

**" THE CHINA CONNECTION "**

**A Memorandum by an Australian  
Georgeist**

**K.N. GRIGG**

**January, 1882**

- THE CHINA CONNECTION -

1. Some biographical notes are relevant to my interest and involvement.

I was born in February 1924, in New Zealand, my father being a Baptist minister. The family migrated to Australia in 1939 when my father was appointed as head of a Baptist theological seminary. My education was completed in Melbourne, graduating in medicine in 1947. My closest friend, now deceased, from school days, was the son of a returned Baptist missionary to India, a certain E. Francis Halkyard, a man of great rectitude, who was a dedicated exponent of the social philosophy of the American, Henry George, contemporary of Karl Marx. The philosophy of George was, in essence, that of radical liberalism in the tradition of John Stuart Mill. It championed individual human rights and liberties, and yet at the same time it set forth the legitimate rights of the community. In economic terms, this required, in a sentence, that the rent of the earth, upon which all men stood and whence all men draw their existence, should be public property. The "socialization" of the rent of the earth was the price to be paid for economic freedom; in the face of monopoly of the land and other natural resources, so George affirmed, "beauty lies imprisoned, and iron wheels ride over the good and the beautiful that might spring from human lives."

During my critical formative years of senior schooling and tertiary education, I was greatly influenced by the scholarly wisdom of my father who instilled into me the nature of the historic contribution of the Baptist movement, under various names on the Continent, in Great Britain and America, to religious attitudes and convictions. Again, in essence, it was that the individual human life is of supreme worth in the eyes of God: individual freedom and responsibility were the keynotes - they were the inseparable two sides of a coin. Against this background, when, through my school-friend Allan F. Halkyard and his father, I was introduced to the existence of the Henry George movement and its philosophy, I was immediately attracted to it, not primarily because of the fiscal neatness and inexorable logic of the need for community equity in land rent, but because of the integration that it afforded my personal belief system and set of values in relation to human dignity, human rights, human freedom and human responsibilities. It was an integration that has been consolidated with the passage of the years. From the same Georgeist circles I further learnt of the cause for the promotion of electoral justice popularly known as "Proportional Representation", the mechanics of which involve the election of candidates to the Parliament on a QUOTA of votes gained within a multi-member electorate. The mechanics of the method are designed to ensure that the maximum numbers of voters participate effectively in determining who shall be elected. The underlying idea is that "the individual voter counts." His vote needs to be of value because HE is of value! Again, the philosophy is that of human worth and of the rights of individual citizens within the overall context of the community. To concertina the account, the mantle of A. F. Halkyard within the Henry George movement and P. R. Society, has, in the efflux of time, been placed upon my shoulders, a burden of responsibility to sustain a cause that goes back over 100 years, and the relevance of which, in the exigencies of our own times, remains, in my view, as urgent as ever.

2. In August/September 1979, my wife and I went on a tourist trip to mainland China. As a Georgeist rather than a Marxist, I visited that citadel of Communism with more than tourist eyes. My knowledge of Georgeist circles was essentially Antipodean - and that, in turn, rested upon Georgeist activity in Gt. Britain and the United States of America, through interchange of journals, publications, letters, and, occasionally, visits. However, from superficial reading, I was aware that Tolstoy and Sun Yat Sen were both strongly attracted to George's philosophy - as had been that great British colonial statesman, Sir George Grey, onetime Prime

Minister and twice Governor of New Zealand, with whose story I was much better acquainted. So I made it my business to read up on Sun Yat Sen in the Melbourne State Library. In the index system I came across references to books and articles on Sun Yat Sen by such authors as Sir James Cantlie, Lyon Sharman (first English biographer of Sun Yat Sen in 1934) and Professor Harold Schiffrin, University of Jerusalem. Of particular interest to me was a journal article by Professor Schiffrin on "Henry George on Two Continents" which dealt not only with George's influence in Gt. Britain, but also with something quite unfamiliar to most Western Georgeists, his influence in Japan in the first decade of this century. On the history of China, Edgar Snow's volume, "Red Star over China" was recommended reading. It was from this that I first gleaned the details of the epic "Long March" of the Communists in 1934, and of the "Xian Incident" of 1936 when Chiang Kai Shek was forced to take the heat off the Communists, and which marked the pivotal turn in their fortunes.

I took with me to China a copy of the Centenary Edition of George's *PROGRESS & POVERTY*, the copy having been just received from the Schalkenbach Foundation in New York. It was known to me that Sun Yat Sen's widow, Mme. Soong Ching Ling, was still alive at a ripe old age in Peking. I had had the copy inscribed to her, in Chinese, "in honour of Dr. Sun Yat Sen who was so greatly influenced by the author of this book." I fed it into the system per medium of our tour guide in the last week of August 1979 - at the precise time that the Centenary Georgeist Conference was being held in San Francisco. Whether the lady actually received it I do not know, because I received no acknowledgement - which I now realize is par for the course!

In the city of Xian, there was a faded propaganda billboard outside our tourist hotel, which read: "The theoretical basis guiding our thinking is Marxism-Leninism," quote Mao Tse Tung. As a confirmed Georgeist, I made the mental note as I photographed it, " - and THAT'S precisely what's wrong with this place. Brother, have I got news for you!" The puny mouse that roared, if you like, but I'm prepared to pit George against Marx anytime. Indeed, upon returning home, I wrote a short article *GEORGE VERSUS MARX - THE WAY FORWARD* which was published in the March 1980 issue of *PROGRESS* the journal of the Henry George League of Victoria. Further reading in Chinese history was greatly helped by having visited the country - particularly having visited Shansi and Shensi Provinces in the North West and perceiving both on land and from the air the famous loess soil region into which the Communist forces under Mao retreated and regrouped at Yunnan - and having photographed the very scene where Chiang Kai Shek was surprised by rebellious troops in 1936. One returned home with a tremendous admiration for the people of this ancient culture, compared with whom we seem so brash - with a tremendous awe at their incredible patience and at their simple dignity in labour. The country was drab and obviously poor. Yet people were clothed and nourished - there was not the squalid poverty that one reads of as marking so much of the Third World. The Chinese Communist regime is strong on slogans. The last one was on the bridge at the border over the Shum Chum river. It said, "Long live the great unity of the peoples of the world!" (Always the exclamation mark!) The first notice seen on the railway station on the Hong Kong side said, "Beware of pickpockets. Do not spit." !! Bang! We were back in the capitalist West, pushing and shoving, grasping and grabbing, with its millionaires' mansions on Hong Kong Island, its armed guards in the banks and its beggars in the streets - and its enormous vitality.

