

iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui
iiiiiu iiiiui iiiiui

N E W S L E T T E R

No. 1.

OCTOBER 1966

A MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

IN introducing the first issue of our International Newsletter, I take the opportunity of sending fraternal greetings to my many friends throughout the Movement and look forward to renewing the acquaintance of many at our next International Union conference.

This Newsletter should provide an ideal forum for the exchange of ideas internationally for which our conferences, alas, give too little time. To start the ball rolling, here is something to mull over.

I have often marveled at one of the features of the human mind, in that an idea or conclusion would seem to require a period of gestation somewhat like that of a living body.

The period, however, differs from the body growth in that it is measured by the speed of operation of the mind involved.

For over half a century I have been a vigorous advocate of the principle (which should never be referred to as a theory) best presented in Henry George's "Progress and Poverty."

But it is only in the last few years that I have arrived at the conviction that public income 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.

I presented this extension of the principle at our meeting in New York, and while it did not meet with general acceptance, some, whom I highly regard, approved it warmly, and I am certain that a thoughtful reading of "A Basic Income" will convince many more students of our social structure of its value.

JOE THOMPSON

MEMBERSHIP
OF THE
INTERNATIONAL
UNION

IF YOU are not already a fully paid-up member of the International Union (annual subscription \$2) then this Newsletter will have been sent to you as an invitation to join. The Newsletter is free to members who maintain their annual subscription. Membership is open to all who sign a declaration of adherence to the objects of the Union.

- O B J E C T S !

To stimulate in all countries a public opinion favourable to permanent peace and prosperity for all peoples, through the progressive removal of the basic economic causes of poverty and war, as these causes are demonstrated in the writings of Henry George. Specifically, towards the realisation of these objects, the International Union favours the raising of public revenues by taxes and rates upon the value of land apart from improvements in order to secure the economic rent for the community and the abolition of taxes, tariffs or imposts that interfere with the free production and exchange of wealth.

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

The Conference Arrangements Committee meets on 14th October to discuss the results of the questionnaire to members regarding the venue of the next International Conference.

The Committee favoured Israel (1968) as a result of its own deliberations, but it will give full consideration to the views of members. The present unrest in the Middle East and its future implications will have to be taken into account in reaching a formal decision.

EDUCATING
YOUNG
KENYANS

A new magazine publishes in Nairobi by the New Era College and appropriately entitled NEW ERA, devotes two whole pages in its second issue to the science of wealth. This is a continuation of a simplified course in economics and is based upon the lessons taught at the College, which appeared in the first issue. The course follows that of the Henry George Schools and is attractively presented. This most readable magazine, designed for young Kenyans, also contains photographs, local news and a number of quiz competitions. We wish it every success and hope its circulation expands with every issue.

W H A T A N O D

By ARTHUR DOWE

Director
Australian School of Social Science
Sydney

TO cross swords with so redoubtable and pleasing a Georgist leader as Robert Clancy is no light matter, and when I do so I am confident that he and his numerous friends will take it in the spirit in which I write it. When I was editor of "The Standard" there was nobody that I quoted more freely and appreciatively than Robert Clancy, so that my task in criticising one of his writings is much against my inclinations.

The error to which I now draw attention is contained in "A Word With You" in "Henry George News" for April 1966. After some ambiguous remarks which seem to confuse inflation and high wages, and to blame high wages, he says "The real culprit, the increase of land rent, escapes detection. As the value of land goes on its inflated way...."

This not only identifies land value (a social evil) with rent (a social good), but it actually identifies rent as "the culprit." It is time to protest.

Rent is a social product, and entirely good. It is the antithesis of land value which is the bad product of injustice (bad government). As the body economic develops and civilisation develops RENT increases. There is no culprit here.

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

It must of course be remembered that land value means the selling value of land. A preferable term is site value.

All Georgists should have their goal clearly in front of them. It is: (a) the abolition of the political injustice by which rent, the natural public income, is at present diverted from the public pocket into individual pockets as unearned income (in the process becoming converted into land value), and (b) using good government to collect the rent into the public treasury.

When the goal is achieved it will abolish land value and will enable taxation to be discontinued. So prosperity will be possible.

But prosperity, although a social phenomenon arising from trade and co-operation, is still an individual matter. Under justice and freedom the individual will be free to decide whether or not he will work and be prosperous. Let us cease to be collectivists.

