

Justification and Limits of
PUBLIC PROPERTY IN FREE SOCIETY

G. Hardy

1917.
P.O.Box 78. Carnegie, 3163. Melbourne. Australia.

INTRODUCTION: FREEDOM: JUSTICE: PUBLIC RIGHTS FOR SURVIVAL . . . 1

PART I: ? THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF "FREE SOCIETY" . . . 3
How "Free Society" is ?

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF FREE SOCIETY . . . 5
THE ETHICAL DENUDATIONS OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS . . . 6

PART II: RECOGNITION: JUSTIFIABLE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC PROPERTY . . . 8

The Justifiable Limitations of Freedom in a CONSENSUAL
TEMPERAMENTAL SOCIETY. 9

THE COMMON GROUND OF HUMANITARIAN AND CONSENSUAL TEMPERAMENTAL
AND "PROPERTY" Disagreement. 10

The Difference between values created by individual effort
and those which are not. (i.e. Natural Resources etc.) . . . 11

HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES IMPLY PUBLIC RIGHTS TO SURVIVE. . . 12
1) Equal share in the products of Survival conditions
(not equal ownership !)

2) "Gifted Occupations" property rights - contrary to
redistribution principles 13

RECOGNITION: HUMANITARIAN AND CONSENSUAL TEMPERAMENTAL VIEWS. . 14

FREE HUMANITY is not possible without equal Survival Rights
Unequal rights result in exploitation: slavery, wage slavery

IMPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC ECONOMIC RIGHTS 16
Equalised Public Property eliminates exploitation and
if equals the operation of truly free markets 17

JUSTIFICATION AND LIMITS OF PUBLIC PROPERTY

IV. THE SOCIETY.

(A consistent Libertarian Approach)

BY G. HARDY.

1. INTRODUCTION.

The objective of this paper is to show that whilst a Free Market Society is the most desirable, such society cannot exist unless it assumes that its members have EQUAL RIGHTS TO EXIST.

The economic projection of political rights is shown in entitlements, ownership, property rights.

As equal political rights to exist ensure that one individual is not entitled to kill another to suit his own advantage - similarly unequal economic rights who survive ought to ensure that one individual be not entitled to deprive others from equal access to survival conditions.

Consistently - Equal rights to exist imply that "survival conditions" i.e. natural resources ought not to be in private property. They form the basis of public property, to which then, each citizen, has an equal entitlement.

There is general agreement that some limitations of individual freedoms are justified in order to protect citizens from each other, and to ensure the safety, security and health of the community.

It is accepted that optimum individual freedom can be achieved if political rights and responsibilities are equal.

Unequal rights clearly permit privileged groups to oppress and persecute others.

An unequal political rights in persecution, similarly unequal economic rights permit privileged (monopolist) groups to exploit others.

Equal Rights projected into the economic sphere imply Equal Access to, or more practically an equal share in the benefits of survival conditions.

So long as some individuals, or some groups of individuals may be entitled to demand a free from others, before they are permitted to survive, to remain in SpaceShip Earth, to breathe air, use water - in other words, to share in the benefits of survival conditions, then neither political freedom, nor free trade is possible.

"FREEDOM" IMPLIES EQUAL RIGHTS FOR SURVIVAL.

In my view, which I call "consistent liberalism" or "Anti-monopolism", "FREEDOM" in the libertarian sense implies both that all citizens are entitled to equal political and economic rights and responsibilities, and also that they have equal rights to survive, to exist.

As the economic equivalent of political freedom is private property so

the economic equivalent of political equality is public property.

To anticipate possible objections concerning the communication of public property: I want to state, that communal management, (or State monopoly) cannot provide the greatest benefits, and it also inherently denies the opposition and exploitation of individuals in the same way as private monopolies and privileges do.

Communication, state monopolies result mostly in bureaucratic exploitation and are neither efficient nor equitable methods of utilization of resources and maximizing benefits.

They are certainly not the only nor the best methods to return the benefits of public property to the citizens. Personal rights to survive, equal shares in the benefits of survival conditions can be secured quite practically without taking land, or other natural resources out of private use.

