

PRIVILEGES

by Ole Lefmann

This article is based on a Slide Show presented 9 Nov 2012 by the author to the audience of The Library Group of 'The Henry George Foundation of Great Britain'.

The author was born 1928 in Copenhagen, Denmark, in a family of shop owners, most of whom were supporters of Henry George's ideas urging for Free Trade and low or no tax on income. In his early days the author worked in retail, in wholesale, in export and in import; and he graduated 1963 from The Copenhagen Business School, CBS.

As he wanted to propagate the ideas of Henry George he preferred a job that gave him the spare time he needed, that worked out to be thirty-four years in insurance business where he began as salesman and later in administration assessing claim notifications and paying compensations for damages. He taught at the Danish Insurance Academy about private persons' liabilities and insurance of claims caused by liabilities and wrote in Danish the textbook *Insurance of Private Liabilities* (1st edition 1987 and the updated 2nd edition 1991).

About public matters he wrote (in Danish) *Three Synonyms* (1979) and *Out with the old Tax* (1993) and many articles, letters to the editor, and treatises. Together with Dr. Robert V. Andelson, Alabama, USA, he sent (in English) *Open letter to Pope John Paul II* (1997) and together with Karsten K. Larsen he wrote the Chapter DENMARK in Dr. Andelson's book *Land-Value Taxation Around the World* (2000).

He served for 8 years as Deputy President of 'The International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade' (theIU), followed by 12 years as that movement's Assistant General Secretary and created its first website (1999); delivered presentations at theIU's international conferences (Ütrecht, Holland, 1982, United Nations-NGO Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark, 1995, and in London 2010); wrote a series of three articles about PRIVILEGES to the English magazine *Land and Liberty* (2007-08) and delivered (2012) the slide show mentioned above under the headline.

In 1957 he married Ulla. In their retirements they moved to London (1996) to be close to their daughter (their only child) who had married a British citizen and settled down in London where they brought up two daughters. Here the author translated Fred Harrison's book *The Silver Bullet* (2008) into Danish (2010) and Henry George's *The Science of Political Economy* (1897) into Danish (2012).

Some time ago when following a lecture about late economists I mentioned that they had not paid much attention to the fact that Privileges damage the market. A member of the audience asked what specifically I meant by the word Privileges, and it seemed that several other members of the audience were also unsure of what I referred to.

As subsequently I thought of that question I realised that the word Privileges is used about different **kinds** of privileges, such as Emotionally felt privileges, Statutory privileges, and Monopolised privileges.

Emotionally felt privileges

People often use the word Privilege about situations that please them one way or another, such as hearing a *great concert*, watching a *moving theatre performance*, listening to a *brilliant speaker*, looking at a *stunning view*, or a *sports event*. It seems to make no difference whether the event in question is free of charge or is paid for.

Some people find it a Privilege to live, to be part of life, and to be able to enjoy it.

Statutory privileges

Another kind of privileges is what I call Statutory privileges, of which some are connected to special jobs.

Presidents and Monarchs, and Judges, and Members of Parliament have personal privileges - besides their high salaries - they have certain economic rights and to some degree they enjoy immunity from being charged with certain offences; and they may also enjoy physical protection of themselves and their family members.

Also private holders of power may issue Statutory Privileges.

From my school days I remember that pupils in the eldest classes were allowed - in the breaks - to go to a special garden and there smoke tobaccos that was strictly forbidden to pupils in general.

And often directors or managers of a firm are allowed to park their private cars at the firm's parking spaces where staff members in general are excluded from parking.

But neither Emotionally felt privileges or Statutory privileges play roles in economics; because - though they are exclusive rights that give their holders appreciated comfort - the holders cannot use them to increase their income and they cannot transfer the rights to other people by sale of them or by lending or hiring them out.

Monopolised privileges

Then there is what I call Monopolised privileges.

They are exclusive rights that people in general are prohibited from enjoying by a powerbroker who enforces obedience to the prohibitions.

Monopolised privileges provide their holders with advantages; and the holders can use them to increase their income either by using the rights themselves or by renting or hiring them out to people who will pay fees, rents or hires to the holders.

Monopolised privileges are therefore both attractive and valuable; and because of that and because they have become widespread they play an important role in economics - both in the national economy and in the citizens' private economies.

IPRs = Intellectual Property Rights are a special kind of monopolised privileges.