It took weeks after getting back home to become dis-Orientated! However, further reading initiated me into the nightmare of the Cultural Revolution, and it left me aghast to realize that those selfsame courteous, patient, friendly, smiling people, who would part like the waves of the Red Sea to give precedence to white foreign guests as they glided through on their magic carpet (with their return air ticket guaranteed and paid for in advance) were those same people who behaved so cruelly and atrociously towards each other during the Cultural Revolution - all in the name of the purity of Marxist dogma. Not only that, I had been home scarcely a

month when, in October 1979, the unfortunate young journalist Wei got clobbered with a 15-year jail sentence for taking his rights to individual freedom of expression too seriously, and the Big Poster Democracy Wall was proscribed. As a result my attitude has hardened. I have great affection for the people of China, but I abhor the tyrannical nature of the regime. I was constrained to write a paper for the sake of formalizing my Georgeist critique on record, which was a development of the PROGRESS article, and which I gave the title, "Sun Yat Sen - Citizen of the World" - subtitle "Marxist-Leninist-Mao Tse Tung Thought gave China the Cultural Revolution" - the implication being "and thereby mucked it up." This subtitle was by way of a rejoinder to the propaganda board outside the Xian hotel.

In this paper I contrasted two ideological streams: that of Marx - Lenin - Mao Tse Tung, and that of George - Tolstoy - Sun Yat Sen, and concluded with the view that the way forward for China lay with the latter - that Sun Yat Sen and the philosophies that moulded him should be rediscovered and reassessed. In the preparation of this paper I was greatly helped in my further understanding of Sun Yat Sen as the result of correspondence that I had entered into with Professor Schiffrin. He acquainted me with the name of Professor Gottfried K. Kindermann of Munich, the leading European authority on Sun Yat Sen, and with a book by Professor Martin Bernal of Cornell University, entitled "Chinese Socialism to 1907". For Georgeists this book is, in my opinion, of seminal importance. Certain chapters which deal with early Georgeist influences on Sun Yat Sen from around 1890 onwards, and the ferment of debate on Georgeist Single Tax versus Socialism in the journals of his revolutionary movement (including the activities of the Georgeist Miyazaki brothers in Japan in the first decade of this century) are, in my view, mandatory reading. I found, to my own fascination, that a major mentor of Sun Yat Sen in the 1890's was an American Disciples of Christ Georgeist missionary to China for whom Sun Yat Sen took part in the translation of PROGRESS & POVERTY into Chinese. This gentleman, W.E. Macklin, was, it has dawned upon me, a man cast in the very ideological mould of my own mentor, E.F. Halkyard. His brother-in-law, Charles Garst, was, similarly, a missionary to Japan. However the single-tax meteor fizzled out in the period covered by Professor Bernal. (Compare this with its decline in Gt. Britain subsequent to the Lloyd George Budget and the onset of the First World War.) Moreover, the economic sophistication of the Single Tax was beyond the patience of students for whom the overthrow of the Manchus was the main focus of their attraction to Sun Yat Sen in those years. Nevertheless, the Single Tax lived on, as we shall see, in the heart and mind of Sun Yat Sen.

Having completed this paper, and having, in its concluding section, noted that the banner of Sun Yat Sen continues to be held high in Taiwan, I considered that it would do no harm to send a copy to the Office of the President of the Republic of China in Taipei. Subsequently I received, over the signature of its Chairman, an invitation from the Organizing Committee of the Conference on the History of the Republic of China to be held in Taipei in August 1981 to mark the 70th. Anniversary of the Founding of the R.O.C. in 1911, to attend, and if I so wished, to present a paper. In accepting, I adopted the attitude that I would in no manner be posing as an authority on Chinese history, but would seek to portray the specific Georgeist influence on Sun Yat Sen in the light of Antipodean experience of those same influences - a "Chinese connection" with which I imagined that most contemporary Chinese historians would be unfamiliar.

Sun Yat Sen had, around 1905, crystallized his Three Principles of the People - Nationalism, Democracy and Livelihood of the People. My paper as already prepared, had borne essentially upon the third of these which involved Sun Yat Sen's Georgeist concept of the Equalization of Land Rights. For the purpose of the Conference I developed a subsidiary paper which I related to the Principle of Democracy, and entitled it "An Australian contribution to experience in the conduct of popular elections." In preparing this, I drew heavily upon J.F.H. Wright's book "Mirror of the Nation's Mind." Wright highlights the Declaration of Human Rights in relation to popular participation in elections. It is important to note that the constitut-

ions both of the Chinese Communist Party and of the Kuomintang Nationalist Party are historically based on the Russian model, and allow of "One Party Government" only. My purpose in including this secondary paper was to document, in the context of that Conference, that P.R. "quota-preferential" voting was appropriate, nevertheless, even with "one party" elections because of the effective freedom of choice that voters were afforded amongst candidates. I was aware that municipal elections are starting to be held on the mainland. I was also aware that the papers presented at this R.O.C. Conference would also be closely monitored on the mainland. Appearing in my role as President of the Henry George Foundation of Australia, I was not averse to seizing the opportunity to highlight P.R. as one of the mechanisms for human freedom - although the point was quite lost initially upon the critical commentator on my paper who thought it quite irrelevant to Chinese history. I had to spell out the implications in the question time.

