

iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu
iuiuiu iuiuiu iuiuiu

N E W S L E T T E R

No. 2.

FEBRUARY, 1967

E D I T O R I A L

THE contributions in this issue indicate the wide interest aroused by the articles in our first number which dealt with definitions of rent, etc., and justifies the need for a forum of this kind.

Among the many points made, perhaps the main one is that of the need to be understood by those we are trying to convert. This in turn must mean that we must speak in the language of the people we are trying to interest and not make the mistake of assuming that potential converts all respond alike and will be moved by the same considerations. It means that we must vary our approach, and if needs be, even vary the terms we use to suit our audiences. The problem of persuasion is a problem of communication and the point has been well made that this is far more important than the insistence upon academic niceties.

For the other side it is argued that understanding is not possible unless the terms used are made rigidly watertight and have only one meaning - our meaning! The solution perhaps must be a compromise. One thing must be borne in mind. If Georgists differ among themselves on the interpretation, meaning and use of words, and cannot evolve a terminology that will satisfy all Georgists, it seems most unlikely an agreement could be easily achieved among potential converts who have not the advantage of knowing what we all mean to say.

Perhaps we should cease trying to convert each other to our own point of view and leave it to the individual to choose the best way he can of putting his ideas across.

I N T E R N A T I O N A L U N I O N

C O N F E R E N C E

1 9 6 8

AFTER much deliberation and taking fully into consideration the views of members who were not able to attend the Executive Committee meeting held in London to discuss the venue of the next conference, it was finally decided to hold it in the United Kingdom - Wales.

Israel had been the first favourite but so many difficulties had arisen which could not be easily overcome, that it was thought best to leave the consideration of Israel as a venue for a future occasion when the situation and conditions were likely to be better.

A date is not finally settled because this will depend to a large extent upon available accommodation but we are hoping to hold the conference during the week commencing September 8th; this will be officially confirmed later. The actual location of the conference is also not yet fixed and your Conference Arrangements Committee will be meeting very shortly to make their decision.

For the time being we hope this will be sufficient notice for enthusiasts to earmark their 1968 holiday in advance.

* * * * *

I N M E M O R I A M

George M. Menninger

It is with much sadness that we report the death of George Menninger in January this year. He was a loyal and generous friend to the Movement for a great many years and a familiar figure at our Conferences. He will be sorely missed, especially at our next gathering when we had hoped that he and his family would make the trip to Wales. To Claire and to his son George we extend our very sincere sympathy.

REPORT FROM THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL

NEW YORK, U.S.A.

Correspondence Division - German Department

ILSE HARDER

INTERNATIONAL SECRETARY

IN 1961 the International Division at the Henry George School launched correspondence courses in Fundamental Economics in French, German, Italian, Hebrew and Spanish. Through advertising in various newspapers we reach people who are interested in taking the course.

For the German department we place usually four advertisements per year in Germany and sometimes in Austria and Switzerland. This is our main source of students. Current students and graduates get a "Widening the Circle" sheet where they may list names of friends who might be interested. This little circular has proven quite successful. By now we have about 150 graduates for the course in German, 100 current students and 600 enrollees.

We have been fortunate enough to have an excellent edition of Arthur Madsen's condensed Progress and Poverty translated by Erich Zincke of Hanover. The interest of our German graduates is very strong and there is an increasing demand for more studies and literature in the German language. We have been trying to fill this need by reprinting some Georgist literature in German and have just begun a periodical Georgist Nachrichten. But the biggest problem is to get advanced courses in German. After searching, we found that the books used in the second course, Applied Economics - Protection or Free Trade and Social Problems - were translated into German years ago, but these editions have long been out of print. The Schalkenbach Foundation is now planning to republish them.

Over the last years there have been many articles published in different German magazines and newspapers, written by Heinrich Richard of Bonn about land-value taxation. A condensed article appeared in the February issue of the Henry George News. Many of us remember Gustav Bohnsack of Hanover, who attended the 1964 International Conference in New York City. Mr. Bohnsack just finished writing a book about the application of land-value taxation in city planning; it is ready for printing now.

Two of our graduates in Switzerland, Charles X. and Barbara M. Bleisch, are planning to open a Henry George School in Zurich. Details have to be worked out yet; but we are very happy to have people there who will give their time and effort to help us spread Henry George's word. For 1968 we plan a meeting in Zurich of German-speaking Georgists. We also hope to renew old acquaintances and make new ones at the International Conference to be held in Wales the same year.

NEWS FROM KENYA

DURING 1966, the Centre for Economic Inquiry with the New Era College:-

* Launched the New Era Magazine for young Kenyans. After publishing the first six issues, the magazine has reached a circulation of 7,000 copies with each copy being read by three readers. The Magazine, sponsored by The Economic Education Institute of Newark, U.S.A., prints a simplified lesson in Georgist economics based on the Basic Course by the H.G. School of Social Science. These lessons serialised in the first ten issues will be followed by a life sketch of Henry George.

* Presented the October issue (No. 5) to H.E. President Mzee Jomo Kenyatta after naming it as Kenyatta Day Issue.

* Sponsored the training of Kul Bhushan at the International Press Institute at Nairobi for a six months Advanced Journalists Training Course. Among the thirty students selected from free nations of West, Central and East Africa, Kul Bhushan stood third at the completion of the course and obtained distinctions in every one of the thirteen subjects examined in. This was in addition to producing the New Era magazine during the training period.

* Welcomed Senator Robert F. Kennedy during his short visit to Kenya on his lecture tour of South Africa and subsequently was honoured by two personal letters from the Senator.

* Continued with the teaching of the Basic Economics course and received with grateful thanks numerous books, reports, magazines from Georgist friends all over the world which were added to the Kennedy Memorial Library at the New Era College for the benefit of all students.

* Acknowledged with sincere gratitude the numerous gifts from Georgist well-wishers in America in the form of scholarships for deserving students at the college, subscriptions for the magazine New Era and donations for the continuance of our efforts.

* Honoured with a special mention by the President of H.G. School, Mr. Joseph S. Thompson in his annual letter to all Georgist believers.

* Suffered the grievous loss of the Founder Principal of New Era College, Mr. V.P. Sharma, M.A. (Eng.) B.T., B.A. (Hons.) Mr. Sharma was a great supporter of our cause in Kenya and helped with the formation of the Kenya extension by amalgamating it with his College.

FOR 1967 the Centre for Economic Inquiry looks forward to:

* Publishing the magazine New Era to carry our message beyond the four walls of a classroom to all over Kenya.

* Printing a small book incorporating the basic economics lessons of the magazine so that these specially adapted courses for our local environment will become a permanent text book for East African students.

