

number of remarkable examples of increase of land values culled from official sources.

Land at the corner of the faubourg Montmartre and the rue Bergère was let in 1427 at 32 francs and sold in 1702 for 26,000 francs. Two centuries later this land was worth 27,000,000 francs.

In 1613 the garden of the Luxembourg was bought by Marie de Medici at the rate of 9 centimes a square metre. Half a century later the price had doubled. But the greatest advance took place during the Nineteenth century. Between 1793 and 1902 the average price per square metre of land at Vaugirard increased from 56 centimes to 85 francs; in the rue de la Chaussée-d'Antin from 11 francs to 900 francs; in the faubourg Montmartre from 38 francs to 1,300 francs.

This great increase in value, says M. Vêran, is due in great part to works carried out by the city and the development of means of transport, paid for by the public but solely benefiting the owners of land. He concludes that the proposed tax will gain for the community a legitimate part of the wealth created by its sacrifices.

In an article in *Terre et Liberté* from which we take these particulars, Mr Sam Meyer points out the idea is deceptive. As soon as or even before any improvement scheme is adopted the increase in value has already taken place. The owners of land know very well the direction in which the city must expand. Proposed improvements are in the air long before they are formally voted upon. When that time arrives the increment of value is no longer future but realised.

All attempts which have been made to collect the increase of value due to public works have been largely abortive. In fact the problem is wrongly formulated—it is not to collect the increase of value due to each isolated expenditure, but to collect the whole value which is continually being created and maintained by the community.

Other articles in the latest issue of *Terre et Liberté* include a valuable survey of Agrarian Reform in Russia by M. Daudé-Bancel, and an article on Land Reform in Czecho-Slovakia by Prof. Borodaewsky with a criticism by Mr Pavlos Giannellia.

GERMANY

Recent issues of *Bodenreform*, the organ of the German Land Reform Union, contain much of interest. An article in the issue of 17th November on the Increase in Price of Building Land quotes from *Die Deutsche Volkswirtschaft* (German Economy), the official economic journal of the Nazis, statistics indicating the rapid increase in recent years in the price of land. The official comment is: "As in current years, apart from quite short periods of stoppage, the activity of the land market has been maintained, one may very well count upon relatively satisfactory figures for this year." *Bodenreform's* comment is: "The figures are only satisfactory in that they prove a rising desire for land settlement on the part of the land-hungry people of the towns. This healthy desire will naturally be frustrated by the unfair increase in the price of building land." The same issue contains an article by Dr Heinz Potthoff on The Pure Land-Value Tax in which he says: "All land-reformers are agreed in this, that the best, the only just tax, on land is a pure tax on its value. It should fall neither upon the buildings nor upon the products of labour that the owner or occupier of the land has produced. The special object of taxation is the rent of land, the unearned income which comes from the ownership of the land."

The issue of 22nd December contains an appreciative notice of Mr Verinder's Land and Freedom.

The issue of 15th December contains an article by Professor Siegfried Sitte of Vienna explaining how taxation of buildings and improvements impedes production and leads to land becoming unused, and stating the case for raising public revenues by a tax on the economic rent of land.

For your Library—Indexed Bound Volumes of "Land & Liberty," price Ten Shillings, are now ready. The price of the Index alone is One Shilling.

ARGENTINA

From the offices of *Tribuna Georgista* (Defensa 553, Buenos Aires), the journal of the Argentine Henry George Federation, comes a new edition of the classic work *Rivadavia y las Legislacion de las Tierras Publicas* (Rivadavia and his Land Laws) by Andrés Lamas.

This work was first published in 1882. It contains an historical account of the circumstances leading up to and the passage of Bernardino Rivadavia's land legislation in 1826. The object of his reform was to give security of possession to the user of the land while at the same time securing for the community its rent. This measure was in advance of the time and its benefits were not understood by the masses. Within a short time it was swept away by the tyrant Rosas who distributed the public lands to his soldiers as Roman conquerors had done of old.

The second part of the book contains an exposition of the economic principles involved. Lamas does not refer to Henry George, and it may be inferred that he was not acquainted with his writings. His knowledge of English writers appears to have been obtained from French or Spanish translations of their works. He points out that Ricardo did not draw the proper deduction from his law of rent, and that Malthus failed to observe that it was the increase of rent, not the increase of population, which impoverished the majority of the people.

If Lamas did not know of George's teaching, this is a remarkable example of the simultaneous discovery of basic principles.

The volume contains an introduction, reprinted from the edition of 1914, by the distinguished Uruguayan statesman Dr Manuel Herrera y Reissig. It contains 112 closely printed pages and is sold at the extremely low price of 20 centavos. It would therefore be unfair to criticize the paper or the type, but we may hope that some day it may be possible to reprint this great book in a still better form and with an index. It is a book which ought to be in the hands of every person who knows the Spanish language.

AUSTRALIA

The Sugar Monopoly

The Australian government has renewed for a further period of five years the agreement with the sugar interests and the embargo upon foreign sugar, but the campaign against this monopoly has stirred up great public interest. The Henry George Leagues have played an important part in the controversy and much valuable educational work has been done.

The original capital of the Colonial Sugar Refining Company was £2,425,000, which has been watered up to £14,000,000 on which an annual dividend of 12½ per cent is paid. Moreover, the original capital has been returned to the shareholders in cash bonuses. The consumption of sugar in Australia is 300,000 tons which sold at the wholesale price of £33 a ton. Of the same sugar 200,000 tons is exported to Great Britain and sold here at £8 a ton after paying duty of £2 a ton. It is hardly surprising to learn that the sugar monopoly has cost the consumers of Australia £7,000,000 a year, or in its ten years of existence a total of some £70,000,000.

Large sums of money have been spent by the sugar interests in advocating their case. Last October, Mr A. G. Huie, secretary of the N.S.W. Henry George League wrote to the *Sydney Truth* in reply to an article which had complained of criticism of the sugar embargo and urged its continuance. He received the following letter from the editor: "Replying to your letter on this subject, I think that you are under a misapprehension when you accept the matter contained in *Truth* with regard to the Sugar industry as being an expression of opinion of this newspaper. This matter is advertising and is inserted by the Queensland Sugar Growers' Association and appears in all newspapers throughout the Commonwealth."

In 1930, when the previous renewal of the agreement was under discussion, a member of the Henry George League wrote to the trade union paper *The Labor Call* protesting against the publication of articles in support of the wealthy