

market gardens will bloom in the desert". (Daily Telegraph, April 28.)

From Australia comes news of costly road schemes to open up thousands of square miles of practically unsettled country in western Queensland and New South Wales and the Kimberleys in Western Australia. The latter could "increase

cattle raising by 50 per cent". (Australian News, April 27.)

● Neither the professor nor the Australian Commonwealth Government apparently has any idea of what happens to land values in the course of these thrilling developments; but at least they seem not to be too overawed by the spectacle of the imminent 'population explosion'.

## LETTERS

### POLITICS FIRST

To the Editor of Land & Liberty

SIR, — The rare independence of mind evident in Mr. John Nibb's book, *Man — the Madman* encourages me to hope he will reconsider his impression that liberty is not the first and ultimate aim of the Georgeist movement, and that our campaign cannot promote peace.

That liberty, the fullest opportunity for every individual to live and develop his powers in natural freedom, is the supreme object of the Georgeist movement every serious reader of *Progress and Poverty* may see beyond the slightest doubt. But, unlike some libertarian movements, we have no mental reservations on any aspect of liberty. For example, instead of overlooking the objection that free trade alone did not cure poverty and unemployment we quote this as an illustration of the fact that without freedom to use the earth and its resources man can be free only as a tethered animal is free: the length of his chain. Land and tax reform are important only as the indispensable means of breaking this chain.

Mr. Nibb refers to economics as if it were an art to be practised. Perhaps this is a reflection of the current picture of economics as juggling with currency, credit, tariffs, taxes, etc., in the effort to maintain employment in a monopolist world. But all these violations of personal freedom, from the operations of Ministers down to the degrading tasks of snoopers and informers, are entirely political activities. Political economy or economics is concerned with the natural laws of human existence, which politics cannot alter. But where restrictions are imposed by some men on others they can be removed only by political means. Georgeists do not shirk this task and in doing so they attack the menace

of war at the point where action is most effective.

As nobody desires military conflict, least of all the dominant "on both sides of industry," who have most to lose and have a monopoly of publicity, the tendency towards conflict must arise from some anterior force, probably something so familiar that it is assumed to be a natural phenomenon. The economic war constantly waged within each nation and between nations exactly fulfils these conditions. Only police action at home prevents the contending parties from using physical force, as it was used in the Iceland dispute; and the futility of economic conferences shows how helpless are politicians to govern this tendency to conflict when crude compulsion cannot be used. And the motive behind it is the instinct of self-preservation of ignorant masses who believe that security for their jobs and businesses depends upon obtaining privileges at the expense of others. Not until men are assured that the menace to their security arises not from natural causes or the existence of other economic or national groups but from denial of natural opportunity at its source, can progress be made towards permanent peace.

To give them this assurance is the object of the Georgeist movement. If it were everywhere successful not only would public opinion see no need for armaments but governments, reduced to their natural revenue, would have no funds for the enormous expense of weapons of mass suicide. This happy condition is now far off but even on short term consideration it is the most practical way to peace; for every step in that direction would relieve tension and make subsequent steps easier.

War is the oldest and most universal problem of mankind. Apart from its historical association with land hunger it is obvious that such a deeply rooted evil must require profound changes in

society if it is to be eliminated. These changes must necessarily conflict with powerful interests and affront prevailing opinions. The effective advocates of peace must appeal to reason not emotion. This is seldom popular. When peace lovers, like earlier reformers, are regarded with horror in many "well meaning" circles they are likely to be on the right path. I am sure this would not deter Mr. Nibb.

Yours faithfully,

Frank Dâpuis

Heswall, Cheshire.

### POLITICS FIRST?

To the Editor of Land & Liberty  
SIR, — Mr. John Nibb (L&L April) undertakes to establish a scale of values between Land Value Taxation, Free Trade and Personal Liberty, ranging the last named as highest. There is no sense in that. Land Value Taxation and Free Trade are in fact essential parts of Personal Freedom, which is imperfect as long as they are not acknowledged and put into practice.

Likewise it is impossible to draw a line between economics and politics and to attribute priority to the one or the other. A sound economy is an integral part of the common weal which is the aim of politics.

Finally Mr. Nibb blames nationalism as alone guilty for wars and armaments in the modern world, although we are witnessing Communism, an international dogma, setting the globe aflame with even more hatred and bloodshed. It is Georgeism which offers the only solution to the underlying causes of both national and social tensions and it would, if successful, eliminate the hydrogen bomb and all the other devilish devices Mr. Nibb and every thinking and responsible human being rightly abhors. To spread Georgeism is, therefore, the best method of serving peace

Yours faithfully,

PHILIPP KNAB

Vienna.

### EDUCATION IN A FREE SOCIETY

To the Editor of Land & Liberty

SIR, — In answer to Robert Tide-man (L&L March) who says that 'our compulsory education laws do not require that parents enrol their children in public schools', our laws do provide that parents send their children to 'school'. That is compulsion without justification. That law is an insult to every parent, who believes in individual responsibility for the consequences of his own actions. With