

have a strong voice in how they shall be allocated."

Miss Ackroyd continued: "A case reported in the House of Commons, July 19, by Mr Ian Lloyd, M.P., illustrates the nub of our evidence about licences. A Mr. Fitt of Portsmouth has apparently made seven applications to open the flexible type of licensed premises for which there is a need, at a place which is a tourist attraction. Local residents are said to be wholly in favour of such premises. When Mr. Fitt made his fifth application it was known that the only other public house in the area would be seriously affected by a road development scheme. Yet his application was refused.

"As a test case, when making his sixth application he asked for a club licence too. This was granted. But a general on-licence was refused. By the time he made his seventh application his premises had been built. Road reorganisation had affected the only licensed premises in the locality. Again he was refused."

Miss Ackroyd asked: "Where consumers give their support to Mr. Fitt, who is prepared to meet a local need, should local vested interests have so strong a voice in opposing them?"

## Fighting for the Landlords

ROBERT TIDEMAN

Reprinted from *The Pacific Sun*

**M**ARCHERS and spectators alike wept as one thousand Americans and Filipinos early this month commemorated the Bataan Death March in which seven to ten thousand men died twenty-five years ago. Altogether twenty thousand men died defending the Philippines.

The bitter fruit of their brave sacrifice was savored recently by a Filipino journalist. "In some provinces," he said, "we have wealthy land owners who gamble \$1,000 on the make of an approaching car . . . But in the fields a few yards away, peasants live in grinding poverty, often with a *per capita* income of \$130 a year."

A favored few now treat as their exclusive property land soaked with the life's blood of thirty thousand defenders. Many of the men who fought and bled for the territory have not even a square yard of it on which to rest their heads. By the laws of their country they are virtually locked out of the land they won unless they come to terms with a landlord.

To such a landless Filipino it makes no real difference whether the rent he pays is consumed by his countryman on the islands or by a Japanese in Tokyo. His countryman gets all the rent he can; a Japanese could get no more. So far as he is concerned, the Japanese might as well have the islands back.

I wonder if it occurred to any of the men who fell in the Philippines that the land they fought for would be rented out a few years later by an absentee landlord who would bet \$1,000 on whether the next car down the road would be a Ford or a Chevy. Did the men who died there know that the land was claimed, even at the moment they lay dying upon it, by someone who would come along after the fight was over and demand rent from

## BOARD STIFF!

**T**HIS COUNTRY is stiff with Boards and the public is bored stiff with them. The record seems to show little or no usefulness in their further existence, whereas to dismantle most of them would release clerical staff to do useful work elsewhere, and stop the use of buildings, mountains of paper, and thousands of office machines, maintained at the public expense.

If we really need an Egg Board, why not a Bacon Board? Why do we have a Potato Board but no Cabbage or Lettuce Board? There is an enormous public consumption of marmalade, beer, soup and bread. The marketing and distribution of these essential components of the national diet is admirably performed without a Board for each.

As to the usefulness of certain existing Boards, consider the delight of ordinary people being told how to suck eggs or swallow more milk, at their own expense, when they already know.

—From a letter in *The Financial Times*, August 15.

whoever wanted to use it?

Does an American soldier who falls in Vietnam today ever wonder, "who holds title to this parcel on which I now lie dying?" If any mortally wounded soldier ever asked the question and got a straight answer, he probably would not die happy. More than two-thirds of the Vietnamese are landless laborers or tenants.

Most of the good land is held by absentee landlords who contribute, as landlords, nothing whatever to the economy of Vietnam. Capital equipment—tractors, barns, machinery, tools—depends for its existence upon someone's investment, someone's willingness to postpone consumption. Land does not. The ownership of land goes back simply to the parcelling out of the soil by earlier conquerors.

Observers report that many rackrented Vietnamese peasants fear peace, for while the bullets fly the landlord stays away and the peasant keeps the whole produce, but when an area is pacified by American arms along comes the landlord who wants his back rents. Many peasants prefer the hazards of war to the certainties of what we call peace.

Too many Americans believe that such predatory systems of land ownership are an essential feature of "The American Way." They think government ownership and control is the only alternative. They are wrong. The third alternative is the taxation of land values. Admiral Spruance recommended this to the Islanders on his retirement as our Ambassador. Under this system, which is applied in some measure throughout the United States, private titleholders pay annual taxes, which offset their special privileges. Land revenue flows into public coffers. Land titles stay private. This practical land tenure system should be our No. 1 export to underdeveloped nations like the Philippines and Vietnam.