

# LAND & LIBERTY

MONTHLY JOURNAL FOR LAND VALUE TAXATION AND FREE TRADE

Fiftieth Year—No. 584.

4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

January, 1943. 2d.

## The Background of the Beveridge Report

### Insurance for Security

In his Report on Social Insurance and Allied Services (Cmd 6404, price 2s.) Sir William Beveridge proposes that the whole population should be compulsorily insured for certain benefits which would be paid for out of a fund composed partly of the insurance contributions and partly of the proceeds of general taxation. These benefits would include pensions for all, payable "on retirement from work" when the minimum age of retirement has been reached, that is 65 for men and 60 for women, with a provision for increasing the basic rate of pension if retirement is postponed; increase in amount and extension of the period of financial help given during unemployment or disablement; comprehensive medical service for all citizens without charge for treatment at any point; marriage, maternity and funeral grants; training benefits to assist people to find new livelihoods if their present ones fail. Built upon and developing the existing insurance schemes for unemployment, health and pensions, a reorganized, unified and universal insurance scheme, subsidized by general taxation, would incorporate also workmen's compensation and the present system of insurance through the approved societies, with compensation in the last case to the interests affected.

### Family Allowances

The proposals provide also for giving family allowances for each child after the first and for the first child as well during periods when the responsible parent is in receipt of insurance benefit, being unemployed or disabled or pensioned and therefore not earning. The allowance graded by the age of the child would average, it is estimated, 8s. weekly per child, corresponding to £20 16s. a year and the annual cost, borne by taxpayers, is estimated at £113,000,000. It is a payment that would go to the poor and rich alike, for in this as in most other respects the proposals take no account of the means of recipients. Distinctions relate only to the insurance benefits depending upon the classification to which the recipients belong; for example the unemployment benefit would be confined, as it is now, to those having the status "employee," while they and "others gainfully occupied" not as employees would have the disability benefit, and "others of working age" not gainfully occupied would have neither of these benefits. One virtue claimed for the scheme and by which it becomes universal is that the old means test disappears. Thus it is given a democratic semblance and it is expected that, with the enlarged

(and heavily subsidized) benefits available to the recipients "by right," the cases where poor relief politely called public assistance is given "by charity" will be greatly diminished.

### Subsistence Standard

A dominating thought in the Report is that without children's allowances a substantial measure of acute want will remain among the lower paid workers as the accompaniment of large families. The aim is to help such and all who by unemployment or by being incapacitated from work have not the wherewithal to live above bare minimum subsistence represented by what is equivalent to 40s. for man and wife. Its contributory pension scheme however only reaches that standard eventually, since such pensions will start at 14s. weekly for single persons and 25s. for a married couple, rising by stages until they reach respectively 24s. and 40s. weekly. Those who enter now the ranks of contributors will not be eligible for contributory pensions till ten years hence; and until it is possible for any one to enjoy the eventual rate, whatever is necessary to ensure the subsistence level will be provided by "assistance pensions," which involves that many will still be subjected to the means test and its humiliations.

### The Compulsory Contributions

The proposed insurance contributions for adult men (being less for women and less again for ages between 18 and 21) would be: for employees 4s. 3d. weekly to which the employer would add 3s. 3d., making a joint weekly contribution of 7s. 6d., which compares with 1s. 10d. each for employee and employer under the existing system and a joint contribution of 3s. 8d. weekly. The new classes coming under contribution for the first time are "others gainfully occupied" not as employees, who would pay 4s. 3d. weekly and carry an "occupation" card for stamping; and "others of working age not gainfully occupied" who would pay 3s. 9d. weekly and carry a "security" card. Together these classes make a population of 4,900,000. Housewives would be insured by virtue of their husbands' contributions.

### "A Shilling for Threepence"

Considering the benefits which the employee is to receive for his 4s. 3d., Sir William Beveridge recalls the "ninepence for fourpence" which tried to popularize the original insurance Acts and speaks of his Plan for Security as doing better by offering a shilling for threepence, because the employee will pay only one quarter of the value of his

benefits; but Sir William is quick to see the trick in this magic, adding that "citizens paying these contributions, irrespective of their earnings, will have to pay in addition as taxpayers according to capacity." This is the crux of the matter: what each will get out of the pool which is created depends materially upon his share of the new burden of taxation imposed, and taxation as it is levied to-day is anything but related to "capacity to pay." Moreover, it is altogether questionable that the 3s. 9d. paid by the employer to the joint contribution rests with him. It is a tax he will pass back to the employee by taking it out of wages, if it is not added to prices so to become an indirect tax on consumers generally. If on the other hand any of it comes out of profits, the employer's capacity to pay towards general taxation will be diminished and the difference will have to be made good by other taxpayers. Ninepence-for-fourpence and shilling-for-threepence miracles simply do not happen.

### The Cost of the Proposals

Tables are provided estimating the cost of the proposals, and how much will be provided respectively by the insurance contributions and by general taxation, the year 1945 being the supposed first year of operation. In the result it appears that in 1945 the sum of £697 millions would be required to meet the expense this coming from £331 millions in contributions, £15 millions interest on funds and £351 millions in general taxation. In 1965 when the pensions scheme is fully in operation, the "basic rate" having risen by stages to 24s. weekly for a single person and 40s. for a married couple, £858 millions would be required. The insurance contributions would then provide £324 millions and the general taxpayers £519 millions. Compared with all this is the expenditure, in 1945, under the present schemes estimated at £432 millions, insurance contributions providing £152 millions and general taxpayers £265 millions; the rest in each case being £15 millions interest on funds. In the argument affecting the finance, attention has been centred only on the "burden upon the Exchequer" as representing the cost of the scheme, so that in 1945, for example, the taxpayers have to find only £86 millions more than under existing schemes to give the first instalment of the new benefits. The ultimate prospect of £254 millions more than at present to be found by general taxation is regarded with complacency. If a distinction is sought to be found between the contributions and general taxation, the demonstration is unsound and deceptive since the whole is taxation.

These flat rate contributions are essentially a poll tax as Sir William Beveridge himself rightly calls them, just as he describes the employer's contribution toward that paid by the employee as a "tax on the giving of employment."

### Can We Afford It?

A question asked in relation to the cost of the scheme is "Can we afford it?" to which the flippant reply has been given "Can we afford not to afford it?" The country is presumed to be able to do what it wills with its annual income of £6,000 millions or whatever the guess-work figure may be. But we must remember Adam Smith's first sentence that "the annual labour of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessary conveniences of life which it annually consumes, and which consist always either of the immediate produce of that labour, or what is purchased with that produce from other nations"; which is the keynote of all Political Economy. It is of first importance that the opportunities for the production of wealth are held open to all without favour; that all the incentives to production have full play and that they are neither restricted nor penalized. It is not the amount of public revenue that matters so much as the way in which it is got and upon whom the burden falls. There is no need to talk in hundreds of millions to make the point. A foolish tax producing but a modicum of revenue can do infinite injury as Chancellors of the Exchequers have discovered over and over again when they have tried to increase the tax only to get less revenue. High protectionism provides examples enough, and such taxes as the window tax and the inhabited house duty proved by their incidence why they had to be repealed. The Report ignores considerations of the kind or glosses them over; and the money-for-social-reform school never have had regard to them or to the effects of taxation as it is levied, or that in subsidizing wages you succeed only in subsidizing rent. A large portion of the revenue of this country is derived from indirect taxation, the weight of which falls most heavily on the poor. What is the balance of an account which, having by its imposts helped to diminish wages and indeed to cause poverty, spends money again to mitigate the evils we see?