Above all let us be Georgists. Our specialty is RENT. Let us not regard it as an enemy or a "culprit." It is the economic life of every community. The switch in Georgism from rent to land-value (traceable to ambiguity by Henry George himself) is a tragic self-weakening and self-

deception, springing from a failure to understand the social phenomenon of rent and the anti-social phenomenon of land-value.

Where Clancy errs Homer nods indeed. Clancy's error is more serious because he is so influential. Almost all Georgists, even our most prominent leaders, are now voicing this error and losing direction. If I can induce Clancy to avoid it in future I shall be doing a first-class service to the Georgist cause, because almost all lesser lights in Georgism follow him.

A WORD FROM THE EDITORS

THIS newsletter is for private circulation only. It is not a propaganda sheet, but an internal "house magazine". It will contain international news of interest to the converted and will also act as a forum of opinion among Georgists.

There is no fixed date of issue but it is hoped to produce the newsletter quarterly. Its contents, both views and news will depend entirely upon its readers' contributions in the form of articles, letters, news cuttings etc. which should be sent to:

"Newsletter", International Union,
177 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, S.W.1. England

If you are provoked by any of the views expressed in this issue - write now while still feeling hot around the collar. Alternatively, write to express your agreement with views, or to state new ones.

The Editors

1964 CONFERENCE PAPERS STILL AVAILABLE

LAND DEVELOPMENT AND TAXATION IN A CENTRAL COMMERCIAL ZONE	-	Frank Wiles
LAND REFORM IN HAWAII	-	V. G. Peterson
REPORT FROM NEW ZEALAND	-	Dr. Rolland O'Regan
REPORT FROM AUSTRALIA	-	E. P. Middleton
THE GERMAN BUILDING LAND TAX	-	Gustave Bahnsack
LAND VALUATION AND TAXATION IN DENMARK	-	K. J. Kristensen
LAND REFORM IN GT. BRITAIN	-	V. H. Blundell
THE WHITSTABLE SURVEY	-	V. G. Saldji
LAND TAX EXEMPTIONS	-	Robert Tideman
REPORT FROM AUSTRIA	-	Philip Knab
THE GEORGIST SITUATION IN DENMARK	-	J. H. Kristensen

INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP

By

ROBERT CLANCY

Director New York H.G.S.S.S.

THERE is in the Georgist movement a camaraderie which transcends national distinctions. I get this most strongly at our international conferences. The friends we meet at these reunions are first and foremost advocates of land value taxation and free trade; only secondarily do we notice their nationality.

Of course, there are national differences, and once in a while they may even get in the way of a complete entente; nor can we forget the language problem. But, in one way or another, the general principles for which we stand usually exert a stronger pull than the various differences.

At one of our conferences (this one happened to be a national Henry George School conference in the United States) one of the visitors was Professor Y. Yamasaki of Japan. He could read English, but could not speak it well or understand it well when spoken. I managed to convey to him the query as to what he derived from the conference. "I get the atmosphere", he replied, and that was reason enough for him to come.

At the international conferences, English is for the most part spoken. Many who come from non-English-speaking countries know enough English to participate. But some do not, and still they too want strongly enough to "get the atmosphere" to travel sometimes great distances. Once in a while someone like the redoubtable Grace Isabel Colbron attends an international conference. At the 1927 Conference in Denmark she, who could fluently speak seven languages, glided back and forth from one language to another, and so she really got the atmosphere!

Another feature of our "internationalism" is that we are intensely interested in the prospects of applying land value taxation anywhere in the world. We feel it is "our" problem, be it Australia or Jamaica, Denmark or Costa Rica.

Although we often hear it said by our friends that our appeal must be to enlightened self-interest - that the homeowner must be shown how a shifting of the tax burden to land would benefit him - yet see how even the advocates of this policy light up when an advance for L.V.T. is won in some place from which they, themselves, could not possibly benefit!

All Georgist eyes were focussed on the elections in Denmark which would decide the fate of the Justice Party - "our" party - and a universal groan went up when "we" lost. We likewise cheered when L.V.T. progress was made in New Zealand - which is as far away from most of us as it could possibly be.

Are other social reform movements like this? Possibly. But I cannot help thinking that there is a special quality to the world-wide fellowship of that movement initiated by Henry George, whose almost last words were, "I am for men".

