

LAND & LIBERTY

MONTHLY JOURNAL FOR LAND VALUE TAXATION AND FREE TRADE

Fifty-sixth Year—Nos. 666 & 667. 4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

Nov. & Dec., 1949. 1s.

European Economic Imbroglio	114	"Colonial Development" in the Raw	123
Farmers Bribed and Coerced	116	Visiting Canada and U.S.A.	125
Nemesis of the Planning Act	118	Sugar under Protection	128
Nearing the General Election	120	French and Spanish Translations of	
International Conference and After	121	Conference Resolutions	Supplement

Whose Welfare State?

In his broadcast on October 24, concerning the reductions in Government expenditure, the Prime Minister's main theme seemed an appeal to the people to work harder and endure more privations in order to save the Welfare State, which, he implied, they all loved so much; as if they were so overjoyed at not having the promised more and more they would be quite contented to have less and less—and, incidentally, paying the chemist a shilling a bottle for it. The Social Services, he said, "are your services and you pay for them directly or indirectly. . . . We have set ourselves the task in this country of creating the Welfare State, a State which seeks security and happiness for all. With the approval of all parties, social services have been established which are an example to the world. But the Welfare State can only endure if it is built on a sound economic foundation. If you are in a job and have to-day, through National Insurance, a greater sense of security than ever before, remember its continuance depends on what you do. Don't leave it to the other man."

Payments and Disciplines

But in the kind of State in which we live the fact is that everyone *must* leave it to the other man, and responsibility is so divided, both in fact and in the consciousness of the people that Ministers and others employ the words "we" and "our" in a manner neither they nor any of their audience could explain. Who can have a sense of property in something which is bought with what is taken from him, less the expenses (over which the victim has no control) of the compulsion? On July 5 the Minister of National Insurance reported that 764 inspectors had been appointed, whose duties included checking stamp contributions, and there had been 320 prosecutions of people who had not paid. Mr. Attlee must know very well that unless compelled to do so, only a small minority of the people would pay these contributions to a scheme which he assumes they consider as their own. The only sound economic foundation for any person's security and happiness is to give him the opportunity of providing for it himself. It is because the masses were denied this opportunity and could see only the results, in poverty and unemployment, of this denial and not the first cause that they tolerate these compulsions. But to tolerate such conditions is not to love them or even positively to support them. In other parts of his talk, Mr. Attlee seemed to be addressing himself to an audience of children, verbally patting some on the head for their hard work and censuring others. One suspected, however, that he was not

entirely confident this method would be effective. A good teacher, like Mr. Attlee, would not like to smack naughty children, but if, as he says, "There are a great many firms who have done little or nothing" of what he tells them, or "workers who only do the minimum, who don't care, who take days off," what else can he do?

Blind Spot in the Broadcast

If Mr. Attlee has the real welfare of the people at heart, and if, as his speeches often suggest, he doubts whether his opponents have an equal desire, should he not hesitate before resorting to compulsions which his opponents also support? If there are in society any privileged interests profiting at the expense of the workers, and protected by his opponents, any measures to redistribute income in an arbitrary fashion must necessarily obscure and protect the privileges.

Mr. Attlee would have found himself in a less difficult position if he had directed the attention of his followers to a privilege which, through all their tergiversations, his Conservative opponents have always defended and which he in years past has verbally assailed. This is the injustice by which one man, by virtue of possessing a piece of legal paper, can own as his private property a site of that land which, without any ambiguity, is *ours*, the collective property of all British people. Mr. Attlee must know that a person who contributes nothing whatever to production, either by direct labour or the indirect labour of saving and risking capital, if he owns a valuable piece of the earth's surface, may take not a "day off," but a lifetime off and die much wealthier than when he was born—all the time drawing his wealth quite legally from the labour of others. In his broadcast Mr. Attlee might have drawn the attention of millions to this kind of "slacker," or—much more usefully—to this bad law. But he was silent. Perhaps he thought it would be inconsistent of him to do so as his Government, by its Town and Country Planning Act, is paying £300 millions of the workers' money to a section of such slackers for a temporary relaxation of their tolls. And this is done through an Act which seems specially designed to keep the people's houses scarce and dear.

Informers on the Job

Although, as we hope, Mr. Attlee is reluctant to apply the whip, to judge by the attitude of other members of his Government we cannot be sure their reluctance would be so difficult to overcome. In a letter to the Editor of LAND & LIBERTY, October, 1947, Mr. Wilfrid Harrison drew attention to a broadcast by Sir Stafford Cripps, which, after referring to total conscription of labour

a last resource," he urged his audience to "take the responsibility" of reporting black marketeers to the authorities. Now, October 31, in Parliament, he states: "I am prepared in suitable cases to sanction the payment of rewards for information which, on investigation, proves to be of value in detecting or preventing evasion of the Exchange Control Act." The prospect thus opening before us must surely arrest the attention of the most indifferent. The next step will be to make it a punishable offence not to give information. Children will be ordered to report their parents. The number of police agents and enforcement officers will need to be multiplied. Already the prisons are filled to overcrowding. What will be left but terrorism and the concentration camp? It has always been a consoling and self-flattering assumption to suppose the Fascists, Nazis and Communists resort to these methods because they are cruel and wicked, and we are not; but under the delusion that universal compulsion is necessary for the welfare of the State, such methods are inevitable when a later stage has been reached. Some indignation at Sir Stafford's declaration has been expressed. We wish there had been more. We wish the indignation would go far enough to investigate *why* a government should find itself in a position when it cannot avoid resorting to such methods. We wish that every person who thinks himself justified in claiming a subsidy, privilege or protection for his industry would realise to what extent he is responsible for the situation.

The Falling Pound

Sir Stafford's threat reveals another consequence of government on false principles. When the external value of the £ was bolstered by artificial measures at a higher rate than its natural value British money out of the country could buy more than at home. Hence the advantage of smuggling money out and the consequent scrutiny by officials of personal correspondence. But when the £ was devalued to its natural price this smuggling would be no advantage until the £'s natural exchange value again started to decline. Evidently this is what is happening. Devaluation has failed, even of its immediate purpose.

Indeed, the impression had been given that the new sterling-dollar rate was deliberately fixed lower than circumstances required, so defeating the black market and giving the Pound a higher purchasing power in "hard currency" countries than at home. If that were true, laud and honour, not fine and imprisonment, were for those who stuffed envelopes with notes and sent them abroad. Patriotic informers and post office detectives would be discovering their whereabouts for the provision of handsome rewards. It is a serious reflection on the Government's conduct of affairs that for the safety of the realm the Pound must be kept at home in protective custody.

European Economic Imbroglio

Years ago one used to meet advocates of Protection who roundly denounced Free Trade. At any rate, there was nothing sanctimonious about them. Now the difficulty is to find anyone who is not a Freer-Trader-Provided-the-Other-Fellow-Does-So-As-Well. When tariffs were imposed in 1931 it was argued they would provide a weapon for forcing down the barriers of other countries. Since then, in quotas, embargoes, licences, exchange controls and experts' conferences the nations should have enough of these weapons to smash a barrier manned by the greatest army of customs officers ever known. One

of these great barrier-smashing campaigns started on July 7, when Mr. Harold Wilson, President of the Board of Trade, made in Parliament the momentous statement that "the time had come" for the British Government "to take steps to relax restrictions," "subject to" . . . "although" . . . "we should need to be in a position to" . . . "it is not possible at this stage to say," etc., etc. We take up the story in headlines and comments of reputable newspapers:—

August 7, "Steps Towards Freer European Trade." August 10, "Benelux and its Difficulties—Obstacles to Economic Union." October 1, "Belgium Seeks Trade Talks—Complains of British Import Ban." October 2, "Canadians Seek Higher Textile Tariffs." October 9, "Meagre Response to Free Trade Lead." October 10, "Tariffs Reduced by Thirty-one Countries," but "The effort depends on the negotiations that are not due to begin until next autumn." November 1, "Aid Nations Given Disaster Warning—Hope Lies in European Integration." November 3, "New Economic Charter for Europe—18-Nation Plan Decisive in History, says Hoffman." November 4, "Food Imports from Canada—Britain to Cut Eggs, Bacon Supplies." November 6, "Jugoslav Trade Talks Deadlock." "Sir S. Cripps's Attitude—Mr. Hoffman Disappointed." "French Distrust a Nationalist British Government, which is being forced by its policies and doctrine into autarchic isolation." November 10, "Higher Dutch Subsidies—Hinders Union with Belgium."

The story closes with the optimistic comment of the *Manchester Guardian's* Diplomatic Correspondent, November 10, concerning a resolution passed by the O.E.E.C. Council of 17 Ministers: "It does not attempt to give any detailed commitment, but the *impression* is that it does accept the principle of the desirability of economic integration."

Bargaining for "Freer" Trade

After the original statement on July 7, Mr. Henderson Stewart asked, "Would it be true to say that the practical meaning of the Right Hon. Gentleman's statement is that we do not intend to make any relaxation at all upon imports?"

To this Mr. Wilson gave an answer which left the question as much in doubt as before. It would have saved much misunderstanding and a lot of travelling and other expenses if he and the Government had answered "Yes," and ceased to enter into useless negotiations. The Danish Commerce Minister would not have been able to say, in effect, as reported by Reuter, November 11, that the Cripps's "Freer Trade" Plan was a sham. The spirit in which our Government conducts such negotiations and the spirit, presumably, in which the Opposition would undertake them was illustrated, November 3, in Parliament, when Mr. Heathcoat Amery showed his anxiety, while "most certainly not opposed to the freeing of inter-European trade," about removal of restrictions on Italian rayon goods. "Will the right hon. Gentleman not agree," he asked, "that success must be judged by the degree of reciprocity?" "I entirely agree with that statement," answered Mr. Wilson.

Marcus Aurelius recorded his gratitude to a friend who taught him to love justice and imbued him with "the idea of a polity in which there is the same law for all . . . administered with regard to equal rights; a kingly government which respects most of all the freedom of the

governed." In their trade negotiations, our democratic rulers to-day follow exactly the opposite of all these principles. They barter the freedom of their subjects to produce and exchange with no more regard for justice than the German princelings in the eighteenth century bartered the lives of their "national servicemen." Every restriction or relaxation affecting a particular article creates a privilege; and all that is bound up in the deception called "Freer" Trade.

Open the Ports at Once

The words, Free Trade, applied to any society can have one meaning only: That every person within the sphere of that society's jurisdiction should have equal freedom of opportunity to produce and exchange goods and services. That any other society should not allow such freedom among its own members has nothing whatever to do with the necessity for justice within one's own society. If our neighbours live in servitude and poverty they cannot produce as much to exchange with us as if they lived in freedom and prosperity; but to reduce ourselves to their condition on that account, and to refuse to break our chains until they break theirs is as rational as following the Gadarene swine over the precipice. Trade is exchange; the capacity to exchange is one of the essential qualities which distinguishes men from animals. Our forefathers, who cherished, admired and protected the smugglers, and despised the informers, showed not only a manly spirit, they showed the instinct of self-preservation. Many people of excellent personal character support or tolerate the idea of "Freer" Trade, usually without investigating it, but in so doing they foster practices which have their origin in the vices, follies, weaknesses, selfishness and deceit in human character.

If the British people want as much trade freedom as possible to be established in the world, the first and indispensable step is to set themselves free. As no rulers in the world, however foolish or corrupt, can prevent their subjects *entirely* from exchanging, this first step would give the British people the unique advantage of participating in every opportunity throughout the whole world of profiting by such freedom as existed. The example of Britain's prosperity would do more in a year or so to inspire others to break their chains than the futile conferences of a century. Owners of wealth or gold throughout the world would rush to store it in an oasis where the State did not plunder it on its arrival, and where men showed signs of some feeling for the sanctity of private property. The "problems of exchange control" would arise no more. But material prosperity would be the least of the advantages to a society in which the trade of inspectors, spies and informers on the one side and liars and deceivers on the other had receded into the limbo of the past; a society not oppressed by foreboding and suffering a fresh "crisis" every month, but looking with hope and confidence to the future.

Fair Criticism by a Liberal

Mr. Graham Hutton's address to the Liberal Summer School, reported in the *Manchester Guardian*, August 2, contains some penetrating criticism of the tendencies and logical outcome of Socialism as it is developing in England. He notices, especially, how it is leading to corruption and the abuse of power. Under comparative freedom producers save out of current production and invest their savings in capital, which increases the wealth-producing capacity of society. When a Socialist Govern-

ment comes to power and by taxation and nationalisation confiscates an ever-increasing proportion of both current production and capital, the process can continue while a supply of capital remains to be plundered; but as it is against human nature for a person to work harder as he receives less and less of the product, or to save and invest if he is to be denied interest, the supply of new capital declines. The Government is thus driven to create new State-owned capital, which it tries to achieve by heavier taxation and preventing the workers spending their income on current needs. At the same time, in order to maintain its popularity, the Government tends to an ever-increasing extent to plunder minorities in order by various forms of largesse to buy popularity with the masses. The result is an impasse, with less and less for all, and minorities especially are the victims.

In contrast to this Socialist régime, the example is cited of unplanned abundance in America, under "initiative, enterprise and originality," with both its political parties "anti-Socialist in spirit"; concluding that "the greater the freedom the greater the capital, the higher the standard of life and the quicker the economic progress." All the evidence supports that conclusion.

Where Stands the Liberal Party?