### Benefits with Burdens

Taking the latest year for which figures are precise, 1938-39, the Exchequer paid out £225 millions upon purposes connected with the social services, housing subsidies, unemployment grants, etc.; on the other hand it received £397 millions in indirect taxation. Since then indirect taxation has been increased and new imposts have been added, notably the purchase tax; and only lately the Chancellor of the Exchequer has pointed out that some nine and a half million wage-earners with small incomes were making a contribution to the income tax of some £270 millions a year. We ask again, what is the balance of the account? The statistician is wanted who will analyse the family budget of the "average working man" to discover how much of his

spendings must go in taxation disguised and undisguised, and reveal what is honest and what is fraudulent in the boons offered by a paternalistic State, and not less in the competition of political parties to hold out more and more of them.

### New Disciplines

A significant provision is in paragraphs 129-131 of the Report which states that unemployment benefit will continue at full rate "subject to requirement of attendance at a work or training centre after a limited period of unemployment," so also the disability benefit "subject to the imposition of special behaviour conditions"; and that "conditions imposed on benefits must be enforced by suitable penalties." Discipline and docility wait upon the given security. The "mobility" and the "fluidity" of labour may be obligatory. The trend is to a totalitarian regime.

The back ground of the Report is a state of poverty. The outlook is upon a world in which the unequal distribution of wealth is a natural though unhappy feature of human society and its growth; a malady for which there is no cure, only its mischief offering scope for treatment.

### And New Teaching

The Report takes the term "distribution" out of its accustomed concept, distorts its meaning, and puts it to a false use in a new economic teaching, agreeable to the upholders of the present social order or trying to silence those who would reform it: "Correct distribution does not mean what it has often been taken to mean in the past—distribution between the different agents in production, between land, capital, management and labour. Better distribution of purchasing power is required among wage earners themselves, as between times of earning and not earning and between times of heavy family responsibilities and of light or no family responsibilities. Both social insurance and children's allowances are primarily methods of distributing wealth." The laws and institutions which deprive labour as a whole of its earnings, and enable some to live who do not produce at all, are not mentioned, much less challenged. The interests benefited by them, assured that there is nothing "incorrect" in what the different agents in production now get, may sleep peacefully in their beds. "Want could have been abolished before the present war by a redistribution of income within the wage-earning classes, without touching any of the wealthier classes" although "this is said not to suggest that redistribution of income should be confined to the wage-earning classes." The "better distribution" is purely arbitrary, depending only on force, and by the process that is approved it is implied that the best or ideal distribution will be reached when all incomes are brought to a dead level for everyone.

### Normal and Mass Unemployment

The calculations in the Report and its proposed provisions are based on the assumption that in future over the whole body of insured employees unemployment

will average 8½ per cent. Taking the figures given in the tables, a static or at least normal condition is envisaged of 1,500,000 people being out of work. No policy to grapple with such a state of affairs and investigate its causes is even hinted at; nor is there any hope of the plans succeeding if mass unemployment should come about, the possibility of which is predicted, causing the whole scheme of things to collapse with its finance broken in pieces. "The importance of the proposals" it is stated, "should not be exaggerated; they are subsidiary measures only; they do not touch the main problem of unemployment; for that other matters are needed; unless such measures are prepared and can be effective, much that would be otherwise gained through the Plan for Social Security will be wasted." The admission is self-condemnatory.

### Other Policies Wanted

These proposals should not deflect the mind of the nation from concentrating *now* upon fundamentals. Attention should be devoted at once to the causes of unemployment, not merely of mass unemployment, but also of the equally avoidable "considerable volume of unemployment" which is the safety mark of recommendations paltering with the effects of poverty and offering niggard alleviation to its victims. Mass unemployment does loom ahead. The Report leaves the matter with the observation that "the place for direct expenditure and organization by the State is in maintaining employment of the labour and other productive sources of the country," and with the vague reflection that "readjustments of British economic policy and structure that will be required after the war should be made so that productive employment is maintained." No readjustment either of policy or structure can be effective short of freedom to produce and freedom to trade, with equal opportunity for all to use the natural resources of the country. But the mentality of the Report says not that, only suggesting the State expenditure which vainly attempts to "make work" for the unemployed, which has been tried before and has signally failed.

### Only one Goliath

The Report asks for acknowledgment as a British revolution abolishing want and implementing a pledge in the Atlantic Charter. It is a travesty of the Charter to suggest that it proposes anything leading to the nationalization of charity which is in effect the burden of the Report. But Sir William Beveridge is entitled to his rhetorical extravagance. It is quite another matter that in official propaganda the B.B.C. and the Ministry of Information have made the plan almost a *fait accompli* with the show of its promises to cheer the troops, sustain civilian morale, fortify our allies and discomfit the enemy. The Government has not disclosed its attitude; the proposals have not even been discussed in Parliament. It is all too reminiscent of the promises lavished during the last war and never fulfilled. Sir William Beveridge contends that in so overcoming want he would clear one of the five giants off the road to reconstruction, the others

being disease, ignorance, squalor and idleness. The picture is blurred and blotted by misuse of metaphor. These are not giants; they are the spectres and miseries at the gateways shut to opportunity and abundance. Ignorance is of course fatal to hopes of progress but it is not the illiteracy of the lowly; it is the ignorance of those who in the highest seats of authority know not or pretend not to know the solution of the riddle of the sphinx—why it is that in spite of increase in productive power wages tend to a minimum that will give but a bare living. It is represented here by the absence of even a nodding recognition of what does obstruct the road, the giant called land monopoly, with the privilege given to some to exact from the rest of their

fellows a tribute before land can be used at all, to appropriate for private advantage the rent of land which is the common fund belonging to all. Even now, in the midst of war, we see how rife this speculation is, forestalling the sites and situations that will be in demand when there is a return to peaceful occupations. The price of land rises the while that taxation is heaped more and more upon the producers of wealth and the consumers to endow and protect the most parasitic of our institutions. We who would build a new social order where men will be free and able in independence to enjoy the full fruits of their labour go forward with all the more confidence in our campaign for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade.

A.W.M.

## THE SMUTS INFLUENCE—STIMULUS OR SEDATIVE?

FIELD-MARSHAL SMUTS is back in South Africa, but we may be sure we have not heard the last of him. There are signs that his voice may have even greater weight at the next peace conference (upon British councils at least) than at Versailles in 1919. It is of some importance to the plain citizen (who will not be at the conference) to gauge in what direction this universally respected statesman's influence might be exerted.

