not equally entitled to resume the whole rent of land without compensation?



The Singletax Victor at Hanley.

Manchester Guardian (Lib.), July 15.—Mr. R. L. Outhwaite, the new member for Hanley, is the son of an Australian farmer, and he spent his youth on sheep and cattle farms in Australia and New Zealand. He left this work to devote himself to the advocacy of land values taxation in Australia, and by his constant work paved the way for the adoption of this system of taxation by the Labor Government of Australia. He went to South Africa on a tour of investigation after the Boer war, and assisted the miners to organize resistance to Chinese labor. After the 1906 election Mr. Outhwaite went to South Africa again on behalf of several English Liberal newspapers, and he took a leading part in the movements which led to the withdrawal of Chinese labor and the conferment of self-government on the conquered States. Mr. Outhwaite has fought two former elections. He contested West Birmingham against Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in 1906, and he led another forlorn hope at Horsham in January, 1910. During the last three or four years Mr. Outhwaite has written a great deal on the land question in England.



Chesterton on Expertism.

G. K. Chesterton in The (London) Daily News and Leader (rad. Lib.), July 6.—If I have a pain in my leg I consult a doctor; not because he is wiser or even healthier than I (often he is neither), but because he knows about some six or seven muscles or some six or seven maladies, as I know the scheme of a triolet. But I should not ask him to teach me how to walk; nor is there any necessity for his walking more elegantly than myself.



G. K. Chesterton in The (London) Nation (ind.), June 15.—I hope you will forget our little feuds so far as to let me thank you for your really magnificent

article on the feeble-minded bill. . . . Mr. Lowes Dickinson wrote, I fancy, to the effect that he was not able to judge as an expert; but he understood the experts were agreed. I beg to contradict Mr. Lowes Dickinson; I give him the lie; I tell him to his false face that he is much better able to judge than all the experts in Bumbledom; and I would far rather leave it to his judgment, if he would only consent to use it. It is not a question for experts. Experts have nothing to do with whether a thing is absurd on the face of it. A specialist may have a claim to tell me that he has counted all the lamp-posts in my street, while I have not. A specialist has no claim to tell me that he has counted all the Chinese pagodas in my street. I have counted them myself, and there are none. I have also (with the same result) counted the arguments for an utterly vague weak-mindedness being hereditary among the poor. It is not a question of whether we have read the evidence, but of whether we should believe the evidence; of whether, properly speaking, there can be any evidence. Suppose the House of Lords (or some such body) examined experts about whether a tendency to bursts of impatience was hereditary or not. I am not an expert, but I would very cheerfully send in a report, divided into three sections, thus: "(1) I would point out to your lordships that the whole human race is liable to bursts of impatience, so there will, I predict, be no difficulty about finding impatient children whose parents have been impatient; (2) it may not have escaped your lordships' notice that whether people are impatient or not depends a good deal on what you do to them; and I believe your victims are tested by being woken up in the small hours with a squirt; (3) as I learn that your lordships (not perhaps in theory, but certainly in practice) are conducting your investigations solely in the state of Montenegro, with which country you are imperfectly acquainted and very much out of sympathy, I think other mistakes will be made." Now this comparison is not exaggerated. Substitute for "impatience" the shy, sullen air of nescience and apathy, which is a much commoner fact among the unfortunate. Substitute for the squirt the cursed cockatoo voice and style of the lady slummer and the amateur inspector. Substitute for the national memories of Montenegro the real secrets and prejudices of the poor, and the picture is exact. They are smashing civil liberty because something they cannot define (weak-mindedness) may be something they don't understand (hereditary) in people they don't know—the English people.



In case the Colonel is elected to the Presidency there ought to be a nice position on The Outlook open to Mr. Taft.—Newark Evening News.



"So," said the Goddess of Fortune, "you are weary of steam-yachts and special trains?"

"Yes," replied her especial favorite.

"And you have ceased to care for motor-cars and aeroplanes?"

"Entirely."

"Well, what do you desire now?"

"I want to go into a convention with my private steam-roller."—Washington Star.