Mr. Hutton, however, does not answer the question which immediately arises in one's mind. If what is taken to be perfect freedom brings abundance, why, then, does Socialism, with its false promise of abundance, make such progress? Apart from the fact that American Protectionism, with its denial of freedom, has been a hotbed for political corruption, to many American lovers of liberty it appears their country is now going Socialist as quickly as our own, although it has as yet much farther to go. Already it is reported that Democratic candidates are openly advocating the Welfare State, which has everywhere proved the first step towards Socialism and, in fact, logically denies the principle that freedom can bring abundance for all who are willing to work. Nowhere do Liberal parties put freedom first in their appeal. If the word is mentioned it is usually in such a connection as "Freedom to enjoy a (State-provided) 'adequate' standard of living." This, in fact, reverses the meaning of the word. Liberals by implication deny faith in liberty.

Look on America

A brief survey of American history suggests where the solution to this paradox might be sought. In the nineteenth century, when Liberalism was everywhere in the ascendant, vast areas of vacant, fertile land were available in North America. There was practically no destitute class, despite the influx of millions of destitute from Europe, who soon were able to provide for themselves, either by directly working the vacant land or supplying the needs of those who did so. And the classes without capital but with the option of working for themselves on vacant land were never obliged to accept low wages as in Europe, where land was all monopolised, although often undeveloped. But, towards the end of the nineteenth century, with the supply of fertile, unmonopolised land rapidly decreasing, there emerged, as in Europe, the very wealthy and the destitute classes; and confidence in freedom began to wane. No Malthusian fallacies could explain this, because it was exactly in the most densely populated areas that the very rich as well as the very poor began to appear: in those places where an owner of land could

live without producing, while landless persons, working hard, found it increasingly difficult to live.

No adequate or final comparison can be made between the Socialist State and a free society without assessing the full effects of the land laws; the laws governing man's access to the earth on which he must depend for every moment of his existence. But when this question has been studied we may see the way, even through the dense clouds that darken the Atomic Age, to a society cleansed from that element of unjust institutions and their influence which leads to the acceptance of fallacies destroying freedom and bringing poverty to all.

Local Government at the Crossroads

On November 2, Mr. Blenkinsop, Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Health, stated, as reported, that, despite the recommendations of the Commission appointed for the purpose, no changes in local government boundaries would be made at present because "the Government were now reviewing the structure and functions of local government." Asked what was likely to be the outcome of this review, Mr. Bevan, Minister of Health, said that to give any idea of the proposals the Government had in mind would give rise to general speculation and unrest. "It was better the Government proposals should be made known later, as a whole."

Some Opposition members expressed misgiving about this decision and, indeed, Mr. Bevan's answer might have been that of a Government intending virtually to suppress local government by a swift act of legislation. But Conservative members should be reminded that it was the Conservative Government of 1929 which first placed local governments on the dole; and the old adage, "He who pays the piper calls the tune," still holds good. Faced with the problem of the Distressed Areas, where the growing need for relief of distress raised the rates with the effect of strangling any new industrial development which, by absorbing unemployment, might have reduced the need for relief, Mr. Baldwin's Government took the "easy" way out of abolishing all rates on agricultural land, reducing rates on industrial concerns by three-quarters, and compensating local governments by an annual sum from the Exchequer of £40 millions, distributed according to a complicated and ridiculous formula. From that time dates a gradual encroachment on the independence of local governments. An emergency payment, followed immediately by radical reform, might have been justified. But the method of the dole, and no reform, made it a permanent corrupter.

Tory and Labour Policies

If the Conservative Party is genuinely concerned about the independence of local government it could demonstrate the fact easily enough by advocating the alternative method proposed to Mr. Baldwin about that time by advocates of economic independence, including scores of local authorities themselves; that is to say by levying rates upon the value of land, irrespective of the improvement upon it.

Mr. Baldwin's method, by relieving agricultural land of rates, ensured that as soon as any lease fell in the landowner collected an increase of rent equal to the value of the relief, and the owner of factory land profited in the same way, according to his proportion. Impetus and licence were given to land speculation, from which sooner or later industry and agriculture and all production were caused to suffer. The Labour Government, with an

almost dictatorial majority of M.P.s, maintains this Conservative Act unimpaired. As dwellinghouses continue to bear the full rates, it may easily be seen how the housing shortage was affected, and remains so. It should not be forgotten how Mr. Aneurin Bevan, when sponsoring the 1947 Local Government Bill, House of Commons, November 18-19, acclaimed the 1929 Derating Act as one of the "reforms" leading to his legislation, and (December 18) rebuked his fellow Labour member, Mrs. Middleton, for daring to suggest that his Bill should amend the Derating Act. On that occasion, Mr. Bevan, often so free with malediction of his political opponents, revealed himself a Tory of the Tories—"more Royalist than the King."

The Politics of Wool Marketing

Statements in the House of Commons on October 29 showed that the farmers of England, Wales, Scotland and Ulster have agreed to subordinate themselves to a Market Board, set up on the initiative of their Unions, for the purpose of selling their wool. And if there are any farmers who prefer to make their own bargains with willing customers the State will now see to it that such action is stopped. Perhaps this enthusiasm to regiment themselves can be explained by the Minister of Agriculture's remark on the same occasion. "I agreed," he said, "that in the event of such a scheme coming into operation we would add wool to the list of commodities for which prices are guaranteed." He added that the scheme "is now being advertised" to afford an opportunity for any objections to be considered. So far we have not noticed any prominent hoardings flaming this question to those especially concerned, i.e., the 50 million taxpayers who must pay to guarantee a privilege to the farmers—and agricultural landowners.

As far as consumers and taxpayers are concerned, this policy enforces the Chancellor's words in the Devaluation Debate. "Nothing—and I mean literally nothing—should be done to increase personal income"; but no explanation is given why farmers and landowners should be exempt. Perhaps the Labour Chancellor's words were intended especially for Trade Unionists. On the other hand, it seems strange that the Chancellor who, by his speeches, is anxious to lower trade barriers, should agree to his colleague's action, which must inevitably add to the "difficulties" which, Sir Stafford insists, form a stumbling-block to international trade negotiations. The "average price" to be agreed upon every February by the Minister in collaboration with the wool farming interests must, of course, provide a profit above production costs. If, in the meantime, any barrier is removed to allow importation of foreign or colonial wool, more money will be required to bolster the price paid to the privileged home producer. In other words, all these price guarantees mean that any progress in lowering trade barriers entails more taxation. So the barriers remain, to foster international friction until the conflict breaks out.

Farmers Bribed and Coerced

A Special Correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, reporting, August 6, on marginal land farmers in Lancashire, cites the example of land at Sabden which twenty years ago was good for grazing, but is now tangled bracken and brown tufty grass. The owner of the farm of which this land forms part, maintained that if he could have sufficient feedingstuffs so that he could balance his economy with poultry and pigs, for which there is great

demand in Lancashire towns, he could make use of the derelict land. But the Government, to conserve dollars, has reduced the subsidy which by keeping prices artificially low, increases the imports beyond the amount which would otherwise be imported. Hill farmers have previously received £300,000 annually under an assistance scheme which includes a "means test." Farmers resent the means test, but want more assistance. It is proposed to give it, and Mr. Attlee, in his broadcast on economies, hints that all agricultural prices will rise in February to compensate farmers for reduction in feedingsubstuffs subsidy. The burden, of course, falls upon the consumer, who, as taxpayer, continues to pay all the other subsidies to agriculture. In Parliament, October 1, Mr. Thomas Reid called attention to an unnoticed subsidy of £1,000,000 on farm machinery.

Agriculture is an industry no more fixed and immutable than others, no more privileged to coerce its customers to buy for ever the same things from the same markets. Under Free Trade the British farmer could obtain feedingsubstuffs at the cheapest world price to produce stock for which the climate and soil and the proximity of markets give him every advantage. And he could also produce in increasing quantity the fresh foods which the modern townsman increasingly desires. So far the farmer has been hampered, frustrated and burdened by a bad land system which prevents him from doing these things as well as he might. Instead of demanding reform and freedom he has been misled into demanding privilege and submitting to servitude.

Alleged Scarcity of Food

The propaganda strength of the organised agricultural interests has profited considerably by the stories of world increase of population out-running the capacity to produce food. Sir John Russell's address, August 31, to the British Association showed that science is discovering methods of raising productivity and bringing previously barren land into cultivation. And this is not surprising, seeing that it has always happened before. The American Government, having guaranteed prices to American wheat farmers, is faced with a huge surplus following a bumper crop. But with Europe's restrictions on imports from dollar countries, the bounty of nature cannot be extended to that area. Furthermore, the quantity and price of British imports of wheat has been officially fixed for the next four years. The Food and Agricultural Organisation in Washington, therefore, proposes to set up yet another body, The International Commodity Clearing House, to deal with this matter. "Much concern is felt in London" about this, according to the Financial Editor of the *Sunday Times*. When the price of bread went up, following Devaluation, we do not remember noticing much concern among housewives lest it should go down again.

Prevention of Cheapness and Plenty

A report of the N.F.U.'s Council gives the explanation. "As production increases, here and overseas, there are *disturbing indications* that world food markets may again be allowed to become glutted by so-called surpluses, which means that agricultural expansion policies will be threatened." To guard against the danger of cheap food the N.F.U. is taking steps towards organising what is in effect an international conspiracy of agricultural interests to keep prices up and farming subsidised. Yet, on November 9 Sir James Turner, President of the N.F.U., in a lecture entitled, "The Battle for Food," is reported

to have protested against crisis reductions in the schemes for extending electricity into the countryside. He hoped that "wiser councils" would prevail. "Failure in the battle would mean a more meagre diet than the British have so far experienced, even in two wars."

Thus American taxpayers are victimised to pay for more wheat than they desire. British consumers, by official price and quantity agreements and exchange restrictions, are denied the wheat the Americans do not want, and the benefit of a reduced price. In addition, they must pay subsidies to bribe and compel British farmers to misdirect their energies so that land which, 20 years ago, under free imports and no Marketing Schemes or regimentation, was in use, is now derelict. And this system of plunder, coercion and privilege has become so generally accepted by the victims that its advocates are able to refer in terms of sanctimonious admonishment to those who might curtail the least of their privileges in the gravest emergency. This is the topsy-turvy situation which has steadily developed since Free Trade was abandoned in 1931 and Socialist and Conservative Planners, in collaboration, set to work to improve on nature's economic forces which, so far from blind, are unerring and irresistible in their effects. And the official Liberal Party supports this madness.

Nationalising Minerals—An Example

The Report of the Mineral Development Committee, presented to Parliament in July, illustrates how the policy of nationalisation or semi-nationalisation combines with existing private interests in monopoly. The Committee proposes that a joint company representing the State and "those private interests concerned" be formed to work the potash now being explored in North Yorkshire, and later a Mineral Development Commission be set up to take over from the Central Land Board the "development rights" at present vested in that body. Apart from potash there is no general suggestion that the State should work the minerals directly, but should supervise their working through the Commission, including financial grants to private undertakings "in the national interest" and make recommendations for "amalgamations needed to ensure economic and efficient development." (Socialism's faith is pinned to amalgamation.)

The obligation to pay development rights in itself tends to keep out the small man, but unless the Commission is different from other examples, it is easy to see how all its machinery will ensure that the industrialists already in position and enjoying influence will retain all their advantages.

JOIN THE INTERNATIONAL UNION

To stimulate in all countries a public opinion favourable to permanent peace and prosperity for all peoples, through the progressive removal of the basic economic causes of poverty and war, as these causes are demonstrated in the writings of Henry George. Specifically, towards the realization of these objects, the Union favours the raising of public revenues by taxes and rates upon the value of land apart from improvements in order to secure the economic rent for the community and the abolition of taxes, tariffs, or imposts of every sort that interfere with the free production and exchange of wealth.

Membership is open to all persons, irrespective of sex, race, or nationality, who in good faith sign a written declaration of adherence to the objects of the Union, and pay a minimum annual subscription equivalent to five shillings sterling.

Write with membership fee to the Hon. Treasurer, Ashley Mitchell, 4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

LAND & LIBERTY

Published by the Land & Liberty Press, Ltd., for the Proprietors, the
United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, Ltd.
Fifty-sixth Year. Established June, 1894.

By Post 5s. per annum.

Editor: A. W. MADSEN.

Assistant Editors:

F. DUPUIS and V. H. BLONDELL.

4 GREAT SMITH STREET, LONDON, S.W.1.

Telegrams:

Enlav, Parl, London.

Telephone:

Abbey 6665.

NOVEMBER & DECEMBER, 1949

NEMESIS OF THE PLANNING ACT

The Town and Country Planning Act development charge came under the harrow in the debates on the Lands Tribunal Bill, House of Lords, May 5 and June 21, and House of Commons, May 25. In the Lords, an amendment to that Bill was carried, to give the new Lands Tribunal, besides its other duties, jurisdiction to determine the development charge on appeals made to it. The House of Commons rejected the amendment and the House of Lords did not insist on it. The development charge thus continues to be fixed by the Central Land Board, without any appeal against its decision. The following are some of the instances quoted in the Lords' debate:—

LORD HYLTON (May 5). A lady owns a small nursing home for elderly persons. Wishing to move into more convenient premises she bought a private residence for £4,700. She was told that before she could use that house as a nursing home she must pay £1,943 as a development charge, said to be based on the difference between the rent (£200) of the premises as a dwelling house and the rent (£330) as a nursing home. Then came the "higgling of the valuation," with solicitors' letters and the rest, the Central Land Board agreeing that £1,000 would be a reasonable charge. Later the Central Land Board intimated that if the lady applied for planning permission limited in time, a further reduction might be made. All this had started eight months before and the development charge was still floating about, the lady not knowing what she would ultimately pay.

By contrast, a commercial college bought two houses for £6,300 and added them to their building. For changing the use of the houses from dwelling to commercial purposes the development charge was £80.

LORD LLEWELLIN (May 5). A house was built in Selby, Yorkshire and a development charge of £144 was assessed. Another house of similar size, a farm house, was made by converting a barn at Paignton, Devon. For that "change in the use of land" the development charge was assessed at £750.

