

Certainly the single tax could never take hold during periods like the 1920's, when unrest is not vocal. Man's struggles for freedom spring mainly from economic causes; hence we cannot acknowledge the efficacy of the ballot for much else than pacifying the populace with palliatives.

If proof is required to amplify this contention we need only point to the classic example of appeasement, a policy essentially synonymous with the palliative method, which was to prevent the present war. Now actually there is no difference in nations fighting for the possession of monopolistic privileges, and groups inside a nation contesting for local privileges. The English, desiring to cling to their world monopoly of mines, markets and oil wells—obtained through the self-same methods Hitler is employing—realized that only by maintaining peace could they hold on to their possessions, since the disillusionment which settles in after the war is the greatest changer of traditions and the most potent force to let loose the forces of dissatisfaction. That they have finally resorted to war proves only that economic questions cannot be solved by bargaining, as in legislative forums, since bargaining is essentially the way of the compromiser—and Georgeists know no compromise.

However, if we are in the midst of a revolutionary change, it is the streamlined version of the absolute State. For obvious reasons, I do not relish the thought of being enslaved under the approaching collectivist society; but it must be understood that, whereas the founding fathers escaped to America to safeguard their freedom (what a chance they had to establish the single tax!), we have no free land on which to go. Indeed, we may rightly say that the free American land, acting as a haven for the more vociferous dissidents of the Old World, lessened the tension again past absolute rulers and thus preserved their battered systems for the reckoning they now face—hence the trend to alter the system of government in all the major powers of the world within a comparatively short time.

The fate of Georgeism under a rigid collectivist state—whether Left or Right—will not necessarily be one of complete doom. The Henry George School may be closed, "Progress and Poverty" may be burned as contradicting the ideas of the master of the land. But the one thing that no government can destroy is the unyielding will on the part of some of the people to question the existing State, if only in whispers and if only in their minds. This, together with the fallacy inherent in Stateism, must in time overthrow even the most absolute of dictatorial systems. To understand this recurring fight for freedom throughout history is to comprehend where our real strength lies; for only when, with each succeeding swing toward freedom, certain traditions are left behind, do we approach the free society.

A FREE COPY of LAND AND FREEDOM is an invitation to become a subscriber.

Trade in The Hitlerian Empire

By PAVLOS GIANNELIA

"INTERNATIONAL Commerce cannot prosper if its current is held up by barriers of excessive tariffs."

So stated the memorandum Mr. Sumner Welles handed to Mr. Reynaud, during his visit to Europe this past Spring. Our esteemed British contemporary, *Land and Liberty*, thereupon wrote: "Neither France nor Great Britain, even between themselves, has shown the least intention meanwhile of reducing the tariffs and the trade obstruction."

Not only has this been the case, but much worse; neither the British nor the French Empires have applied the free trade principle among their own territories! Besides the internal customs duties (*octrois*), Greater France had tariff restrictions between European France and all parts of the French Empire.

Great Britain still has tariffs between England and the Dominions, between England and the Crown Colonies, and between all parts of the Empire.

What is the status of trade in the new Hitlerian Empire? German economists have consulted past German policies. In German history, the customs union of the Northern German States (*Deutscher Zollverein*) was the forerunner of the political union of the German Empire. The Third Reich has remained trustworthy to the customs union principle, and has made a certain application of it in the new Hitlerian Empire. Tariffs have indeed been introduced in the newly conquered territories, but they are employed in the opposite of the usual sense of "protection." Immediately after the conquest of every territory, a free flow of trade was allowed for goods imported from the new territories into the Altreich; and "protective" tariffs were maintained in the opposite direction—that is, tariffs were imposed on goods going from the Altreich into every other part of the Hitlerian Empire.

This policy shows that the German economists, notwithstanding their opposition to free trade, realize that tariffs are more efficacious in handicapping the importing rather than the exporting country.

This "protection" was imposed immediately upon the conquest or annexation of Austria, Sudetenland, Bohemia-Moravia, Poland, probably Denmark and Norway, and probably also France. It was expected to be maintained for about a period of one year after every annexation, but will probably be continued as long as it is advantageous to the Reich.

A mutual benefit, and a strengthening of position, would have resulted from a complete free trade between France and Great Britain. It is to be hoped that Britain will yet learn the lesson. If she persists in maintaining the pernicious "protective" system, she will sooner or later learn that tariffs are not protection, but economic suicide.