

zens, they will also come to respect the claims of others of different communities, of countries, religion or race. There is room in this world for us all, even though our numbers were increased tenfold. It is the prevailing social injustice within each community that separates man from man, nation from nation, which fills the hearts of men with bitterness and vile passions, the world with misery and strife. And yet in the nature of things the interests of mankind are harmonious, not conflicting; there is a true and permanent community of human interests, which the prevailing social injustice alone prevents becoming manifest to the minds of men.

The duty of those who realize this is obvious. They must work for the recognition and realization of Justice as the test and touch-stone of the relations of men within each separate community, as of the international relations of the various communities, countries and races. Thus, and thus alone, will the community of human interests become manifest and arise from under the clouds of suspicion, prejudice, and intolerance and injustice which now hides it from our view. The time has come. The world is ripe, rotten ripe, for change. For, to close with the burning words of Henry George:

"In our times, as in times before, creep on the insidious forces that, producing inequality, destroy Liberty. On the horizon the clouds begin to lower. Liberty calls to us once again. We must follow her further; we must trust her fully. Either we must wholly accept her or she will not stay. It is not enough that men should vote; it is not enough that they should be theoretically equal before the law. They must have Liberty to avail themselves of the opportunities and means of life; they must stand on equal terms with reference to the bounties of Nature. Either this, or Liberty withdraws her light! Either this, or darkness comes on, and the very forces that progress has evolved turn to powers that work destruction. This is the universal law. This is the lesson of the centuries. Unless its foundations be laid in Justice, the social structure cannot stand."

London, England.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE VINDICATED.

(For the Review.)

By J. W. BENGOUGH.

There are some people in the United States who take the position more or less openly that the Declaration of Independence is an out-worn document; that whatever its practical merits may once have been, it is now no more than a cherished relic having certain spectacular uses on Fourth-of-July occasions. There are other Americans—constituting the vast majority—who regard such sentiments as savoring of blasphemy, but who, nevertheless, are ardent supporters of the prevailing policy of Protection. The real difference between these two classes of citizens is merely this: That the one consciously repudiates the Declaration, and the other virtually does so.

The fundamental doctrine of the Declaration is that "All men are endowed with certain inalienable rights, amongst which are life, liberty

and the pursuit of happiness." The meaning of this is clear enough. The fathers undoubtedly intended to assert that whatever the duties of men might be in civilized society, however they might differ in mind, body or estate, all alike were entitled to the enjoyment of certain natural rights, which rights were inalienable—that is, could not be justly taken away, curtailed or invaded by any human power, so long as they were exercised by each man with due respect for the similar rights of every other. Amongst these rights three are enumerated: The right to Life, involving necessarily the right of access to food, clothing and shelter, the right to Liberty of mind and body, so that a man's ownership of himself might be vindicated, and his powers applied to the securing of the things necessary to life; and the right to the pursuit of Happiness, the freedom to move about and to hold such relations with his fellow men as would conduce to the enjoyment of a full and harmonious life.

The writers of the Declaration had but recently experienced the tyrannical power of taxation, and it might almost seem that the weapon of unjust taxation, like Macbeth's dagger, was floating before their mental vision when the memorable words above quoted were penned. For certainly there is no more effective way in which man's right to life can be abridged than by levying taxes upon the results of his labor; and his right to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness can be abrogated in no way more surely than by means of a system which interferes with his impulse to trade.

To all this the spirit of Frenzied Finance bluntly replies that the Fathers were, after all, only a set of academic doctrinaires, whose fine talk of "Rights" was in accordance with the stilted fashion of their day. As a matter of fact, there are no such things as Natural Rights; the true and practical philosophy of national as of individual life is the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest.

On the other hand, the good American optimist, who votes the ticket of his party regularly, says he has the profoundest veneration for the founders of the Republic, and subscribes most heartily to the noble declaration about Inalienable Rights; but he does not see that the tariff system has any bearing upon the subject. At all events, the country must have a revenue, and he is not aware of any method by which it can be obtained apart from imposts upon incoming goods and the taxation of houses and other forms of personal property. If, as a matter of logic, he must admit that the taxation of food, clothing and shelter is in reality as clear an infringement of the right to life as the taxation of air would be, still, how can it be helped? On full consideration he is of opinion that the sentence in the Declaration should be revised to read: "Certain inalienable rights subject to taxation for revenue." Which he will perhaps see to be a contradiction in terms.

Had the Fathers foreseen the difficulty which here confronts the good average citizen, they might have put in another clause for the guidance of those responsible for the collection of public revenue, to this effect: "Some men are endowed by their fellows with certain alienable privileges, amongst which are the private ownership of land and franchises, which by nature belong to all."

It is mere mockery to call a thing a Right—an "inalienable" Right—and then to impose taxation upon it. By the word we understand a something which man possesses by direct endowment of his Creator, in virtue of his being born on this earth; a something which cannot justly be taken away, in whole or in part, unless it has become forfeited by criminal act against laws made for the mutual protection of all the members of society.