For our guidance we have his *Plans for a Better World*,\* now in all the lending libraries, and the record of his recent speeches, especially his dissertation to both Houses of Parliament, broadcast to the nation.

One suspects that the title of his book was chosen in deference to those publicists who seem to think any proposal on social matters utterly unsaleable unless linked to the current enthusiasm to have our lives "planned" for us. It is a collection of speeches made between 1917 and 1941, on a variety of subjects, all reflecting a consistently humane and elevated outlook on world affairs and a depth of thought to which the trite and "up-to-date" reflections of the average politician cannot be compared; but of definite proposals surprisingly few, beyond the organization of a more prudent and maturely conceived League of Nations. "Leave the rest to time" runs the concluding passage of the book, "Let us leave it its place and its function in our vision of the future." One has an uncomfortable reminder of the "Time is on our side" period. In an earlier speech, on "the Challenge to Freedom," delivered in 1934, evidently clearly discerning the dangers arising in Germany, he declared "we have the paralysing sense of having failed. The fair promise of nineteenth-century progress has ended in defeat and frustration and disillusion... Democracy has been no better guarantee against war than the old dynastic rule of kings... International trade and commerce have led to economic nationalism and thereby opened up new sources of international friction and trouble... Of what we call liberty in its full meaning there is to-day less in Europe than there has been during the last 2,000 years." And yet he declares himself an optimist. But the reasons are not clear, neither is his diagnosis of the deeper causes of world malaise. His readers must feel unsatisfied

with an optimism which is little more than an article of faith.

A Karl Marx, a Lenin or a Hitler would have had a message more explicitly related to the urbanized European's life: to the hopes and fears and frustrations which move the masses at the great centres of population and power. One suspects that with all Smuts's wide sympathy and varied experience the land-owning Afrikaner farmer cannot quite feel the irresistible force of those material factors which mould the lives and opinions of a "landless proletariat"; that he has not plumbed the immeasurable gulf which separates the mental background of those with "something to fall back upon" from those with nothing beyond State charity.

In his speech to Parliament, however, there is a hint of something more. It is possible to read some passages as an earnest appeal to an audience beyond those he could see before him, some hint to what is called "the common man" to start seriously investigating for himself those questions of social policy which are "passing beyond the ordinary politics and political shibboleths," and which we can no longer afford to envelop in the haze of "Socialism or Communism or any of the other 'isms' of the market place." It is, he declares, no more than a question of "achieving common justice and fair play for all." He seems to imply that social questions are not affairs reserved for the professional expert, but are capable of solution by the man and woman of average intelligence.

It is not always recognized how rooted and powerful is the opposition to this opinion, although it is an opposition which works for the most part indirectly. Each "ism" has its appropriate "ists," but it is not so much the downright partisans of political groups as others (often operating under pseudo-scientific titles), who are impelled by interest, situation or inclination, to suggest that modern society is and must remain always so complicated and involved that the individual common man must rely upon the instructions of experts rather than upon his individual judgment for the direction of his economic life. And it is absurd to deny that such experts would or could refrain from dominating the individual in other spheres.

It is true, in the words of General Smuts, that "economic conditions can be

built up which will strike at the root causes of war and thus lay deeper foundations for world peace," but this statement carries us little further when, as he hints, even the Atlantic Charter needs clarification. What clear definition do fashionable political economists give of these conditions? How many good and sincere men have in the past believed, however reluctantly, with the fashionable economist, Malthus, that war was not only necessary but salutary? The modern experts are less dogmatic than Malthus. They seem almost to believe that there is no solution for our economic troubles. The plain man simply must help himself.

"With honesty and sincerity on our part it is possible to make basic reforms both for national and for international life which will give mankind a new chance of survival and of progress. Let this programme, by no means too ambitious, be our task and let us now already, even in the midst of war, begin to prepare for it." Such was the peroration which was loudly cheered by Lords Spiritual and Temporal, by Cabinet Ministers, and by the Honourable Members there assembled. Is it too much to hope that they will actually do anything to implement the advice which they applauded?

As honest and sincere thinking on these questions must lead to investigation of the simplest elements of political economy, and as the situation all depends on the common man, can we not expect that every stimulus will be given by Parliament, the B.B.C., and the daily Press to encourage the individual to enquire for himself, for example, what is really meant by such terms as land, labour and capital; by rent, wages, and interest? It is true that should this happen many current opinions might suffer eclipse, but are they such opinions as we can afford to keep? The vast majority appear to believe that imports must cause unemployment, that foreign trade is a "fight for markets," and that economic security is only possible by limiting individual freedom. It is idle to deny that these beliefs are sufficient to wreck any Atlantic Charter and tend to destroy democratic liberty as we know it. Already, to advocate individual right as a matter of practical politics is equivalent to political suicide. Those who advocate widespread, honest and sincere thinking and discussion on elementary political economy are at any rate confident that opinion would turn not towards any form of totalitarianism, but towards economic liberty as a cure for economic distress, especially towards that equal freedom to use the earth of which modern man has been increasingly deprived. If this freedom is not indeed the basis of General Smuts's "common justice and fair play for all," the words have no meaning.

F.D.P.

We ought to tax all idle land the way Henry George said: tax it heavily so that its owners would have to make it productive.—Henry Ford, in *Liberty* magazine, 5th September.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HENRY GEORGE. By Professor George R. Geiger, with Introduction by Professor John Dewey. A masterly treatise. Macmillan Co., New York (586 pages). Price 15s. post free from the Henry George Foundation, 4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

\* Hodder & Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

## FRENCH AGRICULTURE INJURED BY TARIFFS

MUCH HAS been written about the reasons for the collapse of French resistance in the summer of 1940. The political and military aspects have been stressed, but little has been said of the economic side. This defect has in part been remedied by Professor Marjolin in a lecture at the University of Glasgow, to the Historical Association, on 31st October. The substance of this has since been published in an article in *La France Libre* (16th November) under the pen name of Robert Vacher.

Professor Marjolin points out that not only was the population of France much inferior to that of Germany but that its manufacturing industries were less highly developed and did not afford the means of producing the volume of arms and equipment necessary to wage a mechanized war. This is related to the policy of agricultural protectionism which was intended to maintain French agriculture and was from the point of view now under consideration defended on the ground of making the country self-sufficient in food stuffs in time of war. This policy in the first place had the result of increasing the cost of living and meant therefore "a reduction in real wages of the industrial workers (and indeed of the real incomes of consumers generally). Agricultural protectionism was equivalent to a subsidy by the State to the peasants defrayed by taxes on consumption. The other classes of society and particularly the industrial workers met the cost of it."