George
Edwards

A NEW OPPORTUNITY FOR GEORGISTS

London
England

"IF we would make the world a better place, we should start with ourselves." Georgists undoubtedly can see a better world, and are striving to realise it; a society in which land value is the natural revenue, enabling them gradually to dispense with taxation in all its forms. They regard taxation as the hand-maid of militarism, and consequently believe that when we have thus redirected our land values, militarism will die out. So completely are we subject to militarism that even Georgists still look to governments to make this better world. They have wrestled hopelessly for nearly a century to gain majority support for their proposals, in order that government may lay down the new laws which they imagine are necessary for this great reform. Yet never were our people less disposed to welcome new laws of any kind. We are sick of militarism, and self-determination is the order of the day.

We are ready to follow the lead of anyone who can escape from the tyrannies of modern governments. If British Georgists will study certain facts about their economy, they will find themselves well-equipped to effect this escape, and to give the lead for which the world is waiting. Since 1931, we in the United Kingdom have been off the Gold Standard. Today, all internal debts can be settled with paper money. This paper belongs to the Crown whose mark it carries, but unlike gold, it is now pure debt. Our representatives issue this money in the name of the Crown, which today has become the symbol of the will of the whole people. When money was gold, the payment of debts involved the movement of gold from place to place, often a cumbrous, and always a risky, operation. Our debts to the Crown, our taxes, needed not only the tax-collector, but often the soldier, to guard them in transit to the Treasury.

Paper money has revolutionised the situation in a manner that is not yet appreciated. The tax-collector has been such an inescapable part of our existence that when for the first time he became unnecessary, we did not realise it. Thirty-six years later we are still employing him. Yet government today could dispense with him and authorise us to pay our rates and taxes in the simplest and most effective way, by burning so much paper currency in a local office where the amount may be recorded, and the totals passed to the Treasury. Thereafter new money may safely be printed to this amount, for use by our spending departments. If taxes can be paid in this way, so too can any debt to the Crown, including the debt of land values. In British law, all land is held from the Crown, and owes it a duty. Today, this duty can be paid direct to the Crown by destroying paper money and cancelling the Crown debt. Could Georgists ask for a better opportunity of realising their dreams? Any British Georgist freeholder can transform his Title Deeds, vesting ownership in the Crown, and commence to pay his estimated ground rent regularly by burning the necessary money - preferably witnessed by a Magistrate, or other Crown appointee. So doing, he will escape into a new world of the mind, knowing he has begun to build the new Jerusalem.

The Old Rebel Speaks

AS the colours lose their brightness and the glow of feeling dies,
I look back towards life's morning when 'neath sunlit, hopeful skies
And with generous hearts around me rose the promise, clear to see,
Of a world where all might prosper and every soul breathe free.

Of a world not given gratis, but a guerdon to be bought
By patient manly striving, led by vision, based on thought.
Not the comforting acceptance of the specious claims around,
But by sifting and by testing what is false and what is sound.

I saw that in God's purpose each is called to think and speak
In the strife of good with evil. If the selfish or the weak
Delegates his thought to others, pleading ignorance as escape,
He descends the human ladder to the level of the ape.

And as deeper my perception of the glory of the earth,
Love of Truth with Beauty blended, equal sprung from heavenly birth.
Interplay of light and colour, subtle bond of soul with soul,
Thread of truth were interwoven in the universal Whole.

Not for me the beauty pampered in some ivory tower of mind,
Timid refuge from the sorrows of misguided human kind.
The muse that drew my worship stirred the heart and braced the nerve
To defend the helpless victim whom no hand of Power will serve.

For me this faith resplendent lit the blue of distant hill
And the violet in the valley. It called, insistent still,
Amid wild, uncharted forest - boundless, sunswept space,
Where God, in his Creation, meets the wanderer face to face.

It lit the eyes of passers in the busy city street,
And I heard beneath the muffle of the million restless feet,
The music clear resounding, distinct, remote, apart,
The eternal hymn of freedom in the unperverted heart.

It lit for me the pages where the wisdom of the past
And the vision of the poet are enshrined to outlast
All the babblings of the present, that are fashioned to the hour,
And bought to serve the purposes of selfishness and power.

But now in drear night watches when the pulse seems near its close,
Comes the sense that all such labour's fallen dead as falls the rose
Planted out of time and season on some barren, arid soil,
Doomed to perish in oblivion: unrewarding, wasted toil.

I ask in futile musings must men ever draw the screen
O'er the deepest wrong that ails them, wrong that is and long has been?
Must the cunning jargon blind them, lull their sympathy and brain?
Sink their dignity and conscience for the passing moment's gain?

State-schooled and State-dependent, must men ever be content
To serve as automata at the task where they are sent?

Is the universal workhouse the bourne of 'blood and tears' ?
Did God mould us all to pattern for the social engineers?

And what is left for choosing in this affluent human pen
But the pleasures of the farmyard, not the duties of free men!
And the vices that were shameful when Nero ruled in Rome
Rise new, and scarcely blameful, in each Progressive home.

Some few, like selfish children, raise their voices in dismay
When the wheel of favour spinning sends the prize the other way.
But they lack the thirst for justice, the will for thought and deed,
Or to probe below the surface for the wrong whence wrongs proceed.

The fashionable clerics teach us God has changed with time,
And time-serving's universal, now a duty not a crime.
Outmoded tongues may whisper of the fate that was sin's due;
But the myth of sin's exploded, and the State will see us through.

Set me rather with the outcast, doomed to hunger and the grave,
With all the herd against him, herd of master and of slave.
Howsoever vain his struggles he yet spurns the servile bribe,
Keeping true the heart within him, not debased to suit the tribe.

But at length as I sit brooding in dejected, selfish vain,
The earth forever turning brings the dawn, and brings the rain.
But though veiled in misty shadow I detect a shaft of light.
Stirs in me the changing rythm which succeeds the gloom of night.

As I walk out in the dawning my heart's half reconciled,
And I hear, in hush of morning, the fresh laughter of a child.
So fresh, unmeditated; as pure from stain or taint
As voice of noblest hero, noblest prophet, noblest saint.

And smiles beneath the raindrops, in the shadow of a wall,
The wild and unplanned daisy; and its winsome, modest call
Speaks still as spoke the daisy to the bard of Rydal Mount.
It will speak and speak forever through far ages yet to count.

Though fades the early prospect that gilt my dreams in youth
Perhaps in later moments comes a clearer view of truth
And a firmer grasp of purpose, born of failures and of tears
Overcome as man advances through the lessons of the years:

That not for everlasting can the bonds imposed by man
Stifle heart or mind or spirit which responds to Nature's plan,
And whenever youth or maiden feels the urge from beauty born,
Wakes again the innate yearning for a freer, nobler dawn.

