

not only by its library of publications, which covers all the books, pamphlets and addresses of Henry George (and in addition some modern books restating George's thesis), but by its expanding field of activity in the educational and business fields. The Foundation has promoted the circulation of George's works among college professors all over the country and teaching manuals have been requested by several hundreds of them, these being supplied without charge with special lesson sheets. Representatives of the Foundation have also lectured at universities in New York, Ohio, Kentucky, Missouri and Wisconsin. Publicity has been specifically directed towards Congressmen, Governors of states and others in public life. Leading newspapers and magazines receive copies of new editions and new publications for review and also carry advertisements publicising the Foundation's work. Support has been given to journals devoted to spreading the philosophy of Henry George and funds have been used also to promote essay competitions on the Taxation of Land Values and to assist the late Oscar Geiger in the foundation of the now prospering American Henry George School.

An important work still continuing is the translation and publication of George's work into other languages. In 1941 a quarterly, "The American Journal of Economics and Sociology," was started by the Foundation to provide a medium of expression for college and university professors; and, at the same time to interest them in the ideas of Henry George. Several hundreds of college libraries are among its regular subscribers.

A stream of pamphlets, booklets, catalogues and general publicity material goes out every year from the Foundation's offices — and many copies of their publications are earmarked for free distribution; ten thousand, and often as many as twenty thousand copies of George's books are printed every year. While reaching into new fields, the Foundation at the same time serves the people and activities within the movement itself; furnishes literature and supplies the necessary impetus for the spreading of the work.

Projects in hand for the immediate future include a new edition of "Progress and Poverty" with modern format and more comprehensive index; a scheme to circularise "taxing units" in the U.S.A. with information concerning the practical application of George's principles as now exemplified in many parts of the world; and a "Handbook on Land Value Taxation" which will contain a documented history of land value taxation gathered from sources throughout the world. This new book will be a mine of information on present-day activities of the movement and on many aspects of George's teachings.

President of the Foundation is Mr. Lawson Purdy; the enthusiastic and indefatigable Secretary is Miss V. G. Peterson. Its booklet "Twenty-five Years of Progress" is well named.

This Movement has the remedy for maldistribution of wealth, depressions, unemployment and social injustice. Help spread its message to others.

Greater Melbourne Council

The Bill to merge the thirty present municipalities of Melbourne into a single Greater Melbourne Council was carried in the Legislative Assembly, voting being on strictly party lines, Labor and Country Party members supporting and Liberals opposing. In the Legislative Council, in which the Country Party and Labor members are in a minority of one, permission to read the Bill a first time was refused, voting again being on party lines. The Government can introduce the Bill again at any time and should illness of a number of members on the opposition side occur it is quite possible for it to be brought forward and passed. The Government has announced that it will bring the Bill forward after June, 1952, when the Legislative Council elections will have taken place.

An active campaign has been conducted against the Bill by the various councils which would be merged. While there are many good arguments used in this campaign the main interest of this movement centres around the rating system to be employed. In this regard it should be pointed out that certain rate comparisons quoted by those opposed to the Bill are most misleading and may prevent reasoned consideration of the merits of the proposal.

These compare the rate in the £ of unimproved land value and of annual value in the City of Greater Brisbane with those of Greater Melbourne with argument suggesting that a very heavy increase in the scale of rates payable by ratepayers would follow such a change.

In such an argument the quotation of rates in the £ is most misleading. With them must be considered the valuation to which they are to be applied. In this particular comparison it should be borne in mind that improvement valuations and annual rental values are not officially recorded for the City of Brisbane. Nor are there official unimproved land valuations for the whole of the municipalities of Greater Melbourne. The figures quoted are therefore merely estimates of individuals for which the basis used would need to be checked before ready acceptance.

What is more important is the average rate paid per ratepayer. This is readily ascertainable and more informative, but has not been publicised.

	Greater Melbourne	Greater Brisbane
Whole Area		
General Rates	£3,730,000	£1,330,000
No. Buildings	331,000	114,756
Average Rate	£11 6 0	£11 12 0

It will be seen that over the city as a whole there is not much difference between the average rate payable in the one case as compared with the other. We have not figures available as to the number of buildings within the Brisbane Ward as compared with the other wards but as 40 per cent of the whole rate revenue comes from the Brisbane Ward which comprises only 3,429 acres of the total 240,000 in Greater Brisbane it seems certain that the average rates paid by citizens outside this business ward will be less than those paid by their Melbourne counterparts. There is nothing in this to support the allegations of burdensome rates upon Brisbane citizens.