A further development was an invitation to present a paper after the Taipei Conference at a Symposium on Sun Yat Sen to be held under the auspices of Chu Hai College in Hong Kong in September 1981. Whereaw my Taipei paper centred on George versus Marx, the Hong Kong paper highlighted a) the Georgeist influence on Sun Yat Sen particularly as revealed in his SAN MIN CHU I lectures delivered in Canton in 1924, and b) Antipodean Georgeist influence and its practical application enshrined in legislation.

The Taiwan Conference was attended by many Sinologists of international repute, as well as historians from faculties in Taiwan. It was by no means a mere propaganda stunt for the Nationalists. Where occasion demanded it, criticism of the Chiang Kai Shek regime was made - as the printed papers will attest. The Conference was sectionalized. My paper was presented on the afternoon of the first day, and was preceded by those given by Professors Kindermann and Schiffrin. As a non-professional, it was a humbling experience to have the privilege of participating in such a gathering. It was an awesome feeling to be cast in the role, as a Georgeist, de facto speaking for the Georgeist movement world wide, of rekindling an interest in Henry George, cardinal mentor of Sun Yat Sen, Father of the Chinese Republic. As above mentioned, I made it clear that I did not appear in the guise of an authority on Chinese history - my authority to speak lay in my knowledge, from Antipodean experience, to review Georgeist influence around the world, and to highlight Sun Yat Sen - Citizen of the World in that context, for Sun Yat Sen's model for China was a model for all developing nations. I was told that the translator at my session was superb in the manner in which he conveyed the nuances of what was being said. My lack of ability to understand Chinese was a limiting factor in my being able to extract maximum value from other sessions. However, English translations of many of the papers had been printed, which I have been able to study since my return home.

Synopses of the papers by Professors Schiffrin and Kindermann and that of mine, along with photos of the speakers, appeared together in the Chinese language press the following day. Professor Schiffrin noted the consistency of Sun Yat Sen's basic social philosophy, formed in his youth when the Georgeist/J.S.Mill influences of radical liberalism crystallized his outlook, and which stayed with him till his death. He was effectively inoculated against ever becoming a Marxist. Professor Schiffrin stressed that Sun Yat Sen always strove for conciliation and peaceful solutions. He was temperamentally averse to violence. Professor Kindermann highlighted Sun Yat Sen's charisma, and how, since his death, various groups, by selective quotation, have claimed his mantle. But again, his final pronouncements were made in his SAN MIN CHU I lectures, less than a year before his death, in which he specifically rejected the "class struggle" concepts of Marxism. Communist propaganda related to SAN MIN CHU I conveniently forgets this. Professors Chiffirin, Kindermann and myself all made the point that Sun Yat Sen-ism offers the alternative to Marxist-Leninist dogma for China and the Third World.

Several things emerged very clearly from this Conference and from our sojourn in Taiwan. The first is that the Republic of China in Taiwan, the ongoing continuum of Nationalist China, is very much alive and kicking, and is not to be judged by the

admitted corruption and incompetence of the prior-to-1949 era. A great deal of light was shed for me by the paper given by Lord Michael Lindsay of Birker, Emeritus Professor of Far Eastern Studies at the American University, Washington, D.C. In summary, he stated that between 1936 - 1946, the Communists in their Soviet enclaves, won hearts and minds by carrying out sensible land reforms such as those later carried out by the R.O.C. on Taiwan - reforms which were relevant to the requirements of the situation. They were thus successful in situations to which Marxism was irrelevant. He then went on to say, devastatingly, that where Marxism-Leninism was relevant, "common sense went out the window" as when, having achieved power, Mao proceeded to the enforced collectivization of agriculture simply because Marx had decreed it should happen! The result on the mainland was a generation of stagnation relative to what took place in Taiwan where, belatedly, the Nationalists carried out the soil-to-the-tillers programme that they had failed to enact on the mainland when it had lain within their power to do so.

So in Taiwan, the farmers became a nation of smallholders, each acquiring his own farm on economically manageable terms. This was the start of the "economic miracle" of Taiwan. From an agricultural base, they proceeded to simple types of industry producing necessities, and, with the aid of overseas (mainly American) capital, built up light industries. Taiwan now has a most sophisticated economy with capital intensive industry, including heavy industry. They plan to engage in high technology by the end of this decade. Taiwan has needed no foreign aid since 1963. Compared with the mainland, standards of living are much higher, and its people are much more sophisticated in their relationships with Westerners. The tourist going to mainland China is a quasi-VIP, and in many areas is still somewhat of a curiosity. In Taiwan, the white foreigner is no more taken particular notice of than he/she is in Hong Kong or down "Main Street." Once the "mini CHOCOM" of the Conference was over - Presidential and Prime Ministerial receptions and banquets and the like, photos in the dailies and magazines, trained television cameras, etc., etc. - it was very salutary, when going on a subsequent private three-day tour of the island, to have to carry one's own bags and travel like everyone else, on public transport.

Perhaps the greatest illustration of modern Taiwan is the sight of the impressive multi-lane Sun Yat Sen tollway which runs for 200 kilometres the length of the island, connecting Taipei in the North with Kaohsiung in the South. It traverses the green fields of rice and sugar cane, with the farm houses set in clusters amongst the patchwork, as though in a garden; there are clover leaves and flyovers branching off at intervals to serve the towns and cities of the coastal plain.