The Union Club is being turned out of its premises in Carlton House Terrace to make way for a Government department. The Club had almost agreed to purchase two private dwelling houses in Grosvenor Square when it learned that to use them as a Club would incur a development charge of £60,000. After argument with the Central Land Board the assessment of the charge was reduced to £35,000.

LORD IDDESLEIGH (June 21) spoke of having turned his stables into a small bungalow cottage. When the

development charge was originally assessed it was so high that he was near abandoning the scheme, but he negotiated with the Valuer and the charge was cut by more than half. "But," as he said, "it is certainly not worth while for the ordinary small man to employ agents. He is likely to say to himself there is no money in his particular scheme and he may as well throw away the plans."

LORD QUIBELL (June 21) instanced the case of a co-operative society which was prepared to buy at about £1 a yard, half an acre of land that had been used by a small firm for joinery manufacture. The society wanted it for a coal yard, but if they used the land for that purpose there would be a heavy development charge amounting, as Lord Quibell understood (although he was not committing himself) to about £1,400. In one corner of the land the existing owner had a small pigsty and chicken-run and the society was told the development charge would arise because of the proposed change of use from pigsty and chicken-run to coal yard.

LORD RADNOR (June 21) knew for certain of four cases where very desirable development had been dropped because the charge imposed was too great, developments by people who are not in the way of employing professional advice (to negotiate a reduction). He quoted a case of his own. He was selling a plot of land for building purposes and put a price on it for its "existing use value." When the District Valuer intimated what the development charge would be, it proved to be approximately 20 per cent. higher than he (Lord Radnor) would have charged for the whole land, including its development value. The Valuer, being interviewed, asked what price was charged for the existing use value and what would have been the total price including the development value? Then he did a small sum, subtracting the existing use value from the total value and assessing the difference as the development charge. But given that there is any sense, system or method in assessing the values as defined in this Act, how did the Valuer, expert man as he should be, arrive at his first figure?

LORD LLEWELLIN, speaking again on June 21, recounted the case of the nine and a half acres of farm land which a commercial firm in Luton wish to take over and turn into a recreation ground for the workpeople. It means putting up a few goal posts. The charge for this change of user from agriculture to a playing field was assessed at £600; but whether the firm went on with the project, buying the land and then paying that development charge in addition, was not stated.

As for the case of the Union Club and the two houses in Grosvenor Square the dispute was now at an end because it appeared that the Government had requisitioned the houses for the use of the Americans in connection with Marshall Aid. The Government cannot itself be charged and, therefore, the Exchequer has lost the £60,000 or £35,000, or whatever was to have been the development charge on these houses.

It is interesting to notice the floundering of the Attorney-General, Sir Hartley Shawcross, in the House of Commons, May 25, and of the Lord Chancellor, Viscount Jowitt, in the House of Lords, June 21, as they tried to explain away or justify the vagaries and the trimmings of some of these assessments. The Union Club got the figure of £60,000 from the Valuer over the telephone without his having the opportunity to make a formal valuation and only having regard to the price (£100,000) the Club said they proposed to pay for the houses. When

the Valuer went into further particulars and details of the premises proposed to be acquired, he made "a proper valuation" (Shawcross); when the Valuer "realised how much it was going to cost to convert these houses and make them suitable" (Jowitt) he came down to the final figure of £35,000. When the Club realised they would have to pay £35,000 in development charge they "were able to indicate" (Shawcross) to the vendors that they were not willing to pay anywhere near £100,000 as the price of the houses. The "true moral," said Shawcross, was that District Valuers are always willing to negotiate these matters. The true moral, in our view, is rather that this crude and absurd legislation, making the Central Land Board an absolute land monopolist, results in the would-be developer being charged all that the traffic will bear. If the land price is high the development charge is low, and *vice versa*. The land is not cheapened. It is as "held up" as ever against the developer and it is ludicrous to suggest that any science of valuation is being practised.

What happened in the case of the nursing home in Bath? (Jowitt) "It was a most worthy lady and a most worthy cause, and the Central Land Board were anxious to help." The Valuer's assessment had worked out at an exact figure of £1,943, but it was dishd—for "mercy's sake." The Central Land Board said, "We think there will be more cost of conversion of the premises than has been allowed for, *therefore we will make the valuation* (italics ours) £1,000." And at the same time a coach and pair was driven through this preposterous Act and its regulations. What sort of an exaction is this in which an official body can say who is worthy and who is not worthy of commiseration?

The Lord Chancellor bored more holes in the conception of the development charge as the price of the permission to change the use of land or as a difference between the land value under restriction and the land value free from restriction. "The cost of the work which has to be done before conversion," he said, "affects the value of the development charge." But that is surely nonsense. Cost of conversion is a capital expenditure which should normally bring its return in interest on the capital invested. It has nothing whatever to do with the rent of the land, and any idea to the contrary at once disposes of the development charge as a "tax on increased land values." Yet on these lines Lord Jowitt attempted to defend the contrast between the £144 charged on the house built at Selby and the £750 charged on the converted barn at Paignton. But he went further. When he was asked what would happen if building costs came down, would not the development charge go up? He was frank in saying that, "It is obvious that a man can afford to pay more for land if he can build a house for £100 than if the house is going to cost £1,000." Thus on high legal authority the Act for its sins is sentenced to death. Lord Swinton at once expressed himself as being greatly obliged to the Lord Chancellor. "One thing that is not going to happen is that the ultimate cost of building, the price of the finished article, which is what matters, will come down. Certainly other developments will be held up and surely development is being held up to-day."

In the House of Commons (May 25) the Attorney-General, Sir Hartley Shawcross, was no more happy in his defences. They collapsed completely with the lame excuse: "These regulations can be amended . . . it may be that as time goes on it will be found desirable to amend

them in order to enable the charge to be effected in accordance with the desirability of development." The murder is out. The Act is twice condemned. What developments may be permitted, what exactions will be levied on developers, rest on the boards and the officials, who themselves decide who is "worthy" and what is "desirable" in their estimation.

On November 17 there was another prolonged House of Lords debate on the Town and Country Planning Act, which we hope to report in our next issue. The examples given of the anomalies and injustices of the development charge were still more striking. The Lord Chancellor was startled into promising a full investigation and has thereby instituted an official enquiry into the operation of the Act. This is all to the good. Better still it is that the agitation has moved beyond the mere demand that the development charge, as fixed by the Central Land Board, should be subject to appeal. The demand is now for the abolition of the charge which is the right course instead of attempting to regularise a levy which in principle is wholly indefensible. The Annual Conference of the Conservative Party, in October last, carried a resolution urging the repeal of the Act. We have no illusions as to their motives nor as to any alternative they are likely to propose, but they will do a service if they get the Act swept from the Statute Book. The road will be the clearer for the wise and just solution of the land problem, which is by the Taxation and Rating of Land Values.

A. W. M.

FRANK FOX

We regret to report the death of Frank Fox, at his home, 23 Cottenham Park Road, Wimbledon, on October 18, after a short but severe illness. He was in his 73rd year and some time ago had retired from business. His long-standing association with the Henry George movement began in Warrington where, as a young man, he was one of the most active spirits in the local branch of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values. His business connections taking him later to London, he soon became a leading member of the English League and co-worker with the late Frederick Verinder, to whom he was deeply attached. Frank Fox's services to his fellow-crusaders in this cause lay in his capacity as a wise counsellor at the meetings he assiduously attended and in the encouragement he gave both by his personal sympathies and his generous financial support; for in later years, at any rate, he reserved himself from the strenuous active propaganda. He was a past president of the English League and it is as a member also of the United Committee, and for his keen interest in and support for its work, that his association will ever be remembered. His unselfish devotion to the public weal in the voluntary service the good citizen is glad to render was recognised in the Order of the British Empire that was bestowed upon him. The funeral service took place in Manchester, where he chose to rest because there the ties of kinship are greatest. Many friends travelled long distances to attend from Colchester, London, Sheffield, Glossop, Moseley and Warrington. Representatives were sent by John Knight, Ltd., Joseph Crossfield & Sons, Ltd., the Warrington Philomathic Society, the Warrington, Widnes and District Society for the Blind, and others. The Henry George movement was represented by Mrs. S. Catterall and Mr. Arthur Weller. To his widow, Mrs. Kate Fox, and to members of the family we extend our sincere sympathy in their bereavement.

NEARING THE GENERAL ELECTION

Mr. Herbert Morrison, speaking to a Labour audience, is reported to have said, *Sunday Times*, November 7, that "Labour's basic policy was simple. The country would merely have to decide (at the next election) whether the present partnership of State and industry should continue. It would be for the public to decide whether Parliament and the Government should share in the organisation of industry and planning, or whether there should be a return to the chaos of the years between the wars."

Question-begging phrases are an almost obligatory tradition of partisan rallies; but some of his audience might have noticed, after their excitement had died down, that he had not included the labouring people in the partnership. The wool scheme referred to elsewhere, and hosts of other schemes of which it is only a single example, reveals the structure of the partnership which the labouring people are asked to support under the name of "Labour." It is a partnership of State monopoly, trade monopoly and land monopoly; leading, on the one hand, to less freedom, less wealth and less access to the land, without which labour is powerless and, on the other hand, to more restrictions, more scarcities of goods, higher prices, higher rents and, above all, higher taxes. Despite all the technical inventions to increase the power of labour, and thus reduce prices, the organised pressure groups which force the Government to raise wages by decree find that even for their own members the real value of wages has not risen; and for the members of less powerful groups or those not represented by any pressure group living is becoming more difficult every day. No working man even dreams of "a home he can call his very own"; young people are lucky if their names are on the end of a list for the State-owned dwellings which are all that can now be built. The situation of the elderly on slender, fixed incomes, politically helpless and of no use to any pressure group, is a disgrace to any community which pretends to standards of humanity. And all this despite a continuous stream of humiliating alms supplied by foreign taxpayers, who show an ever-growing contempt for those who seem unable to help themselves. What if these alms should cease?

This prospect is such that our rulers do not seem anxious to turn working men's eyes towards it. The *Daily Herald*, largest organ of the Labour Party, advertises—in other newspapers—its article, "The Way Into Uncle Sam's Pocket," describing it as "a brilliant article which brings real inspiration and hope to worker, manager and salesman alike." As an alternative inspiration, labourers may listen to the exhortations of Labour Ministers to work harder and longer in factories owned by the large combines—the monopoly capitalists—whose power, as it is backed by their partners, the State, is greater than before. Although the incomes of the obviously rich are reduced by taxation, their comparative advantage remains, the full harshness of these crude efforts to redistribute income falling upon any working man who might be trying to save and invest a small amount of capital in order to achieve independence.

Political Labour, having taken over power from Conservative Governments, has, in fact, swallowed the worst principles of Conservative politics: its trade privilege, its land privilege, its tendency to deny individual right in favour of State direction. And Labour has continued and greatly developed the bureaucracy of Conservative administrations; until the labour of the people must main-

tain an army of officials, unemployed as far as production is concerned, but engaged in thwarting the efforts of genuine labourers to provide for themselves.

Mr. Morrison repeats the gibe of "chaos" concerning any period of the past in which Labour politicians were not able to direct trade and industry. And there is poetic justice in his reviving a slogan which Conservative propaganda has used so often to describe periods or conditions where the people resisted Conservative attempts to direct trade and industry to the advantage of the pressure groups which swayed their policy. And if Mr. Morrison suggests a fantastic picture of the past, which so many of the younger members of the audience are unable to check by personal recollection, we must not forget that Mr. Churchill, in his references to Free Trade England before 1914, moving slowly towards land reform, has also given a fantastic picture of political affairs which many even of his middle-aged auditors are probably unable to check. The Winston Churchill of 1909 said, "Here in England we have long enjoyed the blessings of Free Trade, but, on the other hand, we have to set against these inestimable boons a vicious and unreformed system of land tenure. In no great country in the civilised world have the working classes yet secured the advantages of both free trade and free land, by which I mean a commercial system and a land system from which, so far as possible, the element of monopoly is rigorously excluded." The Mr. Churchill of 1949, now leader of a party which has always protected the land monopoly he denounced, never gives a hint to the working classes that this was the remedy for poverty he advocated. Instead, he tells them that at that time he advocated the same remedies as Labour leaders to-day. And Mr. Morrison, who in previous years held similar language, is equally silent on the same subject. Mr. Churchill and Mr. Morrison, despite their different political labels, advocate the same principles of a partnership of State and private monopoly, and both draw distorted pictures of the past calculated to divert attention from what they then said to the working classes.

The year 1928 was midway between the two great wars, a period dominated by land monopoly and vicious taxation, just as the Western world is dominated by land monopoly and vicious taxation to-day. Although Britain was still considered "Free Trade," the false panacea of tariffs had already made deep inroads and the drug of Paternalism had started to paralyse the desire for liberation. The number of those maintained by the State for doing nothing—and called unemployed—should have touched the conscience of the nation just as those in similar circumstances to-day, and not always called unemployed, should warn us of our danger.

It was a bad and shameful time, but to call it "chaos" compared to 1949 must seem absurd to any person not blinded by partisan feeling, who can remember it. If to-morrow exchange became free; money became real; the trade gap disappeared; imports and exports gradually increased; taxes went down so much that P.A.Y.E. was abolished; prices were falling instead of rising; we were paying interest on American debt and never even contemplating asking help; and foreign relations were improving, not deteriorating—would we call this "chaos"? It would have been quite easy at that time to point to more examples of obvious poverty and squalor than appear to-day; but is it not becoming apparent that the attempt

to cure these things by pouring out public money to cover the symptoms, instead of remedying the cause, is likely to bring us into worse disaster?