Exclusive use of natural resources can continue. Free market trading in real estate, in minerals, exploration rights etc., will continue, and all possessions, private property can be freely gifted, bequeathed and inherited - as the exclusive right of free individuals.

THE POST-INDUSTRIAL MANAGEMENT (profitable) OF PUBLIC PROPERTY IS REMAINING AN OPEN PUBLIC QUESTION.

Therefore can be required to satisfy detailed requirements, to observe prescribed conditions for land-use, conservation etc. Just as landowners are subject to all this already.

Functions which are currently run as "public services" or utilities (e.g. Post Office; transport; electricity; etc.) can be familiarly leased to "performance contractors" - who can be subjected to penalties for non-performance.

The economic benefits deriving from the use of public property can be collected in the form of a rental fee paid for their exclusive use, as determined by offers made on the free market.

This is the justified public revenue, which represents the maximum value of benefits from the best use of public property, and this is the clearly qualified amount, in which each citizen is entitled to an equal share.

is a necessary term as used in

to reveal end to control

We control

of a system of resistance

in absolute form.

the acceptance of

the power of

total

of power

to

to be a

other social systems

they in

the existence

is defined by

It is therefore

from

us

to the

the need and

it may also

is its of free action

his purposes.

effects of one choice

they are

(too much I be

him instants?)

income from an

to one selected

of a great

... in order to

3) We will have a ... on ... by ...

THE

to be

... or over ... of the ...

we qualify

John and ...

... with

... to leave

any

the

and

... as

... the aim

may be

... the

... or

4-11-68

to obtain
it in

of the

of the

when

of

of 11 living

of the

of the

1968

1968

We can illustrate the framework of similarities and variations of social systems according to their Ethical Denominators and their politico/economic and moral projections in the following tables:

<u>ETHICS</u>	<u>(A) THE INDIVIDUAL.</u>		<u>(B) THE COMMUNITY.</u>
	(The optimal satisfaction of his desires),...on....		(Satisfying the public interest as defined & changed by rulers.)
<u>POLITICAL</u> Projections of Ethics: The Political standards of value:.....	<u>FREEDOM, ENSURED BY RIGHTS TO ACQUIRE BENEFITS. EQUALITY, INSURED BY RESPONSIBILITIES.</u> "Equal" rights to exist and not to damage others. (No right to kill others.)		<u>INDIVIDUAL.</u> Freedom & Rights are subordinated to communal responsibilities. EQUALITY IS SUPPOSEDLY TOTAL.
<u>ECONOMIC PROJECTIONS OF ETHICS.</u> The Economic Standards of Value.....	<u>PRIVATE PROPERTY</u> as a right to acquire benefits.	<u>PRIVATE PROPERTY</u> only in what "the Community does not need."	<u>PRIVATE PROPERTY</u>
<u>MORALITY</u> Projection of ethical guidelines for behaviour most likely to achieve the desired benefits.	<u>PUBLIC PROPERTY</u> as a guarantee of survival. (But no "right" to be "kept" by others)	<u>PUBLIC PROPERTY</u> includes all values, which are distributed according to the changing definitions of "Public Interest"	
	<u>MORAL STANDARDS.</u> may fluctuate between....		
	<u>Anarchistic Hedonism</u> and advice on how best one is likely to achieve happiness, and...	Strictly controlled experimental directives and strictly controlled contradictory directives to complement changes in the definition of "the Public Interest" (Resulting in "Organized insecurity.").	

The variations between social systems can be followed by observing the gradual changes in their ethical standards of value, from absolute anarchy, which permits the limitless satisfaction of the desires of the individual, - to absolute communalism which commandeers all actions of individuals to satisfy the requirements of the "community"*

* These "absolutes" can never exist in reality, only in the abstract.

We can follow the parallel changes occurring in both the political and the economic orders within social systems from the limitless anarchistic freedom for actions without responsibility, and the parallel limitless right to amass private property through force and without the need to consider the property rights of anyone else.

As anarchistic value standards are tempered and man realises that he can obtain greater satisfactions through co-operating with his fellows, and consequently accepts increasing restraints on his actions we find that in the political plane this expressed in the form of limitations placed on individual freedoms and rights.

In the economic sphere also there are conditions and restrictions placed on the ways and means of acquiring private property.