Sometimes it is said that a prosperous agriculture will benefit industrial workers by creating a greater demand for the products of their work. But did protection improve the economic position of the French peasants? Professor Marjolin replies emphatically that "the effect of agricultural protectionism on the standard of living of the French peasants has been disastrous." The price of agricultural products was higher in France than in any of the neighbouring countries, but the production per head was much lower. He quotes Mr Lamartine Yates' calculation in *Food Production in Western Europe* to the effect that the gross produce per head in 1937 in pounds sterling was £240 in Great Britain, £180 in Denmark, £150 in Holland, £110 in Switzerland and Belgium and £90 in France. As prices were higher in France the disparity in the quantities produced was even greater than is indicated by these figures of money values. The average production of wheat for the period 1933-37 was 16.3 quintals per hectare in France, as against 31.3 in Denmark, 31.0 in Holland, 28.5 in Switzerland, 22.5 in England and 21.5 in Germany. The number of animals per hundred hectares of agricultural land showed similar contrasts, being in 1937, 60 in France, 75 in Great Britain, 93 in Germany, 133 in Denmark, 138 in Holland and 154 in Switzerland. It is also of interest to note that the workers engaged in agriculture per hundred hectares of agricultural land numbered 21.3 in France, 28.0 in Holland, 31.8 in Germany, 35.5 in Switzerland, although only 15.8 in Denmark and 7.5 in Great Britain.

French agriculture in Professor Marjolin's opinion is inefficient in three respects: (1) "The number of animals

per unit of area is not enough. Among other results this entails a deficiency of natural manure which is not compensated by the use of artificial fertilizers." (2) "French agriculture is the least mechanized in Western Europe." (3) France is deficient in knowledge and use of scientific advances in agriculture.

These things are largely the consequences, direct or indirect, of reliance upon protective tariffs to meet the changed circumstances of European agriculture as a result of the influx of cheap cereals from America in the latter part of last century. Instead of leaving producers to readjust themselves to the new conditions and sticking to a policy of freedom of trade, as Holland and Denmark did, France endeavoured by means of protection to maintain the existing position and relieve the peasant from any necessity for positive effort. "Indirectly, by reducing the real wages of the industrial population, this had the result of reducing the demand for high grade food stuffs (beef, butter, milk, etc.) an increase in which would have encouraged more intensive methods of cultivation."

"We may come to the conclusion," says Professor Marjolin, "that the French state made a grave mistake in seeking to protect the French peasant against the consequences of the agricultural revolution. Certainly it gave him the French internal market, but a market the capacity of which to consume was limited both by the reduction in real wages of the workers and the check given to industrialization. Above all, tariffs and agricultural quotas, although they have allowed the peasant to live in some security, without having to make an intellectual effort to adjust himself to new conditions, have given him this security at a very dear price. These things are largely responsible for the poor conditions under which he lives and the small return which he gets for his bitterly hard labour."

Another handicap to farming in France is that the land cultivated by a farmer instead of forming one compact area is frequently scattered in small, separate and widely spread parcels. Professor Marjolin does not discuss the origins of this. His article is also likely to convey the impression that France is cultivated mainly by small peasant proprietors. This is by no means the case. In 1929 agricultural land was held as follows: 62 per cent of the holdings were between 2½ and 25 acres but they comprised only 20.5 per cent of the area; 34 per cent were from 25 to 125 acres and comprised 49.5 per cent of the area; 3 per cent were between 125 and 250 acres and comprised 13.5 per cent of the area; while 1 per cent were over 250 acres and comprised 16.5 per cent of the area. It is to be remembered that more than one holding may belong to the same owner, because the cultivators are frequently tenants or share-croppers (metayers).

So far as protection does benefit the agriculturalist, it benefits him as an owner of land. If he is not an owner, the benefit in the end is reaped by the owner in higher rent. Protection is never of permanent advantage to the farmer as farmer. But it is frequently of no advantage to him

in any capacity. This is particularly true of the small farmer who depends upon animal husbandry or mixed farming, and who in order to conduct his business properly has to buy feeding stuffs grown by large scale farmers or imported from abroad. The price of these bought articles is frequently increased by protection much more than the high grade food-stuffs (eggs, bacon, etc.) produced by the small farmer, for, as Professor Marjolin points out, the increase in the cost of food-stuffs forces consumers to economize in their consumption of the more expensive foods. This is one important reason why the free trade policy of Denmark and Holland was advantageous to the small farmers of those countries.

## NOTES AND NEWS

At a General Meeting of the Hereford Branch of the A.E.U. on 30th November, the following resolution was moved by Mr D. R. Thomas:—

"Believing that the rating and taxation of land values, concurrently with the unrating and untaxing of houses and improvements, provides the only satisfactory basis for post war reconstruction and development schemes, this meeting of the Hereford Branch of the Amalgamated Engineering Union condemns the recommendations of the Uthwatt Committee which propose to use public money for the purchase of publicly created values and for the compensation of monopolists."

In discussing the motion it became evident that some members were in difficulties through their unfamiliarity with the subject. After these had been dispelled by the chairman's (Mr W. D. Griffiths) explanations, the resolution was carried unanimously. The Secretary was instructed to inform the Member for Hereford (Mr J. P. L. Thomas, M.P.) who has since replied saying that he had handed on the copy of the resolution to the appropriate Ministry.

I have just heard a striking detail of the wave of optimism which the recent war news has brought about all over the country. A well-known firm of agents have received over 50 telegrams from clients anxious to invest in real estate. I was told of one case in which half an acre of unbuilt-over freehold land in one of the best residential suburbs of London, which was bought for between £1,500 and £2,000 before the war, had just been sold for £6,000.—The columnist "Peterborough" in the *Daily Telegraph*, 10th November.

Unless the Government act quickly, speculators in land will reap a rich harvest as a result of the war. I hear that, in anticipation of the vast housing programme that must be undertaken immediately the war is over, they are buying up land from landlords who owing to heavy taxation, are glad to realize some of their landed assets. Unless appropriate action is promptly taken, these speculators will sell at a huge profit—to the detriment of the community.—Sub-editorial in the *Leader*, 21st November.



## INDUSTRIALISTS' POLICY FOR INDUSTRY

A NEW "National Policy for Industry" has recently been propounded under the signatures of some 120 chairmen or directors of leading industrial concerns, such as Imperial Chemical Industries, Stewarts and Lloyds, United Steel, Ford Motors, J. & P. Coats, and others. Among the names mention may be made of Lord McGowan, Lord Melchett, Lord Hirst, Sir Valentine Crittall, Sir Cecil Weir, Lord Perry, Mr J. V. Rank, Lord Dudley and Lord Sempill.

It is proposed to set up a Central Council of Industry which shall among other things maintain contact with the Trades Union Congress, and it would seem that steps for this have already been taken. The programme is calculated to enlist the sympathy of trade unionists and workers generally by laying down a code of conduct towards employees which shall include full opportunities for every man and woman to rise to positions of greater responsibility; a minimum basic wage, a system of payment by results, and the principle of co-partnership where practicable; unemployment pay of subsistence rates as a right and not a charity; Government and local schemes of work to relieve unemployment, which might include State assistance for industry; holidays with pay, reasonable hours of work, family allowances, and contributory pension schemes; adequate housing with industry assuming the duty to ensure that its employees are properly housed; and the raising of the school-leaving age to 16, with plans for part-time education up to 18 and more industrial and vocational education.

