

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  
\*\*\*\*\*

177 Vauxhall Bridge Road London S W 1  
England

No. 3.

JUNE, 1967

E D I T O R I A L

---

"FOR a man who, seeing the want and misery, the ignorance and brutishness caused by unjust social institutions, sets himself to right them in so far as he has strength, there is disappointment and bitterness. So it has been of old time. So it is even now. But the bitterest thought - and it sometimes comes to the best and bravest - is that of the hopelessness of the effort, the futility of the sacrifice. To how few of those who sow the seed is it given to see it grow, or even with certainty to know that it will grow."

So wrote Henry George in Progress and Poverty.

Yet those of us who at times have felt such despondency, quickly recover and then we search our minds for a magic formula. We finish up facing realities. What can we do to best advance our cause in present day circumstances?

One thing soon becomes clear, reform - short of bloody revolution - can, in the final phase, come only through our elected representatives. How to influence them? Directly, through correspondence and leaflets? Personally, by getting elected to local or national government ourselves? By educating their advisers? By educating the professional people and professional bodies who have influence? By tackling the universities where many of our future politicians will be trained? By educating the voter - the man-in-the-street?

Perhaps all of these. But what is our best course - and how best can we pursue it? What can organisations do? What can individuals do?

Views and practical ideas would make a welcome contribution to our Newsletter. Let's be hearing from you!

---



---

NOTE FROM THE EDITORS

---

IT would appear that our editorial comment in Newsletter No. 2 has been taken amiss. Our concern was that readers might become bored with the subject of terminology, etc., after it had been covered in three consecutive issues (we invited comment on the same subject in our third - this - issue). However, it would seem from letters in this issue and particularly that from Mr. Auld, that the subject is by no means exhausted and that the demand is for further discussion. Since the Newsletter is published for the readers and not for the editors, we are happy to agree. It is up to other readers and contributors to raise their own subjects as they think fit, and we shall continue publishing letters and articles on the subject of terminology and subjects allied to it until readers have had enough of it - and no doubt they will tell us!

Arising from Mr. Auld's letter there are one or two points we cannot refrain from taking up as they refer more to the editors than to other correspondents. Contributors who took up Bernie Donohue and others were indeed challenged to re-think but it seems hardly fair to charge them of refusing to re-think simply because their re-thinking did not lead them to change their minds; nor can we see any more emotion in letters from those who took up the challenge than in those who threw it down. It may perhaps be of some consolation to Mr. Auld that there is no confusion among tutors and advocates of land-value taxation in Britain. They have not been brainwashed and are as eager and able to re-think and reassess current terminology etc., as are our international friends.

In defence of the charge that the editors want the Newsletter to become an avenue for local "chitchat", we would point out that we merely asked for views on other subjects - and after all the Newsletter can only be what contributors make it. When the contents cease to be lively, controversial, educative, etc., the Newsletter will cease to have any purpose.

There seems to be some confusion over the need for scientifically exact terminology. Our ultimate purpose is to convince the man in the street, we do not need convincing ourselves, and the whole question as the editors see it is how can we express our ideas in order to win support. Strict adherence to scientific terminology is not always the best method if the would-be convert does not understand it. We should be clear therefore as to whether we are trying to convert each other, explain our ideas to each other, or whether we are trying to formulate a terminology to convince others. The editors are not sure!

---

GREETINGS to all, good Sirs. Did I say something about muddle? Dr. Grigg states "what is paid for land closely approximates ... to the rent which the use of it will yield" and further on "rent is the physical surplus associated with its use" but he forsakes these very sound concepts when he falls into the use of jargon in an attempt to show that home sites yield rent, and asserts that "rent" which now becomes "human satisfactions arising out of productive efforts elsewhere" attaches to home sites. This is not good enough Ken.

Mr. Hutchinson rejects my contention that it is always the tenant who receives the rent, on the peculiar grounds that it only passes through the hands of the tenant. The very fact that they do receive it, and readily agree to pass it over, is the clearest evidence possible that the payment to a landlord is not for the privilege of using the earth but for the privilege of receiving that surplus over marginal cost which attaches to some land. Where the site user is also the owner nobody pays him anything, but the surplus (rent) gets into his cash register and stays there. Hence to define rent as that which is paid for the use of land is most inaccurate, for, as Dr. Grigg pointed out such payment is only an approximate measure of the rent produced on a particular site. Ricardo saw how rent was thus measured from the margin, but unlike George, he never saw the nature of rent as a product of association.