Political assurances and newly declared responsibilities introduce a modicum of equality and this is reflected also in the economy, through arrangements which give an increasing share from the benefits previously expropriated exclusively by individual strongmen, as their private property to members of the community (public property).*

As we observe a gradual shift in the accepted social "standards of value" from the optimal satisfaction of the individual citizen towards the increasing intensity of the need for protection either in emergency situations (external attack, natural disaster) or because of increasing violence within society, or by other dangers (threatening safety or health), we see a gradual decrease in individual freedoms and rights, which are handed over to the community, in exchange of the expected protection and guardianship of individual interests. *

* Refer to: "Schematic illustration of Social Systems" in "Society in Conflict" by G. Hardy. - Pp21-25.

PART II.

EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL THREATS TO THE "FREE SOCIETY".

Our survey of the causes which create the fluctuations of systems between the extremes of individualistic anarchy and absolute communalism indicate that there are both external and internal reasons which make it very difficult to maintain a free society of voluntarily individuals devoted to the optimal satisfaction of its members, without some restrictions on individual freedom.

The external threats are usually dramatic and clearly memorable. A conquering enemy or a dictator, supported by his henchmen may impose by force his rule on a community. The internal threats to freedom are less noticeable and less definable, because they represent gradual reductions of individual freedoms.

Destruction of freedoms can result from the rule of a popular revolution or from a body of administrators, planners or other groups representing "Big Brother", who can abolish individual freedoms in the "alleged interests" of the community. Increasing restrictions are justifiable from time to time, and they are even voluntarily accepted and demanded by citizens, who realise that some dangers to their safety, security and health can not be overcome without

concentrated, communal action.

It is obvious, that oppressed groups of slaves and citizens down-trodden by ruling classes will plan to obtain their freedoms.

It is less obvious why citizens, who were persuaded that their interests are protected if they transfer their freedom to choose their actions to the directors, planners and administrators of the community - should decide to change their views, and demand the removal of the imposed regulations. An organised body of specialists, such as Big Brother's administrators are, can always conduct a more persuasive campaign of argumentation than the dissatisfied and disunited citizenry.

This is particularly the case in such ill defined, highly debatable, and inherently divisive areas of social value judgements which deal with the question of what represents the "good of the individual" and what arrangements are conducive to achieve the "optimal satisfaction" of a large body of independent and different individuals.

Such value judgements must unavoidably be subjective, and we are charged with the task of preparing objective criteria to define the degree of freedoms and the forms of restrictions on individual freedoms which are conducive to achieve "optimal satisfaction" by the citizenry.

Difficult as the task is, the united arguments of the vested-interest groups of administrators can be effectively countered, - provided that the arguments for regaining individual freedoms (which originate from the most diverse motivations) are organized into a logical and CONSISTENT STATEMENT OF ETHICAL PRINCIPLES MOTIVATED CONSISTENTLY INTO POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ACTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

The justifiable limitations of freedom in a
CONSISTENT LIBERTARIAN SOCIETY.

In our considerations we have concluded that the most satisfactory society for the benefit of the individual is a Free Society.

We have also accepted that absolute freedom cannot exist, and that Social Systems differ according to the increase or decrease of individual freedoms and community restrictions.

We could not avoid accepting that varying limitations on individual freedoms are necessary to ensure the safety, security, health and even the equal survival conditions of the individual.

This necessity gives rise to the increasing contemporary trend towards communalistic, socialistic, welfare-statist societies. As a result, unjustified restrictions are imposed on individual freedoms which are contrary to the interests of the citizens, inasmuch as they transfer benefits which rightly belong to some individual-to others, through political oppression, persecution and economic exploitation.

My task is to provide concise and consistent definitions for the justifiable limitations of individual freedoms. Such definitions enable us to demonstrate in consistent, ethical, political and economic terms what are the unjustifiable

restrictions which are detrimental to the whole society except for privileged groups of individuals who stand to benefit from persecution and exploitation.

THE COMMON GROUND OF
LIBERTARIAN AND CONSISTENT LIBERALISM.

We are one in the conviction that man can achieve his optimal satisfactions when he is free to act as he considers best for him. Consequently when he joins with others to live in a society he ought to have the political "right" or "entitlement" to direct his life and to act freely.

