

than the world at large knows the man is sincere, or the movement has merit, and both are effective. The Times does not repel all attacks on the nobility, but only such as are likely to attain their end. Socialists, Anarchists, and Utopians of all schools, religious and economic, may inveigh against the privileged classes to their heart's content, and the "Thunderer" will remain as mute as a pensioned clergy; but let a political party, or a leader who has the power to carry out his purpose, lay hands upon the sacred institution of Privilege, and the storm-swept heavens do not reverberate as does the atmosphere about Printing House Square.



David Lloyd George is the latest favorite of fortune. There have been those who have doubted the wisdom and the good faith of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But they can doubt no longer. The Times has spoken. And it has spoken with all the solemnity and circumstance of the medieval church pronouncing the doom of a heretic. The Chancellor is charged with political blackmail, maliciousness, and lying, and—worst of all—with being afflicted with mental infirmities. Referring to his attacks on dukes, the Times says: "Mr. Lloyd George's horror of those who happen to occupy this position, for which they are not responsible, is so fanatical and unreasoning that it amounts to a fixed idea such as is described by writers on mental pathology as an obsession. . . . He suppresses other names, but goes out of his way to abuse dukes." And after giving time, occasion, and circumstance, and deploring the cultivation of a spirit that "debases public life," and "discredits not only ourselves but the whole country in the eyes of foreign observers," the Times closes with the statement that "the feelings of dukes are not what matter most. It is the question of the whole conduct of public life."



David Lloyd George is a forceful man, possessed of an idea. He believes that the wealth of the world is produced by the workers of the world. Being a practical-minded man he sees that it is not possible to give to the workers what they produce without depriving the idlers of what they enjoy. And being a successful politician he realizes that great masses of men can be moved only by an appeal to their imagination. The mere fact of unrequited toil and parasitic privilege may appear on a small farm, as well as on a great estate, but the average man is not able to sense it. He is still enough of a child to want his text written large. Hence, Lloyd George holds up the English

Duke to public ridicule. But how can this harm innocent men? The Englishman may be a little slow, but he is sure. No nation, when its better self has been awakened, has a finer sense of fair play. And if the dukes suffer from the Chancellor's attacks, it can only be because they are guilty. England is confronted with a very menacing condition. Rural life has become so intolerable to labor that it is fleeing the country. The only way to stop this is to raise the wages and conditions of the laborer; in a word, raise the standard of living in England to something nearer what it is in the newer countries. This can be done either by laying greater burdens upon manufacturers and other industries, or by placing it on the idle landlords. Lloyd George has chosen the latter course. Hence, the attack of the "Thunderer." For that unflinching organ of toryism well knows that if the dukes, who are the rarest fruit of the Tree of Privilege, can be shaken off, the rest must follow. No one need doubt hereafter that the name of Lloyd George has become a point in history, no less than a factor in English politics. s. c.



Governor Colquitt's Opportunity.

Governor Colquitt of Texas is reported in a recent speech to have made the following statement: "We ought to have a law in Texas requiring owners of unused tracts of land of unhealthy size to alienate their surplus of holdings. We ought to have a land credit union law in Texas that will enable those who produce to own the entire fruits of their toil. We need legislation that will make home owning possible and home enjoyment the rule."



The Governor's suggestions are rather hazy, although his aim to "make home owning possible and home enjoyment the rule" is unquestionably a desirable one. He does not explain what he means by "tracts of land of an unhealthy size." But any definition he may give of that term must necessarily be an arbitrary one. If, instead of size, he would make use the measure by which he would determine the healthfulness of the holding, he would come nearer to a correct solution. A holding put by the holder to its most productive use, will be a more healthful one, no matter how large it may be, than a small plot put to other than its most productive use or not used at all. Texas is said to have no less than one hundred million acres of arable land unused. Harmful as the withholding from use of this vast area undoubtedly is, there is even greater harm in the

withholding from use of land much less in area but greater in value in the centers of population. Withholding of an acre worth \$1,000 is far more harmful than the withholding of an acre worth ten dollars, because the same effort can produce much more wealth from the \$1,000 acre than from the ten dollar one. An arbitrary limit to the area which any man may hold would either be so large as to place no difficulty in the way of withholding valuable land from use, or so small as to seriously interfere with the best use of land that has comparatively little value. Governor Colquitt must change his standard of healthfulness in land holding, if he would accomplish results worth while.



That does not mean that an arbitrary standard of use or of value should be set for individual holdings. There is a better way. To discourage withholding from use it is only necessary to make the best use of land the only means of profiting by its ownership. Land may now be profitably withheld from use because it may increase in value without any labor performed upon it. The growth of the community together with its industry and enterprise will bring about increase in land values, which owners who do nothing may appropriate as easily as owners who work. If the owner were not allowed to appropriate this unearned value, he would have no gain to hope for in withholding from use. The only hope of gain would be in use. But existing laws not only put a premium on idleness in allowing private appropriation of communally created values, but also penalize industry through taxation of labor and its products. So the logical and scientific remedy for the evil which Governor Colquitt deplors is to abolish all taxes on labor and its products and raise all public revenue by taxation of land values alone. Any attempt to remedy the evil in any other way is sure to result in failure. Governor Colquitt's duty to the people of his State is clearly to help in bringing this reform about. Accordingly, as he may follow or neglect this course, will his administration be remembered as one that has wrought good or evil to the State.

S. D.



Paying Taxes as a Duty.

When Mrs. Ella Flagg Young, Chicago's Superintendent of Schools, insisted upon paying the income tax on her legally exempted income, on the ground that all citizens should contribute something toward the support of the government under which they live, she displayed extreme sensitiveness to the obligations of citizenship. It is the

duty of every one to pay for what they get, whether it be groceries, clothing, or government service; but to assume that any self-supporting person does not contribute toward the support of the government under which they live, is to fall into the prevailing carelessness in analyzing the problem of taxation. How could Mrs. Young spend one dollar of her income without contributing a fractional part of it toward the support of the government under which it is spent. She pays, indeed, not only for all the benefits the government confers upon her, but pays in addition for the privilege of paying.



All the benefits of government appear in the value of the land subject to that government; and that value to the last cent is collected by the owners of the land. And since all taxes on industry are shifted to the consumer, it necessarily follows that the citizen who buys the goods pays for the benefits he has received from the government to the land owners, and pays for them again to the government. The income tax is not for the purpose of compelling payment of taxes by citizens who otherwise would escape; but is designed to correct, though in a clumsy way, some of the injustice of the present system, which throws the burden on the poor. Law abiding citizens enjoying taxable incomes should pay the income tax as long as it remains on the statutes; but good citizenship does not call for any one's going out of his way to pay on an income not covered by law. A higher act of citizenship would be the devotion of the amount so paid toward the overturning of the hodge-podge revenue system that makes an income tax necessary.

S. C.



An Evil and Its Remedy.

"If the house owner improves his property, making it more fit for human beings to live in, and desires to rent it for the same price, will the town fine him for his laudable desire by raising his taxes proportionately to the greater value of his building?" This question, asked by Grace Isabel Colbron in the Johnstown (Pa.) Democrat of February 9 of the local charity organization, is one dodged by the last National Housing Reform Conference. No one can ponder over it without realizing that in the untaxing of improvements and increasing of taxation on land values lies the solution of the housing problem, together with solution of many other problems. Under existing laws the answer to the question is "Yes." The injustice and folly of the situation are shown in the question itself. The remedy is also implied.