However, Taiwan is developing the problems typical of Westernized economies. There is frenetic competition within the education system, and the very day after I presented my paper, the editorial in the English-language Taipei newspaper discussed the problem of urban land price, the difficulties for home ownership of lower income earners and the problems associated with the implementation of Dr. Sun Yat Sen's theory of "unearned increment." I felt quite at home: two days later the paper published a letter by me, as President of the Henry George Foundation of Australia and Conference Participant, on the need for land rental taxation on the Australian site-value rating model in order to cope with the situation! It was an uncanny feeling to be there, uniquely, in the right place at the right time, to make the right comment. It was a matter that I would take up again in Hong Kong. Since returning home, a copy of the N.Y. HENRY GEORGE NEWS for March 1955 has come into my possession. It contains an article by Dr. S.Y. Wu who was a secretary to Sun Yat Sen and who was responsible for the subsequent drawing-up of land legislation. He notes that he visited Europe and the Middle East to observe methods of land reform, but it was significant that there was no mention of his having visited Australia. In the same copy there was an account of Georgeism in Germany, and again it was highly significant that ideas gradually drifted in the direction of majoring on the "unearned increment" an entirely different thing from George's concept of an annual tax on land rent. Further, a German, Dr. Schrameier, was adviser to Sun Yat Sen in

the nineteen twenties, and was instituting land value taxation in a former German enclave when he was tragically killed in a rickshaw accident - and that was the end of the experiment. I had always been under the impression that Sun Yat Sen gleaned his ideas on unearned increment from John Stuart Mill, but the most recent influence upon him was this German-derived one. At any rate, the land legislation that was finally adopted by the Kuomintang was most certainly not specifically Georgeist. It has been carried over into land legislation in modern Taiwan, but obviously has not been working satisfactorily. NO LAND LEGISLATION WILL BE SATISFACTORY THAT DOES NOT EFFECTIVELY SOCIALIZED THE RENT OF THE LAND AT ITS FULL MARKET VALUE. That is as true for the economy of Taiwan as it is true for Australia, or any other country. I therefore did not need to be an expert in Chinese affairs to be able to comment authoritatively, as a Georgist, on that issue. My summing up is that Sun Yat Sen's heart was in the right place, he was well aware of the danger of the capitalization of social progress into land price, but his practical ideas were to prove ineffectual, and he evidently was in complete ignorance of Australian experience in land value taxation and of the quintessential nature of Georgeism in our site value rating. It became evident to me that my major role in this visit to Taiwan would have to be to publicize the Australian experience.

I had taken with me a fair assortment of Georgeist material from Melbourne, some of which I sent to the newspaper in support of my letter. I also had some photostat copies of my paper for Hong Kong. In this paper, I had specifically called attention to the deficiencies of the John Stuart Mill proposal that only future increment should be taxed, albeit as a lump sum. This was the solution that Sun Yat Sen as a practising politician settled for, but he sounded a warning in his 1924 SAN MIN CHU I lectures that China must solve the land problem in its cities like Canton or Shanghai, or else it would soon be too late. And right there in Taipei, the very day after my paper was given, a newspaper editorial comments that it was probably now "too late" to be able to do anything about land prices in that city! (Henry George, where were you? Where are you!) But in my Hong Kong paper as prepared, I had proceeded to point out that Sun Yat Sen was presumably unaware that Henry George's practical solution of an annual land value tax had been applied for municipal purposes in Australia since around 1910. The Antipodean experience was obviously unknown to him or to his successors. And now in 1981 it was falling to me to provide the link. But it would not have been possible without the faithful efforts of three generations of active Georgeists ahead of me! Most importantly, I took with me for distribution dozens of copies of the booklet by Sir Ronald East published in 1944 when he was Chairman of the State Rivers and Water Supply Commission of Victoria, entitled THE FINANCING OF DEVELOPMENTAL WORKS. It was one of a series published by Melbourne University Press under the general heading of "Realities of Reconstruction." I had been immediately reminded of this booklet when I first read in Lyon Sharman's biography of Sun Yat Sen about his book "The International Development of China." Sun Yat Sen dreamed great dreams for China. Here, a generation hence, was a Georgeist senior public administrator in Australia, setting forth the practical principles under which those dreams could be realized in economic practicality. The rent of the land was the natural source for public revenue. THAT was the key to guaranteeing the repayment of foreign loans and at the same time retaining national equity in the public work or utility. (I had occasion to make the same point when chairing a Conference session other than my own.) Finally, I had taken with me, hot off the press, a galley pull of A.R. Hutchinson's paper on Natural Resource Rental Taxation in Australia, which quantified in 1981 the principles of East's 1944 paper - which, in turn, had the very terminology of Sun Yat Sen's own programme. Henry George was the common key!

One of the Conference papers, on Land Reform in Taiwan, was presented by Director Tseng of the Bureau of Land Economics. I was able to arrange the delivery of this material to him, and from whom I have heard since my return home, and to whom I have subsequently sent further material. It was most gratifying to have him inform me that he was arranging to have it translated into Chinese for dissemination and further study. Also, earlier this year, I had drawn the attention of the Treas-

urer of Queensland to reports in Melbourne newspapers concerning foreign investors in Queensland real estate, and my correspondence was passed on to the Minister for Valuations, to whom I have also sent copies of the papers by East and Hutchinson. By his reply, it is quite obvious that Sir Ronald East's proposals are given much weight. The Minister is currently examining valuation methods with a view to improving the Queensland Act. Queensland is akin to Taiwan in that both have large areas growing cane and tropical fruits. Techniques and requirements in land valuations may well have much in common in both countries. I am hoping that this may be an avenue for mutual contact between Australia and Taiwan whereby lack of knowledge in past decades about Australian experience in land value taxation may be corrected. It is not for me to presume in the matter, but this contact may prove to have been my most effective act of participation in the R.O.C. History Conference. Taiwan will need to get the "land question" right, because not only have they problems with regard to land price in urban areas, but there are emerging rural problems also. Their "soil to the tiller" programme has been their pride and joy. However, with the mechanization of agriculture, small, individual farms are proving to be uneconomic, and so there is a trend to aggregation into larger holdings. The danger is that they are heading for the situation of fewer and fewer people having an equity in the landed estate of the nation. Only the socialization of land rent can save the day. And that is the Georgeist contribution to the fulfilment of Sun Yat Sen's dream for Taiwan, as I see it!