A million seeds may wither on the heedless, dusty plain,
Yet, unknown to the sower, one may grow - and seed again.
The sower falls unnoticed by the wayside and alone;
But Eternity's his ally; he will triumph he has sown.

FRANK DUPUIS

L E T T E R S B E U N D E R S T O O D

Charles E. Byrne, U.S.A.

IN reading the letter from Arthur Dowe I am quite surprised that a director could make such obvious mistakes. In saying that land values are the product of injustice he fails to realise that land values are merely the capitalisation of land rent. Land values never disappear as long as there is land rent - even when the government collects 100% of the annual economic rent. It is true that under such circumstances an individual could not sell his land for anything, but the fact remains that his government could. The land value is still there regardless of who the landlord is. Neither land value nor land rent is a social evil, or a social good. Whether a thing is good or evil often depends upon its use, and is the concern of justice, not economic science. A science can have no opinion.

To understand how land values are merely capitalised land rent it is necessary to understand the inter-relationship between rent and interest. If, for example, the free market interest rate was 5% it can be calculated that land with an annual rental of \$1,000 would have a value, if capitalised, of \$20,000.

Assume an ideal situation in which the government allows only leasehold. The government leases parcels of land to the highest bidder for a stipulated period. If the period of the lease was ten years at an annual rental of \$1,000 (the highest agreeable bid by a lessee) the total amount due would be \$10,000. This could be paid in one lump sum or in ten yearly payments of \$1,000. The land value for the period would be \$10,000; the annual rent would be \$1,000. In either case we are referring to the same thing with only the element of time as a variable.

I would also submit that the use of the term "land value" is much more economically acceptable than "land price." "Price" is the bug-a-boo of the twentieth century economist and we would do well to avoid this term whenever possible. It must be remembered that "value" attaches to an object when it gives the possessor a command of labor. We understand by "land value" that land is exchangeable for labor, or labor products. This fact is unalterable regardless of who we define as the possessor - whether government or individual.

The Australians are suffering a useless hang-up over terminology, which I hope will not disrupt the '68 International Conference. When we seek to promulgate our ideas to the public it is best to converse with them in the language they understand. The public understands what we mean when we talk of taxing the land, and they misunderstand what we mean when we talk of a government collecting land rent. The use of the latter phrase connotes government ownership and control of the land which smacks of socialism or communism to the average individual. We must be contemporary in our use of the King's English or surely our cause is lost.

THE PRACTICAL
APPROACH

Laurie S. Mannell, Canada

I HAVE read the Newsletter and re-read it and although I am one of the truly convinced, I am now completely and totally confused with the various definitions of land, land value, land rent, rent, economic rent and a half dozen different things. Yet all this confusion is caused by each person using words that he knows what he means, but be darned if anyone else does. Yet here we are, a group who teach and preach the word as laid out in Progress and Poverty which makes one point very clear and that is that we MUST define our terms.

I hate to say this, but I am certain that all Georgists are to a degree guilty of faults that we condemn in others. We advocate simplicity in government, business, definitions, and in everything that people do, yet we continue to confuse the issue ourselves. I am a firm believer in solving problems within the present structure. Thus let us not pass any new laws to solve a problem until we make sure that there is not some law already on the books that will take care of the situation. In fact if we wanted to scrap all laws and go back to the Ten Commandments we could run all government a lot better. So when we come to words, let us use the ones we have that people know the meaning of.

I am a former Municipal Consultant. While not an expert on Taxation, I do know a lot about Assessment and Rating as it is known in certain places. I feel that here is the place for us to start. Using the words that are now in common use and explaining them to the layman, and then trying to get what we call "Land value Taxation" at the Municipal level, we can go on from there. But if we keep on confusing ourselves, we will never convince the masses that we know what we are talking about (in fact sometimes I wonder if we do).

OUT OF THE
MAZE

W.H. Pitt, Australia

CLANCY, Dowe, Donohue, Grigg, Middleton! All of them toilers, all giants! I have been having success with the use of the phrasing "That the rental value of land should be the source for public revenue rather than for private enrichment." It seems to me that this avoids the various difficulties into which our past terminology has been tumbling us. Also, it has the advantage of displaying the mechanics by which our reform proposals can be put into effect. I agree with Dowe that the rent of land is not "culprit"; with Donohue that all of us, right back to George, have muddled our terminology; with Grigg that we err if we omit to use "economy of effort" as our checkpoint; with Middleton that no holds should be barred; and with Clancy that land value is usually understood to mean the selling price.

But yet again doth Homer nod, for in his next sentence Clancy's "selling price" which was the correct, I think, translation, became "selling value."

The bone I here chew upon, and invite the giants to snarl at me about, is that "price" expresses something of certainty that clinches a deal, while "value" reflects the idea of evaluation. Evaluation is something which we all indulge in, even though we be unconnected, ourselves, with the particular deal.

So, in my slogan "The Price of Land is your Enemy" and in "The Rental Value of Land," I think are the clues which, if followed, will lead us out of the maze in which we otherwise are entrapped.

LOGIC , THE CLASSICS'
AND THE GERUNDIVE

Kenneth N. Grigg, Australia

MR. DOWE says that 'rent' is good, but 'land value' is bad. Let me clear this up once and for all. The clue to a proper understanding lies in having had a classical Latin education, so that one knows what is meant by a gerundive: 'that which is required to be ...'

Now, Rent, the profit of association, is good, but in order to obtain it, one must, in the cliché of a local real estate firm, 'first secure the land'. That which must be paid in order to obtain the land closely approximates - through competition in the market - to the rent which the use of that particular land will yield. And that which must be paid is the value of that land. If it is accounted on a periodic basis, then it becomes the annual or monthly or weekly rental value of that land. In any case it is a value. The word 'rental' is the gerundive analogue of the word 'rent'. Rental, as a form of value periodically expressed, is a function of scarcity. 'Rent' on the other hand, as part of current product, is a function of abundance. Now when the rental value of land (the value of its rent = the physical surplus associated with its particular use momentarily evaluated in the market) can, by default of government, be privately appropriated, then it can be, and is, capitalized into a selling price or capitalized form of land value. Note that we can get rid of land value in its capitalized form, but, under free enterprise conditions where land title may be privately held, we can never get rid of rental value. They got rid of rental value in Russia, but on the other hand they cannot ever get rid of Rent.

So please to note the three separate and distinct identities:-

- (1) RENT - product - surplus arising from human association depending upon just where such association takes place.
- (2) RENTAL - value - the value of rent, estimated at second remove in the value of land with rent-potential. (Note that Rent generated at one place may be revealed in rental value of land at another; so that a home site may yield a rent [human satisfaction] due to a generation of rent at a distance in some transport service or other).

