

## NEW MAN—SAME VIEWS

SIR ANTHONY EDEN'S resignation on grounds of ill-health from the office of Prime Minister was announced on January 9 and shortly afterwards he resigned also from Parliament and political life. He had held office for rather more than 20 months, having succeeded SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL in April, 1955. Sir Anthony had always specialised in foreign affairs, taking little part in domestic and economic matters. However this did not prevent him from registering his opposition to the taxation of land values which he described in 1931, in a reference to Mr. Snowden's Land-Value Finance Bill, as "piracy without the gallantry of the High Seas."

MR. MACMILLAN, the new Prime Minister, is no more favourably disposed towards the reform we advocate. In December, 1952, during the second reading debate on the *Town and Country Planning Bill*, he said:

"If land is not required for compulsory acquisition or compulsory preservation, there is nothing fundamentally wrong in its being sold like any other commodity in the ordinary way. It is quite true that profits may be made, but under present taxation, from any profits realised the State is a great and sometimes the greatest beneficiary."

When MR. R. R. STOKES, Labour Member for Ipswich, interrupted to ask whether the Minister did not see "any difference between creating wealth, and land values which are created by the community and not by the landlord?"

Mr. Macmillan replied shortly:

"I know that those to whom the memory of Mr. Henry George is the guiding light in their lives are fanatics, and that is the end of it."

Mr. Macmillan is also a silver-tongued protectionist. As reported in our previous issue, he affects to believe that when Britain abandoned free trade, tariffs were imposed "largely" so that in the future they could be abolished by negotiation and free trade could thereby be secured once again. A most curious argument. As Chancellor of the Exchequer in the previous administration, Mr. Macmillan

introduced the Premium Bond scheme (a "squalid raffle," a Labour Member called it) which he maintained was not a form of gambling because only the (so-called) interest on the bonds would be distributed as "prizes." It is doubtful whether a single purchaser of these Macmillan bonds accepts that contention.

## LET'S ALL PULL TOGETHER Monopolists and Rent Recipients Too?

MAKING HIS FIRST party political broadcast as Prime Minister on January 17, MR. MACMILLAN spoke bravely and flatteringly about the courage and character of the British people:

"Don't let's have any more defeatist talk of second-class powers and of dreadful things to come. Britain has been great, is great, and will stay great, provided we close our ranks and get on with the job." He would try to give the country the leadership it expected; he had a strong and united team each member of which believed in "progressive conservatism."

The listener would have been justified in concluding from Mr. Macmillan's earlier remarks that his united team believed in "Fabian socialism." He was, of course, at pains to emphasise that people wanted "ample opportunity, not drab equality" but also he was insistent that "no one should be allowed to sink below a decent level, but everyone should be free to rise according to his gifts, his work, and his worth."

When he entered Parliament as a young man 33 years ago, Mr. Macmillan was struck by, and rebelled against, the inequalities of wealth and the poverty "caused by large-scale unemployment."

"But a lot has been done since then. The great inequalities of wealth have disappeared. There's poverty and suffering still, particularly among retired folk and others living on fixed incomes. But broadly speaking the standard of living, the level of employment, and the enjoyment of life have steadily risen. We have built our defences against want and sickness, and we're proud of it. Of course, however well it's managed, it costs, and must cost, a great deal of money. And then there's defence. That costs money, too. How are we going

## "The Greatest Social Evil In Our History"

*Reprinted from the Kentish Independent, January 18*

Speaking at the first annual dinner of North West Kent Branch of the Land-Value Taxation League, Mr. V. H. Blundell (Director of Studies, Henry George School of Social Science) said: "Much of the social reform in modern society was founded on mistaken thinking.

"Sympathy with distress and love of one's fellow men was admirable but too often led to false conclusions. It was false reasoning that, because certain things exist with or follow another thing, it is proof that it is because of that other thing, yet this was the approach made to most of our social problems.

"In the study of the economic issues

which governed living conditions it is vital to define our terms. For example, value can mean contrary things, value in use and value in exchange. Some people confuse inflation with rising cost of living—money, with prices. Such misconceptions were the reason for the failure of the present social security legislation to live up to the promise expected of it."

In welcoming the guests, Mr. Stephen Martin, who presided, commented on the historical background of the "King's Head," Bexley, where the dinner was held. It was in one of these rooms that the commissioners appointed under the iniquitous Enclosure Acts met (about 1820) and

distributed the common land, thereby depriving the village labourers of their right to use this land.

This was of much interest to the league because their objective was to destroy the spectre of want which had haunted the social scene ever since those Acts came into operation.

"We believe," he said, "that everyone has a right to the use of land providing they pay to the state the community-created value of their land holding. The Enclosure Acts constituted the greatest social evil ever perpetrated in our history."