

of raw materials and machinery sent from Britain and the U.S.A. Such are the real impediments to the success of international charity.

War on Want, a world survey published recently by the Association for World Peace, illustrates the attitude of many who advocate international assistance for under-developed countries. On page 52, for instance, the problems of peasant communities are attributed to "avaricious landlordism, or to out-of-date systems of land tenure, or simply to sheer pressure of population" (they actually separate them). "The world can show far too many areas where overcrowded peasant communities have been driven to deplorably low standards of life." The root cause is laid bare—"avaricious landlordism." And in the same paragraph the remedy is advocated—"the problem of overcrowded land requires the opening of new areas." We know that new areas have been opened up because the development schemes have come into being. We know also that the land was not free, for had there been free land there would have been no problems. We must conclude that the "avaricious landlords" were first bought out. Yet throughout this booklet there is no mention of the sums paid for land purchase. Haven't we the right to know? Is it any wonder that Asians are "sick and tired of paper plans and promises and are clamouring for results"?

The people whose living standards we are attempting to raise are poor and "backward" because they have been robbed of their equal rights to the land on which they were born. They have been, and are being, exploited by their own countrymen as well

as by Europeans. What the Lord provided for all has been appropriated by a few. A study of the plans to develop the backward areas of the world leads one to conclude that what the western nations are offering is not really aid at all. No attempt is being made to restore even a part of what has been taken from the landless—that remains securely in the possession of the expropriators. Instead the taxpayers of the world are obliged to contribute to these peoples' rehabilitation.

When representatives of the "poor" countries come cap in hand to the round table to plead for international charity, they should be asked one simple question: In your country, what is the relationship between the people and the land on which they were born? Means tests and large scale enquiries are unnecessary; this one question provides the acid test. If the answer is that a few own the land while the rest are landless, the plea for financial and other assistance should be dismissed. The delegates should be instructed to return to their own countries and to inform their Governments that the means for helping their people lies in their own hands—not in the mulcting of foreign taxpayers. For the immediate and fundamental "aid" that the people of the backward countries require—just as do their brothers in the West—is the restitution of their equal rights to the land, the value of which collectively they create and enhance. Unless and until this is achieved, foreign assistance is powerless to help the exploited; it merely condones and consolidates privilege and injustice.

L. J. HUBBARD.

NYASALAND - WHY FEDERATION IS FEARED

A survey of developments in the Nyasaland Protectorate, which adjoins the north-eastern boundary of Northern Rhodesia, affords useful information on the question whether Africans can develop land. As that Central African Protectorate embodies some of the aspects of West and East Africa other details are also of general application. Here, in 1889 and 1891, the British Government, pressed by anti-slavery opinion, proclaimed a Protectorate "with the consent and at the desire of the chiefs and people." There was a somewhat denser population in a fairly well watered country and the inhabitants were adaptable and well disposed. After slave raiding had been suppressed the cost of maintaining peace and public works was remarkably low, and to save further expense the administration tended to avoid interference. Hut tax for revenue was according light. Europeans who had already acquired land from chiefs—in the most promising situations—naturally were confirmed in possession, but further land grants were made only reluctantly. The steady progress of European plantations demonstrated that Reserves, Pass Laws and Colour Bar regulations were not necessary for development. Africans began to acquire technical skill as well as scholastic education; a few started to grow export crops on their own account.

Europeans and African cultivators continued to thrive. In the Labour Government's White Paper on Federation figures of imports, exports and revenue show that, during the ten year period to 1950, Nyasaland's rate of progress in every instance

but one surpassed that of both its partners in the proposed federation. A more reliable guide to prosperity, however, is furnished by growth of population. Nyasaland's population is estimated at nearly 2½ million compared with approximately two millions each for Southern and Northern Rhodesia, countries that are respectively four and eight times the area of Nyasaland, perhaps equal in fertility and favoured by immense mineral resources, whereas Nyasaland is lacking in them. Part of Nyasaland's prosperity is derived from wages paid to Nyasaland Africans who, when it suits them, work in Rhodesia for the higher rates payable, due to the proximity of great mineral wealth, and then return to their homes in a freer country where the cost of living is lower.