- (3) CAPITALIZED SELLING PRICE OF LAND - value - the sign of disease in the body economic just as rental value publicly appropriated is the sign of health.

It is not land value which is to be destroyed - it can't be. It is the capitalized form that we must attack. When land rentals - that which must be paid for the use of land - goes into the Treasury, all is well.

PRECISION AND CLARITY
OR PEDANTIC PHILOLOGY

Peter Hudson, U. K.

I THINK that Mr. Donohue has gone rather far in citing his examples as "evidence of the deep-seated confusion prevalent in our ranks." While I do not choose to take issue with him on the pertinent points he makes I think we might remember that, at best, words are but vehicles for conveying ideas. There is always the danger when using words that the idea or concept will not be accurately transmitted. If, for example, two deaf people were to hold a conversation the language would have little relevance since neither would understand the other. It is of course to the good that from time to time we should remind ourselves of the inherent dangers of language and particularly of loose expression. I am inclined to think that what Mr. Donohue understands as evidence of "confusion" is in effect no more than lack of disciplined expression. It is well known that all writers allow themselves a little licence from time to time and I think our approach to fellow Georgist writers should leave some margin for errors of expression, particularly in view of their limited number and the demands that are made on their talents.

To turn to the specific, however, I do not agree with Mr. Donohue that rent is a "social good." Nor do I feel that it is a "social evil." To me rent arises; it is completely impersonal. It has no moral qualities at all.

As Georgists we may believe that economic rent should provide government revenue but to state as Mr. Donohue has done that "government has the exclusive right to all rent" implies that governments - at best a mere representation of majority opinion - have claims to "moral" rights. Moral rights, in my view, must be those of the individual or those of individuals living collectively in free community with one another. I do not see that "governments" have any stronger moral claims on rent than a land owner. In playing the "devil's advocate" in this discussion I do not dissent from the view that governments ought to collect economic rent. I only wish to point out that outside "community forum" politics in which everyone may participate or not as they wish, governments do not possess moral rights. They may, of course, with or without the backing of the majority of the population exercise revenue collecting power and control (justly or unjustly) by virtue of legal sanction. And this leads me to another point: I do not think there is much cause for alarm over the use of what Mr. Donohue calls "land value" terminology; I agree with his sentiments, however, that a greater emphasis on site rent might bring advantages but these, I think, would be marginal.

I think that people may be excused for resorting to precise technical descriptions when they are in company which is fully conversant with the contemporary jargon in a specialised field. We all tend to do this from psychologists to cricket enthusiasts. When, however, we are faced with pushing forward ideas into fresh fields the use of familiar words is most important if we are to receive a sympathetic hearing. To hope to teach a new language to the English speaking world before we can introduce an idea is to ask far too much of those very few people who might be interested initially. I do not think that I could approach a prospective convert with statements such as "I believe in the abolition of land values" or, more technically perhaps, "I advocate the progressive collection of site rents by governments with a view to making land more readily available by negating the tendency towards ever-increasing rent capitalisation." Nor would I like, with respect to Mr. Donohue, to begin to approach a person by saying:

"Land values are not created by the community; they arise simply from the ability to capitalise site rental values which are created by the community. Moreover the ability to capitalize the rental values is made possible by legal and government sanction which although bad has the implicit support of the lawyers, judges, producers and consumers who combine to make up the community and who do not really know the difference between good natural laws and bad human laws. If the government was to pass a good human law to harness the good natural law of rent the community created rent would flow into the pocket of good government and the community would be better off for the disappearance of the bad land values which in any event it did not create. The government would then leave people to look after their own affairs and pay their rent or change the system if they did not like it by passing a bad human law."

I am sure that in presenting the above parody on Mr. Donohue's words I have more than overstated my case on these issues, but I must conclude by referring to Mr. Dowe's contribution on the same theme. He wrote:

"As bad government develops land value develops. The culprit is bad government. Land value is the result."

I understand that legally there is no "land value" in the U.S.S.R. and land has no selling price. Do we conclude therefore that we have good government where there is no land value? I fear we do not. By all means let us continue to examine the foundations of our beliefs, but at the same time let us try to remember that we live in the real world and that our aim should be to put across clear concepts in the language of the voters who, from observation, show little enthusiasm for pedantic philology.

SEVERAL matters in the first Newsletter cause me to reach for my pen in response to the invitation for constructive comment.

First is "Land Value Muddle" by E.B. Donohue which impresses me as 'good in parts only' like the curate's egg. The worst part is the opening paragraphs which state flatly that for more than half a century our cause "has failed to achieve even a little success" and "the failure to make any real progress is the most urgent question we have to face ...". His suggestions are for local conferences followed by an international conference to deal with their gleanings.

I disagree both with his diagnosis and suggested remedy. These statements are probably directed at overseas countries rather than at Australia. Here we have a large measure of practical application of the principle which has been extended over the last half century to the point that 92 per cent of the municipalized area of this continent now uses site-value rating almost exclusively for municipal purposes. There is constant pressure to get the balance of Local Government revenue over to this basis and it is noteworthy that, in Victoria at least, the big step was made in the postwar years; the municipalities using site value having jumped from 14 prewar to 55 now.

It would be better for the advancement of the movement generally to draw the attention of exponents to the expansion of this system in Australia and the beneficial results in improved social and economic conditions, as recorded statistically in the booklet "Public Charges on Land Values", rather than to negate our achievements. To be able to cite and substantiate successes in some countries as a ground for taking similar action in others is a very positive means of advancing the world-wide cause.

For the rest of the world the sweeping statements made can only harm the movement in the eyes of exponents as well as outsiders. Self-denigration is never good policy. To say progress is slower than might be expected, while less extreme, would still be arguable (because it all depends what you put into the movement as to whether you can expect more out of it). But to say there has not been "even a little" or "any real progress" in fifty years is simply untrue.

Progress is measured not only by further legislation achieved but also by public education and discussion from which legislation springs. The Henry George Schools in America, United Kingdom and elsewhere have developed entirely within this period and shown very healthy growth. Bronson Cowan's studies, and those of the Land Values Research Group and other bodies which are now having great effect on the thinking of public administrators in many countries, are entirely a postwar development. The various seminars of experts from many countries were recently convened by the Lincoln Foundation and the "House & Home" and "Fortune"

publications are within the last six years. The extension of land value rating to Jamaica and Hawaii are recent developments. In 1930 the United Kingdom passed Snowdon's Land Tax Bill only to see it sabotaged and eventually repealed by the Conservatives. The London County Council Bill seeking power to rate land values fared no better in 1936. Here you have active demand for our principle frustrated by perfidy.