Some of the rather frightening statements as to rates payable have arisen from comparison of the total rates payable to Brisbane Council with those payable in Melbourne, ignoring the fact that Water and Sewerage are handled by Brisbane Council whereas in Melbourne they are handled by a separate rating authority the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works. The figures used in this analysis compare the General Rate Yield only and therefore cover the same services in each case.

As far as the matter of rates payable is concerned, provided site-value was used as the rating basis and not annual value, it would be a good thing if such an authority were established. With site-value rating the outer areas would share in the very high land values which arise in the central business section due to community factors. The proportion of the total city rates borne by the central business wards would increase and that borne by municipalities or wards outside would be reduced.

The following figures show the proportion which the central business Ward or Municipality would contribute of the total revenue of the overall city in a number of cases. The proportion shown is not in the same year in each case but this does not vary greatly from year to year.

Ward or Municipality	Proportion of Total Revenue of the whole area which would be contributed under	
	Site-Value Rating (per cent.)	Annual-Value Rating (per cent.)
Greater Brisbane (1948)		
Brisbane Ward	40	†
Other Wards	60	†
Greater Sydney, 1947		
Sydney City	34	24
Other Municipalities	66	76
Greater Melbourne (1944)		
Melbourne City	29*	23
Other Municipalities	71*	77
Greater Wellington (1941)		
Central Business Ward	74	62
Other Wards	26	38
Greater Auckland (1941)		
City Business Ward	55	44
Other Wards	45	56

† There are no figures available for Nett Annual Values to enable dissection.

* The Melbourne figures have been calculated for the year 1944 by capitalising the N.A.V. and deducting the value of improvements as returned for War Damage Insurance in order to arrive at the Unimproved value of the land. The site-value of Melbourne City was then found to be £48,000,000 and that of the whole Greater Melbourne as £166,600,000.

In each case it is evident that site-value rating calls upon the central business areas where land values are highest to contribute a substantially greater share of the overall revenue than would be given under nett Annual value. The proposal to use annual value rating in the Greater Melbourne Bill was, therefore, retrograde and would have increased the burden on those in other sections while reducing that of the owners of central city sites.

**WE KNOW YOU VALUE THIS JOURNAL.
WILL YOU HELP TO EXTEND ITS INFLUENCE TO
NEW SUBSCRIBERS?**

Social Injustice and the Nazis

"Why The German Republic Fell," by Bruno Heilig, published by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, contains some informative yet little known material concerning the important influence of social injustice in the rise of the Nazis to power, and it has been thought well worthwhile to give an outline of the contents of the booklet, especially in view of its historical significance.

The author was an Austrian journalist who for 30 years was editor or foreign correspondent of leading newspapers in Austria, Germany, Hungary and the Balkans. He observed first hand the development of modern tyranny both in Germany and Austria. In 1938 he was obliged to escape to England. But his acquaintance with modern tyranny was even more profound in the concentration camps of Dachau and Buchenwald.

Land Values Boom.

In 1924, after the disastrous inflation, an amazingly rapid recovery began in Germany. A feature of the industrial boom was the fantastic jump in land prices. In six years land prices rose on the average by 700 per cent in Berlin and 500 per cent in Hamburg. Land speculators often doubled and trebled their fortunes overnight. For instance, being on friendly terms with the Berlin City Council often yielded dividends—one could become a millionaire if one knew where Berlin's traffic director intended to have a big underground station built.

A further feature was the way in which the cost of building materials soared, as a result of high customs duties imposed as protection for local manufacturers against foreign competition.

Besides the tribute to land monopolists, the German people were compelled to subsidise business activity. Thus in Hamburg taxpayers were robbed of 60 million marks to compensate landholders, and also of 40 million marks in order to subsidise builders of houses. This was at once followed by a substantial rise in rents. Again, in purchasing the Alexander Platz in Berlin, 85 million marks, over and above the 35 million mark valuation figure, were paid out to landholders on the ground that this extra amount was the rightful property of the vendors because it represented the value given the land by the expenditure of public money on the improvements to be made.

More Land Rackets.

Typical of the land rackets in cities and towns is the case of the Berlin river harbour basin, on which millions of marks were spent on improvements. The basin was leased to a private firm for 1/150th of the amount that should have been paid in rent for the land alone. Twelve months later the city official in charge of the basin was appointed Director-General of the company.

Half of the agricultural land in Germany was in the hands of the Junkers, the military aristocracy. After 1914-18 war, no land reform worth mentioning was initiated; on the contrary, more and more privileges were accorded the fortunate Junkers. Heilig states that in various ways a total of about one thousand million marks (50 million pounds) was presented to these