However, other members of society can only enjoy the same freedom if the rights of every member are not greater or lesser than those of other members. Consequently, rights must be equal.

Some acts may harm the equal rights of others; one member may inflict damage on others. As the collateral to individual freedom, we agree to accept equal responsibility and equal obligations for the consequences (bad or good) of our actions. We accept the need for regulations (limitations of freedom), but only to maintain the safety, security and health of the community.

Projecting political rights and responsibilities into the economic field - we agree that each individual is entitled to own his body, and consequently he is entitled to own his products and services, and he has the exclusive right to dispose of them.

We agree furthermore, that he has exclusive ownership rights (PRIVATE PROPERTY) to all goods and services which he obtains in FREE EXCHANGE for his products and services.

We agree that "re-distribution" of so acquired private property is an unjustifiable interference with individual freedoms unless it serves the safety, security and health of the community.

We agree that taxation levied on incomes is theft, - or a form of civil war.

We may subscribe to different modes of valuing products and services (i.e. according to "merit", "utility", "need") but we agree and insist that they be exchanged on a FREE MARKET price.

We agree that no one should initiate force or fraud against others, and we probably agree that in a complex technological society it is necessary that suppliers of products and services should either comply with regulations for the protection of the safety, security and health of others or be responsible for consequential damages.

THE APPARENT DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN

LIBERTARIAN AND CONSISTENT LIBERALISM.

"Apparent" disagreement, because if we apply our commonly held principles consistently - I believe that there is no disagreement.

+ + + + +

libertarians contend that since rights and responsibilities originate in individuals, the derivative economic rights and obligations justify the existence of only Private Property. According to libertarian interpretation what is called "Public Property", is the result of the unjustifiable confiscation of private properties of individuals.

Whatever is considered to be "Public Property" derives from the violation of individual freedoms, the rights to own ones body, ones products and anything, that the individual has obtained in his own way.

Libertarians consider, (1) that natural resources, (land, water, air, oil etc.) and any other benefits and conditions which are not created or produced by individuals can be justly taken into private property. (2) According to this view, the first occupiers of any lands have exclusive title to it, as if they had obtained ownership through "free exchange".

It follows from this assumption, that land-ownership is just as absolute as private property right as that which an individual has in his personal product, in his labour, and in values which he has obtained in free exchange.

+++++

In my view there are essential differences between values created by individuals, and values not created by individuals:-- such as natural resources in their unimproved form. Whilst one clearly belongs to the individual, values not created by him, such as natural resources, do not. In fact it is not usual to obtain property rights in natural resources until a point of scarcity is reached. As long as there is more land available than what is required for the use of every scavenger member of a herd, tribe, nomadic or grazing community -- the question of territorial rights, or property in land does not arise, or it is restricted to nesting places.

The need for exclusive use, or property rights develop with the relative scarcity of resources necessary for survival. This scarcity may be prompted by various things. Food, vegetation, animals, water etc. may have been used up by the inhabitants who may be forced to move to other territories to seek their means of survival. Changes in natural conditions, disasters, (drought, flood, earthquakes) may destroy survival conditions and force inhabitants away. Populations may grow too large compared to the available means of survival at the existing level of productivity.

+++++

This illustration shows, that natural resources are freely available to everyone -- until relative scarcity creates a value, a worthwhile benefit in their exclusive ownership. These values develop in accordance to the relative scarcity created by the fluctuation of market demand.

The significant point is, that in their natural, "unimproved" form these resources are not valuable as long as enough of them are available.

Consequently, it does not practically diminish the rights of any individual if others use, or enjoy the benefits of natural resources which are available without limits, -- compared to the current requirements.

However natural resources are limited. (In general, natural conditions which are beneficial for human survival favour some geographical areas, giving them comparatively greater value.

Temporary natural disasters inflict local disadvantage, reflected in loss of value - quite independently from any individual efforts.)

Although, without the availability of natural resources human existence or survival is impossible, their value fluctuates according to the needs of the inhabitants..

Today, we do not have to pay for air to breathe, simply because there is enough of it to satisfy the needs of all of us. But even with air, in some areas - we must contribute individual efforts to keep it healthy, and free from pollution.