The local conferences suggested could be productive only if they result in actual campaigns on proposals embodying the Georgist principle and not merely talk to the converted. There is scope for this right on Mr. Donohue's own doorstep. Although development of local rating on site values in New South Wales has been great there has been no real campaign there to extend this tried principle to the State and Federal Government field. Local activities are geared to the School without harnessing the abilities of graduates towards this extension. If Mr. Donohue and his colleagues can launch and press successfully a campaign for a State Development Fund financed by a rate on site-values, those in Georgist centres elsewhere will gladly seek their advice on how to do likewise. And Victorian Georgists pressing this and other applications will be the first to congratulate them on the basis that a victory for the principles anywhere is a victory for them everywhere.

However, I agree with Mr. Donohue (and Messrs. Grigg and Dowe) that it is wrong to speak of land rent as though it is an evil. Land rent must exist in the nature of things. It is good, it is in the interest of the community that it increase, and its increase is not naturally at the expense of labour and capital. The only evil thing about it is the result of its absorption as private revenue instead of public revenue. But his remark about the tenants receiving the rent instead of owners is incorrect as a general statement. It only passes through the tenants hands on the way to the ultimate recipient which is the landlord or the government.

Mr. Donohue's criticism of the concept of rent as a payment for the use of land is not really correct. I agree with Mr. Clancy's answer where he maintains this is an adequate concept of rent. This payment for the use of land takes place whether the rent is matched with actual production from the site or not, where, for instance, the rent payment commences long before the buildings are erected and in use. In this period the payment is not matched with an excess product.

The total payment for the use of land here is its rent potential. The part paid until it is in production can be regarded as speculative rent. The part paid from the excess product over other sites can be regarded as the real rent. Mr. Donohue is correct to the extent that there are two parts to the payment but he exaggerates the importance of the distinction since "the rent payment for the use of land" is what we propose to base our land taxes upon. It is neither practicable nor desirable to separate out the two parts. To the extent that part of the total is speculative rent this will be squeezed out progressively as it is taxed and when the holding of vacant land becomes unprofitable only rent which is the "excess product" will remain.

* * * * *

THE NEED FOR A GEORGIST DICTIONARY

H. Marquis - Ontario, Canada

THE Newsletter's articles show a need, if not for a special dictionary, at least agreement on what the terms 'rent' and 'land-value' shall be used to mean, and, like concurrence on the words 'taxing' and 'appropriating' (especially when used regarding the other two) could save one from having to guess what exactly each writer intended each of the four to stand for!

Mr. Donohue, in 'Land Value Muddle' made clear what he meant by 'rent' and 'land-value'. He seems free from what he terms "... the mistake of conceiving rent as payment for use of land..." Rent, as he defines it, is no such payment. But he did not say which term he uses for what is called 'rent' by John Doe and Joe Blow when they hand over what, as well as being 'rent' in Mr. Donohue's sense, also is 'payment for the use of land.' Had he edited the sentence on which he made "COMMENT", what would he have put in place of 'rent'? And to explain to John and Joe why what they call 'rent' keeps rising while what they are left with of 'buying power' gets less and weaker, would he insist that they first master his terms lest he be misunderstood in using theirs? Incidentally, for the various concepts such explanation would involve, what would his terms be?

I deem those questions pertinent to the complaint with which Mr. Donohue opens his article: What about our slow progress? For one main 'why' of that slowness is, I believe, the fact that no Georgist idea has its own word but is represented by some term which is already the agent of other and even several other concepts; each is made merely another connotation of some word already in use. Take for example, 'land'. The sentence: "When I land back in my own land I'll buy more land." This will be quite clear to anyone familiar with colloquial English. Yet it contains three quite different meanings each represented by the one symbol, l-a-n-d. We add another meaning, wholly new, then moan that most seem slow to grasp it, and find it difficult to keep clearly in mind! Later we attach yet another 'land', land in the sense of 'site' - and 'land' ourselves right into what Mr. Donohue quite rightly calls a 'muddle'.

Much of the 'slowness' of our progress has the same cause as the confusions about which your contributors complain - and at the same time exhibit. The use of 'everyday' terms for special meanings.

The use of 'everyday English' words to represent specific Georgist concepts hampers communication regarding those concepts - even among Georgists. The trouble is not that the user of any of the 'everyday' terms is confused as to what he intends to convey. It is that the familiar, deep-seated, customary connotations of his terms affect, not only his choice of it but his hearer or reader's interpretation of it - unless there is some prior agreement between user and hearer that it shall be taken to mean precisely one thing, and nothing else.

And if the use of already overloaded words to represent certain

ideas hampers communication among those greatly interested in and familiar with those same ideas, what does it do to those parties' attempts to communicate them to others? Doesn't the complaint made by Mr. Donohue give at least part of the answer?

What to do about it? The need to communicate to others seems to deserve priority; but, does it rank higher than the one just mentioned, i.e. definite agreement as to which word shall be used for which idea, meaning or concept; the allocation to each of the more important concepts of Economic Science of its own verbal symbol?

Would that be so difficult? Could not some body of interested Georgists get together, even by mail, to thresh it out and bring out what would become the basic dictionary of the entire science? It might mean word 'coining', as is done in all other sciences. What would be wrong with that? 'Land' for instance, might have its basic Georgist 'over-all' meaning represented by some hybrid or coined term such as say, 'Terraquaer' whose derivation is obvious and which is clumsy but which nonetheless conveys the 'all-inclusive' sense better than does l-a-n-d, and it could hardly be taken to mean any of the three 'lands' earlier mentioned.

Once that first plank was laid, once leading Georgists all spoke the same 'economic Esperanto' and there were no more semantic wrangles, one could hope for success in the next task, that of bridging the gap between a precise language of Economic Science and the very imprecise speech of 'everyday'.

A COMMENT FROM MR..H.T. BOOTHBY, LIVERPOOL, .U.K.

I am obliged for the first Newsletter which I found most interesting and stimulating. I would comment only on one mention, i.e. the formation of a political party and feel this would not help the cause, having in mind the Commonwealth Land Party which I remember well. My recollection is that the only publicity obtained was a small headline in the press "Consternation in the House of Lords!" (in a satirical sense). On the other hand I think it might do good to emphasize more the continued robbery to which we are subject and the necessity to revert to what was - as Graham Peace did.

MR. LEWIS A. ELLIS OF ENFIELD, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, makes the suggestion that individual members might exchange local newspapers and journals. For example an Australian might send on his local paper to a Londoner or a New Yorker and receive his local paper in return. Mr. Ellis says: "Apart from the receiving of the publications, the personal association would tend to bring members together. I did this for years with Harry Levitt in South Africa and a good friendship resulted."