It is a pity that some older members of the Party were not able to inform the younger members of his audience about Mr. Morrison's efforts on behalf of the principles advocated by that great Labour leader, Philip Snowden, a man of the people, who became Chancellor of the Exchequer and under the banner of Labour fought for labour against land monopoly, trade monopoly and the oppression of taxes on the work of men's hands and brains. He did not tell the working classes their salvation depended on working harder and longer, on paying more taxes, on ceasing to bargain in a free market for higher wages, or on submitting to the regimentation of the Paternal State. He told them that their salvation depended upon removing taxation from work, thrift, foresight, the saving and risking of unprivileged capital, and the exchange of goods. He urged them to support him in breaking land monopoly and collecting for public services the value of land which the monopolists inter-

cepted under Liberal Governments, Conservative Governments—and now intercept under a Labour Government. On the point of success, when an Act was already on the Statute Book, came an economic crisis which, starting in Protectionist America and felt worse in Protectionist-Paternalist Germany, threw the British people into a panic which enabled Snowden's Conservative opponents to save land monopoly and extend trade monopoly. And now some of Snowden's colleagues at that time, in the name of Labour, continue and extend the policy of his Conservative opponents. Snowden saw that the maladjustments of the inter-war years, and before, were due to the intervention of privilege, checking the natural harmony of economic law. Accepting the teaching of Henry George, he saw that labour could obtain its highest reward only in a community united in a partnership of justice to all and privilege to none. By regimenting the people his successors have only imposed more privileges upon those already existing, and chaos is steadily extending its influence throughout the world. Wittingly or unwittingly, Labour has betrayed Labour.

F. D. P.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AND AFTER

As a supplement to this issue we publish the French and Spanish translations of the International Conference Declaration and Resolution, for which we are indebted to Mr. A. V. Beuret and Mr. L. Ceballos respectively, colleagues both resident in London. Copies, separately printed, will be made available for any of our readers who can undertake their circulation or their publication in the Press in the countries affected, as in France, Belgium, Switzerland, Canada, Spain, Cuba, Mexico and South America. Translations into Spanish have been made also by Mr. Baldomero Argente, Madrid, and Mr. Santiago Serra, Barcelona, which were thankfully consulted by Mr. Ceballos. Other translations: To Mr. Ole Wang, in Norway, we are indebted for the Norwegian translation; to Mr. Pavlos Giannelias, in Lyon, for the Greek translation; to Mr. Robert Major, in Rome, for the Hungarian translation, and to Mr. Rupert Mason for the Chinese translation, which has been made by his friend, Mr. Hou C. Chang in San Francisco for printing in Chinese papers on the West Coast. The Danish translation will appear in *Grundskyld*, organ of the Henry George Union, and the Dutch in *Ons Erfdeel*, organ of the Justice and Freedom Union. The texts of these other translations and of the German and Italian (the latter two being prepared) can be obtained on request; but considering all the expense of printing and the necessary assurance that effective use will be made of the prints, what the International Union can do by way of undertaking publication needs careful thought. Correspondents have been approached for translations into Portuguese, for circulation in Brazil, and into Swedish, Hebrew and Esperanto. It is obvious that if the Union is to do the work so enthusiastically demanded of it by the Swanwick Conference, considerable financial aid is required, and in this we stress the special appeal that has gone to all members at the instance of the Treasurer, Mr. Ashley Mitchell, who wishes to acknowledge the ready response he has received so far.

We wish to compliment several of our contemporaries on the excellent reports they have published on the proceedings at the International Conference. Readers of the *Henry George News*, New York, had the benefit of the impressions taken home to America by the President, Mr. Rupert Mason, by Miss V. G. Peterson and

Mr. Robert Clancy. In Denmark, *Grundskyld* had Mr. Nils Ebbesen, and *Ret og Frihed* had Mr. Arge Krapper as their reporters and the account was well told. The same issue of *Grundskyld* reports the flying visit which Dr. O'Regan of New Zealand paid to Copenhagen on a journey from Sweden to England, not long before he left for home. A meeting was hurriedly arranged by the Henry George Union and was held in Parliament House, with a remarkably good attendance, considering the short notice. Dr. O'Regan gave an informing address on the progress of land-value rating in New Zealand, and there was much helpful publicity in the Copenhagen dailies.

Readers of LAND & LIBERTY are urged to help in circulating the Declaration of Principle and Policy and the Resolution on Individual and Common Rights in Land, the Message of our International Conference to people in all countries. The Declaration and the Resolution form one pamphlet of which, meeting the demand thus far, already 11,000 copies have been printed. Quantities will be provided free if effective distribution is guaranteed. Let us also assist YOU in this work by your sending name and address of the persons or associations to whom you would have the document sent, we mailing them on your behalf. In this respect the President of the Union, Mr. Rupert Mason, by the quantities he has handled and the many prominent names he has supplied, has set a notable example and he is entitled to be emulated. It has been well said that the work of the Conference did not finish with its closing session. It had only begun.

For distribution within special circles, the Resolution on Individual and Common Rights in Land has been issued as a separate print in pleasing style and carrying the signatures of the President and the Secretary of the Conference. Dr. O'Regan, the mover of the Resolution, had in mind its particular appeal directed to quarters where Henry George's attitude to property in land has been misapprehended. It is well, therefore, to have this document by itself that it may fulfil its distinct purpose.

The Conference Declaration of Principle and Policy, in translation by M. Daudé-Bancel, together with his report on Swanwick, is appearing in the *Revue Socialiste*, of

Paris. M. Daudé-Bancel's colleague, M. Gracques, has translated the excellent brochure, *Earned Income Public and Private*, by Joseph S. Thompson, which is published by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. The translation has appeared in the *Journée Vmicole*, of Montpellier, and will be reprinted in pamphlet form. In his published articles on the Land-Values and Free Trade question, M. Daudé-Bancel shows a marvellous activity. How industrious he has been, and successfully, since his return from Swanwick, is shown in the fourteen distinctive articles spread over recent issues of the *Journée du Bâtiment*, the *Journée Vmicole*, the *Agence Quotidienne*, and *La Republic*. Considering the combined circulation of these newspapers, a large public is being reached in this way. M. Daudé-Bancel's chief concern, however, is the future of the Journal of the French League, *Terre et Liberté*, which is in need of immediate financial assistance if it is to continue, and we take this opportunity of saying that headquarters of the International Union will be pleased to hear from any members who can contribute toward a special fund for the purpose.

Pavlos Giannelias who, on the Executive Committee of the International Union represents Greece and Austria, on his return from the Swanwick Conference gave a long interview to the Buenos Aires paper, *Patris*, published in the Greek language for the Greek community in the Argentine. This was transmitted by the representative of that paper, Mr. Konstantine Beys, in Lyon, France. Mr. Giannelias made an informing statement on the principles of land value taxation and free trade and their practical application, in which he pointed particularly to the example of Denmark as a guide to what Greece could and should emulate. So also he spoke of the land-value rating system in operation in New Zealand, Australia and South Africa, and the instructive lesson to be learnt from the Irrigation Districts in California. The statement is so comprehensive that it could well make a pamphlet by itself, combining in it the equally long interview which was given to *Patris* before Mr. Giannelias set out on his journey to Swanwick. Ably introduced into these talks, for the benefit of both Greek and Argentine readers, are the references to the laws of Solon by which it was ordained that land should be assessed not on what men produced from it, but on its *potential productivity*, so that Solon was truly a precursor of Henry George; and to the land and taxation system which the great reformer, Rivadavia, would have established in South America. It is good to know that this material will have an influence much farther afield, as *Patris* is sent to the Greek Embassies all over the world. Mr. Giannelias contributes also to the Athens paper, *Oikonomika Nea* (Economic Time), and has the goodwill of Dr. Emmanuel Tsouderos, the former Finance Minister and Governor of the Bank of Greece who was the Minister in London for the Greek exile Government. Dr. Tsouderos himself writes in *Economic Time* in favour of Land Value Taxation substituted for taxes and tolls on improvements and trade.

It will be seen that Mr. Giannelias has an inviting opportunity to give publicity to both Greek and Spanish translations of the Conference Resolutions.

In Switzerland, too, he has his contacts by his articles in the Swiss *Co-operator*, and his association with Dr. Melzer, the Burgomaster of Innsbruck, who has written applauding the report Mr. Giannelias sent him of the Swanwick Conference. Obviously the next step is the effectual circulation of the French and German translations of the Resolutions, perhaps also the Italian, in Switzerland.

CONFERENCE PAPERS ON SALE

THE COMPLETE SET IN SPECIALLY PRINTED
WALLET—TEN SHILLINGS POST FREE.

Individual numbers may be had at the prices quoted. Add 2d. postage for each shilling's worth or fraction thereof.

- | | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| | Declaration of Principle and Policy and Resolution on Individual and Common Rights in Land | 3d. |
| | Constitution of the International Union and list of Officers | 3d. |
| No. 1. | Can International Trade Problems be solved Internationally? By Hon. Bue Björner | 6d. |
| No. 2. | Message from E. J. Craigie, past President of the International Union ... | 6d. |
| No. 3. | Practical Statesmanship for Great Britain. By Frank Dupuis | 6d. |
| No. 4. | Land-Value Taxation in Denmark. By K. J. Kristensen | 6d. |
| No. 5. | The Future of Georgeism in France and Belgium. By A. Daudé-Bancel and Marcel Cortvriend | 6d. |
| No. 6. | Land Reclamation and Land Tenure in California. By J. Rupert Mason ... | 6d. |
| No. 7. | The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, New York. By Miss V. G. Peterson ... | 6d. |
| No. 8. | The Henry George School of Social Science in the U.S.A. By Robert Clancy | 6d. |
| No. 9. | Capitalism: Its Conception, Origin and Basis. By Baldomero Argente ... | 6d. |
| No. 10. | False Land Reforms in Eastern Europe and in Italy. By Robert Major ... | 6d. |
| No. 11. | A Social Democrat's Tribute to Henry George. By Hon. K. K. Steincke, Chairman of the Danish Upper House of Parliament | 6d. |
| No. 12. | The Need for Co-ordination and Dissemination of Information on a World Scale. By Miss Margaret E. Bateman | 6d. |
| No. 13. | Starting Anew in Germany. By Rudolf Schmidt | 6d. |
| No. 14. | Land Values and Local Taxation: the Exemption of Buildings and Improvements | 6d. |
| No. 15. | The Operation of Land-Value Rating in Various Countries
(Papers Nos. 14 and 15, being texts of Evidence submitted to the Government's Site-Value Rating Enquiry.) | 1s. |
| No. 16. | A Lonely Campaigner in Tangier. By Louis Hirschfeld | 6d. |
| No. 17. | The History of Land-Taxation in Denmark. By Hon. Viggo Starcke ... | 6d. |

The Pamphlet containing the Declaration of Principle and the Resolution on Individual and Common Rights in Land is offered FREE to those who will guarantee effective distribution in appropriate quarters. The PRECISE QUANTITY so wanted should be stated.

THE INTERNATIONAL UNION,
4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1.

"COLONIAL DEVELOPMENT" IN THE RAW

The first Annual Report of the Overseas Food Corporation, to March 31, 1949, is a startling record which would have appeared fantastic to the British public before the abandonment of Free Trade by all the main organs of opinion revolutionised conceptions of human rights and the sphere of State action. It affords abundant material for the Government's critics, but these partisan exchanges should not blind us to the fact that once the principle of Protection (that most misleading title) has been accepted such ventures as the Ground Nut Scheme are only a logical development of efforts to divert trade into artificial channels.

The Ground Nut Scheme, started at the end of 1946, is only the first project regularised by the Overseas Development Act of February, 1948. This Act empowered the Government to devote public money to undertaking agricultural projects outside the United Kingdom, especially in the Colonies. It was based on the assumption that unprivileged private enterprise operating within a free market cannot secure the greatest advantage of the British and Colonial peoples, and this assumption and the policy it entails remains an essential part of the Conservative Party's programme. Indeed, during the debate on the Scheme, in Parliament, on July 27, when most of the substance of the Report was already known, Conservative speakers seemed at pains to repudiate the suggestion that if they came into power they would abandon the Ground Nut Scheme. Liberal members, with the noteworthy exception of Mr. Hopkin Morris, voted in favour of it. Labour speakers contended that at every stage the Government acted on the advice of the most qualified experts available and the Report confirms this. They contended also that even if this scheme had been undertaken by a private firm the owners would have had to take risks and be content with a future not an immediate return. No Opposition speaker pointed out that no Government has the right to take risks with public money and although private people have every right to risk their own money they are likely to take far greater precautions against wasting wealth than anyone experimenting with the wealth of others.

The Ground Nut Scheme appears to have been originally conceived by the manager of a private company in Africa. One might ask why he did not persuade his own shareholders to undertake it. He estimated that by using mechanical contrivances in a manner and on a scale never before employed, for a capital expenditure of £8,000,000, two-and-a-half million acres could be cleared and planted and thereafter 400,000 tons of shelled nuts could be produced annually at a cost of £7 13s. 2d. per ton in Africa. To quote the Report: "The plan was received with profound interest" by the Government in March, 1946. An official mission under Mr. A. J. Wakefield, after visiting Africa, reported in September recommending its immediate adoption. They estimated 150,000 acres cleared and planted in 1947 and 450,000 in the following year; with a harvest of 56,920 tons in 1948 and 227,676 tons in 1949, leading up to 3½ million acres by 1952 and 600,000 tons of shelled nuts annually. But they estimated the cost per ton at £14 5s. 6d., and the capital expenditure (by 1952) at £24 millions. The European staff was to be 160.

The Government, after submitting the Wakefield Report to many officials and experts, decided to proceed immediately with the scheme, and afterwards, in February,

1947, published a White Paper stating it was "practicable, agriculturally sound and involved no unjustifiable financial risk."