The other personal contact I made was a very heart warming one. This was, to meet Professor Huang Chi-lu, the "grand old man" of the Conference, onetime head of Academia Historica, and as an historian held in high repute on both sides of the Taiwan Straits, and, so I understand, secretary at the First National Congress of the Kuomintang in 1924. He treated me as a favoured son. I think that it meant a great deal to him to meet an active Georgeist, because it must have struck vibrant chords from his own younger days when he was directly following the leadership of Sun Yat Sen. I am certain that there would be no-one at that Conference who would have understood me better. It was with tremendous satisfaction that I personally delivered into his hands copies of George's works, and I hope that this might eventually lead to their translation into modern Chinese versions through the Taiwan Office of Translation and Compilation. Professor Huang would have had his counterparts, on the Australian scene, in Huie and Craigie, men who were part and parcel of the generation who followed on from those who had known George in person. How great and fruitful a thing would it have been if, in their active days, Huang, Huie, Halkyard, Craigie and other stalwarts could have known each other. The Georgeist movement internationally would have been the stronger for it. I also gave Professor Huang a volume in Japanese on the Economics of Henry George by Emeritus Professor Y. Yamasaki of Kobe, who is also the author of an article on Henry George and Sun Yat Sen.

I would like at this stage to dwell further on the article referred to earlier written in the N.Y. Henry George News in 1955 by Dr. S.Y. Wu. He toured Europe, Africa and Asia in 1927-1928 to investigate land reform measures, and was responsible for drawing up the land laws for the Nationalist Government in 1930. The invasion of Manchuria by Japan in 1931 brought his efforts to nought. He was later in the Cabinet of Sun Fo in the dying days of the Nationalist regime on the mainland, but it was then too late to accomplish anything in the face of the Communist onslaught. However, as we have seen, when the Nationalists regrouped on Taiwan, land reforms and legislation for "equalization of land rights" were at last instituted. It is a matter for regret that Dr. Wu never visited Australia and thus became acquainted with our long-standing land tax and land rating legislation and the Georgeist-inspired leasehold system for the Australian Capital Territories - or met with Huie, Craigie and other Georgeists such as Culley who first endowed the Henry George Foundation of Australia. Had he done so, then he may have cast his land legislation in a form to glean land rent in an ongoing fashion instead of "unearned increment" on the J.S. Mill model, concerning which I refer back to earlier discussion. Nevertheless, Dr. Wu was right in the tradition of Georgeism-Sun Yat Senism, for he concludes his article to the effect that "Whether Karl Marx or Henry George prevail on land reform in China, only time will tell." My own article on George versus Marx which I wrote upon my return

from China ( and at that time in complete ignorance of Dr. Wu and his role in the Nationalist administration) concluded with the sentence, " It is George, not Marx, who illumines the way forward for China." I wrote it 25 years to the month after Dr. Wu, secretary to Sun Yat Sen, posed his question. And so I have the deep-seated and rather onerous feeling that there is a torch to be passed on, almost an "apostolic succession" of responsibility, laid upon the Georgeist fraternity. As one of that body, in this sense, to have met Professor Huang and to have experienced the warmth of his welcome at the History Conference of the R.O.C. in Taipei, was a figurative, indeed I will say real, "laying on of hands."

Tragically, there have been so many near-misses in the story of Georgeist endeavour and aspiration. Firstly, George himself died on the eve of the Mayoralty of New York election which he might well have won. Then, in China, as portrayed by Professor Bernal, the Single Tax Movement, organizationally flickered out before the end of the first decade. As a Georgeist with Western connections only, it was fascinating to have been assigned as a commentator to a Conference session at which Professor Scalapino from Berkley University, and Professor Gilbert Chen from the University of Miami gave papers that dealt with single-tax attempts within the early Republic, ie., circ 1912-1913. Professor Chen (who was commentator on my paper) was particularly scathing of the single tax as a panacea. I was glad of the opportunity to re-emphasize to a fresh audience in that session that in the circumstances of Australia Felix, in an evolutionary rather than violently revolutionary process, and as the outcome of parliamentary debate that issued in stable legislation and administration, the principle of single tax HAD taken solid root. The Chinese attempts were brave ones in the face of odds that were stacked against them. These papers are important to Western Georgeists because they give accounts of Georgeist influences of which, in the main, we have known nothing, and because they illustrate that those influences were persistent and persuasive amongst the progressive elements of the new Republic. But there were just so many other issues. To get rid of the Manchus was one thing. Liberal reforms were another - and let there be no mistake but that the New Order continued to have its reactionaries. Then Sun Yat Sen had to stand down in favour of Yuan Shi-Kai, the strongman, who was the only leader that the Western Powers would recognize and who tried to himself become a new Emperor. Then there was the warlord era and then there was Versailles when the West intended to carve up China with the Japanese; and, in rejecting Sun Yat Sen with his vision, programme and plea for the INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHINA, the West forced him to turn to Russia. There was indeed a programme for a single tax enclave in the German-leased territory of Tsingtau under the guidance of Professor Schram-eier in 1922 - only to be abandoned when he was killed in a traffic accident. Then all of Sun Yat Sen's carefully collected books and his manuscripts for his major exposition were destroyed in insurrection in Canton, so that even his SAN MIN CHU I was ad hoc and sketchy. Otherwise his relationship to Henry George's philosophy might have been fully documented for posterity. Finally, Sun Yat Sen died of cancer in 1925, and the Kuomintang was split asunder in 1926 into Left Wing with which Soong Chingling sided, and the Right Wing under Chiang Kai-Shek which she bitterly attacked as having betrayed the Revolution. And this was the start of the open break with the Communists - and what has followed is now history. Henry George was forgotten, as Dr. Wu attests.