VALUE PRICE AND THE
UNITED NATIONS

Philipp Knab

Austria

I FULLY agree with the idea expressed in the "message" of our President Joe Thompson, namely: That public income (from the proceeds of land-value taxation) should not only be collected in the interest of the public, but should be distributed to all, impartially, after the legitimate expenses, in the public interest, had been paid.

Mr. Dowe has confused the selling value of land with the total value of land. This total value of land is arrived at when we add to the selling value of land, which is commonly called its price, the (capitalized) value of all taxes and other public charges.

Thus the prices of all sites and territories of the United States added together would not yet constitute the total value of the land of the nation. This sum would have to be increased by the capitalized value of all taxes, rates and other charges paid or payable by its citizens, because these imposts are finally borne by land, the value of which is reduced. If this increased total value were taken as the basis of assessment, land value taxation would be sufficient to cover public expenses and yield a surplus for eventual distribution as suggested by our President Joe Thompson.

Its greatest advantage, however, which the late Siegfried Sitte of Vienna was the first to point out, would be that it would apply taxation, which is now destroying many natural opportunities, to a factor which not only responds differently, but which would provide limitless possibilities for the use of land in production. Thus the sphere of productive activity would be widened to an extent which can hardly be overestimated. Henry George was not a dreamer. Siegfried Sitte proved the practical applicability of his theses by exact calculations and statistics reaching back to three generations. Sitte sharply distinguished between the "value" of land and its "price" which is only the remainder left for private profit after public charges.

United Nations. My suggestion that the International Union should submit my proposal of fixing the contributions of the members of the United Nations according to the value of their land and not according to their industrial wealth; that the principle of Henry George, that the earth belongs to all men should find expression in free migration throughout the world; and that all states which impede or prohibit it should pay an adequate compensation to the United Nations, could I admit not be speedily adopted. I am not so unexperienced as to cherish such hopes.

However, this Georgist principle should be brought to the attention of the United Nations Bureau so that they might notice, and possibly make use of it, as an instrument of their international and financial policy, no matter if my proposal would be effective or not at present.

To wait until a member state would take up this proposal and present it to the United Nations in a formally effective way, would mean to abandon it altogether. Karl Marx did not wait for his or any other country to accept and carry out his principle and to recommend it to the rest of the world. He started an international campaign to influence public opinion everywhere. We are lucky to have an international organisation fully equipped with instruments of publicity, but lacking constructive ideas. Why not inspire it with ours? Let our International Union get in touch with it! We are small, surely and the United Nations are big. But ideas are not the privilege of the big organisations. Let us try to advance our way of thinking and feeling wherever there is an opportunity and neither be timid nor discouraged if it is not accepted at once. As our wise President Joe Thompson put it in his message: "The human mind seems to require a period of gestation like that of a living body."

John T. Tetley

T E R M I N O L O G Y

New Jersey, USA

MOST of us understand what we mean by the terms we use, but it is rather difficult for us to communicate this to anyone else. To a certain extent this inability to communicate is "good" in that it sharpens our own thinking.

With reference to Rent - Ricardo formulated The Law of Rent - "The rent of land is determined by the excess of its produce over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use."

This implies that the same application (of labor or of labor using the same amount of capital) will result in a greater product on any land more productive than at the margin. This product is termed RENT (Economic Rent.) Therefore, I conclude, RENT is a part of product.

This is my basic understanding of economic rent and upon which the land tenure system proposed by Henry George rests. In simple words, the idea is that the user of natural resources pays for the privilege of using them - and pays to all others for the surrender of their equal right to use such resources.

For many years I have been thinking in these terms and as yet have been unable to discover any fallacy in the premise. If anyone desires to comment I shall appreciate having their thoughts.

NOBEL PEACE PRIZE 1967 : LORD DOUGLAS OF BARLOCH, author of Land-Value Rating, has written to the Nobel Prize Committee of the Norwegian Storting proposing the International Union for the Nobel Peace Prize for the year 1967. Mr. J. Möller Warmedal, M.P. in the Norwegian Government, has also written to propose the International Union for next year's award.

WHITE ELEPHANTS

ON THE
CLIFF TOPS

by

Ashley Mitchell

Yorks

England

THERE were many interesting articles and letters in the first issue of the International Union Newsletter. But above all we must never forget that if we are going to make progress we must keep our propaganda clear so that it can be grasped by the masses whose support is necessary to secure legislation. Mr. K.N. Grigg says that because private developers can open up opportunities to use land, they have the right to collect the rent. He then proceeds to show that it is people who really create land rent. This

was clearly seen, in the negative sense, in a development that missed many years ago. In the early days of this century beautiful coastal sites attracted developers, especially after a successful development at Peacehaven in Sussex.

A London syndicate bought about fifty acres on the cliffs at Ravenscar, between Scarborough and Whitby; it was a lovely position on the occasional few days of decent weather! Roads were made with sidewalks curbed, drainage and water supply laid. Then invitations were issued to possible buyers, with special trains and hospitality.

But there was never a bid. Probably on that day it was blowing a gale as it frequently does on those cliff tops. For years the development stood unused with the roads breaking up and with no more people there than before.

If the people had come it would have been claimed that the development had made the land values. The absence of people showed who does and who does not make land value.

In seeking popular support for our principle it is necessary to stir people's minds and to point to the way land values rise following on improved accessibility (which calls attention to the place where the revenue ought to be sought), but the real unassailable argument for the collection of the rental value of land is that land is a natural element and necessary for all life.

I was fully immersed in the great land campaign in Britain in 1909 - 10. Then we were singing the Land Song: "Make them pay their taxes for the land, we'll risk the rest, God gave the Land for the People."

PLANNING AND
ZONING
THE
USE OF LAND

Stephen Martin, Hants, England.

IT has always been clear to me that the economic rent of land arises from the pressures of population for the use of land and the natural economic advantages attaching to any particular site according to the use to which it is put. Further, that the rewards of Labour and Capital are governed by the margin of production. Therefore it logically follows that an accurate assessment of rental value can be made only if all men are free to pursue their activities without let or hindrance.

Mr. Arthur Dove in the last issue of the Newsletter referred to land value as the product of bad government. In recent years bad government throughout the world has added to and encouraged speculation in land value by planning and zoning the use of land. This I submit is the greatest injustice of all times. Today millions of acres of land are sterilised at the dictate of planning authorities. The fallacy of their actions is exposed when the pressure of population compels them to amend their plans.

It is a grave mistake to believe that if land is free for use for any purpose whatsoever that many people will disfigure and despoil the land. Claims are made by the planners that attractive rural countryside has been spoilt by suburban sprawl; that sectional industrial interests have scarified the land; that certain areas have been made infertile by excessive cultivation and so on.