They are granted by authorities after applications from inventors, artists, composers, authors, film-makers, etc., and their values are considered as rewards for successful use of time, money and manpower in creating useful tools for, or methods of production, or for enjoyable entertainments or appreciated information.

The Government will decide details of the Intellectual Property Rights it grants, such as *how long the privilege should last*, and about *its transferability to a third party*.

Advantages that make Monopolised Privileges attractive and valuable are such as:

Privacy and Peace to work

supported by the holder's right to exclude other people from the premises.

The holder may use the premises in any way that is accepted by the authorities and agreed by the owner of the site.

A lead in competition

caused by the fact that competitors respect the prohibition embedded in the holder's rights. It is unfair competition, yes, and it enables privilege holders to *boost their income*, to the detriment of competitors.

Extra-high profit

that means that the holder is able to *add extra profits* on top of the prices the market would have decided had the exclusive rights not been protected. Monopolists and holders of privileges will not deliver satisfaction to anybody for these extra-profits.

Extra income from a fee, a hire, a lease or a rent

that the holder is able to collect from persons who want to hire or lease or rent the holder's exclusive right.

Boosted income, extra profit, extra fee, hire lease or rent are purchasing power that enables the holder to take out from the market what he wants.

Monopolised Privileges exclude people in general from doing and using things or services they would like to do or use, which limit people's living. I will revert to that later when I discuss both advantages and disadvantages caused by Monopolised Privileges.

Monopolised Privileges are valuable - but their values **vary considerably**. Some are of very little value, some are of considerable value and some reach astronomical heights, such as

- Rights to use certain bands of electronic waves, for mobile phones, e-mails, Internet, and television.
- Rights to extract sought-after resources, such as fuel, minerals and metals of many kinds, and precious stones, etc.
- Locations for homes and work at attractive locations.
- Quotes for hunting, fishing, foresting, etc.

The total value of all monopolised privileges

Valuable privileges play an important role in Economics. But how much the values of all monopolised privileges make is a question that today cannot be answered exactly, because nobody has shown an interest in registering it.

Today we only have a register of values of landownership.

No statisticians, politicians or journalists and only very few philosophers and economists have in the past paid attention to that part of the national economy that regards other monopolised privileges but landownership.

I would imagine that **when** a family today pay their daily shopping, pay for supply of water, gas or electricity power, and petrol; pay for purchases of special things like white goods, vehicles, electronic equipments, furniture, etc.; and for services, such as phone calls, e-mail connections, health service, and service needed to a car, a boiler, a computer, etc., **then** the family pays to holders of privileges an amount that annually runs up to at least 50 percentages of the amount the same family pays in taxes to the public chest.

Few days ago in television it was told that a firm's application for a patent of a newly invented commodity had raised some doubt that might lead to refusal of the application; and the doubt had had the immediate effect that the share prices of that firm plummeted considerably.

Investors pay much higher prices for shares of firms that hold valuable privileges.

The Government who has granted the privileges and currently protects them does know who the holders are, and could - if it wanted to do so - easily make a register of the holders and of the estimated values of the privileges.

There is no doubt that monopolised privileges play a very important role in Economics.

The Market

When speaking about Economics we usually think of The Market.

The market is highly praised as a **two-ways system** to which suppliers

- deliver their products - goods or services, that may satisfy other people, and get money in return, by which they
- take out from the market goods and services that satisfy their demands.

Nobody is forced to go to the market. It is instituted by human beings' natural inclination to exchange what they produce for something they want more than their own production.

Nobody accepts a deal unless they think they will gain by it.

The Market is governed by a principle of **mutual satisfaction** and it works best when the parties in the deals are free from any pressure.

But we have to be aware that the Market is not the only way, in which means for satisfaction are distributed in the community.

Satisfaction without the market

Besides the citizens' *Production*, and *Exchange* of products and services via the Market, satisfaction of wishes, wants and needs may be delivered via other means, of which I have listed four:

Charities

initiated and carried out by individuals who feel sympathy and maybe solidarity with the applicants. It is to some degree similar to individuals' giving presents and inheritances to friends or family members.

Social Security Services

initiated and carried out by public administration according to democratically decisions based on feelings of sympathy and maybe solidarity.

Monopolised Privileges

initiated and protected by lawfully exacted physical power;

Criminal offences

initiated and carried out by illegally exacted physical power.

Charities and Social Security Services - based on human sympathies or solidarities - are not comprehended by the economy; but **that** are Monopolised privileges and Crimes offending properties.