Now, in the fulness of time, Mao has been discredited and there is a resurgence of interest in Sun Yat Sen, particularly with the success story of Taiwan viz a viz the mainland..... It was with such thoughts in mind that I boarded the plane to return to Hong Kong.

Several items remain to be mentioned. The first was the screening at the Conference of a film entitled "Coldest Winter in Peking." It was an horrific saga, on "Dr. Zhivago" scale, of the Cultural Revolution, portraying opposing bands of marauding Red Guards mowing each other down with machine guns. The other was the most ironic scene I have ever witnessed: a room in that holy-of-holies, the Chiang Kai Shek Memorial featured a T.V. replay of the trial of the Gang of Four - and they were playing it for laughs! There was that jezebel Shangai bitch, the actress

Jian Jing in the pigpen, answering back the Prosecutor with biting repartee, giving as good as she got - and better - and there was this group of Kuomintang historians, roaring their heads off, barracking for her! The message, loud and clear, is that the Marxist regime on the mainland will be waiting a long, long time before these people haul down their flag. No compendium on modern Chinese history is complete that rings the curtain down on the Nationalists in 1949. They have undergone an enforced renaissance in order to survive, and, by dint of hard work and sensible policies, the Republic of China on Taiwan portrays the other authentic China that must be taken into account. It is authentically Chinese in its culture, as in its long history. Sun Yat Sen, in my view, remains the key to reunification with the mainland. The sheer logic of necessity is forcing the Communists to retreat from Marxist rigidity. And now, decades late, they are following the example of Taiwan and concentrating on light industry before launching into heavy industry, whilst private profit from agriculture is now also being permitted. They have been forced to take the steps appropriate to recovery from the self-inflicted wounds of their era of "liberation." As for political liberality, both sides have a long way to go. Taiwan has, understandably, had a siege mentality for 30 years, like the English facing the Hun across the English Channel, and their security measures are tight. The ever-present threat of invasion yields a perpetual excuse for the political power of the military. They fear contact with the mainland lest they should be admitting spies. After all, their distrust of the Communists goes back, with good historical reasons, to the 1920's. But when President Chiang goes, who will succeed him? A military strong man? A question mark hangs over democracy in Taiwan for this reason - an aspect which has been raised by a political scientist in Melbourne who is well familiar with the Taiwan scene. It has to be emphasized that popular parliamentary elections with a multiplicity of parties freely contending has never been within the tradition of China. Our own method of single-member electorates, let alone first-past-the-post in Gt. Britain and New Zealand still limits the political power struggle effectively between two major contenders, with a feeling of powerlessness on the part of millions of virtually disfranchised voters. ( In Taiwan, elections are based on multi-member electorates with single NON-transferable votes. It is virtually a block first-past-the-post system on the Japanese model.) If there is still a struggle to attain a fair electoral system in Britain, Australia and New Zealand, can we be too critical of the Orient? I merely reiterate my gratification that the occasion to present a paper at the History Conference in Taiwan presented the opportunity to document the requirements for a fair electoral system. When China finally emerges from her phase of tutelage in this matter, I can but hope that quota-preferential voting will be recognized as the methodology for a fair electoral system in democracies.

Some further observations. Firstly, Taiwan under the Kuomintang as the continuing Republic of China, as the separate, continuing, non-Communist political and economic regime, remains, despite much American influence, very authentically Chinese in its cultural roots. This was most evident in the Chinese Opera and Costume Display and in the new Confucian temple overlooking Sun Moon Lake in the mountains of Central Taiwan, part of the interior of which could easily, on a colour slide, be mistaken for one of the gilded pavilions in the Forbidden City in Peking. Many of the tourists at Sun Moon Lake were honeymooners, in Western dress, like many an up-and-coming young Australia or American couple. The scene was that of a modernized Chinese society, but with much more breathing space than is possible in Hong Kong - that human hothouse!

Secondly, there is, I fear, a real danger that Taiwan could become just another Westernized economy, just like South Korea. I think that they have no more really successfully solved "the land problem" than we have. To enable the farmers to become smallholders owning their own farms is excellent - as far as that goes. But they still have not socialized land rent in the Georgeist sense, and real estate speculation in urban areas is obviously a problem. I have already made reference to incipient aggregation of farm holdings. The name of Sun Yat Sen and his SAN MIN CHU I has been a rallying cry ever since the 1920's, but the hard core of what Sun Yat Sen declaimed on equal land rights has been glossed over. The early Georgeist influence on Sun Yat Sen was not featured by local scholars in papers presented. I doubt whether, as scholars

of Chinese history it has lain within their ambit of study. I would assert that it is not possible to understand Sun Yat Sen without a study of George and of Christian missionary influences upon him. Confucian influences are not, in themselves, sufficient explanation - although, quite understandably, these are the influences that indigenous Chinese scholars would be thoroughly versed in.

It has been disturbing to find that in a new edition of SAN MIN CHU I published in English along with a number of other languages, Sun Yat Sen's discussion of the land question has been omitted. Without this, it is without teeth, and in my view, lacking the ideological impact necessary to win converts on the mainland. And this leads me now to an account of my paper prepared for the Hong Kong Symposium on Sun Yat Sen.

My wife and I were paid a very signal honour in Hong Kong, insofar as the President of Chu Hai College arranged a special luncheon to welcome us. The Symposium was on a more modest scale than that in Taiwan. Scholars from Taiwan attended. Others from overseas were Professor Kindermann from Munich, Professor Guy Alitto from Chicago, Professor Tatsuo Yamada from Keio University, Tokyo, and myself. Again, I found myself at a great disadvantage in being unable to either understand or speak Chinese - and this made rapport so much the more difficult.