The use of the earth by individuals is not, as we so often say, a privilege but a right, and without this right there could not be a body economic. Privilege only arises when individuals can charge for its use (usury) because of the neglect by government to collect the rent as its natural revenue and its consequent capitalisation. Taxing this capitalised figure, which is grossly inflated with speculative or future rent, can achieve no more for society than could have been achieved by the taxation of slave values, for the victims of slavery.

Mr. Hutchinson then refers to the "excess product" that will remain on vacant land after tax has squeezed out the speculative rent and I think it might be very helpful to this discussion if he, or any other reader, would explain precisely how any product can arise on vacant land or on a home site.

John Tetley does not help us out of the muddle when he says rent is a part of product attaching to superior sites, only to say in the next sentence that rent is a payment for the privilege of using a natural resource. These two concepts are as different as chalk and cheese.

Peter Hudson should have realised that I was referring to the nature of rent when I said it was good i.e. a good thing. Morality is from our will and not in things.

My sympathies to Laurie Mannell and H. Marquis who will probably be doubling their aspirin intake.

LET'S STOP

E. P. MIDDLETON

TALKING ABOUT

NSW, Australia

LAND

NEWSLETTER No. 2 demonstrates how well justified was the original proposal to provide such a medium for the exchange of ideas within the Movement. The only disappointing note was sounded by the editors; this reads very like a desire to paper over the cracks before they get too visible. What 'New subjects' would they like us to write about?

Well, here's my suggestion - a negative one, I admit: Let's stop talking about land. Thank you, Mr. Marquis of Toronto. We're not interested in land, whatever Henry George said, bless him. Let's not quarrel with him; but we don't have to perpetuate the parables of his day. What we want is the site rent. Whoever occupies the land, under whatever tenure, is utterly immaterial - so long as the site rent becomes the national revenue. (Even Bob Clancy, in Henry George News Feb 1967 wrote about "failing to provide for equitable land tenure"). Let's stop talking about 'land monopoly' and the alleged iniquity of private land ownership. This is one contribution we can make to an easing of semantic confusion. There are, of course, plenty of others.

KIMBA COMES IN

AT our meeting of the Kimba Henry George League last evening, I was instructed to write to the Newsletter re Mr. Richard C. Grinham's criticism of Mr. Bernie Donohue in No. 2 Newsletter. Our meeting unanimously support Mr. Donohue in his article "Land Values Muddle" and we strongly disagree with Mr. Grinham - and I quote "That little support will be forthcoming for Mr. Donohue." When discussing a Georgist government land values would never be mentioned as it is a product of bad government. Rent is the basis of a Georgist government and should be used by the government for the people's benefit and all of it should be used. Mr. Grinham is confusing a Georgist government with the bad government of present day when he says the governments always spend every penny they can obtain and more. This would not occur in a Georgist government as you would have the Rent no more and no less. The suggested imposition of a poll tax is also a hangover of bad government and the need would not arise under a Georgist government. To suggest automation will upset the balance under a Georgist government of the collection of Rent is to distrust Natural Law and our organisation is based on Natural Law and our reasoning must be in accordance with Natural Law and this is what Mr. Donohue is striving so hard to obtain in the Movement and it is our duty as members to support him.

Betsy. J. Harris, Hon. Sec. Henry George League, Kimba,  
South Australia

R E N T    B E L O N G S  
T O    T H E  
P E O P L E  
R. Grinham    London S W 1 U. K.

BERNIE DONOHUE'S outrageous statement that "Government has the exclusive right to all rent as revenue, and no individual has any right, equal or otherwise, to any part of it" has so far received no support except from the Kimba Georgists, and neither they nor Mr. Donohue have produced any argument in support of this statement, which is a direct denial of everything that Georgists stand for.

The Kimba League take issue with me for saying that governments spend every penny they can get and protest that only bad government does this and that a Georgist (good) government would be different. They then say that a Georgist government must spend every penny of the rent fund!

The idea of returning the rent to the people is not a denial of natural law; it is an expression of it. There is nothing natural about government - it is thoroughly artificial, whether it be Georgist or otherwise. The natural moral law is that the land, and consequently the rent, belongs to the people, not to the government. This is the argument on which the whole Georgist case rests.

Why has it suddenly been decided that land rent belongs as of right to the government, and that the government must spend every penny of this rent? Perhaps Bernie Donohue or the Kimba Georgists could enlighten me.

\* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \*  
\*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*   \*

N O G U A R A N T E E O F A

S U R P L U S

W. J. Cadman

Enfield, U.K.

IN all the discussion in the two previous Newsletters respecting the surplus land rent which might, in a Georgist society, be available for direct distribution as a "present" to each individual, there is one important contingency that has not been mentioned.