Against Crimes the community has established police-forces who do the best they can to prevent or minimise criminal activities to the lowest possible level.

Monopolised Privileges have great impacts on the Economy and **they** are what we shall deal with now.

Abuse of the Market

We described the highly praised Market that ideally functions as a two-way system to which people deliver what satisfy other people and take out what satisfy themselves; BUT that is not the way Monopolised Privileges work.

Holders of that kind of privileges do not deliver anything for the over-charges they collect as extra profits, extra-high prices, or as hire, leases or rents; they only take out from the market!

They use the market as a ONE-WAY system, and thereby they distort the Market that is meant to work as a TWO-WAY system.

Holders of Monopolised privileges **collect purchasing power from people, without giving them things or services they want.**

As long as landowners and holders of other valuable exclusive rights are allowed to keep the values of their power protected privileges and use it as their private properties, they *prey* on their customers

and leasers. But they also prey - indirectly - on all tax-payers, because **when** the Government does not collect its natural revenues from values of land and other natural resources created by

- the citizens' market-effective demands
- good government, and
- public investments,

then the Government has to collect taxes on producers, products and production, regardless that these taxes lay considerable deadweight on industry and trade.

Customers and tenants of holders of monopolised privileges, and taxpayers in general suffer every day year in and out as long as these parasitical arrangements last; and the Market is abused and distorted. Unfortunately most of these victims are blissfully unaware of the unjust inflicted upon them.

People's spending powers are reduced, which also **reduces people's abilities to pay rent to landowners.** So, as time goes by *the size of the rent that landowners can pick up shrinks by the monopoly-profits captured by holders of valuable privileges and by tax-collectors.*

Suppression of the visible rent of land

'The visible rent of land' is the amount a rent paying tenant or buyer of a site pays to the holder of the exclusive right to use the site in question; either a lump sum for a long period of renting, or rental payments for shorter periods; or a lump sum for taking over all the seller's rights regarding ownership of the site in question.

The size of 'the visible rent of land' is influenced by many things, among which is the advantages the buyer expects to get from the exclusive right to use the site. Another important thing that influences the size of the 'visible rent of land' is the purchasing power the buyer/ tenant can provide. That amount depends of facts such as:

- The buyer's
 - Income
 - Fortune
 - Credibility for taking out a loan
 - Ability to find security within his family, friends, or employer;
- The lenders' conditions for granting loans (such as interests, and length of the period of instalments);
- The taxes that governments collect;
- The ability of holders of Monopolised Privileges to capture purchasing power from people in general without giving them things or services they want.

So, heavy taxes to the Governments reduce the purchasing powers of potential buyers/renters that therefore reduce buyers' and tenants' ability to pay rent of land to landowners. And the same effect is caused by holders of monopolised privileges when they capture huge parts of purchasing power from people in general; "Robbers" as Henry George called them in his book *Protection or Free Trade*, Chapter 25. (The

book is available online from 'Robert Schalkenbach Foundation's website: [schalkenbach.org/protection or free trade](http://schalkenbach.org/protection%20or%20free%20trade)).

The total Rent of Land that the classical economists and Henry George spoke of consists today of

- The visible rent of land, plus
- Taxes collected by Governments, plus
- The extra-high profits on top of the prices holders of Monopolised Privileges would have been content with had they not had their power protected privileges.

Suppression of people

Producers *become still more dependent* on holders of valuable privileges, and the social situation in the modern society may be that unprivileged people or under-privileged people gradually fall back to the serfdom, under which peasants lived until the middle of the 19th century, and under which urban working-class people remained until the middle of the 20th century.

That decline will be advanced by two forces:

1. The natural force of the market that keeps rewards to suppliers of manpower and things used in production low, and
2. The society's strongest physical human power that excludes people in general from
 - a. enjoying *advantages of nature and society*, and from
 - b. a fair share of the *excessive values of production*, and
 - c. a fair share of the *incremental values of monopolised privileges*,all of which are led to holders of monopolised privileges.

The Market with its competition deliver manpower to production at the lowest possible wages or salaries; unless we speak about specially sought-after abilities that the elite of the society want to take advantage of and therefore pay generously.

Wages in general will be low, and - when the economy progresses and wages raise - they will stay low compared to that part of the result of production that goes to holders of monopolised privileges.