Let us look at the handiwork of these Planning Authorities - and they have been at work for 40 years or more. Are their cities really the Utopian ideal or merely the product of a different concept in architectural design? Slums and crowded living conditions remain and in place of terraced houses we now have mountainous flats, often with smaller rooms.

In arbitrarily locating industry in selected parts of the country they have added to the costs of production. Above all by refusing planning permission they have frustrated individual initiative in the use of land and thereby held back the production of wealth to the detriment of social progress.

Authoritarian dictation and planning of land use is bad government. Furthermore, whoever controls the use of land controls the economic and social destiny of the people. Land and its use must be completely free if economic justice is to prevail.

P O L I T I C A L A C T I O N N E E D E D

James A. Higgins

New York, U. S. A.

PEOPLE have a difficulty in grasping the niceties of an abstract explanation as to the how and why of the natural law of rent; and why it belongs not to the landlord or property owner, but rather to the community which creates it and must have it by collection through taxes. They may lean toward an understanding of the problem while they are at your elbow listening to the message which would bring a better way of life. But they fail to understand why it is wrong for the individual to collect rental value for the use of land - particularly if they have invested in a home, or have someone near and dear to them who owns a home, or there is some possibility that they themselves shall own a house. All that comes to mind is the obvious fact that they have paid "x" dollars for the land or will pay that at some future date. If land value taxation will have the effect of making land unsaleable and no specific money can be obtained from landlordship of the land, that is the end of their ever so slight interest in the topic.

The job of the advocates of land-value taxation is to put matter before the people in words and figures which completely paint the picture of results which will follow from this natural system of taxation. Dollars of cost and return on investment, with and without taxation upon improvements and equalization of rentals for the use of land according to its economic and or social value in particular areas, etc. It must be laid before them so clearly that the eye will convince the mind that all is well with the endeavor and that it must become the law of the land.

In New York the Georgists have an excellent opportunity to present the case for land-value taxation before the State Constitutional Convention which begins its endeavors on April 1st 1967 to bring forth a New State Constitution for submittal to the people for adoption. The Movement cannot succeed without positive political action by those who know the philosophy of land-value taxation and understand it well enough to be convincing, without compromising the basic principle underlying the heart of the system.

A New York victory would give real life to eventual success everywhere. We have been teaching for seventy-five years and there is plenty of evidence that there are people around who believe as we do but take no political action to create the atmosphere necessary to affect governmental taxing laws.

The opportunity is golden but it needs more than desire and mental waves. It needs positive political action of a concise nature which will reach the people and awaken their understanding of the basic problem.

The wrong premise we are working from is that land value should be publicly collected because it is publicly created. Rather should it be that land value should be publicly collected because the land is the common heritage of all men. This makes what Mr. Grigg says, although very ingenious, rather unnecessary. - Peter Tracey, London, U.K.

A S U C C I N C T
S U M M A R Y

Joseph S. Thompson
Calif. U.S.A.
PRESIDENT

READING Mr. Dowe's piece, reproving Bob Clancy, I think, if there was any error in Bob's statement, it was that he took it for granted any Georgist would understand that private collection was the culprit. In this connection, I am reproducing the text of an old rubber stamp with which I sometimes stamp correspondence:

Taxes can be abolished - rent cannot.
Rent is the value of location among
people. Someone must inevitably
collect it, though no one creates
it. That someone should be the
PUBLIC TREASURER
J.S.T.

I think Mr. Donohue does a little quibbling when he says that no man has a right, an equal right, to the land. The word equal takes care of that, and in A Basic Income, I try to make clear how all men would have their rights, to the land, equalized.

Mr. Donohue refers to Mr. Philipp Knab's contention that United Nations' contributions should be based on land rental collections of the member governments, but unfortunately, more will be paid for exclusive occupancy of land, among enterprising, industrious, creative people, than in less progressive lands. I'm afraid it would even more unbalance the proportions.

I think a great fault in Mr. Grigg's piece, is his ignoring of the fact that private services are paid for directly. It is after their recompense is taken care of, that any surplus adds to the desirability, and consequent higher rental value.

.....

EDITORS NOTE: We regret not being able to include every contribution we have received from members on the subjects raised in our last issue (and we have had to trim the most lengthy ones) but we feel that those published cover all the relevant points raised. We feel readers will not want these subjects to be debated indefinitely, but we will welcome further correspondence and suggest that it is confined to 200 words or less. Readers are invited to open up new subjects for our next issue - and particularly we would like news items and progress reports.

A N Y N E W S F R O M D E N M A R K ?

- S. Sevenster, Holland -

WE in Holland are rather annoyed about the elections in Denmark. As we can see the Justice Party did not get into parliament. Some papers told us about a "small tax party" which did not get in.

We would like to know what has happened to the Justice Party and to Dr. Starcke? And what about the other parties? Are the radicals or the socialist or the "left-socialist" in any way thinking about land-value taxation?

To which parties did the votes of the Justice Party go? This of course no man can tell but there may be some explanation of it.

Perhaps we also can know something about the progress of the movement as a whole.

With us here it is still going strong. The problem of space is getting a problem more and more. Our new Prince Klaus is also having an office on this matter. I sent him the book of Heinrich Richard. Die entfesselung der Wirtschaft.

The price of land for agriculture is much too high and some people want to nationalise it. We are telling them it is no good spending public money on buying the land.

We are writing letters to all the leading papers with some success. I received a letter from a paper telling me they now know all about Ricardo and George and so they do not want more than two letters in a year from me!

Our economic situation is not so good and perhaps people are going to think in another way. Some do of course. The socialists, for instance, want to do the same as the British Labour Government. But as you know, this is the wrong way.

A new party, chiefly liberals, are thinking about the land problem but they are not getting down to fundamentals. We wrote to them explaining our views.

The government decided to make a new law for the county councils to raise their own money. We as Georgists have written to the Ministry of Finance and explained land-value taxation.

* * * * *

I N T E R N A T I O N A L S E C R E T A R I A T

- W.E. Standring, Western Australia -

IT is gratifying to learn that a session of the next Conference is to be devoted to the consideration of an International Secretariat and other matters for the greater co-ordination of our many affiliated bodies.

I feel that such a body should be evolved rather than 'factory made'. To this end I suggest that as many of our members as possible should constitute themselves International Secretaries by the direct exchange of ideas with other members.

All that is required is a few addresses, a few stamps, and something to write and enquire about. This would not throw more work upon the already overworked centres in London and New York and elsewhere. Moreover in the course of time some correspondents would be more successful than others, gaining wider recognition, and thus, form the grass roots as it were. There could be an organism created which would become the foundation for a more permanent framework.