LIBERTARIAN PRINCIPLES IMPLY EQUAL RIGHTS TO SURVIVAL CONDITIONS.

1) The point that needs to be emphasised is that, although we tend to treat natural resources as other kind of value, they indeed represent a unique kind of value.

Natural resources represent the basic possibility of survival. Without nature, without the materials available in nature, without conditions available in nature which permit life - we cannot survive.

Natural resources in toto, represent our basic survival conditions. If we want to survive within our complex technological society, we need other conditions as well to ensure survival, but without access to natural resources: air, water, land etc. - we cannot survive.

Perhaps because of the similarity of value-increases between man-made commodities and natural resources, the essential difference between property in commodities and property in "survival conditions" has not become self-evident.

Perhaps the gradual value-increases in response to relative scarcity has hidden away this essential difference.

Once we acknowledge the essential difference between ownership of survival conditions and the products and services of individuals,

IT IS INEVITABLE TO REALISE THAT EQUAL FREEDOM, EQUAL INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS IMPLY EQUAL ACCESS TO SURVIVAL CONDITIONS.

"Survival conditions, natural resources etc. can not in justice belong to individuals. They are the property of the community - in equal shares. Public property is justified. It ensures equal economic rights for the citizenry.

+++++
"Equal" political rights presuppose that each individual be ensured of an "equal right to exist, to survive". In economic terms, this is not possible without guaranteed equal access to survival conditions. (i.e. air to breathe, water to drink, land to live on; in toto = natural resources.)

Consequently:

It is not possible to enjoy

"Equal political rights" without ensuring first

"equal rights for survival", that is: the acknowledgement, approval, permission for each individual to exist.

In political terms the "Equal Right to Exist" is parallel to the right of not being killed without legal justification. Access to survival conditions must be equal, and no individual ought to be denied equal access to the means of survival without legal justification. (i.e. it is contrary to the principles of a free society to expel a member or a group from "Spaceship Earth", or to restrict the access to survival condition for some members over others, except in order to protect the safety, security and health of the community.)

In economic terms the "Equal Right to Exist" is projected into the form of ownership rights - similarly to other political rights. "Public property" represents the Equal Economic Right to exist.

The "Equal Right to Exist" can only be ensured by providing an equal share in the benefits and disadvantages of survival conditions (i.e. an equal share in "Nature", commonly described as natural resources.) which belong to the whole community: the "Public".

PROPERTY RIGHT THROUGH "FIRST OCCUPATION" IS CONTRARY TO LIBERTARIAN PRINCIPLES.

2) Although, I have shown already that it is consistent with Libertarian principles to uphold equal rights to survival conditions, and consequently it is justified to distribute equally benefits/derivatives from such "public property", I feel it is now necessary to refute a false argument used to support property rights on the basis of "first occupation".

"First occupation" occurs either as a result of the use of force or fraud, and consequently it violates the accepted Libertarian code of behaviour.

It is impossible to support the claim of "first occupation" to any piece of land historically. Human existence goes back well past recorded history, and indications are, that all lands occupied today have served as living space to some of our early ancestors.

Land which is claimed by "first occupiers" in historical times has almost always been appropriated from previous occupiers by force or fraud.

Historical legend tells the story how nomad tribes have symbolically "bought" the lands they occupied during the 9th Century A.D. "Peoples' wandering" in Europe.

The leader of the Hungarian tribes is said to have invited to a feast the local chieftains from the border regions of the country soon to become the Hungarian homeland. They were asked to bring nothing except a bit of bread and wine. The rest was to be supplied by the hosts. However, at the end of the feast, the Hungarians declared, that the chieftains have "symbolically" sold their territories, by handing over the produce of their country and accepting in return the protection which was "symbolically" represented by the Hungarians performing the functions of a host to their guests.....

The so called "squatters" and "selectors" who claimed

property rights on the basis of "first occupation" or even cultivation, have taken over the land occupied (in the fashion of nomads) by the Indians in the Americas, the Aborigines in Australia and various other natives in other lands. When it was necessary, they used force.

Since the use of force or fraud are contrary to libertarian principles - property rights based on first occupation, or cultivation are unjustifiable titles to hold or transfer.