The statement is intended to be made palatable to the public by the assertion that industry should be responsible not only to those who supply the capital and to employees but also to consumers who should receive the full benefit of technical progress in higher quality or lower prices or both. Private enterprise should continue and the profit motive should not be eliminated. The signatories assert that it is quite untrue to say that industry has restricted production to enhance profits.

These high sounding phrases are to be judged in the light of the proposal that there should be an industrial tribunal or commission which would be set up by the Government and be in the nature of a final court of appeal on all industrial matters. This appears to mean that the formulation of high economic policy shall virtually be taken out of the hands of Parliament and placed in the hands of industrialists fortified by the pretence that they speak for the trade unions and the consumers as well. Such a policy would take us far towards the establishment of a corporative or totalitarian state.

The declaration that industry has not restricted production in order to enhance profits cannot be taken at its face value. There is no denunciation of tariffs, quotas, bilateral trade agreements, exchange restrictions and the many other devices which in recent years have gone so far in restricting markets, raising prices and creating monopolies. If the authors of this manifesto believe in free enterprise and the benefits of free competition, then here is the touchstone of their sincerity. Let them repudiate all state interference which

helps to create and bolster up monopoly.

We can hardly do better than quote the pertinent criticisms of the Financial Editor of *The Observer* (15th November):

"If Industry (always with the capital 'I') in fact had all these elaborate responsibilities, it might begin to seem reasonable that it should be given the extensive powers of self-government which are suggested. But surely it all rests on an inflated conception of Industry's part in the social structure. What is meant here by the word Industry but a collection of manufacturers? And what is the duty of manufacturers save to produce as efficiently as they can?"

"Manufacturers need not bother their heads about the protection of the consumer. The one sure safeguard for the consumer, and it is certainly worth a whole heap of pious protestations, is the power to buy elsewhere. Yet this is precisely the safeguard that the home consumer (though not our overseas customers) would be giving up—which may explain why the memorandum has so much to say about the consumer's interest. Where competition is no longer effective, of course, the protection of the consumer is the responsibility of the State, which can lay down standards of quality and see that monopoly is not abused."

"Similarly with the relations between manufacturers and their employees. Public feeling undoubtedly demands increased provision for social security on the lines set out. It is well that our manufacturers are sufficiently enlightened to favour such proposals. And an enlightened employer can always go beyond the minimum requirements of the law and may find it to his advantage to do so. But in principle it is for Parliament to say what shall be done and for employers to conform. The claims of the unemployed and the aged are not a first charge on 'industry' but on the nation, which is a wider and very different thing."

"Thus *The Times*, which gave the scheme a very sympathetic reception, undoubtedly hit the nail on the head in arguing that the proposed Central Council, especially if it were acting in concert with the T.U.C., 'might easily become a body strong enough in its own sphere to challenge the authority of Parliament.'

"The associations, we are assured, would discourage only 'wasteful and destructive' competition. But industrialists are hardly the people to decide which competition is of that nature. To the established producer, any increase in capacity is apt to seem uneconomic, because it lowers the return on his own capital. New products and new processes are from that point of view simply anathema, because they may destroy the value of existing fixed capital entirely."

"Yet the councils would be seeking to ensure an adequate remuneration for capital as well as labour. A guaranteed return on capital is, of course, the one thing which capitalism does not provide. Every investor must risk the loss of his capital through shifts in demand or new inventions. There is clearly a danger that the new organization would slow down industrial progress, which is the last thing an exporting country can face."

## HOW GREEN WAS MY VALLEY

THEY WERE all talking about the Unions when I got in, and Mr Evans looking very black indeed.

"I pay my men well," he said. "The best wages in all the valleys they have from me and always have."

"But your colliery is only a small one," Mr Gruffydd said, "and the rest of them think differently from you. And they pay differently, too. That is the evil. You manage your own colliery. But others are managed by paid servants with the owners interested only in the profits. Rich, lazy lordlings and greedy shareholders are our enemies."

"And middle-men," said Davy.

"Keir Hardie says the mines should belong to the people," said Ianto. "Like the Post Office."

"Hyndman says the land should all belong to the people," Davy said, "and I am with him."

"Marx has always said so," Owen said.

"I am not in favour of anything put up by a lot of old foreigners" my father said. "Owain Glyndwr said all there is to be said for this country hundreds of years ago. Wales for the Welsh. More of him and less of Mr Marx, please."

"The peoples of all countries should own their countries," said Mr Gruffydd. "The world was created for Mankind, not for some of mankind."

"It is a good job some of us have done something with what land we have got, whatever," Mr Evans said, still sour. "Enterprise is in the individual, not in the mob."

"Then let enterprising individuals pay rental to the mob," said Mr Gruffydd, "and the mob will be that much better off. It is money that enables men to come from the mob by education, and the purchase of books, and schools. When the mob is properly schooled, it will be less a mob and more of a body of respectable self-disciplined, and self-creative citizens."

"We have come off the Unions now, properly," said Mr Evans.

"The Unions are only part of a whole," Mr. Gruffydd said. "Let the Unions become engines for the working people to right their wrongs. Not benefit societies, or burial clubs. Let the Unions become civilian regiments to fight in the cause of people."

—From *How Green Was My Valley*, by Richard Llewellyn.

Mr Edwin C. Fairchild, PH.D., M.A., who is the editor of the "Design for Britain" pamphlets (J. M. Dent, 6d. each), is himself the author of No. 17 of the Series with the title *Housing in a Well-Planned Britain*. He has instructive sections on "A Levy on Improvements," "Speculation in Land Prices" and "Source of Land Values." For further information on these topics he refers his readers to Mr Douglas's pamphlet in the same series—No. 8—*Rating and Taxation in the Housing Scene*.

A GOOD NEW YEAR TO ALL

## "TESTAMENT TO DEMOCRACY"\*

LORD WEDGWOOD's latest book is devoted to the virtues, but not without mention of the failings, of Parliamentary Government as it is practised in the United Kingdom. By democracy he means government by reason and persuasion, not by force, and the best example so far devised is the British Constitution. This is exemplified by an account of how our system of government works in practice and by comparisons with other methods. To this task Lord Wedgwood brings the experience of many years of active participation in the work of Parliament, historical knowledge, travel and observation in other countries and above all an unconventional outlook.

Many will not agree with him. It is not the fashion to judge of "excellence in government by how far it enabled the governed to do without them." In matters which affect the private interests of many individuals it is not easy to find objective and invariable standards. The ebb and flow of opinion carries men too far now in one direction and now in another. We live in an era in which a natural reaction from a period of apparent indifference to social problems has resulted in a trend towards believing that the state must interfere in every sphere of living and towards denial of the importance and value of individual initiative and freedom. The more the State intervenes in human affairs the more important does it become to examine what are the purposes and what are the ultimate results (for these are not necessarily the same) of the measures which it takes.