After the first World War a number of settlers came to Nyasaland from Rhodesia and the Union. Finding all freehold land at a monopoly price and labourers, unhampered by Pass Laws, able to change employment at will, the newcomers pressed for Pass regulations and the alienation of more land for Europeans. These requests were refused on the ground that Nyasaland was a Protectorate. A group of these settlers then determined, as they said, to "smash the Protectorate" by some form of amalgamation with the Rhodesias. To familiar observers, of which I was one, they were quite frank about their motives and these do not accord with the tone of later official statements of the proposal. For a time the agitation languished, but as increasing peasant pros-

perity began to affect the labour supply to Rhodesia and also to the tea estates, in which big interests were now concerned, more powerful influences began to intervene. The growth of belief in economic planning afforded them an excellent opportunity for pleading that the economic life of the three countries was "complementary" and therefore must be "co-ordinated" or "integrated." Planning, of course, requires political authority and this has taken shape in the Federation Parliament in which 26 freely elected European and 6 "specially elected" African members are to have almost unrestricted power of formulating economic regulations for the three countries. Rhodesian planners are not likely to see the necessity for a free peasantry whose existence conflicts with interests they consider most important. But so insidious is the spell of the planning idea that no prominent anti-Federationist spokesman challenges the alleged economic advantages of the proposal; in public controversy the question is not even superficially examined and the case against Federation thus fades to a shadow. The future will show whether planning against the wishes of the vast majority can be imposed successfully where there are 600 Africans to one European.

I have cited Nyasaland, of which I had long personal experience, not as an example of a dependency enjoying good laws of taxation and land tenure, but only as an African territory in which, hitherto, more by accident than design, some mistakes have been avoided. Africans have not been pushed into Reserves, European land ownership, although considerable, has not been allowed to encroach dangerously into areas where the Africans maintain their customary system of tenure, and Africans have shown

they are quite capable of developing land successfully for purposes in which they have experience. But the native land system badly needs adapting to modern conditions, and as taxes are not assessed according to benefits received the question of paying for public works becomes more acute as development reaches a higher stage. It is to be noted that the benefit of useful public works is always registered in the increased value of land in the vicinity. If this value comes into the public treasury the public works pay for themselves.

It is not the duty of the ruling power to decide in advance who is best fitted to develop land; its duty is to make laws under which competition decides the question; and rent is the indication. If in our African dependencies each holder of land, rural, industrial or urban was obliged to pay into public revenue the annual value of his site alone, apart from improvements, and whether or not he made full use of it; and if the revenue so received was used to abolish or reduce other forms of taxation, every inhabitant, without distinction of race, would have equal opportunity of using land and all land would be put to its most profitable use. This is a clear practical policy that answers both ethical and economic requirements and attacks the root of all the African problems now demanding solution. It gives Europeans every opportunity to prove their contention that they are best fitted to make use of land; but it gives Africans the same opportunity. British electors cannot be expected to know in detail the circumstances in each territory, but an enlightened public opinion, acting through Parliament, could insist that the Colonial Office applied the principle.

F. DUPUIS.

DE TOCQUEVILLE'S SERVICE TO MANKIND

Alexis de Tocqueville, 1805 to 1859, came of an aristocratic family strongly influenced by liberal opinions. His mother was a grandmother of the wise and humane Malesherbes who had been associated with Turgot in the Physiocrat administration of 1774—1776. As Turgot had been dismissed by court influence and Malesherbes was later guillotined in the name of the people, a descendant would have had particular reason to reject any form of political power as its own justification.

Tocqueville adopted the legal profession and in 1831, as a young deputy judge, was commissioned by the government of Louis Philippe to visit the United States and report on the prison system. In that period of surging thought and high aspiration a reflective investigator was not likely to restrict himself to a mere question of administration. The revolution of the preceding year in France and the agitation for electoral reform in England indicated that Europe was turning towards democracy, and democracy appeared to have succeeded in America although it had failed in France. Could the American example yield useful lessons for the guidance of his own countrymen? Tocqueville asked himself. The result of his investigations appeared in 1835 as *Democracy in America* and, with Stuart Mill's *Representative Government*, written with its warnings constantly in view, it remains one of the most profound surveys of

democratic government from every point but the economic.

Briefly, Tocqueville found that the power to vote members to a vast centralised government was not in itself a guarantee of liberty. Such a constitution fostered the impression that all men are equal rather than that they all have equal rights, and by magnifying the conception of the State, it might lead to a condition in which all are equal and all slaves. The real liberty that existed in America, Tocqueville considered, derived from other causes, some of them anterior to the Declaration of Independence: the powers reserved to the component States, the absence of a bureaucracy, and, especially, the constitution of municipalities governed by the town meeting. "Township independence is the life and mainspring of American liberty to-day." He recognised, however, that the American democracy he analysed was based upon an "equality of fortune" which was not to be seen in Europe and that the ownership of land was the basis of a governing aristocracy. He seemed to think that democracy, by its constitution, would perpetuate this equality of fortune, but in one important chapter he pointed to a factor "more important than the laws," namely, "The peculiar and accidental situation in which providence has placed the Americans" on the edge of a vast area of fertile and unoccupied land. "The European emigrant lands in a country