But even if there were still genuinely "never-occupied" locations, "first occupation" is no different in principle from the exclusion of others from the use of a natural resource. As it is an extremely drastic violation of political and economic freedom to deny someone's equal right to breathe air, the denial of an equal share in the benefits of unimproved, natural resources is simply a less drastic violation of equal rights.

THE RECONCILIATION BETWEEN
LIBERTARIAN AND COMMUNIST IDEOLOGIES.

1)...As we have seen, the principle of Equal rights implicitly includes equal rights, equal access to, equal share in survival conditions inherent in the existence of nature, as represented in the form of natural resources and natural conditions.

To enable the assessment, collection and equal distribution of the benefits and disadvantages of survival conditions it is necessary to consider the ownership of natural resources, different from private property.

^{as} Whilst private property relates to the free ownership of ones body and the products of the individual together with whatever products and services he may obtain in FREE EXCHANGE, - public property relates to such benefits which are not created by an individual.

2)...Private property, private ownership (as different from contractual permission for "exclusive use") of natural resources - results in the diminishment of equal rights of other individuals in their equal property rights to an equal share in survival conditions.

The "first occupation" or cultivation of "unused" natural resources is based on the use of force or fraud. This is explicitly contrary to libertarian principles.

Furthermore, "unused" land or other natural resources are a potential source of survival conditions to people living at other geographical locations as well as for future generations.

No individual has exclusive right to deny equal rights for survival to others, within the framework of libertarian principles.

LAND EXCHANGE IS NOT POSSIBLE WITHOUT EQUAL SURVIVAL
CONDITIONS.

It follows from the foregoing considerations, that "free" market conditions and "free market exchange" cannot exist when some of the trading partners are denied equal access to survival conditions.

If some individuals are denied equal rights and an equal share in the benefits of natural resources whilst other individuals are permitted to "own" natural resources, then the trading conditions under which the market exchange of goods and services takes place are rigged in favour of those individuals who are entitled to hold private property benefits which were not created by individual effort.

It is obvious, that there can be no equal rights between those who are permitted to charge a fee for the permission to remain on "Spaceship Earth" and those who must pay such a fee for the bare condition and possibility of survival.

If an individual can be denied permission to survive, to share equally in the benefits of nature by another individual or group of individuals, then he is politically oppressed, persecuted, and economically exploited.

If he can be forbidden to stay somewhere on Earth, because it is "owned" by others, if he is forbidden to drink water and breathe air - unless he pays a fee for this privilege then he may be forced to exchange all his labour, his products, his efforts, his savings for the bare permission to survive.

Private Property of natural resources, of land and access to food has in fact made voluntary slavery possible, in times of extreme natural disasters.

* "One of the earliest records in history describes the development which led to slavery in Egypt during the seven years of famine at about 1600 B.C. This is how the Bible narrates it in Genesis XLIV 1.19.: 'Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land? buy us and our land for bread and we and our land will be the servants unto Pharaoh...'"

Whilst under extreme conditions man has been willing to sell even his body into slavery for the bare chance of survival, he may be forced even under "normal" conditions to "exchange" his labour for his bare sustenance or rather for the necessities required to survive and reproduce.

This condition of "wage slavery" (David Ricardo) - "The Iron Law of Wages" is the direct result of unequal rights, unequal access, unequal sharing in the benefits of natural resources, land, and other survival conditions.

The enormity of this exploitation is not so apparent under conditions of general prosperity. But as long as some citizens must first pay over part of their individual efforts to buy their right of survival before they can bargain for the price of the remaining part of their labour and products - they are obviously forced into an unequal trading position with those who do not have to first pay such a fee, or who may even have their income augmented by such effortlessly collected fees.

Those whose income is diminished by a fee for their sheer survival, have to accept lower paid work, cannot hold out as long to find better bargains or more suitable employment, as those

* "Anarchy and the Individual" G. Hardy, (Reform Publishing Co) Pp1. Melbourne. Australia- 1965

who can use all of their incomes.

Those who can keep all of their incomes or receive even fees for the use of natural resources "owned" by them, can build up savings easier, they can wait to buy on the market all kinds of commodities and services when prices are low, and they can delay the sale of their products and services until prices are high. In other words, they enjoy, a definite market bargaining advantage over other individuals.