L A N D

V A L U E

M U D D L E

FOR more than half a century and despite a lot of dedicated work the splendid cause which we inherited from Henry George has failed to achieve even little success and our congratulations are due to those individuals who conceived the idea of

E.B. DONOHUE
President
The Association
for
Good Government
NSW, Australia

this news sheet (as yet unnamed) which I hope will lead to a searching and profitable examination of any traditional aspect of our ideas and methods that may accelerate our progress. The failure to make any real progress is the most urgent question we have to face and it is my greatest wish that this publication will result in the formation of a committee to draw up an agenda that may be recommended as a programme for a local conference in every Georgist centre and that an International Conference be subsequently devoted exclusively to a study of the best material that may emerge from such conferences.

There is abundant evidence that our thinking, for example on the vital concept of economic rent, which is the very tap root of our proposition, is, to say the least, very muddled. I think the reason for this is simply because we have remained smugly satisfied that our traditional preaching and teaching about land reform and tax reform contains all the answers. Extracts from our most influential publications, which I quote hereunder are evidence of the deep-seated confusion prevalent in our ranks, a confusion which I attribute to our obsession with land value terminology. I am not berating anybody in particular because I am in no position to do so, having made too many contributions to the muddle myself, even in the class room and many may feel that my later comments indicate plenty of muddle.

Henry George School Magazine, October 1965. "Rent is a toll upon the other two factors (labour and capital) for permission to use the earth."

Land & Liberty, April 1966. "We observe that the rent of land inevitably goes on rising - an ever increasing charge upon production and living space."

Henry George News, April 1966. (Steven B. Cord). "Georgists often say that land values are community produced. This is uncontestable."

Land & Liberty, May 1966. (Another Land Conference) "Land rent of course is an economic phenomenon. The moral justification for taxing rents rests on the moral principle that all men have equal rights to what is not a product of labour."

COMMENT: In no circumstances whatever is rent "a toll on labour and capital;" nor an ever increasing charge upon production and living space;" nor "a culprit because it increases;" nor do all men have equal rights to it." Nor is rent a return to land as we say in our teaching

manuals, because land can do nothing to justify a return. Man is the only doer and rent is the product of his act as an associator, just as wages and interest are returns to man for labouring and investing respectively.

Government has the exclusive right to all rent as revenue and no individual has any right, equal or otherwise, to any part of it.

By its nature rent is a secondary bounty of a beneficent Creator - land being the primary bounty - and our whole movement is exposed to ridicule by the tools of vested interests if we project its image as a social evil, when we are fully aware that it is a social good. The fact that must always be grasped is that rent is that surplus that flows into the cash registers of the users of all the better sites because of the superior power that attaches to labour on such sites, in proportion to the aid rendered by the rest of the community. It is the tenants who receive the rent, not the landlords unless the latter are also the users and no burden or toll is imposed on the user of the site when the rent is appropriated, either by landlord or government. (I am not now referring to speculative rent which, of course, is a levy on wages and interest).

Most of the confusion appears to stem from the mistake of conceiving rent as a payment for the use of land, which, normally it never is, instead of a handing over of the excess product that attaches to a particular site and it is likely to persist until we drop the fallacy that land values are created by the community when in reality it is rent that is produced by the community. Land values are the creation of bad laws but economic rent is not the product of human laws but of natural law.

EXTRACTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION FOR LAND VALUE TAXATION AND FREE
TRADE HELD ON TUESDAY, APRIL 5th 1966 AT 177 VAUXHALL BRIDGE
ROAD, LONDON S.W.1.

Before the business of the meeting began, tributes were paid to the memory of Mr. Charles H. Batty and Mr. E. J. Craigie for their devotion and their untiring work on behalf of the Union over many years.

The Minutes of the last Executive Committee meeting held in New York on September 2nd 1964 were read and approved.

In the Secretaries' report reference was made to the international work in progress in many parts of the world. Following on the New York Conference assistance in the organisation of economic study classes had been given to the New Era College in Nairobi by the New York and London Henry George Schools.

The International Union Conference Paper "Land Development and Taxation in a Central Commercial Zone" by Franklin A. Wiles, which had been revised and attractively reprinted by Rawson and Wiles Ltd., had been widely circulated among professional people and professional journals. Appreciative acknowledgments had been received from a number of the recipients and one review had been brought to the notice of the International Union. (Continued overleaf)

The International Union had submitted evidence to the Royal Commission on Valuation and Rating in New South Wales.

The report from the Treasurers showed a balance in hand of £501 -5s -10d.

Mr. Blundell read correspondence from Mr. Ole Wang reporting the initial steps he had taken to secure the nomination of the International Union for the Nobel Peace Prize for 1966 before the time limit expired. The executive Committee unanimously approved Mr. Wang's initiative in this matter and the Secretaries would take all necessary action to follow it through. An extract from a letter from Mr. Wang to the London Headquarters was read to the meeting.