It is unnecessary to recapitulate the Report's 150-page record of failure and disappointment. By March 31, 1949, over £23 millions had been spent, only £9 millions of this representing fixed assets, and it is estimated by Mr. Strachey in Parliament that £50. million capital expenditure alone will be necessary. Expenditure is proceeding at the rate of £1 million per month. The acreage planted at the end of March is given as 46,267, only 25,105 of this to groundnuts. The crop harvested was 1,561 tons of *unshelled* groundnuts, all of which is retained for seed. Thus, after two years £23 millions have been spent, the practical return is nothing, and future expenditure is a guess. But "valuable experience has been gained" and the Board has "ordered that the logistics of large-scale development in the year 1950-51 should be re-studied." The office furniture, of £450,296, and the staff of 1,200 Europeans, 232 of them in the London office, should facilitate this re-study. The average salary and expenses of the European staff, as far as one can discover from the Report, works out at £1,000 per annum and only a small proportion appear to be actually engaged in agriculture.

A reputable firm of chartered accountants, in presenting the Balance Sheet, states: "We are unable to report that proper books of account have been kept by the Corporation and that we have obtained all the information necessary for the purposes of our audit because proper records of expenditure were not maintained and there have been many instances where documents have not been produced to us."

It is evident that only a very small proportion of the £23 million has found its way into the hands of African labourers. The Corporation claims to pay wages "in line with those paid by leading commercial concerns" and, judging by statements in Parliamentary debates, these are higher than wages paid by the sisal estates. But those who doubt whether the perfection of human felicity consists in being employed by a big corporation at a "standard of living" determined by authority will not be reassured by some passages in the Report, especially if these doubters have had practical experience of comparing some of the Banthu people living as their own masters under conditions they have evolved themselves, with the same race detribalised, serving European masters and reduced to aping their outward manners and standards. The Corporation deplored the lack of "machinery for wage fixing," so that wages could not be standardised in the remote interior at the same rate as in the neighbourhood of Dar-es-Salaam. Africans tend to change their employment when they want to and, instead of "making a career," prefer to cultivate their own holdings, where they can "maintain their standard of living and pay their taxes *without having to work*." (To work on your own business does not count as "work," apparently, although it is admitted the African, besides producing enough for his family's immediate requirements, produces a surplus for sale.) The African also prefers to bargain for wages on the spot instead of trusting to official machinery. Worst of all, he tends to move always "in search of the maximum wage for the minimum of work." In fact, the African seeks to satisfy his desires by the least exertion, but has not yet learned how to do so at the expense of others.

The Corporation, in pursuit of its aim to "provide an outlet for the ambitious and capable African" and "give him the opportunity of participating in the organisation of his life," has set up machinery "whereby tribal laws and customs can be replaced by a new civil and communal responsibility." In other words, British taxpayers' money is being used to foster the growth of a traditionless African proletariat ripe to be influenced by leaders seeking power. This impression is confirmed by statements made in Parliament during the July debate by Mr. John Hynd, Labour Member for Sheffield, who seems exceptionally well informed on the Scheme, which, he says, is to, "provide a new basis of economy for Tanganyika, Kenya, and the other territories." And this certainly does not contemplate "letting the Africans continue to live on the same old basis." "It is estimated that an African producer, after providing for his own subsistence, would produce 15 cwt. of groundnuts, whereas under this Scheme he is in a position to produce 20 tons of groundnuts in addition to his food." After the experience of the Corporation's own estimates, such a plea to interfere with the lives of others takes one's breath away. One passage in the Report concerning the selection of seed, after experiment, in the Urambo Region, is apt: "*Asiriya Mavitunde*, a variety grown with some success by local Africans, has been selected for future planting."

The Corporation, despite its great expenditure on research, is thus obliged to pay some deference to the African private enterprise its sponsors disparage. But the policy of discouraging peasant proprietorship is already taking effective shape in ways none the less effective because they are likely to be overlooked. The Tanganyika native pays annually a Poll Tax, originally a Hut Tax and, as any visitor can verify, each family seldom occupies more than 3 or 4 acres of land. As this Poll Tax is uniform over vast districts it is absurd to give the impression (*vide* Mr. Creech Jones in Parliament, October 26) that it is analogous to Income Tax. Few families, we believe, pay less than ten shillings and the effect must be to force those in the remoter parts of the district to go long distances to work for big concerns. Assuming a minimum of ten shillings, this Poll Tax is equivalent to a rent of 250-330 cents per acre, and as costs of government increase it is almost certain to rise. The Corporation has a tentative agreement with the Tanganyika Government for a 33-years renewable lease at 5 cents per acre. This is one-fiftieth of the African peasant's rent. The number of natives dispossessed in favour of the Corporation is stated to be "small," but the policy of rent discrimination, unobtrusively developed, could be used very effectively to dispossess them indirectly and thus cure any "labour shortage." As the big planting companies always suffer from labour shortage, their representatives are not likely to bring to public notice a development which would result in their advantage also.

The Corporation, in its Report, pays an unwitting tribute to free enterprise when, after an unhappy experience as retail trader, it decided to transfer ownership of all its shops to private traders. It is now "encouraging competition and discouraging any attempts at monopoly," and inviting shopkeepers to open new shops "where they are found to be necessary." Presumably the Corporation decides where they are necessary. If so, this is restriction. The customers themselves should be left to decide where shops are necessary. This can be done without any elaborate machinery to enable them "to participate in the organisa-

tion of their lives." The Corporation has merely to offer shop sites where traders are willing to pay rent for them, and take the best offer. Thus all the risk is left to the enterpriser, no enterpriser is favoured or handicapped more than another, and the general community (in this case represented by the Corporation) instead of having to tax any of its members individually, receives an easily-collected revenue which can be offset against necessary public expenditure. The Corporation has found private enterprise the best purveyor to its own people of retail goods; by assuring that all retailers have an equal opportunity to use sites, private enterprise may be purged of the element of monopoly which has brought it into disrepute. Unfortunately, the Corporation, by its privileged leases in Africa and the $\frac{1}{2}$ million acres of "largely freehold" land which it is buying in Queensland, is itself in the position of land monopolist, and a payer of public money to land monopolists.

It might be contended that as the number of Africans evicted to make way for the Corporation was small, therefore most of the land it now occupies could have little value. But this contention assumes that land rent should be properly assessed and paid to public authority. It points to the necessity for a total reform of the Tanganyika land laws. It is absurd that an African in the remote interior should have to pay the same hut tax as one nearer the centres of population and commercial activity. Each holder of land, African and non-African, should be obliged to pay on the value of land he occupies, apart from improvements, and whether he puts it to its best use or not.

All would then be on equal terms, apart from subsidies from the British taxpayer. If Mr. Hynd's estimate of an African being unable at any time to produce more than 15 cwt. of groundnuts as his own master, but 20 tons as an employee is true, then the peasant proprietor could not monopolise land which the Corporation could use more effectively. But the present writer, from considerable experience of Africa, is confident that under a sound land system the African would not have much to fear from others competing on equal terms and enjoying no subsidy. The wasteful, semi-communal land system at present in operation, virtually preventing long individual tenure, is probably the greatest factor not only in limiting production and investment of capital, but also in fostering that characteristic lack of foresight which so often nullifies the African's intelligence and skill.

To apply the taxation of land values immediately to all East Africa would not be practicable, but a beginning could be made in the more closely settled and developed districts and in others an adjustment of the hut tax, village by village, could be carried out. This incentive to the best use of land would be reflected inevitably in increased production of goods for which the British (and other) people were prepared to pay market price. Instead of breaking up the African's way of life it would enable him to develop in his own way and respecting his own traditions; and it would provide the basis for a society of peasant proprietors cherishing their own property and loyal to a government which secured them in its possession.

And it would not cost the British taxpayer one penny.

F. D. P.

The above was written before the Ground Nut Scheme was debated in Parliament on November 21. Since, according to reports, that debate did not bear on the principles and points emphasised in the article no change has been made in it.

MR. ASHLEY MITCHELL IN CANADA AND U.S.A.

By a fortunate coincidence Mr. Ashley Mitchell, Treasurer of the International Union, was due to make a business visit to America soon after the Conference at Swanwick. He arrived in New York on October 1 and left almost immediately for Montreal, thence via Winnipeg and Calgary to Vancouver. After turning south to California he returned via Chicago to New York, leaving that city by air on November 11 in time to attend a meeting of the United Committee in London on the following day and give members a fresh and vivid account of his meeting with so many friends in the International movement. By chance another member present, Dr. A. R. Lee, had also recently returned from America and was able to confirm some of Mr. Mitchell's impressions.

From Montreal, where Mr. Mitchell stayed for a week, he found time to address a meeting of the Ottawa group at the home of Mr. Herbert Barber, Messrs. Owens and Code being among those who attended. He also met G. R. Donovan, W. Halls, Arthur and Ernest Farmer, and others in Toronto, where a group is being re-formed. In Montreal Miss Strehel Walton arranged a goodly gathering of supporters, presided over by Mr. James, to learn from Mr. Mitchell of the success and encouragement of the Swanwick Conference. There Mr. Turner and Mr. Boelens were present. At the home of Mr. and Mrs. Woodward in Vancouver he met other friends of the movement in Western Canada, including the veteran, Mr. Peddie, Mr. Simmons and Roy Hollins, son of Mr. and Mrs. H. H. Hollins, who were at Swanwick.

In California the energy and inspiration of Rupert Mason, President of the International Union, ably assisted by Joseph Thompson and Robert Tideman, was apparent in the arrangements for Mr. Mitchell's reception. On October 25 he addressed an important luncheon meeting, at which Mr. Thompson presided, at the Bohemian Club of San Francisco. Henry George was one of the founders of that club. Many of the leading citizens attended and from correspondents we learn of the profound interest with which the audience followed Mr. Mitchell's review of England's experience of Socialism and his indication of the only alternative. On the following day, at a luncheon of the Immigration Section of the Commonwealth Club, he was unexpectedly called upon to speak. From correspondents also we learn of the impression created even by a brief impromptu address. At the Henry George School in Los Angeles, of which Mr. Bill Truehart is the Director, Mr. Mitchell noticed the enthusiastic ingenuity of the teachers who have evolved a method of illustrating economic law by working models exhibited by H. T. Bode, another striking example of a veteran busy spreading the truth of the younger generation.

In Chicago, under the inspiration of John Lawrence Monroe, Mr. Mitchell was impressed by the progress of the School and Group. Denied the medium of political action, the movement in Chicago has directed much of its efforts to persuading business men of the danger to themselves unless they awaken to the urgency of promoting the only alternative to the influences which throughout the world threaten all freedom of enterprise. At a large Commerce and Industry luncheon meeting, attended by leading personalities in business, Mr. Mitchell was able to drive this lesson home. Among old friends present were Henry and George Tideman, Judge Korshak, Jerome Joachim and George Strachan.

In New York, although the movement for some time past has tended rather to confine itself to the educational sphere, the enthusiasm of members to make practical contribution to public affairs cannot be restrained and is expressing itself through the S.A.G.E. organisation, the Society for the Advancement of Georgeist Economics. This organisation arranged a gathering, attended not only by Georgeists but also by others interested in the deeper aspects of social affairs. One of the appreciative letters received is from Miss Alice Davis, Editor of the *Henry George News*, in which she referred to the enthusiastic remarks following Mr. Mitchell's talk. Dr. Ashner, the physician, said it was very unusual in New York to find a group of "intellectuals" who were not Left Wing! Another guest went about the whole week telling of her experience, which she said was the most thrilling intellectually since she came to New York.

Mr. Mitchell noticed to what a surprising extent England was still considered to be a leader in social thought. So long does the influence of the great Free Trade leadership with all its associations of advancing civilisation and tolerant humanity endure. Even the bad example which Britain has now set is for that reason not appreciated as the warning it should be. British members of the International Union will be pleased to know that Mr. Mitchell's visit has done something to check this danger as well as to strengthen the link which is binding together the uncompromising lovers of fundamental liberty in a world-wide organisation which they hope will in the not so distant future lead the revival against Collectivist illusions.

F. D. P.

"PLANNING IN PRACTICE"

Leading Article in THE TIMES, November 7

Six experts, none of them hostile to planning, record in the current issue of the *Journal* of the Town Planning Institute their views on the first year's experience of the Planning Acts of 1947. None is more than cautiously optimistic.

A well-known county planning officer states that "the Act is not working and is highly unpopular even with many persons who are not against planning in principle."

A Scottish expert holds that, "In drawing up the code for planning, too little has been left to the discretion of the public or their representatives and an attempt has been made . . . to prepare a meticulously detailed set of rules and regulations which are cumbersome and for the most part incomprehensible. . . . There is far too much work for far too few planners."

A surveyor states bluntly that "the great 'governing principle,' namely, that land should be 'freely and readily sold at its existing use value' . . . in practice is proving a paper fantasy and the merest wishful thinking."

Though there is hopefulness about the progress of surveys and local development schemes, there is also agreement that planning staffs are swamped by the voluminous daily routine inseparable from the detailed regulation of building and land use, and that this burden of immediate decisions as to what particular citizens may or may not do with their property is hampering the planning authorities' fundamental task—that of determining what kind of communities they want to have. The severest criticisms are reserved for the "compensation and betterment" sections of the Act.

All seem to agree that Mr. Silkin's development rights scheme . . . is not achieving most of the desired results.

It has enabled local authorities to forbid development they dislike, but in all kinds of ways is hampering development which they would approve.

"Here," states one writer, "we have a situation adequately provided for by the authors of the Act, if only everybody would play according to the rules, but which has developed into an impasse because many owners of land and many local authorities think the rules are unfair."