A privilege is an altogether different thing. It is something bestowed by the assumed consent of all on some, and is held strictly on sufferance. It is in the very nature of things alienable. The power that bestowed it can modify or resume it. The real ownership remains with the community, and all that is given, in any case, is the possession and exclusive use. Not only is a privilege a fit and proper subject for taxation, but in justice it must be taxed. Otherwise the public heritage is actually alienated and an unjust advantage is bestowed on some. An equivalent must in fairness be given for every privilege granted, and taxation based upon the value of the privilege is the most accurate, natural and convenient method of securing such equivalent.

The ownership of land and franchises by individuals obviously comes under the head of privilege. All the land of a country belongs to all the

<p>CIVILIZATION presupposes Government which presupposes Taxation which Must be levied on some form of Industrial Rights either</p>		
NATURAL INALIENABLE RIGHTS	OR	LEGAL, MAN-BESTOWED RIGHTS
amongst which are	—which are of two kinds—	
LIFE (Requiring food, clothing, shelter)	COMMON AND GENERAL All rights guaranteed by civil- ized government, such as Right to worship Right of free speech Right of free press Right of postal service Right of voting under certain conditions Right of use of highways, etc., etc. (NON-TAXABLE)	SPECIAL PRIVILEGES Exclusive use of public fran- chises, such as railways, telephone, street cars, gas, electric light and other ser- vices, necessarily monop- olistic. Fishing and hunting privi- leges. Exclusive ownership of coal, mineral and other mines, and of oil and gas wells, etc. Exclusive possession of speci- fic portions of land, as against the equal natural right of all others. (JUSTLY TAXABLE)
LIBERTY (To have use of mental and physical powers, and to apply same to the produc- tion of the wellfares of life)		
PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS (To pursue in individual well- being along all legitimate paths, and to be free to obey the natural impulse to trade.)		
ALL THREE RIGHTS Being dependent upon the right of access to the en- vironment in which the Creator has placed man. <i>i. e.</i> Right of access to land on terms just to all other men. (NON-TAXABLE.)		

people of that country; and each man, having an inalienable right to life, has an equal right with all others to access to all land, the first essential of life. But since land can only be put to effective use when specific portions of it are held in the private possession of specific individuals, it becomes necessary to bestow upon individuals the legal right of thus holding land. Those so favored enjoy their special right by human law, by consent of their fellows, each of whom has an equal natural right; in short,

as a matter of privilege. Similarly, the private "ownership" of public service franchises, of fishing rights and other valuable prerogatives belonging in reality to the public, is pure and simple privilege, as distinguished from natural right.

Here, then, is the conclusive reply to the plea that the necessity for public revenue involves an inevitable invasion of natural rights—the field of privilege is open to the public Treasurer. There he finds a domain in which his presence is not an affront to justice; which is, indeed, the God-appointed source of public revenue, from which he takes for the community only that which belongs to the community.

The American patriot who has a real respect for the venerable Declaration ought to hear with joy and relief that the inalienable rights of man are, after all, compatible with the practical working of democratic government; and he should consider it his first and most urgent duty to assist those who are laboring for the abolition of a system of revenue-getting which gives a flat denial to the principles of that grand old document. That legal rights rather than natural rights—special, man-bestowed privileges, rather than general God-bestowed birth-rights—should be the objects of taxation, is a proposition which, it seems to me, must commend itself to every reasonable man. It is, moreover, a proposition which is capable of being set forth in the form of a simple diagram:

If there are any who, upon examining this diagram, are still prepared to say that the prevailing system is one which ought to be maintained; that public franchises should remain in the hands of the few, with little or no compensation to the public for their value; that land should continue to be regarded, not as a God-given heritage to the children of men, but as a commodity of monopoly and speculation for the enrichment of some without equivalent to the disinherited many; that a portion of the earnings of labor, the product of individual industry, should be taken for public revenue, while the automatically created values of the public domain are absorbed by the holders of privileges—he is entitled to his opinion.

But let him at least be candid enough to join those who openly repudiate the teachings of the Declaration of Independence.

Toronto, Canada.

THE QUESTION OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND.

By ROBERT B. MARTIN.

We should fix a proper meaning to what is understood by the word land as used in the economic sense. Is it not all the forces and substances that are manifest in physical nature, such as air, heat, light, water, rock, mineral, timber, etc. I think we are agreed as to this. Now as to the other economic term "property." Does it not mean anything that man has, by the application of his labor to natural forces and substances, so shaped and formed as to minister to human desire. I apprehend that here again we still are agreed, and now from this common premise let us approach the subject of dispute, "Private property in Land."

Just here allow me to make this statement, namely, that as every kind of property or wealth contains land in some of the elemental forms heretofore mentioned, and since man can labor upon nothing other than