My paper as printed, highlighted Sun Yat Sen's warnings about the escalation of land price in the large cities, and I related this to the historical antisocial effects of land monopoly in Gt. Britain, and how this had been recapitulated in the Antipodes, and indeed, in Hong Kong. SAN MIN CHU I needed to be re-read in relation to such matters.

Insofar as the paper was circulated in printed form, when my time came to speak to it I decided that there was no point in merely reading out what people already had in front of them. But there was another aspect of Sun Yat Sen that I felt that I ought to comment upon because it dawned upon me that I was in somewhat of a unique position to do so.

In Taipei, Professor Schiffrin had pointed out that Sun Yat Sen temperamentally looked to conciliation and to non-violent solutions - there was nothing of the ruthless Marxist-Leninist in him. Moreover he was the eternal optimist. Then, in Hong Kong, Dr. John D. Young, a local Chinese scholar, in discussing early Western influences upon Sun Yat Sen, remarked that Sun placed considerable influence upon individual worth and responsibility. When I read that, pennies started dropping in all directions.

I realized that the type of person who had considerable influence upon Sun Yat Sen in his formative years was very similar, almost identical in type, to those under whose tutelage I myself came in my formative years. Very largely, they were people of evangelical Christian background, like E.F. Halkyard and my own father. Sun Yat Sen in Honolulu as a teenager was, it seemed very evident to me, an enthusiastic member of a church young peoples' group - the flavour of which I can claim to know intimately. Its counterpart I have seen in Melbourne amongst a church youth group of overseas Chinese students - a real bunch of "keen-ites." Among Sun Yat Sen's mentors were thus W.E. Macklin, a member of the Disciples of Christ (they have an Historical Society based in Nashville, Tennessee), Sir James Cantlie the Salvation Army-ist, in charge of the Medical College in Hong Kong, and Charles Hager, the Congregationalist missionary who baptized Sun Yat Sen, and who, according to Lyon Sharman, thought that if there had been a theological training seminary in Hong Kong, then Sun Yat Sen may well have become one of the outstanding preachers of his time. Finally, it was with the utmost fascination that I learnt from a British historian as we got off the plane in Taipei, that he had known Sun Yat Sen's first wife in Macao. "She was a Baptist", he said.

These facts relating to Western influences, plus the fact of Sun Yat Sen graduating in medicine, has given me a strange affinity with his aspirations and outlook, particularly with the Christian/Georgeist link typified in his case by Macklin, and in my own by E.F. Halkyard. And, of course, in my own case, I have been endowed with

the advantage of 50 years of the wisdom of hindsight to view his career, to estimate his strengths and weaknesses, to affirm the increasing relevance of his social outlook to the needs of modern China, and to document the practicalities.

To repeat, it is not possible to adequately assess the life and meaning of Sun Yat Sen without including in that assessment the fundamental elements of evangelical Christianity and the radical liberalism of Henry George. Lyon Sharman, herself the product of a missionary environment, has, I believe, captured the first of these two aspects of early influences upon Sun Yat Sen as well as it is ever going to be - including the flaws in his character - his ability to rationalize his questionable actions (no monopoly in that!) and the cloud over his "marriage" to Soong Ching Ling (no monopoly in that, either.) The second aspect has been well highlighted by Professors Schiffrin, Kindermann and Bernal. The influence of Confucianism as a cultural factor in the makeup of Sun Yat Sen has been thoroughly canvassed by Chinese historians. However, it has seemed to me that there has been a general ignorance - dare I say a profound ignorance - on the part of Chinese scholars, as to the fundamental contribution of the above first two influences to the person of Sun Yat Sen. Sun Yat Sen was an enigma, a complex personality - as we all are - and Professor Schiffrin has cogently demonstrated that he had to temper his actions to the political possibilities that lay within his power - and these were really very limited. Yet there was a thread of consistency in Sun Yat Sen throughout his whole career.

I realized that this consistency was tremendously fashioned by Georgeism and Christianity. For this reason I felt an urgent constraint to make this the focus of my spoken contribution to the Symposium on Sun Yat Sen in Hong Kong. I therefore sat at my table in the Conference Room and wrote an entirely new short paper on the person of Sun Yat Sen as I perceived him - a pen portrait of him, warts and all. I was impelled along in writing that paper by the rather strange sense of affinity that I felt for Sun Yat Sen by virtue of the similar influences upon him and upon myself, in formative years. This Judaeo-Christian/Georgeist complex within the personality of Sun Yat Sen needed to be documented - and this is what I proceeded to do when I got up and spoke. Much of it would be strange and foreign-sounding to Chinese scholars from a non-Christian background - and not necessarily to be appreciated or endorsed by them as a value system. This was a risk that I had to take, albeit at the risk of appearing elitist in relation to this thread of affinity. But what I was seeking to do was to add a certain flavour, a certain insight of understanding, as to how the young Sun Yat Sen came to be motivated. Objective study by professional historians in pursuing their evaluation of Sun Yat Sen will, I believe, need to evaluate Macklin and Hager and Cantlie and George. They will find the roots of their investigations taking them back to the Pilgrim Fathers and to English history as far back as Henry the Eighth! When all this has been done, then the real significance of Sun Yat Sen to the sociological development of China will be substantially further unravelled.

"Sun Yat Sen's greatest talent was for failure!" So wrote Professor Schiffrin. In the political sense this was true for Sun Yat Sen as it was for Henry George. Neither of them had any real political power base. Rather, it is in the realm of ideas that they were - are - effective. As Professor Yamada suggested, it is Sun Yat Sen-ism, rather than Sun Yat Sen, which is significant, and with this I must agree. The greatness of the vision is greater than the foibles of the man. So it was that, in concluding my pen portrait, I referred to "Sun Yat Sen - Symbol of his nation's hopes", and sat down.