Another writer asserts that "liability for payment of development charge is at the moment being evaded in many cases. . . . A considerable staff is required in order to check not only that development which is being undertaken has had planning approval, but also to ensure that conditions imposed in consents are actually being complied with."

The general impression given by the review is that the development rights scheme runs the risk of breaking down completely, and the constructive parts of the Acts, which enable local authorities to determine the future design and character of their communities, have a chance of succeeding only if planning can be simplified, conducted with imagination, and promoted in such a way as to carry public opinion with it.

Already there is sufficient presumptive evidence of deficiencies in the working of the new planning system to justify a searching inquiry into its effects and costs.

WATER POLICY IN CALIFORNIA

On October 5, the Commonwealth Club of California received from its Section on Agriculture, and will shortly print, its report on *Fundamental Principles Underlying a Water Policy for the State of California*. The following passage occurs:—

"The problem in this case would be how land-owners can be induced to develop their lands fully. Practically, this can be achieved through taxation by assessing the land for its share of the project costs regardless of whether or not the owner buys water. This will either induce landowners to develop their land, or sell or lease it to someone who will. In this way speculation can be avoided and, in addition, project costs could be spread more effectively and maximum economic development obtained more quickly and more smoothly. This type of taxation can be applied through Irrigation Districts.

"In the Section-discussion of the above principles it was argued that the overall objective of the development of our water resources is to permit maximum use by our present and future population; that the question is fundamental as to whether there shall be restrictions that may interfere with such development; that the restrictions imposed by the government do away with the liberty of the small farmer who wants to increase his activity and of the large farmer who wants to retain his holdings; that we should not use the (federal) reclamation laws to achieve family size farms; and that the opportunity for unearned increment of land values can be abolished through the traditional and constitutional means of assessing all land under the project, irrespective of improvements, for the cost of the project."

The vote of Club members composing the Section on Agriculture, on this recommendation in the Report was 42 Yes and only 2 No.

The Commonwealth Club of California has some 7,000 members, to all of whom this printed report will be mailed,

and copies of it may be bought by anybody at 25 cents. The Club offices are in the Hotel St. Francis, San Francisco 19, Cal. It is a long and interesting report, with many passages consistent with the portion quoted above. These reports also go to leading libraries, universities, etc., and are also frequently referred to by legislative and judicial bodies.

The Commonwealth Club Secretary has posted on the Club Bulletin Board the list of the officers and Executive of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade. There it stood for three weeks, the longest time any notice was left on that board.

JAMAICA

The People's National Party, which is led by Mr. Norman W. Manley, in its "Plan for To-day," which was issued in 1940, made the following Declaration:—

The chief source of production in Jamaica is land. But the best land in the country is in the hands of a few persons. In fact, just over a thousand persons and companies own nearly half the land of the country—and at that the best land—and much of that land is unused or badly used because the owners have not got the money to use and develop it properly and they cannot get the money because the lenders of money are afraid they will lose it if they lend it to them.

Meanwhile, there are thousands of workers who want land and who can work on the land and make it pay. Obviously, therefore, the land must be made available to these workers and one way to do it is to levy a tax on the unimproved value of land—that is, to tax the landowner to the full rental value of the land, whether it is used or not. The result will be that the owner will be forced either to cultivate the land or to get rid of it. If he gets rid of it the worker will get land and work.

Another point about the system is this. At present, if a man has land and puts it to use by building a house or cultivating it, or so forth, the more he builds and develops, the more he is taxed. In other words, he is taxed for putting the land to use. Under the system of taxing the land on its unimproved value the man who is industrious and enterprising will not be penalised for his industry and enterprise, but the man who holds land and makes no use of it, but is merely keeping the land idle and waiting for it to increase in value will find that he is made to pay for doing so.

A later Manifesto, now in circulation, entitled "P.N.P.'s Policy for Land," prints the foregoing on the end page, but in the body of the new statement, the proposal for Land Value Taxation is given a subordinate place, and only in a few lines, preceded by much else that is in direct contradiction with the principles on which Land Value Taxation is based. Thus there is an appeal for "The control of all exports of agricultural products linked up with import regulation"; "in the absence of import regulation local industries and local production will both suffer"; there should be "power to survey the needs of the people and to acquire land to satisfy those needs"; "power to take over all lands that are not being used or are being used wastefully"; "power to pay for lands taken over by the issue of Government bonds at a fair valuation"; the "provision of credits for land purchase and development."

It is unfortunate that those who, in 1940, stated and saw the beneficial effects of Land Value Taxation in breaking up the land monopoly and bringing about the cheapening of land and its good and adequate use, should have been moved or influenced to resort to plans that call for restrictive practices, for conferring privilege through trade controls; for arbitrary regimentation of controls; and last, but not least, for spending the public treasure on

buying from land monopolists the access to land which is by right equally open to all. In other words, the fiscal machinery of the Government would be used to steal the wages of the workers to compensate the rent-receivers and give the latter, as bondholders of public debt, a perpetual lien upon the wealth of the Island which they do nothing whatever to produce. It may be—such are politics even in Jamaica—that for the sake of “unity” there must be some concession to the Socialist and, therefore, also the Protectionist and “economic planning” element in the Party. If so, it could only be excused if the playing to the gallery came at the end of the document, as something to be considered *supposing that Land Value Taxation did not provide the relief and did not liberate the land for the people as the 1940 declaration so confidently affirmed*. But there cannot be any such supposition and the thing to do now is to put the demand for Land Value Taxation once more in the forefront where it was before. Obviously, unless Land Value Taxation is made the first step and is sufficiently applied, there can be no surcease of the Island's misery.

It is now more than five years since a Government Commission, appointed by the Governor, Sir John Huggins, issued its report, which recommended in favour of Land Value Taxation; and it was only in May, 1949, that the *Crown Colonist* was able to report that “legislation is being prepared to introduce land taxation on unimproved value.” In 1948 advertisements appeared in papers in this country and in Australia and New Zealand offering the post of Valuation Commissioner in Jamaica, qualifications required being “considerable experience of the practical administration of a system of taxation based on ‘unimproved value’.” Later it was announced that the post had been given to Mr. L. C. Harris, Chartered Surveyor, formerly valuer to the Borough of Kingston, in Surrey, England. But as the necessary legislation has not yet been enacted, Mr. Harris can hardly have begun his work. The position is obscure and we wait upon private advices which may help to clarify it. But in all the intervening time there was surely a chance for the People's National Party to press all they knew for the carrying out of the recommendations so admirably and so emphatically contained in the Report of the 1944 Government Commission.

HENRY EDGCUMBE

In the death of Henry Edgcumbe, of Wimbledon, on October 29, the Henry George movement has lost a most zealous and loyal supporter. In his enthusiastic belief, he saw in it a way out of our economic difficulties and it was a subject very near his heart. In his quiet unobtrusive way he worked for it. He took the Christian approach to the righteousness of equal freedom and equal opportunity and of the “Earth for all,” as he did to every other interest in life. He caused his own leaflets to be printed, always carrying a few about with him and leaving them where there was a possibility of their meeting the eye of a stranger—such as by insertion in a library book, or a hymn book, and by placing them on the seats of any public meeting he attended. Among the Committee meetings of fellow-workers in London, those of the Liberal Liberty League gave him particular joy and it was a great disappointment to him that illness latterly kept him at home. His kindly and genial presence will be greatly missed. To his widow and his daughters and son, and to the family circle, we extend our sincere sympathy in their bereavement.

THE CENTRAL LAND BOARD

The Report of the Central Land Board for the period to March 31, 1949, has been published, price 4d., as White Paper, No. 223, and is available from H.M. Stationery Office. Appended tables give figures analysing the receipts from the development charge, but since then, a question in the House of Commons, November 1, elicited the information that to the end of September, £1,525,000 had been paid in respect of development charge and a further £1,530,000 had been determined and set off against claims on the £300,000,000 compensation fund which is to be distributed to landowners some time in 1953. This “setting off” of the development charge affects those privileged interests—and the Act is shot through with such concessions—which are to have a prior claim on the £300,000,000 so that they get as much out of that fund as the amount of their liability for the development charge. Borne in mind should also be the owners of the “dead ripe land,” as the Act defines it—virtually the land which provides the most notorious examples of land speculation, land of high value, standing vacant and completely exempted from either local or State taxation (other than death duties). The owners of it are in a special category, having no claim on the £300,000,000 nor being subject to the development charge. They are in the same privileged position as they ever were—the appropriators *in full* of the land value and assured of the monopoly price. A question was asked in the House of Commons on May 17 as to how many had made claims that their land was “dead ripe” (by which they would be entitled to pocket all this land value to themselves). The answer was 13,785 in England and Wales and 246 in Scotland, the latter covering 903 acres, but the acreage in England and Wales could not be stated.

The resignation of Sir Malcolm Trustram Eve from the chairmanship of the Central Land Board and of the War Damage Commission was announced on September 20. Sir Thomas Phillips has been appointed Chairman in his place. Sir Robert Fraser, who was secretary of these two bodies, has now been made a member, and has been appointed Deputy Chairman of the Board. In a published letter to the Presidents of the Surveyors' Institution, the Auctioneers' and Estate Agents' Institute, the Institute of British Architects and the Federation of Building Trades Employers, Sir Malcolm Eve referred to his position as Chairman of the War Damage Commission since 1941 and Chairman of the Central Land Board since November, 1947. Knowing that the administration of “compensation” legislation was a burden which no one could carry indefinitely, he had accepted the latter office on the understanding he would be free to tender his resignation after two years if he wished to do so. He had thus been faced with the alternative of continuing in public service until he was too old for anything else or now cutting adrift into another sphere. He had chosen the latter, although he did not yet know what the other sphere would be. He closed with tribute paid to the help and goodwill the Board and the Commission had received from the bodies he was writing to, without whose generous co-operation his work must have been rendered impossible.

The members of the Central Land Board, which is the supreme authority in control of the valuations required under the Town and Country Planning Act, appear none of them to be professionally trained in that special field. They are: Sir Thomas Phillips, until recently Secretary to the Ministry of National Insurance and formerly Secretary to the Ministry of Labour; Sir Robert Fraser, before occupying his present offices, was Secretary to the Scottish Board of Health, 1939-43, and principal Secretary to the Treasury, 1934-39; Dame Myra Curtis, the Principal of Newnham College; Sir Luke Fawcett, Secretary of the Building Employees' Trade Union; Sir Basil Gibson, one-time Town Clerk of Sheffield; Mr. J. R. Philip, K.C., a member of the legal profession; Mr. A. MacDonald, one-time general manager of an insurance company, and Mr. J. R. Rutherford, who has spent his life in Scottish local government.

A Free Copy of “Land & Liberty” is an invitation to become a subscriber. Monthly, 6d. By post, 5s. a year; U.S.A. and Canada, \$1.

SUGAR UNDER PROTECTION—By George Winder

(With acknowledgments to the "Free Trader," September—October, 1949, and the Author.)

War spawns innumerable customs tariffs. Among the most notable of these are the duties against sugar, which have long existed in most of the States of Europe.

During the Napoleonic wars, when Nelson's fleet was blockading the mainland, the Frenchmen discovered that, with difficulty, sugar could be obtained in commercial quantities from the humble beet. This war-time expedient, with the aid of heavy protective duties against the produce of the sugar cane, has become, in times of peace, the principal source of sugar in France, Germany and in most of the smaller countries of Europe.

Great Britain was more fortunate. She continued to obtain her sugar inexpensively, chiefly from the cane grown in her Colonies.

LORD SAMUEL'S CONCLUSION

The first Great War and the events of the earlier years of the armistice caused her to follow the European example and to protect a home sugar beet industry. The cost of that protection was long ago revealed by Sir Herbert (now Viscount) Samuel in a superbly illuminating article on "Beet Sugar and the British Taxpayer" in the *Nineteenth Century and After* for August, 1931 (pages 153-163). Sir Herbert demonstrated in the year 1929-30 the value of the sugar grown in Great Britain at world prices was £4,389,000 and that the assistance given by the Government towards growing this sugar amounted to £7,830,000. This was equivalent to a grant of £22 9s. for every acre of land under sugar beet. It also represented a sum of £400 for every man employed in the industry.

Much water has flowed under Westminster Bridge since Lord Samuel wrote this famous exposure, but the sugar beet industry is still highly protected and subsidised, costing fully as much to-day as then. The cost, however, is a little more difficult to elucidate as bulk buying obscures the true position.

"DEFICIENCY" PAYMENTS

Last year the price paid to the refiners was 4.94 pence per lb., a price which, being well above world parity, conceals a very large subsidy. The price, however, was insufficient to cover the costs and profits of the industry, and so at the end of the year the Government gave an additional "deficiency" payment of £3,441,756. Over the past ten years this "deficiency" payment has averaged £3,222,000 per year.

The total cost of these two forms of subsidy require a full knowledge of overseas prices to ascertain exactly, but part of the cost is reflected in the price paid for sugar by our confectionery manufacturers. This is 54s. 6d. per cwt., against the world price of 34s. For the important by-product, glucose, it is 65s., against a world price of 27s.

Confectionery was once a very important export of Great Britain, but it is naturally greatly handicapped by such an unfair imposition placed upon its raw material for the benefit of another section of industry. The sugar industry claims to save us dollars. There is little doubt that, owing to the injury to our exports, it is losing them.

COST TO THE PUBLIC

As far as the British public is concerned, the cost of protecting the sugar industry is concealed by a series of

controlled prices which appear to be based not on value but on use. The housewife, for example, pays 5d. per pound for sugar, while the bee-keeper pays 7½d. In the long run, of course, the money the housewife saves in the shop is paid by her husband in taxation.