Government by discussion, by reason and persuasion is certainly the ideal at which we must keep aiming. That it has not achieved as much as we had hoped lays it open to the attacks of all brands of totalitarians, whether of the right or of the left. That it has not achieved more is due not to a defect of the method, but to lack of agreement as to the object to be gained and as to the means of attaining it. That lack of agreement, and indeed of knowledge, is not confined to the members of Parliament; their views on the whole merely reflect those of the electorate. Hence the necessity which Lord Wedgwood so often emphasizes of freedom of discussion not merely in but out of Parliament, in the press, in broadcasting and on the platform. Hence also the need of an educational system which will encourage the citizen to think and not to swallow unreflectingly the opinions of others. The growing power of the press, of the printed and of the broadcast word makes this latter need all the more imperative.

Many other topics are discussed in this book—reconstruction and planning after the war, federal union, the colonies, India, sound currency, the League of Nations. All invite comment and discussion, but we must leave the reader to pursue these themes under Lord Wedgwood's stimulating guidance.

\* *Testament to Democracy.* By Lord Wedgwood. Hutchinson & Co. 8s. 6d.

## THE IMMEDIATE NEED FOR LAND VALUE RATING

By Councillor Sydney Needoff, Manchester

UNLESS DRASTIC reforms are made in our present Rating System grave injustices are going to be encouraged and colossal fortunes unearned and undeserved are going to be reaped at the expense of the general community at the end of the War.

It is no less a scandal (even though there is no apparent explanation why) that a rating system containing so many anomalies, so many injustices and so many hindrances to progress and enterprise, should have been allowed to carry on for so long.

Let us look at some of the inflictions that the community has borne with more than Christian resignation under the present system:—

(1) The owner of property, who spends money and brains and effort on improvements is rated higher and higher in proportion to the extent of these improvements.

(2) The owner of vacant property is un-rated and of property in badly developed conditions is lowly rated, however valuable the site itself may be.

What sort of a system is it that thus promotes inefficiency, and discourages enterprise? It's the economics of Alice-in-Wonderland.

(3) By not rating unused land and property, and lightly rating the ill-conditioned and poorly developed, we make it easy for persons to hold land lowly-rated or un-rated against a possible demand for it. What windfalls have fallen to landowners in the past, this way! What tremendous profits are likely to be netted after the War in this way, when the municipal corporations and private building firms come into the market to cope with the vast re-housing, town-planning and general development schemes, by owners of lowly-rated land, who have done nothing to make the land valuable,

but who will be ready, as past records show, to charge the "market price" for that very land which they fortuitously or speculatively happen to possess.

What creates the value of landed property, after all? Two things: (1) The labour and capital that the owner spends upon improving it, and (2) The presence of, and the improvements created by, the community in relation to the land.

Surely the fair and rational thing would be that the value of the former should go to the landholder, whereas the value of the latter should belong to the creator of it, namely the community?

This in brief is the theory and object of Land Value Rating, and its introduction would create the following boons:—

(1) It would provide a substantial new source of income from the rating of unused or inadequately used land.

(2) It would lower existing rates, by distributing the burden over all the land instead of only that which is being put to use.

(3) It would cheapen the price of land by forcing into the market land which is kept idle under the present system through being un-rated.

(4) It would provide a fair system of valuation for the purpose of purchase in connection with public or private development, housing and town-planning schemes.

(5) It would, if fully applied, relieve improvements to property and buildings of all rates, and thus encourage enterprise.

Thus, the community would be enriched, and the way would lie open to the new era when everybody would live and work under conditions that become a worthy civilization, and when the door would be closed to a vicious form of speculation which, like a canker, has been eating out the good from the domestic scene of this great country, for generations.

## "INCONVENIENT COMPETITION"

The Financial Editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, 19th November, ends his statement on what the railways are planning in regard to civil aviation with a remark which provides its own comment:—

Civil aviation is largely suspended during the war, but the British railways are already preparing to run air and surface lines after the war in co-ordination. The Great Western, London Midland and Scottish, and Southern railway companies have just jointly acquired a "major" share interest in British and Foreign Aviation, Ltd., a finance company controlling several air lines.

It is some years since the railway companies were given authority by Parliament to run air services. Before the war all four main-line companies were concerned in a joint enterprise, the Railway Air Services, which maintained air lines in and around the British Isles. Only one section of this network is still working, but the company is carrying on. The new purchase by three companies means that the shares in Great Western and Southern Air Lines Ltd., West Coast Airways (Holdings) Ltd., and Isle of Man Air Services Ltd.,

will now be owned by the railway companies and the cross-Channel companies operating in the same areas. The transaction is intended, according to a statement by the railway companies, to facilitate the maximum co-ordination between air and surface travel. It will, incidentally, also rid the railways of some inconvenient competition which before the war was conferring important benefits on the travelling public.

Stories about millionaires can usually find publicity. The New York *World-Telegram* has been running a series on men who have lost their money and ceased to hold this status. In its issue of 20th October the subject was Mr J. E. Aldred, a former public utilities magnate. The loss of his former estate, Ormston, Long Island, evoked the observation:

"I know a lot more on Long Island who'll be losing their estates before this year has gone if taxes continue to rise. I think Henry George had something in that single tax idea."

The U.C. Treasurer's Thanks—Page 8.

## CORRESPONDENCE

## LIBERALISM VERSUS LIBERTY

To the Editor, *Land & Liberty*

SIR,—Mr Dupuis's comments on the Liberal Party Assembly ought not to be allowed to pass unchallenged. The Assembly may have paid too little regard to the question of land values, but its discussions and resolutions are hardly recognizable in Mr Dupuis's version of them.

Lord Samuel said that monopolies are inevitable in some fields, but must be subject to control; Mr Dupuis interprets this as "agreement that monopoly is invincible." The Unemployment resolution says, among other things, "The State should, whenever industrial depression threatens, be prepared to incur internal debt both in maintaining the Social Services and in financing enterprise and improvements which add to the welfare and wealth of the country." Mr Dupuis calls this "borrowing money to 'provide work.'"

Mr Dupuis thinks that because the phrase "the proper function of the State is to insist on the conditions necessary for the free development of individuals" was omitted from the Liberal Goal resolution, therefore the Party has gone collectivist. He fails to point out that the same resolution contains the words: "All planning must be for freedom, not restriction. . . . The Liberal Party is utterly opposed to a 'planned national economy' in the totalitarian sense."

And so on. I hope readers of *Land & Liberty* will form their own opinions from the actual resolutions.

Yours etc., BM/REDA.

London, W.C.1. 11th November, 1942.

Mr Frank Dupuis, having seen the above letter, has made reply as follows:

"Readers of such a periodical as *Land & Liberty* are not likely to form final judgment on any political party without consulting original texts. My short article had to confine itself to the most important aspect of the apparent meaning of the resolutions; and that I took to be the dangerous aspect. When Goebbels declares that our post-war planning so much advertised has all been anticipated by National Socialism one cannot escape the suspicion that the doubtful meaning of similar well-meant resolutions has played into the hands of dictatorial groups, and that it may do so again.