A suggestion for the establishment of an international secretariat was the subject of a memorandum included in a letter received from Mr. Eric Standring which was read to the Committee. Mr. Standring had requested that time be allotted on the programme of the next Conference to its consideration, together with any other suggestion for improving the effectiveness of the International Union's propaganda by the international co-operation of Georgeists. It was resolved to devote a session at the next Conference to the discussion of this subject.

The following extract from a letter received from Mr. Philipp Knab was read to the meeting:

"I think it might be useful to submit my proposal of a compensation payable to the United Nations by all states which impede or prohibit immigration to the UN Bureau, considering that the earth belongs to all men and contributions should therefore be fixed, according to the principles of Henry George, in proportion to the extent and value of the land held by the different member countries. So far the contributions are being levied on a wrong basis, namely the industrial wealth of these states.

My proposal could, if adopted, end the chronic financial crisis of the UN and perhaps a contact of the International Union for Land Value Taxation with them could lead to a mutually advantageous co-operation of parallel interests between the two world organisations."

While the Committee had much sympathy with the sentiments expressed, it was felt that until individual states recognised the principle of equal rights to land in their own countries, such a recommendation would be ineffective. It was further thought that as the United Nations could consider only matters introduced by member countries themselves, it might be better for individuals to bring the matter to the attention of their own governments if they so wished.

Mr. P. R. Hudson suggested the setting up of a special fund to enable delegated members of the International Union to attend international meetings having a definite bearing on Henry George's economics and ideals.

Preliminary consideration was given to suggestions for the venue

(continued on back of next page)

HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL

ORGANISES

A

GRASS ROOTS TAX

ASSOCIATION

By Noah D. Alper

Director Emeritus HGSS
St. Louis

THE Homeowners and Renters Tax Association, "HARTA" for short, seeks to speed up tax-education and reach more people at local or grassroots levels. This organization is especially designed to carry this program to homeowners, neighborhood groups, labor union membership, parents and teachers associations, and the like. The only requirement for membership is a belief in the policy of untaxing improvements and raising revenue only from the location value of land. Dues are \$2.00 a year. The organization is non-profit and non-political. One unusual feature of HARTA is the inclusion of home and room, and apartment house renters with homeowners and to advance the thought that both have common interests in good housing; that renters of homes and places to live

may one day become owners, and owners may, indeed, become renters. The basic facts of the educational program rests on the fundamental economic science fact that to make it easier, rather than harder, for people to secure access to land and to build thereon, we must collect land location rent, exempting improvements from taxation, to meet the basic needs of government.

A course of two sessions is offered. The first is a basic presentation session, the second some review, and then discussion. At the end of the first session, reading material covering what has been offered and items concerned with application, will be presented to those who attended the first session. Special training is given to session leaders.

Six general areas of education were selected by the Executive Committee:-

1. Laws of taxation on real estate, with the exception of two or three States in the United States, make land and improvements one taxable classification, each taking the same common rate. The advantages of making land one, and improvements another classification, are developed in the course with different rates being applied to each classification.
2. Establish the advantage of having assessments made on full (100%) of true market value, thus allowing the tax-rate as the only possible variable.
3. Secure equality of assessments on different kinds, uses and ages of property so that each \$100 assessment means \$100 real value of property at all times.
4. To study and show the advantages of publication of all assessments on land and improvements in the community each two years, to prevent favoritism. This will assure more community interest and fair play

in taxation of land and improvements.

5. To encourage higher educational requirements of assessors. To discuss State-sponsored courses in classrooms and by correspondence for assessors, and for seminars to be held at qualified universities in the State.
6. To stress understanding of who really pays and when they pay property taxes; to show that roomers, renters of houses and apartments, and people who buy products and services as consumers, pay all taxes levied on improvements, and provide as well for the payments of RENT-of-land. Far too frequently the assumption is made that those who get the tax-bills pay the taxes. This type of misinformation is often used as a basis of propaganda to oppose property taxes as being unfair to homeowners, as such; and to substitute non-property taxes for these.

* * * * *

(I.U. Minutes continued)

of the next Conference, which included:

Grenoble, London, Montreal, Spain, San Francisco
and Israel.

After an examination of the above mentioned places, it was generally agreed that, subject to (a) further suggestions

(b) a consensus of opinion from the general
body of members and

(c) conditions prevailing nearer the date chosen
for the next conference, Israel would be
recommended as the most suitable place.

It was agreed that 1968 would be the date for the next Conference.