At the summing-up of the session, I had a few more minutes, and I devoted these to documenting what, since going to Taiwan, I perceived to be the essential shortfall in the land legislation both in Taiwan and Hong Kong. I stressed that the fulfilment of the intent of Sun Yat Sen was the effective, real attainment of equalization in land rights; that to achieve this, the rent of land must be socialized on the Georgeist model; that SAN MIN CHU I must be looked at again in this light, and that Australia showed the way with its legislation for municipal site value rating.

One way and another, I gave the Symposium a fairly concentrated serve of new material that is really old material crying out to be rediscovered. The opportunity

came but once, so I had to run the risk of sounding dogmatic. That, plus the language difficulty, must have made my presentation appear a bit bald. I can merely reiterate that I felt that what I said needed to be put on the record, for I was dealing with matters that would otherwise probably not be aired. Yet they were quite central to the Sun Yat Sen story and to the fruition of his hopes and vision.

There was some other material which I circulated and which caused particular interest amongst certain of the students attending the Symposium. I made reference to the fact that the lease on the New Territories will expire in 1997. The Territories will then be due to revert to mainland China. I painted a scenario in which Hong Kong and the New Territories continued on as an autonomous region - in which there is already a precedent in such regions as Tibet and Inner Mongolia. Indeed, I took the scenario a stage further and imagined a united China incorporating Taiwan which also came under the heading of an autonomous region. I painted this scenario leaving open the question of the political nature of China's central government. However, the key element in the scenario was the socialization of the land rentals of each and every region. Part of the land rent would be earmarked for the needs of central government, part for county/provincial/autonomous regional needs, and part for local needs. The economic relationships between each part and the whole could then be stable and defined; and patterns of economic development which had already been evolving with the passage of time and with the requirements of rationality could be left undisturbed.

A very significant fact is the development of private entrepreneurship within Communist China, both indigenous and in combination with foreign investment. And as night follows day rental advantage in the operation of businesses is going to emerge, and competitive entrepreneurship is going to batten right on to it and jockey fiercely to appropriate it. Now a freeway, financed from Hong Kong, is mooted, to run from Hong Kong to Canton, with a side-arm to Macao. Running through the rice fields, and linking two large cities, it will recapitulate the impressive Sun Yat Sen Freeway on Taiwan. Perhaps it ought to be also so named! One if forced to think again of Sun Yat Sen the visionary with his programme for the "International Development of China"! And one is equally forced to think of his warnings in SAN MIN CHU I about the effect of Western influences on the value of land in Canton - and, for that matter, Hong Kong. THAT will be the eventual real payoff for investing in the freeway! Has Sun Yat Sen's time, then, now come?

One can envisage before very long the huge economic entity of Guangdong Province as a rich agricultural, manufacturing and commercial region, with advanced infrastructure, with Canton as its capital and Hong Kong as its seaport. The tremendously exciting factor in this prospect is that the land of Guangdong Province, being communally owned, need never be subjected to the ravages of land price such has stultified the economies of the West - and indeed bids fair to stultify that of Taiwan. Here is the perfect opportunity for the Georgeist experiment on an economically viable scale (ie., not as a mere enclave), provided that private entrepreneurship is freely allowed in Guangdong Province. This could be facilitated if the Province were to be declared an autonomous region.

The George/Sun Yat Sen scenario would be that described by Professor Kindermann. Farmers could own their own farms, subject to payment of the annual site rental. But since the land is vested in the State, the conditions of tenure would virtually be perpetual leasehold. But they would have complete equity in all of their farm improvements and equipment. They would be free to sell their produce in the market on the best possible terms. Private manufacturing in Canton and other cities and towns would be free to compete with that in Hong Kong, whilst Hong Kong would also thrive as a free port. The whole capital outlay for infrastructure in the Region - including the intercapital freeway - would be met from assessed land rentals, and rentals in Hong Kong and the New Territories would be required to contribute. By this Georgeist means of the socialization of land rent, the "Communism" of Sun Yat Sen would be attained; and exploitation, ie., the private capitalization of community development, could not occur.

It has seemed to me that the original vision for leasehold in Canberra and the Australian Capital Territory is almost tailor-made for the projected requirements of the Guangdong Region: private use of land, both urban and rural, but the land to be held on leasehold title, the rentals payable to be the full market rentals, and freshly assessed every two years.

As a Georgeist who is confident that the basic underlying theory is right, I envisage that such a proposal would work and become a model, not only for the rest of China, but for the whole world. Indeed, Taiwan would need to look to its laurels!

And so one looks forward to the evolution of free interchange between Taiwan and the mainland. People are people, and there is a unity in the culture of the Chinese people that is very obvious to those who have had the privilege of witnessing it on both sides of the Taiwan Straits.

I believe that Sun Yat Sen is the key to the building of the bridge across. There is an opportunity opening functionally in Guangdong to bring the lives and the livelihood of the people of Taiwan and the mainland closer together. Hong Kong now constitutes the intermediate physical link. Goodwill is needed to complete the bond. I cannot do better than close with a composite quotation from Sun Yat Sen which spans his career, and which, I believe, says it all:

" Why has the West not solved the social problem? Because it has not solved the land problem ... The poor have no fields to till, and so they must crowd into the industrial cities for work... Class struggle develops when a social group lacks the means of livelihood and resolves as the last resort to use abnormal means of obtaining its livelihood. It is not the cause of social progress but a kind of social disease. Marx's trouble was that he mistook a social pathological condition for the cause of social progress. Modern economic progress is caused by the harmony, not the conflict, of the economic interests of society. Why is there harmony? Because all men must live, and all men face the everlasting problem of livelihood. They either perish through conflict, or live through co-operation."

...---