T H E H I D D E N

V A L U E

W.E. Standring, Western Australia

The collectors of the temple tax came and asked Peter "Does your teacher not pay temple-tax?" He said, "Yes." But when he went indoors, Jesus spoke first. "Tell me, Simon," he said, "from whom do earthly kings collect customs or taxes? Is it from their own people or from aliens?" "From aliens" he said. So Jesus then said to him "So their own people are exempt. However, not to give offence to them, go to the sea, throw a hook in, and take the first fish you bring up. Open its mouth and you will find a five shilling piece; take that and give it to them for me and for yourself."

Matt. Ch. 17. Dr. Moffatt's Translation.

We are not told the outcome of this strange instruction, but it is reasonable to suppose that the Master indicated a deeper meaning than the record discloses. It will be noticed that Peter was not told to sell the fish (the normal product of his labour) and give the proceeds to the church, which in that day exercised the functions of the civil government, but that, independently of his labour, and only after taking his wages free of tax, another, hidden factor would be found to discharge the obligation. Was this not rent?

Theologians will no doubt dispute this interpretation, but if so, will they please find a better one. We have all heard sermons preached upon more slender evidence.

NEWS

FROM

FINLAND

Pekka Virtanen

Regional Planning Director

Karkhula, Finland

IT has been very interesting to read your paper (Land & Liberty) because of my special interest in a just land policy and valuation.

In Finland there has just been made two proposals concerning land rates (taxes). They have been made by a small committee of higher civil servants (not politicians).

The first proposal means that unbuilt building land must be put under a special tax so that it is unprofitable to the owner to keep the site waiting and unbuilt on. This tax can be collected only when the development plan has been approved and when the street before the site is ready and when the necessary sewers and waterpipes have been built. This annual tax would be progressive so that year by year it grows. Maximum would be 5% of the site value.

The other tax is meant for unearned increment (increment tax?) This tax would be imposed upon the difference between a "basic value" and an "up-to-date value" (I have just invented these terms because I don't know better ones). "Basic value" is for example the purchase price and "up-to-date value" the selling price. This taxing would be carried out on actual transactions (selling, inheritance, donation). This latter proposal has been gravely criticized, and not without reason. It has not been presented to parliament, but I think that our present government (Labour) tries to get it approved.

Another alternative would have been an annual tax which I think would have been better in theory.

Editors Note:

Mr. Virtanen is a newcomer to Georgist ideas. He recently visited England and spent some considerable time in our London Headquarters seeking information on land tenure and taxation. He was interested to learn of the history of land-value taxation in Great Britain and of the work of the Movement in other countries. The working of the United Kingdom's Labour Government's Land Commission was explained to him and he could see how far removed this was from the real remedy.

F A I R S H A R E S F O R A L L

Richard C. Grinham, London, U.K.

I was not able to hear the President's address at the 1964 International Union conference, but I have read his booklet "A Basic Income" with interest. Joe Thompson's plan, it seems to me, is a profound one, and bears directly on two other subjects mentioned in the first Newsletter.

Mr. Thompson's plan is, of course, in direct conflict with Bernie Donohue's, but little support will be forthcoming, I suspect, for Mr. Donohue's argument. The land of any country is the common heritage of all the people of that country. The rent of that land, then, must belong equally to all those people and the requirements of justice would be met by dividing the entire rent among all the people.

However, even the most anarchistic among us will agree that some jobs need to be performed by government - even if it is only the collection and distribution of the rent fund - and we might adopt, as a maxim, that government should do only those things which it is not practicable for the people to do for themselves, and only those things that benefit all people equally.

On the basis of our principle of taxation according to benefits received, this would call for the imposition of a poll tax. Obviously the two cancel each other out, but to the extent that it is larger than the necessary tax revenue, the rent fund should, in my opinion, be shared among the people.

It is a fact of common observation that governments always spend every penny they can obtain, and often more. To allow the government in a Georgist state to spend all the rent fund would simply encourage unnecessary expenditure.

It may be argued that by George's view of natural law the rent fund would be exactly enough for the necessary government expenditure, but although this may have been true in his day it cannot be so forever. Government activity having been properly limited, government expenditure must only increase in proportion to the increase of population. With the passage of time, however, the rent fund must necessarily increase in much greater proportion than the increase of population. If this surplus is not to be distributed, what is to be done with it? If government is to spend it, upon what is it going to spend it?

Considering the material progress confidently to be expected under a Georgist economic system, the proposition that government should spend the whole of an ever-increasing rent fund is clearly absurd.

Observe how the idea of a surplus to be distributed so neatly fits into the natural order of things. It is quite conceivable that after many years of development in a Georgist economy, automation will be carried to such a pitch that it is no longer necessary for everyone to work. (Some economists already predict this, but it is not likely to happen under our present economic system.) By the time this stage

is reached the Basic Income from the distributed rent fund will probably be sufficient to enable those who do not wish to work, not to do so. They would have a subsistence land income from the rent fund.

L E T T E R S T O F O R E I G N N E W S P A P E R S
- a suggestion from Leonard A. Tooke, Portsmouth, U. K. -

EDITORS of newspapers are usually flattered to receive letters from abroad, and so I believe that, if we wrote to each other's local newspapers, the letters would stand a good chance of being published and of sparking off controversy.

I suggest that the addresses of newspapers and also the addresses of Georgist Headquarters in various parts of the world, are published in the Newsletter. The address of my local paper is: The News, Stanhope Road, Portsmouth, Hants, England. The ball could be set rolling by writing there, but, to avoid the possibility of a spate of foreign letters arriving at the same time, I suggest that they are spaced out as follows:-

- 1 from Australia in February
- 1 from the U.S.A. in March
- 1 from Denmark in April
- 1 from Canada in May

Copies of the letters (if published) and any answers could be sent to the Georgist headquarters of the writer, and the letters could of course be about anything, but I suggest that site-value rating would be the most fruitful topic. Typed letters are preferred.

EDITORS NOTE :

Since those choosing to write to a particular paper are not to know if others are doing the same, a development of this idea might be for individuals who would like to start the ball rolling to write to any International Union friend abroad asking for the name and address of his or her local paper (if it publishes readers' letters). That is all that is required. The letter could then go without fear of duplication. Alternatively, many members might well have access to foreign newspapers. We in England have Willings Press Guide which lists foreign newspapers. However, views of members on the idea would be appreciated.

J. PALUZIE-BORRELL of Barcelona, Spain, has completed his revision of the third Spanish edition of Protection or Free Trade. It contains a foreward by Senor Baldomera Argente (to the first edition) and one by himself signed as a Vice President of the International Union.