"When the Liberal Assembly deleted the phrase defining the proper function of the State it repudiated a clear principle limiting the powers of parties and officials in favour of a phrase which implied that freedom must be 'planned'—an absurdity which might easily allow dangerous extension of power. Similarly, when Lord Samuel says monopolies are inevitable 'in some fields,' without giving any clear reason for, or definition of, those fields he tends to give monopoly the benefit of the doubt in all fields. To say with Mr Horabin that 'In the sphere of large-scale industry the trend to monopoly is inevitable' is so superficial as to be misleading. Every industry which enjoys privilege will become a large-scale industry.

The answer is surely to destroy all privilege—and then see how many of these large-scale inevitabilities survive!

"Your correspondent's quotation is surely an example of borrowing money to provide work—as if the duty of a government were not to safeguard each man's right to work for himself but to act as some super workhouse. When depression threatens, the State is to mortgage the future taxation to those people who have spare money during a time of depression, i.e., the richer members of the community. This money is to pay the unemployed to create public works which under existing land laws will enhance the value of land for the advantage of landed interests.

"Other resolutions adumbrate the method. 'Greater fluidity and mobility of service' will be required; and 'the benefits of security' will be given only to those 'prepared in return to render service' or 'to undertake training which will enable each to render service.' Who is to decide these matters, except the officials of the State? And in what way is this entirely at variance with National Socialism?

"I am quite sure the Liberal Party does not wish to be associated with 'a planned national economy in the totalitarian sense,' but when the only definite meaning conveyed by its resolutions is a move in that direction one is justified in hoping that some clearer thinking may be introduced into its councils."

## THE BEVERIDGE REPORT

To the Editor, *Land & Liberty*

SIR,—The function of Government is the preservation of liberty so that each man directly gets what is his own. A policy of an enforced sharing of incomes after wealth has already been wrongly distributed under the present inequitable conditions is a mere compounding of a felony and it is a road which leads to the subservience of the individual to the State with no liberty at all. People robbed of character and initiative finally remain passive instruments in the hands of others to do with what they will.

Doubtless many will welcome such a prospect and be willing to pay the price in order that the existing order of things may be continued and even perpetuated, but it is to be hoped that the people themselves will appreciate that the regimentation of their lives and finances by the State is the very negation of progress. True liberty should enable all to provide for themselves and expedients such as we have in the Beveridge Report can only imply that social justice and self-reliance are impossible of achievement.

We have seen in other countries the extension of State absolutism which has captured the bodies and souls of men, which has in effect made them slaves to the State, and one would have thought that this was the very last thing which we wanted in this country which has spent so much treasure and human life in fighting for the ideals of liberty and progress.

There is, in this Report, no attempt whatever to cure the evils of the present

system and to secure a just and proper initial distribution of wealth produced; all we see is a perpetuation of the existing injustices with the State relieving the results of maladjustment in various forms and at public expense. Ameliorations deal with results and not with causes and are mere opportunism. The people are brought into greater bondage to the existing system which presumably, in the minds of some, must be perpetuated whatever the cost, material or spiritual; but larger ameliorations and more of them will have the result of making the people more acquiescent in their dependence, and rendering it increasingly difficult to arouse them to the demand for their just rights.

For that which is the only basis of social justice there is a veritable cloud of witnesses which make all this State meddlesomeness perfectly puerile. John Stuart Mill stated that "The essential principle of property being to assure to persons what they have produced by their own labour and accumulated by their abstinence, this principle cannot apply to what is not the produce of labour, the raw material of the earth. . . . No man made the land; it is the original inheritance of the whole species. . . . The land of every country belongs to the people of that country." Professor J. E. Cairnes stated that "Sustained by some of the greatest names, I will say by every man of the first rank in political economy, from Turgot and Adam Smith to Mill, I hold that the land of a country presents conditions which separate it economically from the great mass of the other objects of wealth." Thomas Carlyle said of land that "Properly speaking the land belongs to these two: To the Almighty God and to all His Children of Men." The foremost economists, historians, theologians and writers of all countries have told us in no uncertain voice and in the most emphatic language that if we desire a just social order we must lay a just basis, and from that just basis all other things will be added unto us. Let us have a State founded upon freedom in which men can stand upright, take a pride in their individuality and initiative, and be the servants of none, answerable only to their own conscience moulded in a citizenship of equal rights and opportunities.

Yours etc., H. E. H.

*Country Life* of 13th November had a leading article on the Royal Academy Plannings Committee's ambitious scheme for the replanning of London and the opposition of the City of London's Court of Common Council. It is written: "May this view be less that of City businesses themselves than of those interested in site values. But before that is possible the land speculator must be checked, a provision which applies equally elsewhere. . . ." A correspondent, giving us this cutting, says "Some pluck to write like this in a publication depending largely on property advertisements."

A free copy of *Land & Liberty* is an invitation to become a subscriber. Monthly: 2d. By post 3s. yearly; U.S.A. and Canada, 75 cents.



**THE UNITED COMMITTEE FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES LTD.**  
4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.  
Hon. Treasurer, W. R. Lester; Secretary,  
A. W. Madsen; Assistant Secretary,  
F. C. R. Douglas. (Telephone: Abbey 6665.)

The Treasurer wishes to express again his thanks to the many friends who have sent support to the funds of the Committee, a response to his invitations which is the more gratifying as the revenue thereby provided has materially exceeded what was forthcoming from donations and subscriptions in the corresponding period of last year. With such votes of confidence, the work is greatly encouraged and its responsibilities are correspondingly borne in mind. Whatever help other friends can give when their contributions may be regarded as renewable will be equally welcomed and valued. *Land & Liberty* itself counts many new subscribers gained during 1942.

There have been many more applications from municipal and other circles for the publications of the Committee relating to the Reports of the Uthwatt and Scott Reports. Of each of two documents several reprints have had to be made reaching a total of 7,000 copies to date; and these in turn have brought much correspondence. The same applies to the interest being taken in the Essay Competition under auspices of our Henry George Foundation which has been advertised by circulation of the Prospectus and advertisements in a number of periodicals. Apart from those who have had the Prospectus in the general distribution, 437 correspondents have made individual and direct application to the office for it and of these 56 have bought the four recommended books, which indicates their intention to compete. There will be many more who are reading the books available at the public libraries. One correspondent sends a 5s. book token. It is a suggestion for others who have such tokens which we will gladly exchange, for their value, with any of our publications. Latest date for the submission of the Essays is 31st March; the awards as already repeatedly announced are: one of £20, two of £15 each and five of £10 each. Particulars are in the Prospectus which will be sent free on application. There is no entry fee.

Miss N. McGovern at her own instance has had a large poster printed relating to the Essay Competition which is being displayed in a number of places. She is also advertising the Competition in the Mersey Railway trains referring enquiries for books to a bookseller with whom special arrangements have been made. Correspondents in Hereford, Shrewsbury, Cardiff, Brighton and other places have interested booksellers in the sale of the books.

**ENGLISH LEAGUE:** Frederick Verinder, General Secretary, 4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1 (Telephone: Abbey 6665).

A Happy New Year to the members and friends of the League. May 1943 bring to a distressful world at least the promise of a just and stable Peace!