Arising from correspondence between Mr. E. P. Middleton, Mr. Robert Clancy and Mr. V. H. Blundell on the subject of an International Union News Letter, it was agreed that the secretaries invite contributions for a trial issue to be published in the Autumn. Subsequent issues to be published as circumstances permitted, preferably at no longer intervals than quarterly. Issues of the proposed News Letter would be numbered rather than dated so as to maintain continuity without being tied to datelines.

A formal resolution for inclusion in the Agenda for the next General Meeting which had been submitted by Mr. E. P. Middleton, was read and noted.

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting closed.

O-O-O-O-O-O-O-O

GEORGISTS would in general, agree that "because public activities raise land values, land values should be publicly collected." In Australia, such an assertion seems valid because so many of

the utilities and services are publicly owned. But what of countries like the U.S.A. where even the telephone and electricity services are owned by private corporations? Are not their role and that of the State identical as entrepreneurs? Do not private bus lines contribute to "locality desirability" in exactly the same manner as State railway lines? Is there any essential difference between T.A.A. and A.N.A. as community services? (A.N.A. and A.A.A. are public and private airlines). In other words, I am trying to illustrate that the statement, "Because private activities raise land values, land values should be privately collected," can be an equally valid statement. The issue is important, because it faces us with the question as to whether the one type of service should be subsidized (out of the proceedings of land-value charges) whereas the other should not. Are we, perhaps, working from a wrong premise? I think that we could be, and that what we need to do is to re-examine Henry George's own central premise, and to rediscover its significance.

The central theme of Georgist thought is "the saving of effort," and it is from this theme that our whole case must develop.

Let us suppose that the total number of people in the community is X and that the average productive capacity of each individual within the community is Y.

Then the total productivity of the community is NOT X multiplied by Y but, rather, $X \times Y$, plus Z.

The 'Z' component in the gross national product is the EXTRA PRODUCTIVITY (over and above the summation of individual capacities $X \times Y$) brought about by those economies in effort which the organism of society insensibly makes possible. Each of us, in attending to his own affairs, unconsciously contributes to the efficiencies of community life, and so finds widened opportunities, increased enjoyment and ways to added convenience and saving of effort which could not have existed in the absence of organized society.

Neither individuals nor the community 'create' this ability to save effort, any more than we 'create' the wart on the side of our nose! They co-exist! People, by their very presence unconsciously co-operating in the midst of competing, bring about the possibility of this extra income. Dr. H.G. Pearce of Sydney calls it "profit of Association"; not privately-created (by individuals in their private capacities), not publicly-created

LAND VALUES -
ARE WE WORKING FROM
THE WRONG PREMISE ?

by
KENNETH
N.
GRIGG
Vic.
Australia

(by State entrepreneurship), but "people" - created. This bonus of wealth, this large tributary to the stream of production, this amorphous creation of everyone in general, belongs to everyone in general and to no-one in particular. And whether the velocity of the stream be large or small, depending upon such things currently dear to the hearts of economists as propensities to consume or to invest, credit control or control of interest rates, this "income from association" remains a substantial, integral, and quite unavoidable part of the whole.

It is the particular contribution of Georgists to economic thought, firstly, to plea that this "Z" factor be recognized as a concrete entity and that its significance be appreciated and not ignored; secondly, to demonstrate that this extra income through saving of effort, is channell-ed through the differential advantages of LOCATION: and further, that the extra income is identical with the rental value of land. Competition within community for these advantages creates the value, because the value of anything is the amount of human effort it can command; and the potential for extra income springing from the advantages of location, sets the general limit to which the rental value will rise.

So then, land rentals, no matter what functions the State assumes in a free society, exist, and have a purely social origin. It is for this reason that the State, as trustee for community interests, must collect it. What is then done with this huge sum which we confidently expect to run into hundreds of millions of pounds per year, is then a matter of prudence. It could even be distributed to each citizen like child endowment for that matter! Or perhaps both private and public transport facilities might be subsidized so that fares could be lowered. As Georgists, though, we would advocate that it should be the prime source from which to meet the legitimate costs of Government.

The essential point is that we should not differentiate between economic rent arising from public activities as opposed to private activities. The hub of the argument is that "economy of effort" gives rise to a social value which should be socially utilized.

To sum up:

"Where COMMUNITY exists, land rent co-exists.

"Where LAND RENT exists, land titles acquire a rental value.

"Where LAND RENTALS exist, therein lies the source for COMMUNITY REVENUE."