Henry George, the American economist has shown clearly in his "Progress and Poverty" and other works, how land-monopoly is the major cause of such exploitation, and how it prevents the operation of free trade.

FREE MARKET CONDITIONS HAVE NEVER EXISTED YET.

The precondition of free market exchange is: Equal Right for survival, which is ensured by an equal share in the benefits of nature, and those not created by individuals.

Whilst it is easy to see that monopoly-ownership of land and natural resources results in exploitation (i.e. from one moment to another ~~to another~~ oil producers could extort fourfold price increases in 1973 from the energy-dependent world community), more and more complex economic conditions provide other opportunities for some privileged, monopolist groups to distort equal trading terms, through various restrictions or compulsions, and similarly exploit the rest of the community. Such unequal economic rights, and conditions give unequal monopoly benefits to those with privileges. These privileges ensure that others, who have unequal rights are exploited.

*"For a long time it was thought that the system of free enterprise would automatically achieve just distribution of incomes according to the value of the effort exerted by individuals.

It has become clear however, that market conditions, restrictive practices and exclusive advantages enjoyed by some, have greatly distorted the bargaining power of some groups.

In fact, prevailing conditions prevent the operation of a "Free Market".

"Free enterprise" did not fail - it has not yet been tried!"

In the midst of economic progress, - poverty has been increasing. The rich are getting richer and the poor are becoming poorer. Some people can earn huge fortunes by very little effort, whilst others stay at the bread line, no matter how great their exertions are."

THE ELIMINATION OF SOCIAL MONOPOLY RIGHTS (the elimination of exploitation)

The political freedom of citizens is ensured by enforcing equal rights and responsibilities, and thereby eliminating political privileges, discriminations, exclusive monopolies, restrictive practices which favour some groups of citizens and consequently oppress or even persecute others.

**"Progress and Poverty" by Henry George.
(Henry George Foundations)

* "Society in Conflict" by G. Hardy (Pp.110-1)

In a similar manner, the economic freedom and equal trading conditions of citizens must be ensured by EQUAL ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, to permit the operation of "FREE MARKET EXCHANGE".

This requires the elimination of economic discrimination, privileges, monopolies and restrictive practices, which permit some groups of citizens to exploit, blackmail or hold to ransom others.

As it is found necessary to impose some limits on individual freedoms in order to obtain better safety, security and health, - it is sometimes necessary to impose or retain some exclusive economic rights and even some restrictive practices - provided that the additional benefits obtained through such exemptions are shared equally by all citizens.

EQUAL ECONOMIC RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES ARE IMPOSED,

- 1) If each individual can obtain an equal share in the benefits (and disadvantages) of nature, and
- 2) an equal share in any other benefits which do not derive from individual efforts. (i.e. licences granted; monopolies; restrictions imposed or lifted; etc.)

All benefits and disadvantages which do not result from individual effort do not rightly belong to individuals, nor to private property.

Crops and buildings are the result of individual efforts and their income justly belongs to individuals. Better crops, suitable buildings result in higher incomes, and this differentiates the more successful individual effort from the less successful, less efficient, less productive.

On the other hand the value, or rather the rental value, the use-value of the un-improved land, upon which cultivation, or building takes place is not created by the individual user.

The value of a breath of air, a drink of water, or a parcel of land depends on the scarcity of the natural resource compared to the demand created by an increasing population; the quality, fertility, accessibility of the natural resource in relation to the needs of the population and the technology, the mode of production of the community.

Similarly, the market value of individually produced goods and services consists partly of the value of the individual efforts and partly of additional, communally created value-components if the production of goods and the performance of some services are restricted only to some individuals (licensed Hotels; trade restrictions; Restrictive practices; i.e. doctors, or compulsory unionism etc.)

Those components of market values which are not contributed by the suppliers of goods and services (i.e. access to the use of natural resources, or higher prices resulting from artificial scarcity caused by restrictions) - do not justly belong to the supplier.

Such monopoly values are created by the community and they justly belong to the public to ensure Equal Economic Rights. Hence Public Property is just and necessary to eliminate exploitation.