Low wages to manpower is a natural consequence of the free market, which we cannot change. We can regulate the market in some ways; but then it is no longer the free market, and the more we regulate it the worse it works as we saw it happen in the 20th century in countries based on governmentally planned economy, where it was usual to see empty shelves in stores, long delivery times, a proliferating black market, etc.

We really prefer that the market is as free as possible, and we therefore accept to live with the disadvantage of low wages and some unemployment.

But certainly: **that is the reason why many people really hate free market and free competition.**

Don't blame the market

It is wrong to address this anger to the market.

The problem is not embedded in the market; it is a consequence of the distorted distribution of

- the *excessive values of production*, and of
- the *incremental values of monopolies*,

which today together make up **what the classical economists would have called Rent of Land** in the 21st century as specified below.

The excessive value of a production

is the difference between *the value* of the product(s) that satisfy the final consumer, and *the costs* of production in all the links from the growing, gathering, extraction, excavation etc. from nature to the delivery of the end product to the final consumer; including rewards to all suppliers of manpower and things used in production, transport, storage, distribution, etc.

This excessive value was what the classical economists living in centuries when the economy was dominantly based on agriculture called Rent of Land. This value appears because of human exertions, but is caused by advantages of nature and/or advantages of the society; and the classical economists found that it could be taxed almost up to its total value without hampering the productivity, because the suppliers of manpower and things used in production had already got their market determined rewards. Therefore the classical economists recommended the excessive value of production as the tax base instead of taxes on producers, production or products.

The incremental values of monopolies

was not a topic at the time of the classical economists when determination of the size of rent of land was dominantly based on the soil's ability to yield results of agricultural production.

Values of other monopolies but landownership have gradually grown over the two centuries since then, in number as well as in magnitude; incremental values of monopolies are due to increased demand for monopolised privileges including landownership, and is caused by changes of parameters such as:

- Increase in the amount of money and other means of payment accessible to potential buyers (better income caused by higher technologies, increased fortune, lowered taxes or tax-evasion, easier conditions of borrowing, etc.).

Summary of advantages and disadvantages

Now we can summarise the advantages of Monopolised Privileges to the holders of the privileges, and disadvantages to unprivileged people and the community:

Advantages to holders of the privileges are or may be:

- Privacy
- Peace to work

- Reduced competition
- Extra-high profits on monopolised goods and services for sale
- Extra income from tenants, leasers, borrowers of exclusive rights
- Possible windfall income.

Disadvantages to unprivileged people and their trade, and to their struggle to keep their life-style are:

- Exclusion from gifts of nature
 - Exclusion from advantages of society
 - Increased prices on goods and services
 - Reduced spending power; that means also:
 - Reduction of Landowners income of rent of land.
 - Taxation on production that hamper productivity
 - Increased need for Social Security Benefits
 - Widened gap between rich and poor
 - Class division of the population
- and
- Tensions in the society.

Disadvantages to the community as a whole when the values of monopolised privileges are not collected to the public chest are:

- Missing rental income from nature and society, and
- Need to secure revenues by burdening producers with taxation and hampering productivity.

As the effects of monopolised privileges are **so overwhelmingly bad** - the question is:

Why do Governments grant Monopolised Privileges?

There are two main reasons for that:

One reason is:

The Government has a NEED for Regulations,

and the other main reason is:

The Government has a NEED for extraordinary Rewards:

The Government's NEED for Regulations

appears in several cases, of which I will mention four groups:

Productions that involve **High risks**, such as *pollution* of air, water, soil, or silence, which call for prohibition of the productions in question. But if the products of such production are strongly wanted and cannot be produced without pollution, the way to solve the conflict between wishes for production and against it has been to prohibit the activity in general, but allow a single or a few producers to go on with it subject to *restrictive conditions* and *stringent governmental control*.

That has been the case regarding:

- handling of nuclear and gen-manipulated products;
- production that is extremely smelly, noisy, or causes electronic disturbances

- production that imply unhealthy waste water, dusty smoke, and poisoning or otherwise harmful materials.

Productions that involve **Use of natural resources** where chaos would occur if everyone at any time were allowed to use them.

That is the case regarding

- natural deposits, arable land;
- dilution of scarce resources;
- natural environments;
- use of electronic waves;
- use of space for homes and work.

Productions that involve **Use of unique infrastructure** where chaos would occur if everyone at any time were allowed access to them.