With the Government as the sole first buyer of all food, customs tariffs have lost their full significance. Protection can be given in the price paid by the Ministry of Food to the local producers. However, when bulk buying ends, as we hope it will, customs tariffs are still in existence to fulfil the protective function at present exercised by the Minister. Meanwhile, they bring to the Exchequer some £7,000,000 a year, for, in any case, three-quarters of the sugar we consume must be imported.

The sugar duties mark a step in our Imperial policy which should make them particularly obnoxious to those who believe in the future of the British Commonwealth and Empire. The Import Duties Act of 1932 will never be praised by any Free Trader, but it has one redeeming feature. With very few exceptions it does not in the main impose tariffs against the products of our fellow British subjects beyond the seas.

In our Dominions, Imperial Preference has invariably meant protective tariffs against the Empire, their disastrous consequences being hidden by a still higher duty against the foreigner. Great Britain has done more to save the economic unity of the Empire by refraining from indulging in this perverted form of patriotism than by any other single act.

AGAINST THE EMPIRE

The outstanding exception to this British policy is the sugar duty. This has been directed not only against the foreigner but against the Empire. It has been imposed in spite of the submissions made to the Imperial Parliament by the Legislatures of Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados and the Leeward Islands. As in most cases of Imperial Preference, the harm done to the Empire by the protective duty is far greater than any benefit derived from the preference.

The historian of the future will look upon the breaking-up of the economic unity of the Empire by tariff barriers (all erected under the cloak of Imperial Preference) as one of the outstanding disasters of history. Great Britain, however, in largely refraining from this Empire-breaking policy, is indefinitely delaying the final dissolution. None the less, the sugar duties constitute a most dangerous exception to this policy.

For the purposes of these duties the Empire is divided into two parts. One comprises the Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated Territories to which Section II of the Finance Act of 1932 applies; the other, the balance of the Empire.

Against the first we demand a duty on sugar which rises according to its polarisation from 8s. to 17s. 6d. per cwt. Against the second a duty ranging from 6s. to 14s. per cwt. is imposed. Against the foreigner the duty ranges from 10s. to 23s. These duties, when the world price for sugar is low, amount to more than 100 per cent.

ENGLISH COOLIE-LABOUR

One of the arguments often used against Free Trade is that it subjects the Englishman to competition with coolie labour. Strange to say, this competition exists in England

only in the case of the sugar industry and is itself the result of protection! Sugar beet growing still belongs largely to the era of the hoe, and the hardest, most monotonous and most coolie-like occupation in Great Britain is sugar beet hoeing. In spite of this back-breaking toil, the hoer does not produce enough wealth to support himself and his family and must be subsidised in his efforts by the State.

Owing to these subsidies we see the sugar beet fields in East Anglia, but we do not see the fields of grain or mangolds which would exist had Government assistance for sugar beet growing not been forthcoming! Nor do we see the workers in the factories who would be employed producing goods to send to Jamaica, Trinidad, Barbados and the Leeward Islands to pay for a plentiful supply of cheap sugar!

It is strange that this industry is among those threatened with nationalisation. The industry is not an asset to be nationalised but a liability to be liquidated. Nationalisation would only tie this liability more tightly round the necks of the people of Great Britain. The sugar refining industry appears to be extremely well managed. Management costs work out at less than one farthing per pound of sugar. When we recall that the cost of protecting the industry is probably ten times that amount, we can see at once that the enemy of the worker is not free enterprise but its negation, bulk buying and protection.

AN EX-SOCIALIST'S AWAKENING

Extract of letter appearing in the "Daily Telegraph," October 28, which is printed here with due acknowledgment to the newspaper and its correspondent.

"Sir,—I am a 'key' mechanic employed by the London electricity supply industry. During 40 years in this industry I have been an active supporter of the Labour Party, a trade unionist, and a shop steward. I have put in much hard work during my life to carry my Socialist theory into effect.

"As a practical man I cannot be blind to the rather obvious fact that, as a manufacturing country, we must run our industry efficiently or go under. That we are now in danger of going under is, I fear, also evident, and I believe that the cause is the elimination of the 'Third Power,' as represented in the past by the hated 'capitalist' acting through his directors.

"In bygone days this over-riding power kept both men and management up to scratch through a keen self-interest, as in efficiency lay their profit. To-day this influence has gone, but self-interest remains unchecked as the motive to which we all react, from top manager to lowest labourer, and there is a clear-cut urge for all of us in the industry, as it is at present, to be slack. For, in simple words, the more a job can be made to cost the more we get out of it.

"To the ordinary manual worker with a tradition of hard times due to past unemployment, the duty to 'make work' is almost a religion. The sins of past bosses are to blame for that. If a low-paid man can slack during normal working hours and then make up the loss by overtime, it is more than likely that he will do so if he can get away with it. It is not to be expected that he will display any high moral sense of duty if such fibre is lacking in his so-called superiors.

"As a working mechanic I can say from my personal day-to-day experience that this type of 'ca-canny' is rampant. In my own trade the same men are doing the

same job in the same way with the same tools and materials, yet 'man hours per job' have more than doubled during the past three years. On that score, I could meet any challenge with proof.

"Why don't I myself set out to reform? I do, so far as I am allowed by the weight of opposition. One serious objection is that as a member of a trade union I should be kicked out from my trade, which is my living. This I should be ready to fight, but there is another and greater bar which I cannot fight—the opposition of the whole united strength of the managerial class.

"This may sound absurd—a manager who will not let his men work—but it is a fact. At every level, from foreman to chief engineer, there is an association which fixes wage or salary. The grade is fixed by the number and cost of the staff controlled. I am a charge hand because I have six men; if I do the job with fewer men I lose my pay, so six men it is. My engineer was single-handed, and, therefore, low in grade. By introducing a mass of paper work he procured—first one, then two, three—an army of assistants. As the army grew so did his grade, and his salary, without increase in work.

"Before the war my department had one engineer, one assistant, one foreman. To-day the volume of work done is perhaps a third of pre-war, yet the department has been split into three sections, each with its bloated staff. My own sub-section has two engineers and three foremen to supervise seven mechanics. . . ."

"TRADE UNION EMPLOYEE."

"London, E."

THE GOETHE BI-CENTENARY

Mephistopheles asks the student to choose him a Faculty. The student says he has little taste for jurisprudence. Mephistopheles sympathises and this is how he regards the subject:—

Es erben sich Gesetz' und Rechte
Wie eine ew'ge Krankheit fort;
Sie schleppen von Geschlecht sich zum
Geschlechte,
Und rücken sacht von ort zu Ort
Vernunft wird Unsinn, Wohlthat Plage;
Veh dir, das du ein Enkel bist!
Vom Rechte, das mit uns geboren ist,
Von dem ist leider nie die Frage.

Faust, Part I.

*

Laws and rights are handed down,
Inherited like lasting ills,
From age to age they drag their course,
And stealthy spread from place to place.
Make sense to nonsense; good deeds a drudge.
Woe's thee, that thou art child and heir!
But of that right we have by birth—
Of that, alas, there's ne'er a word.

(L. & L. Translation).

2s. LAND VALUE REFORM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. By J. Dundas White, LL.D. A special chapter suggests the requisite legislation.

3s. 6d. HENRY GEORGE ON ECONOMIC JUSTICE. New Edition of the favourite *Gems from Henry George*. Selected passages from his writings and speeches. Handsomely bound in cloth. An ideal gift book.

7s. 6d. THE SCIENCE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY. By Henry George. The meaning of Political Economy; The Nature of Wealth; The Laws of the Production and Distribution of Wealth; Money and its Functions.

QUESTION TIME IN HOUSE OF COMMONS

NATIONAL INSURANCE 38,642 OFFICIALS

On January 1, 1949, there were 22,708 men and 15,934 women employed under the Ministry of National Insurance.—*H. of C.*, May 3, written answer, Col. 47.

FOOD MINISTRY

The total number of non-industrial staff employed in the Ministry of Food at May 1, 1949 (part-time workers counted as halves) was 6,245 headquarter staff; 31,943 regional staffs, and 10,260½ casual staff in local food offices employed on the distribution of ration books, for approximately 6 to 8 weeks between April and June.—*H. of C.*, May 18, written answer, Col. 23.

EXCHANGE CONTROL

The persons employed at the Treasury and the Bank of England on exchange control numbered approximately 1,550.—*H. of C.*, June 21, written answer, Col. 5.

BOARD OF TRADE

The Board of Trade Controls. Under this Department there are altogether 20 controls, of dyestuffs, fertilisers, leather, hemp, hosiery, jute, wool, paper, timber, etc. The total number of the staff thus engaged in the "controls and directorates" is 2,133, and the total of annual salaries is £992,400. Besides the industries directly affected by the controls there are others. For example, the leather control affects leather goods and boot and shoe trades, while the activities of the timber control affect a large cross-section of the industries of the country.—*H. of C.*, July 28, written question, Col. 157.

SPOON-FED AGRICULTURE

The total of grants for ploughing up grassland paid to United Kingdom farmers during the 12 months to June 30, 1949, was £5,975,000. The total acreage involved was 1,508,000.—*H. of C.*, July 21, Col. 1555.

The number of "important measures" adopted, with the object of increasing the output from marginal and hill lands, were cited by the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. T. Williams. These include the Marginal Production Scheme, the grants for improvement of hill farms and the hill sheep and cattle subsidies under the Hill Farming Act, 1946, and the grants for water supplies, liming and farm drainage.—*H. of C.*, July 30, written question, Col. 198.

On the question as to the aid given by the Government to private industry in recent years, Mr. Douglas Jay, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer, provided a table comprising 14 industries, the amount of subsidy granted in the three years 1946-47, 1947-48 and 1948-49, and the amount voted for 1949-50. The grand total comes to £109,844,029. The biggest dole-receiver, or spoon-fed industry, is agriculture, the total of the subsidy granted to it for these years amounting to £70,137,000. The total of the subsidies to all these industries does not include losses of trading by Government Departments nor expenditure provided under general policies such as housing, social services, cost-of-living, the training, resettlement and transference of labour, distribution of industry, improvement of design or research.—*H. of C.*, November 1, written answer, Col. 20.

Excluded also from these figures is the immense annual subsidy to agriculture and to the landed interests which takes the form of exempting all agricultural land from local taxation, under the notorious and nefarious Derating Act of 1929—Mr. Churchill's and the late Mr. Neville Chamberlain's most evil gift to the British people, that which is as responsible as anything for the economic crises we go through.

The amount of grants authorised in respect of field drainage and farm water supply schemes has amounted to £5,350,300 in the years from 1941 to 1949. It was asked, what was the area of land thus benefited and the reply was 4,700,000 acres.—*H. of C.*, November 3, written reply, Col. 65.

But it is not so much a question of the *area* benefited. It is a question of the *interests* that are benefited and these, of course, are ultimately the persons entitled to the rent of the land which, along with the price of the land, is raised to make *labour's earnings* so much less.

HOW FARMERS SELL THEIR INDEPENDENCE

The number of farmers in England and Wales who were under supervision for failure to comply with the rules of good husbandry (under the dictatorial provisions of the Agriculture Act, 1947) was 939.—*H. of C.*, July 30, written question, Col. 197. The figures are given in detail for each county. The most numerous "sinners," who, if they do not "obey," are liable to eviction, are in Devonshire, Durham, Kent, West Riding of Yorkshire, Carmarthen and Monmouth.

In Scotland, since November 1, 1948, the agricultural executive committees have issued warning notices to 36 farmers in respect of failure to conform with the rules of good husbandry.—*H. of C.*, October 18, written question, Col. 17. This regimentation, with threat of eviction (farmers often unable to cultivate as *they* think best), is the price farmers have to pay for the doles they pocket in the way of all sorts of subsidies paid by the British taxpayer.

The Minister of Agriculture was asked to state by counties the number of farmers who have been dispossessed since the war ended, the acreage involved, and the profit or loss on an annual basis on the holding of those dispossessed. The Minister replied that it would involve disproportionate expenditure of time and manpower to provide the information asked for, and not all of it could be obtained in any case.—*H. of C.*, November 3, Col. 596.

EXAMPLES OF INCREASED FARM RENTS

The rents of seventeen farms in the Bowland area of the Skipton, Yorks., Division, belonging to the Duchy of Lancaster, have recently been reviewed. In twelve cases increases averaging 30 per cent. have been agreed with the tenants; the remaining five have been referred to arbitration under the Agricultural Holdings Act, 1948. Mr. Drayson pointed out to the Minister (Mr. Dalton) that typical of the five cases not yet agreed there is an increase of rent from £270 to £520 and from £630 to £1,030. The Speaker intervened by saying it was understood that the matter had been referred to arbitration.—*H. of C.*, October 31, Col. 43.

THE STATE AS TRADER

Sheep carcasses imported by the Ministry of Food from Holland on or about September 26 were condemned at Smithfield Market. The shipment consisted of 2,067 carcasses, 55 tons of which, about 1,850 carcasses, were condemned. The matter is under investigation by the Netherlands Government and the Ministry.—*H. of C.*, October 24, written answers, Col. 99. A question awaiting reply is, what has this State Trading transaction cost the British taxpayer?

What price is being paid for the maize, barley and oats now being imported from the Soviet Union, and how this compares with prices of grain offered us by other countries? Mrs. Summerskill replied that it would not be in the public interest to disclose at present the price paid for coarse grain being imported from the U.S.S.R.—*H. of C.*, October 31, Col. 22.

During 1949 the Ministry of Food has purchased 24,446 tons of soya beans from British East Africa, Nigeria, China and Brazil. The Ministry's selling price is £59 per ton. Asked for further information, the Minister, Mrs. Summerskill, said, "It would not be in the public interest" to reveal the total profit that was made in these dealings.—*H. of C.*, October 24, written answer, Col. 95.