And so the wheel goes full circle.

As a corollary, one may add that IF the State fails in its duty, this social income, this "people" value, related as it is, to advantages of location, attaches by default to the ownership of land title as a private income. Capitalized, it then appears as land PRICE - the prime hurdle leading to monopoly.

* * * * *

L
E
T
T
E
R
S

L
E
T
T
E
R
S

L
E
T
T
E
R
S

L
E
T
T
E
R
S

L
E
T
T
E
R
S

NO HOLDS BARRED

Sirs: May I offer my congratulations on the enterprise of launching the Newsletter which I feel confident will serve a valuable purpose throughout the international Georgeist movement by providing a channel for the expression of views and the exchange of ideas not previously available to members during the long intervals between International Conferences.

That there are views and ideas to be aired in this way I have no doubt; the need has been demonstrated by the correspondence which has appeared from time to time in the various journals published throughout the movement which are not properly the vehicles for this purpose in view of their circulation beyond the fringe of actual membership.

Personally, I am hopeful that the Newsletter will enable the frankest possible exchange of views on such matters as the future of the International Union, the fitness or otherwise of its name and organisation, its actual objectives, the correctness or otherwise of the terminology in use - even our fundamental concepts. This should be an opportunity for the widest possible discussion, with 'no holds barred' save those precluded by the ordinary rules of courtesy and tolerance and by the knowledge that we share a common ambition to bring the world to an understanding of the Natural Order underlying the increasing chaos around us. Let us only be guided by George's own magnificent affirmation: "To beg no question, to shrink from no conclusion, but to follow truth wherever it may lead."

Australia. E.P. MIDDLETON, Hon. Secretary,
Association for Good Government

A GEORGEIST PARTY?

DISILLUSIONED with existing political parties in Great Britain Georgeist, David Russell, former Liberal Party Parliamentary candidate, wrote to "Land and Liberty" saying "surely the time has come for a party standing for liberty and justice - a Georgeist Party?"

Leonard A. Tooke of Portsmouth, England writes:

"Forming a successful Georgeist Party would be full of difficulties, because it is doubtful if the Press and Television would give it much publicity and because of financial considerations. However, I suspect that these difficulties could be overcome and I think that David Russell's idea is worthy of further consideration.

When I stood in a local council election, I polled more votes than most of the Liberal candidates.

Two ideas which might prove successful vote-catchers are:-

1. To give generous publicity to Sir Winston Churchill's

wise words on the land question.

2. To distribute reply-paid envelopes to prospective voters, inviting them to ask questions and to answer each question individually."

EDITORS' NOTE In the 1920's and early 30's the Commonwealth Land Party under the direction of J. W. Graham Peace was quite active but although two parliamentary candidates at a general election polled 2,000 to 3,000 votes each, it attracted few members to aid the hard core of devoted workers. Denmark offers the best example of a successful (?) Georgeist Party. But is the idea practical in any country in today's conditions? Your views are invited.

THE UNITED NATIONS

Sirs: May I suggest that a more constructive and realistic gesture towards the United Nations, than the one advanced by Mr. Wang urging the nomination of the International Union for the Nobel Peace Prize, would be a proposal to the U.N. Economic Council that it adopt a resolution calling upon all members of the United Nations to adopt the collection of the site rent of their land as the State's proper revenue, with the accompanying elimination of all taxation and all forms of exclusive privilege or advantage for which the State is not adequately compensated.

Australia.

E.P. MIDDLETON, Hon. Secretary,
Association for Good Government

REPLY TO W.A. DOWE BY ROBERT CLANCY

(See "What a Nod")

Mr. Dowe has a point. Clancy nodded in not being clearer about the difference between land rent and land value.

However, if I nodded, it was with one eye open. It is not just the increase in land value, but also the increase in land rent under today's condition of land speculation, that presses against the returns of labour and capital. A normal increase of rent under the conditions we visualize (community collection of rent) would not so encroach. Possibly a different name might be given to this normal rent and today's abnormal rent, but both conform to the definition of rent as given by Henry George, "payment for the use of land."

Perhaps we need to be clearer about these various terms. Land value is usually understood to mean the selling price of land, but it does not necessarily mean that exclusively; it could also mean rental value. Would it not be better for Mr. Dowe to use "selling value" when he wants to contrast it with rent?

I am sorry Mr. Dowe found some ambiguity in my remarks "which seem to confuse inflation and high wages, and to blame high wages." I re-read my April "Word" and it is clear to me at any rate, that that is not what I meant or said.

* * * * *