That is the case where private individuals or organisations have been allowed to operate governmentally provided

- *observatories, and other plants for research,*
- *rails or harbours for public transport,*
- *nets of tubes and wires for transport and supply of energy and water,*
- *nets of tubes, wires or relays for communication systems.*

Productions that involve **Use of institutions** that cannot function if all people at any time were allowed to use them, such as:

- *circulation of money;*
- *final handling of rubbish; or*
- *handling of dead corpses.*

The Government's NEED for extraordinary rewards

appears when somebody has served the ruler or government, or the nation in meritorious ways, such as:

- acted heroically; or
- helped the ruler out of financial or political crisis; or
- increased rulers private income or fortune, which is called CORRUPTION. It is a temptation for the person(s) in command of the nation's strongest physical power, but should be prosecuted and punished.

However, a few years ago British public media broadcasted news about a Prime Minister who were able to stop the search for evidence in a case about transactions as parts of an oil deal, by asserting that further investigation would 'impose a risk of the nation's security'.

Also the need appears when somebody has invented useful things, or methods of doing things, or music, films or other works of art; and applies for what we call Intellectual Property Right (IPRs).

How should rulers cope?

How should rulers cope with the values of Monopolies and Privileges that we find necessarily needed though they damage our society?

Henry George wrote in his works (in second half of the 19th century) that all monopolies, except landownership, should be abolished, or - if they were strongly needed - be nationalised.

Regarding landownership - that he really wanted to keep as private property - he found that it **could** remain as such **on** the condition that the owner would pay the annual rental value to the Common Chest, so that the public could use the revenue to benefit all people and their businesses.

-- --

At this point some people would raise the question:

Why should “benefit all people” be more preferable than benefit a few*?)

There are several reasons for that and I will only mention nine:

- All people are born with equal rights to the free gifts of nature.
- The community becomes more harmonious to live in when nobody preys on others.
- Voluntary cooperation will flourish.
- Trade will prosper.
- Class division of the society will disappear, while differences due to decent aptitudes, talents and skills **will** remain.
- The market will be free from abusers. Nobody will be able to take out from the market more than unprivileged people can, unless they *supply to the market goods or services that other people want*.
- There will no longer be economic advantages connected to exclusive rights or to monopolised privileges.
- Nobody will suffer hard times because they are preyed on by people who protected by the society’s strongest physical power collect income via monopolised privileges.
- Taxes hampering production and trade will no longer be needed.

*) including landownership, but excluding Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs)

-- --

Nationalisation

Generally Henry George did NOT propose nationalisation; to the contrary.

He wanted Public Administration as slim as possible in order to avoid rigidity, inefficiency and corruption, and in order to make it easier for people in general - and journalists in particular - to keep an eye on the public administration.

He found at the end of the 19th century that valuable privileges were few (railways, telegraph, telephone, printing of money and circulating it, etc.) and that nationalising them would not clash with his general attitude of keeping public administration as slim as possible.

Today, however, *that* has changed dramatically

Today we are surrounded by monopolised privileges in abundance, and the number of those we have to accept because they are strongly wanted has grown enormously as a consequence of the technological development in production, in extraction, transport, distribution, storage, communication, and in payment systems.

Nationalisation of all strongly needed privileges would today mean a great expansion of the society's public sector, and **that** would indeed conflict George's proposal of **a public administration as slim as possible**.

Therefore, the followers of Henry George's ideas have to find a solution of the problem about the many *strongly needed valuable monopolised privileges*.

Use the means proposed by Henry George

To me it is obvious that the system George recommended us to use on the rental values of land - landownership **is** in fact a monopolised privilege - is the right means to use also on other monopolised privileges that we might consider strongly needed and therefore will not abolish.

In several countries Governments have established institutions to assess the market prices of all sites in the country in question; in UK we have the 'Valuation Office Agency' (VOA) - www.voa.gov.uk) that today assesses land-values, but can as well assess the actual rental values of land.

The registered land-values make a tax base; and registered rental values of land will also be a tax base on which the Government can impose taxes.

In the same way the Government can establish an institution that will register other monopolised privileges but landownership.

The Government has granted or approved all monopolised privileges and does already know the identity of the holders, and the assessors will easily be able to estimate with sufficient accuracy the rental values of them.

Thereafter the Government will decide the degree to which the holders will have to forward the publicly created rental values to the Common Chest.

The revenue of all valuable strongly needed monopolised privileges will be huge, really huge, when traditional taxes are reduced gradually.

Use of the revenue

As important as it is that the public collects the rental values of all monopolised privileges, including land-values but excluding the values of Intellectual Property Rights (IPRs), it is also important that the public **uses the revenue in a way that benefits all citizens as equally as possible**.