The question was why the price of glucose in this country was approximately £60 per ton as compared with the equivalent price in America of £30 per ton. Minister Mr. Strachey replied that American glucose is produced from home-grown maize, while the raw material used for glucose production in this country has to be imported, and often from dearer sources than the U.S.A., "because of our lack of dollars." Since devaluation, American glucose would cost us about £54 per ton ex-store and excluding import duty, while the net cost to British exporters is now £57 11s. 8d. per ton, "so the difference is not great." Then followed the astonishing remark, "moreover we have made available some glucose for dollar export purposes at £40 per ton."—*H. of C.*, October 31, written answer, Col. 4. What can you make of it? Isn't it maddening?

LIBERAL LIBERTY LEAGUE

(Communicated by Mr. Stephen Martin, Joint Hon. Secretary.)

Progress of the petition, "The Modern Magna Carta for Freedom," which the League is organising for presentation to the House of Commons was considered at a recent meeting of the Executive.

Because of the summer holidays the number of completed forms coming in had fallen off and the opinion was expressed that greater efforts would have to be made if the petition was going to have the success anticipated when it was launched.

It was pointed out that the real value in the petition lay in the opportunity it provided to propagate the fundamental principles of true liberty and justice by contacting members of the public.

Excellent work has been put in by some League members, in one case over 60 signatures were obtained at a regional conference of the Chamber of Trade, and another had persuaded the majority of his business colleagues to sign.

It has been suggested that members should write to their local newspapers about the petition, thereby helping them with the work in the collection of signatures. Assistance by way of material for this letter can be had by applying to the League.

Meetings of the South Hackney Liberal Association and the Sevenoaks Liberal Association on Free Trade, Taxation of Land Values and the aims of the League have been addressed by Mr. Stephen Martin.

A double crown poster, giving the wording of the petition, is available and members who can use it should apply without delay to the League's address, 4 Great Smith Street, S.W.1.

FOOD SUBSIDIES

The food subsidies at present total £462,600,000 a year. Asked how this sum was made up Sir Stafford Cripps replied as follows:—

- £183.5 million to reduce the cost of imported food.
- £211.3 million to reduce the cost of home-grown food.
- £33.8 million to reduce the cost of imported feedingstuffs.
- £2.9 million to reduce the cost of home-grown feedingstuffs.
- £16.1 million for "average payments" (re wheat?).
- £15.0 million for fertilizers.

H. of C., November 3, written answer, Col. 64.

COST OF FAMILY ALLOWANCES

The Minister of National Insurance, making reply, said it is estimated that £60 million will be paid in family allowances during the current financial year. At September 30, 1949, there were approximately 2,900,000 families in receipt of allowances in respect of some 4,600,000.—*H. of C.*, November 1, written answer, Col. 15.

THE BREAD SUBSIDY

The annual rate of subsidy on bread, after taking into account the increased costs of imported wheat and flour and the increased selling prices, is now estimated at £65½ million. Before devaluation the annual rate was £67 million. Including flour used for other purposes, the annual rate of the combined flour and bread subsidy was 91½ million before devaluation and is now £92 million.—*H. of C.*, October 24, written answer, Col. 97.

AGRICULTURAL LAND DEATH DUTIES

The total amount of death duties paid on agricultural land is not separately recorded, but, as Mr. Glenvil Hall said, "On the existing basis the figure would be about £3 million a year."—*H. of C.*, May 10, written answer, Col. 85. (The assessment of agricultural land is deliberately reduced as compared with other lands.)

DEVELOPING COLONIAL LAND MONOPOLY

The total sum given or promised to Colonies on behalf of the British taxpayer since January 1, 1944, is approximately £160,500,000, comprising the following main items: (a) £120,000,000 made available under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act of 1945; (b) £15,544,000 grant-in-aid of administration; (c) £8,918,000 for defence and reconstruction in the Far East; (d) £2,539,000 for subsidies, mainly for food, to Malta and certain West Indian terri-

ories; (e) £13,500,000 for claims waived by H.M. Government, chiefly in the Far East.—*H. of C.*, July 20, Col. 1365.

We notice such items as North Borneo Chartered Company (the great private land-owning company): Purchase price of the company, £1,400,000; redemption of Chartered Co.'s currency, £502,296; reconstruction and war compensation in North Borneo, £1,318,962. As to British Guiana, compensation to sugar growers, £117,669; Trinidad, subsidies for sugar replanting, £190,450; West Indian Colonies, subsidies to reduce cost of living since the war, £580,908. The total figures, except for the £120,000,000 under the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, do not take into account assistance in the form of loans. But disguised in all this are the immense sums provided by British taxpayers which go inevitably to foster land monopoly and land speculation in these territories. Always the private landowner is the "residuary legatee."

WHERE DOES THE TAXPAYER'S MONEY GO?

A glance at the Estate Market column of *Country Life*, September 9, reveals the following among many similar sub-headings and phrases: "£100 per acre for Sussex farms." "Agricultural land again fetched good prices." "Fourteen acres of arable and grass land averaged £140 per acre." "Prices also ruled high . . . 158 acres realised £29,525." Could any unbiased person deny that these rising land values had no relation to the agricultural subsidies? These subsidies, etc., are taken from the people, passed to the farmers and then on to the landowners. If a farmer happens to be a landowner also he, of course, receives all; but this does not affect the principle. Moreover, farmers as beneficiaries under Protection and other privileges gain as monopolists as well as producers. And this is taking place under a Labour Government denouncing its opponents as supporters of privilege.

HENRY GEORGE—A NEW BIOGRAPHY

The late Anna George de Mille's life of her father, *Henry George: Citizen of the World*, will be published in the spring by the University of Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, at the price of \$4. A large part of the book appeared in instalments in the *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* before Anna George died. The publication of the book, a companion, to the "Life," written by her brother, Henry George, Jr., will be welcomed on all hands, but we could wish it had been possible to produce it at a lower price to the purchasers who must find non-dollar currency at the new rates of exchange.

4s. THE CONDITION OF LABOUR. On the rights of property and justice in the distribution of wealth, with explanatory introduction and appendix containing the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, statement by the Rev. Dr. McGlynn and extract from Bishop Nulty's Essay "Back to the Land." By Henry George. New Edition.

3s. 6d. LAND AND FREEDOM. A comprehensive treatise on Land Value Taxation. By Fredk. Verinder.

3s. 6d. PROGRESS AND POVERTY. An Inquiry into the Causes of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth—the Remedy. By Henry George. Complete edition.

3s. 6d. A PERPLEXED PHILOSOPHER. Ethics of the land question and examination of Herbert Spencer's recantation of his earlier declarations. By Henry George.

2s. 6d. THE THEORY OF HUMAN PROGRESSION. By Patrick Edward Dove, abridged by Julia N. Kellog.

2s. 6d. PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE. The tariff question considered with especial regard to the interests of Labour. Carries the discussion to a point not dealt with in other books on this question. The most popular and most scientific exposition of the subject which has ever been written. Lord Snowden. By Henry George. Abridged. Red cloth 2s. 6d. Paper covers 1s. 6d.

6d. LIGHT ON THE LAND QUESTION. A frank inquiry, in conversational styles, into the Land Value Policy. By an eminent London journalist.

2d. HOW THE ENGLISH PEOPLE BECAME LANDLESS. And how to Regain the Land.

HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL

The Economic classes, which started in September, are proceeding satisfactorily. Since our report in the last issue classes have been organised in Whalley, near Blackburn, Lancs., and in Guildford, Surrey. The class in Whalley is being conducted by Mr. Sumner and was organised almost single-handed by Mrs. F. G. Sumner, with untiring zeal and persistence. The Guildford class is being conducted by Mr. W. E. Fox, assisted by Mr. W. Elliott. Plans for the New Year include a tutors' training class, and a new course based on "Democracy versus Socialism," by Max Hirsch.

LONDON GEORGEISTS

At the October meeting, held at 4 Great Smith Street, Westminster, members were addressed by Mr. Don Wright on "The Aims of the Crusade for World Government." The meeting could not accept the idea put forward by the speaker that a world government should first be formed and details of its principles and policy worked out afterwards. The lack of clear-cut basic principles and the vague suggestions of Welfare State measures were other lines of criticism. Those members who did not totally reject the idea of a world government thought it at least premature—the putting of the cart before the horse.

"Dealing with the Crisis" was the subject for the November meeting, held at Hope House, Great Peter Street. It was an open debate, which gave rise to lively discussion. Members found difficulty in getting down to real issues when problems were expressed in the jargon of politicians and modern economists. The maze of legislation and controls had given the "Problems of the Crisis" a complexity wholly unjustified.

On December 14 members will be addressed by a representative of the Socialist Party of Great Britain on its principles and policy. Question time should reveal how much members know their own case and the arguments of their opponents.

Members of the Speakers' Panel received excellent publicity in the local Press when they addressed Liberal organisations on the subject of Land Value Taxation.

On November 9, at 4 Great Smith Street, members organised a classical musical concert for students and their friends, and the proceeds were donated to the funds of the Henry George School.

More and more propaganda work is being done individually, members making full use of their local opportunities of participating in debates, writing to the Press, attending public meetings and distributing leaflets, etc.

The Annual General Meeting and the Second Anniversary Dinner will be held on Saturday, January 7, 1950.

On November 3, Mr. F. R. Jones, Chairman of the Liverpool Land Values League, spoke to the luncheon meeting of the Crosby Rotary Club at St. Luke's Hall on "The Sole Remedy for our Economic Troubles." There was a crowded attendance of leading local business and professional men. The information given opened a new point of view to most in the audience, none of whom showed disagreement. Arrangements may be made for a special evening meeting to present a fuller exposition of the practical application of land value taxation and the removal of taxation from the work of man's hands. It was a successful gathering, and there was unexpected support from two clergymen, the head of a large advertising firm and a bank manager.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE DECLARATION.
Corrections in text. The following should be made:—Page 2, line 9, insert comma between the words "franchise" and "industry." Page 2, line 23, the word "state" should read "State," with a capital S. Page 2, line 28, the word "landowners" should read "landholders."

"There are many practical economists who think that the circulation of gold coinage is an essential first step back on the road to financial sanity. Putting intrinsic money back into the pockets of the people, they say, would give them a far more effective means of controlling the financial extravagance of their governments than any other system yet devised. Government expenditures, they claim, would then be subject to the same discipline of the market-place that every housewife knows."—*The Star City Editor*, November 10.

A farming correspondent in the South of Scotland writes: "Land inflation is rampant here now and steadily all the benefits to farming by means of Government aid are being absorbed more and more in rent. My landlord demands £300 more per annum and refuses to spend a penny on improvements, or to carry out his obligations re repairs. He refuses consent to me to make repairs, and this is typical of thousands of cases. Of course, I can fight him and I think defeat him, but most of the smaller farmers are helpless. The Agriculture Act, as we told the Government, is almost useless to stop it. It is far too weak. Consider also the incidence of Death Duties on agricultural land. The new regulations give 45 per cent. remission of Death Duties to landowners. That means in respect of one farm I know, that the tenant on his property on the farm will have to pay about £15,000 but the landlord only £8,250, and the latter has never done anything than draw rackrent for 90 years except where he has been compelled by the County Council or Agricultural Executive Committee to effect required improvements."

SUBSCRIPTIONS AND DONATIONS

The United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values Ltd. (proprietors of *LAND & LIBERTY*, postal subscription 5s. or \$1 from U.S.A. and Canada), the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, and the Leagues listed below are maintained by the voluntary support of those who believe in and would seek to advance the principle and policy which the Committee, the Union and the Leagues advocate: Land Value Taxation and Free Trade in its fulness, with removal of the tax burdens on industry and abolition of all monopolies and special privileges that interfere with the production of wealth and prevent its just distribution.

We press upon our supporters the need for funds to advance the movement in every field of endeavour. Cheques, etc., may be made payable to R. W. Frost (United Committee) or to Ashley Mitchell (International Union), 4 Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1. The office can receive and will transmit contributions on behalf of any of the allied Associations named below.

ADDRESSES

At 4, Great Smith Street, London, S.W.1. Telephone: Abbey 6665; *United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, Ltd.*, Richard William Frost (Hon. Treasurer); A. W. Madsen (Secretary); *Henry George Foundation* (Literature Department); *International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade*, Ashley Mitchell (Treasurer); *English League*, V. H. Blundell (Honorary Secretary); *Henry George School of Social Science*, V. H. Blundell (Director of Studies), with Branches at Manchester, Glasgow, Liverpool and other Centres.

Scottish League for Land Value Taxation, R. J. Rennie (Hon. Sec. and Treas.), 220 Mill Street, Rutherglen, Glasgow. *Yorks. and Northern League*, Howard Binns (Hon. Secretary), 3, Westfield Road, Riddlesden, Keighley. *Manchester League*, A. H. Weller (Secretary), The Dingle, Chester Road, Hazel Grove, Manchester; Clitheroe Branch, Mrs. F. G. Sumner (Hon. Secretary), Oakside, Mitton Road, Whalley, Lancs. *Welsh League*, Eustace A. Davies (Hon. Secretary), 206, Newport Road, Cardiff. *Midland League*, Miss N. McGovern (Acting Hon. Secretary), 11 Arthur Road, Birmingham, 16. *Liverpool League*, H. T. Boothby (Hon. Secretary), 15, Ashdale Road, Liverpool, 7. *Crosby Henry George Fellowship*, C. C. Paton (Hon. Secretary), 11 Tudor Road, Liverpool, 23. *Portsmouth League*, H. R. Lee (Hon. Secretary) 13, Lawrence Road, Southsea. *Derbyshire League*, G. Musson (Hon. Secretary), 29, Denby Lane, Codnor. *Edinburgh League*, W. N. Alexander (Hon. Secretary), 63, Baronscourt Terrace, Edinburgh, 8.