Mr Herbert A. Berens, former Hon. Treasurer of the League, safely returned last month from a thirteen months' tour in North and South America and Australia, during which he was able to make contact with many of our American and Australian co-workers, with whom he "had many very interesting talks." His son Dennis is in the Australian Air Force.

Mr Reginald Pott, L.C.C., is to be the new Vice-Chairman of the London County Council. Lord Latham, leader of the council, is a Vice-President of the League, and Mr F. C. R. Douglas, Chairman of the Finance Committee, is the League's President.

Mr W. E. Fox, a member of the Executive, recently addressed a meeting of the Clapham Labour Party Discussion Group on "Landlordism," and was briefly reported in the *Clapham Observer*. He had a short letter

in the *Daily Herald* (11th December) on the Beveridge Report.

A member in Hampshire, a former student in Mr Fox's class of the Henry George School of Social Science, has taken part in a discussion on the Money question in the *Southern Daily Echo*, and has sent to the office several cuttings from that paper of letters criticizing the Beveridge Report. This is a kind of help which is always highly appreciated.

Mr John E. Grant has generously presented to the League six copies of his valuable book, *The Problem of War and its Solution*, to be sold at 5s. a copy for the benefit of the League's funds. The book, originally published at 10s. 6d., can be sent post free for 5s. 6d.

The General Secretary is to address the South Hammersmith Women's Co-operative Guild at the Hampshire House Social Club, Hampshire, Hog Lane, on Thursday, 21st January, at 2.30 p.m. Subject: "Land, Labour and Taxation after the War."

**WELSH LEAGUE:** Eustace A. Davies, Hon. Secretary, 27 Park Place, Cardiff. (Telephone: 1563.) Hon. Organizing Secretary, I. T. Rees, 2 Southey Street, Cardiff.

A deputation from the League, consisting of Capt F. Saw, C. A. Gardner and I. T. Rees, had an interview with Mr W. Thomas, the Secretary of the Welsh Advisory Council for Post-War Reconstruction, at the Welsh Board of Health. The deputation had an excellent reception. The attitude of the League to the Uthwatt and Scott recommendations and its own policy for ensuring the better use of land in both town and country opening opportunity to all were explained. Mr Thomas expressed appreciation of the explanatory literature which has been provided both by the League and the United Committee. The League was invited to prepare and forward a memorandum having particular application to conditions or circumstances in South Wales which could be circulated to the Welsh Council, and any comments or even recommendations which its members were prepared to make would be reported to London with such memorandum.

Mr F. C. R. Douglas, M.P., is to give public lectures arranged in the session of the Workers' Educational Association, Swansea Branch. The date is 30th January, day school at 3 p.m.: "The Uthwatt and Scott Reports on Planning and Land Utilization"; evening session at 5.30: "Land and its Rent in Post-War Reconstruction." The meetings of the Swansea W.E.A. take place at the Friends' Meeting House, 200 High Street, Swansea. Admission is free.

**MANCHESTER LEAGUE:** Arthur H. Weller, J.P., Secretary, Pytchley; Bean Leach Road, Offerton, Stockport.

At Peace meetings in Birmingham, Stafford and elsewhere, organised by the Society of Friends and addressed by Mr D. J. J. Owen, the land question has been introduced by members of the audiences, and special meetings for its discussion may eventuate.

An article entitled "An open conspiracy," written by the Secretary, has been sent to a number of Lancashire newspapers.

At a recent meeting in Warrington, addressed by Messrs R. R. Stokes, M.P., and J. R. Davies, M.P. In the course of his speech Mr Stokes turned to the land question and his remarks prompted a question which evoked interesting discussion.

In his weekly "Leaves from a journalist's log-book," in the *Stockport Express* of 10th December, "The Idler" severely criticises the Beveridge report and makes the following reference to the land question: "It seems to me that he (Sir Wm Beveridge) entirely overlooks the cause of the evils, and deals only with the effects. For instance, one of the causes of poverty is the private ownership of the land of Britain by a very small number of people. The great majority of us are

landless and therefore at the mercy of those who hold it as private property. The rent roll of Britain runs into millions of pounds annually and increases as the population grows. If all Sir William's plans became operative to-morrow, the people would still be divorced from their native soil, and rents would continue to rise, sliding always one way, upwards, as we increase and multiply. Naturally the few who own the land are interested in any proposal to increase the population."

**DERBYSHIRE LAND VALUES LEAGUE:** George Musson, Hon. Secretary, 29 Denby Lane, Codnor, Derby.

The following resolution was adopted on 12th December and circulated to the Press:

"The Executive of the Derbyshire Land Values League, having considered the report of the Uthwatt Committee on Compensation and Betterment, re-affirms its belief that the Taxation and Rating of all Land Values, whether Urban, Agricultural or Mineral, and and Untaxing and Unrating of all Buildings and other Improvements in or on the land, are the indispensable pre-requisites for Reconstruction and Development after the war; and declares that it is not in the public interest, nor is it necessary for the purposes of Reconstruction, to purchase with public money Land Values which are created and maintained by the public; that the value of the 'Development Rights' which the Committee proposes should be purchased is merely a speculative value due to Land monopoly, which should be taxed out of existence; and that the proposed 'periodic levy on a proportion of increase in annual value' is not an acceptable substitute for the Taxation and Rating of Land Values, and will not ensure the same economic benefit."

Among other papers that have published the declaration are the *Nottingham Journal*, the *Nottingham Evening Post*, the *Derbyshire Advertiser* and the *Heanor and Ripley Gazette*.

**HIGHLAND LEAGUE:** Isaac Mackenzie, Hon. Secretary, Queensgate Arcade, Inverness.

In the course of a long letter to the *Ross-shire Journal*, 4th December, "J.M." writes: "When government permits private appropriation of ground rent and takes by force a citizen's earnings for public purposes it is no less guilty of crime than he who robs on the highway. . . . In the new world the slogan will be not the greatest good to the greatest number, but the greatest possible good to the individual through his own efforts; and thus will be attained the greatest good for all—a maximum of individualism."

#### ADDRESSES

International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade; Ashley Mitchell, Hon. Treasurer, Henry George Foundation of Great Britain, Henry George School of Social Science, 4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1. Telephone: Abbey 6665.

Yorkshire and Northern Land Values League; F. Skirrow, Secretary, 129 Skipton Road, Keighley.

Henry George Freedom League; Wm. Reid, Secretary, 9 Woodside Crescent, Glasgow, C.3. Telephone: Douglas 5599.

Midland Land Values League; John Bush, President, 20 Cannon Street, Birmingham, 2. Portsmouth League for the Taxation of Land Values; H. R. Lee, Hon. Secretary, 13 Lawrence Road, Southsea.

Liverpool League for the Taxation of Land Values; Acting Hon. Secretary, Mrs Alex Maclean, 6 Darley Drive, Liverpool, 12.

Crosby Henry George Fellowship; C. C. Paton, Hon. Secretary, 11 Tudor Road, Liverpool, 23.

Edinburgh Taxation of Land Values League; Hon. Secretary (*pro tem.*): A. Davis, 8 Kirkhill Terrace, Edinburgh, 9. Telephone: 43588.