There are many ways in which the Government can use the huge revenue. These ways can be sorted into three categories:

The first category will pay expenses of

tasks that are already on the Government's budget,

That way will enable the Government to reduce and gradually abolish taxes on production, products and producers, which will release the nation's productivity, and increase what people will pay for the exclusive right to use locations, which will increase the revenue of the land-value tax.

The second category will pay expenses of new democratically agreed

tasks to be added to the Government's budget.

That way will make it possible to implement projects that hitherto were refused because of missing funds. More facilities will comfort citizens and their businesses, and will increase what people will pay for the exclusive right to use locations, which will increase the revenue of the land-value tax.

The third category will pay

shares of the revenue to all people, who have their main citizenship to the nation in question.

That way will increase the citizens' purchasing power, raise productivity, and raise the amount people will pay for location in this environment, and it will increase the revenue of the land-value tax.

Most likely the legislators will prefer a combination of the above three categories of ways to use the revenue.

All the proposed ways - if tax reduction gives equal amounts to all citizens - will benefit all citizens equally and will implement the idea that nature and society belong to all people in common.

The effects of that will be that:

- The purchasing power of people in general will increase;
- Demand will expand;
- Production will increase;
- Export will proliferate;
- People will like to settle down in this environment;
- Prices and rents for locations will tend to increase; and
- The revenue of public collection of the rental values will increase.

Sharing - or individual greed

When the revenue of collected rental values of not-abolished monopolised privileges including landownership has replaced all taxes on production - except behavioural taxes some of which protect human health and the environment - ***there might still be a surplus.***

If some of the values of advantages of nature and society are used to pay a special favour to a single or a few individuals it is a ***violation against all people's equal rights to nature and society.***

When few persons get values of advantages that nature provides for free and/or of advantages provided by the society, the consequence

is that *most of the people are excluded from the free gifts of natural materials and energies, and from advantages of the society.*

Suppression by physical power

The above-mentioned consequences were understood centuries ago by philosophers who wrote and spoke about them and had their writings published; but propagation of this *knowledge has been suppressed* by interests who benefitted and still benefit on private capture of

- excessive surplus of production, and of
- incremental values of monopolised privileges.

These interests are the same who controlled and still today *control both education and the public media.*

Greed - or developed Democracy

We must change the attitude to education that today aims to serve the interests of Business and Trade and to suppress questioning the privilege holders' interest in valuable privileges.

We should urge for more qualified education in class rooms and in auditoriums about understanding the functions and values of

- our society;
- of cooperation and exchange of products and services, including:
 - consequences of various ways of use of governmental power, and
 - the importance of Democracy and how we can protect and develop it.

An easier way?

Some people - who sympathize with the proposals of Henry George - may say that it is difficult enough to make people understand the need for public collection of the rental values of land, and that they therefore don't want to complicate the picture by adding new points to it.

I think it would be easier for people in the 21st century to understand that what should be collected publicly and used to benefit all people on an equal footing is **the values of all advantages of nature and society** that today are captured by holders of a great variety of monopolised privileges, including landowners.

Landowners take only what is left by the other "robbers", as Henry George called them in his *Protection or Free Trade*, Chapter 25.

Our challenge - because we have adapted to the injustice

The value of **nature** was originally our common inheritance; and it should be re-instated as common property; and the value of the **society** has been built up through generations by citizens in common, and should therefore also be regarded as common property.

Powerbrokers have captured most of it for their private use; and they will take all of it unless we make them understand that **it belong to all people in common.**

Privatising the values of land was bad enough; these decades power-brokers are about to privatise the values of drinkable water; and maybe also the values of breath-able air will be privatised one day in the future.

We have to re-instate all values of nature and society as our common property.

But the original justice - that became violated when powerbrokers incorporated common properties into their private properties - has lasted for so long time that it has gained time-honoured custom, and today is considered legal rights.

Advantages of these instituted injustices have through several generations been sold and paid for by money that honest people have earned by honest labour.

Therefore, when un-privileged people in a not so far future will raise the clamour for the necessary change, privileged people will feel it as an injustice and resist it. That was also the situation in 1789 that led to the French revolution. That situation may be repeated if the privileged people will not understand the need for the change and support the clamour raised by unprivileged and under-privileged people.

We have to spread the message in a way people will understand. That is our challenge today.

Ω

The End.