Are we so sure that 100 per cent land value taxation will result in an ever-increasing fund of public revenue, so much so that we shall be faced with a surplus we hardly know what to do with?

Henry George states that private ownership of land leads to large concentrations of people in the cities, whilst at the same time thinning out the population in country districts. Land-value taxation might well have the effect of so spreading out the people that the value of land in all areas would be more or less equal, only the central sites in towns yielding much in the way of revenue. We have to remember that economic rent is a differential, and the pressure of a tax on all sites, with the exception of absolutely worthless land, might well result in such a mighty migration from today's overgrown and ugly cities that much of what we now count on as being potential governmental revenue would entirely disappear.

In the free society that we envisage the advantage of being here rather than there might not be very great. And we are now so good at production that "the margin" (i.e. the place where production is most difficult), would nevertheless be a place where it is quite easy.

The late Arthur Madsen was fond of saying that under the single tax the town would invade the country and the country invade the town and I believe he was right. The ever-increasing motor cars that in England here choke not only the main roads but litter every suburban street as well, will provide an irresistible reason for spreading out if and when land-value taxation makes it possible.

If Richard Grinham's final thought in "Fair Shares for All" comes about, and a proportion of the population are not required to work at all but live on a handout of land-rent from the government how does this square with the notion that "In the sweat of his brow man shall eat his bread"?

## SELLING VERSUS ANNUAL VALUE

Robert Clancy, New York, USA

THE discussions in the IU Newsletter prompted by Mr. Donohue's "Land Value Muddle" and other articles are very interesting and indicate that the subject deserves attention and clarification. We plan to develop a lesson supplement on the subject for the Fundamental Economics course based on Progress and Poverty. Land value is the broader term and can mean either rental value or selling value. In the context in which it is used it is usually clear which is meant - but it is surprising how many students are confused by it.

(By the way, in reply to W.H. Pitt, I would say that "price" and "value" have pretty much the same meaning, as the economic meaning of "value" is exchange or price.)

As "land value" is generally taken to mean "selling value", it does seem to be the culprit (as Mr. Donohue holds). Yet Henry George proposed to make use of land value and to tax it, in order to begin the process of community collection of rent. It may be interesting to note what George said on the subject in response to a query, in his paper The Standard (Feb 16, 1889). Here are excerpts from his article:

"Our theoretical proposition is that the full annual value of the naked land should be taken in taxes. But the immediate proposition ... is that by the abolition of taxes at present levied on improvements and personal property, a larger proportion of land values should be so taken.

"I make this distinction ... because it is probably to the failure to keep in mind the distinction between the immediate and the ultimate that much of the difficulty as to what we propose is due ... And hearing us say, when we are thinking or speaking of the immediate, that we propose to tax land values just as now, by assessing the selling value, many persons, thinking of our ultimate aim, imagine that we contradict ourselves, and propose to tax land values while we propose to destroy land values ...

"Very much of the land of this country is today held at prices not warranted by its present rental value, but based solely on prospective rental value. This being the case, our present method of assessing land for taxation, viz.: by its selling rather than by its rental value, is the truest and best. We would not wish to change it so long as speculative land values remained ... Were we to attempt to tax rental value we could only tax actual rental value, there being no practical way of getting at prospective rental value except by the estimate which shows itself in selling value. Thus there is not only no reason why we should not in the beginnings of the single tax continue the present method of assessing land by its selling value, but it is the only method which



would enable us to accomplish our purpose. And the same reasons which would make it advisable thus to begin, would make it advisable thus to continue, so long as sufficient selling value remained to give a means of estimating value.

" The effect of a tax on the value of land is, of course, to diminish selling value ... Yet so long as the tax did not take the whole rental value, some selling value would remain. And so long as this remained fairly tangible it would be enough to enable the assessment of land values ...

"As annual or rental values would remain, while selling or capitalised values would diminish, all we would have to do when the increase in the tax brought it so near the point of ideal perfection - that of taking the whole annual value - as to destroy selling value, would be to change the assessment from selling value as now, to rental values. And as land speculation would by that time be gone, there would be no more difficulty in assessing rental values then, as a basis for taxation, than there is now in assessing selling values. Whether it would ever be possible, or wise if it were possible, to reach such theoretical perfection that land would have no selling value, is a matter that at present and for a long while to come can have no practical interest. It is sufficient to show that even if the selling value of land were to absolutely disappear, it would still be easy to assess it by rental or annual value."

\* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \*  
\* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \*

LETTER FROM

HOLLAND

S. Sevenster  
Benneköm, Holland.

I HAVE just read through the second "Newsletter" and feel as though I have been at School again, learning all about Rent and other terms. One realises how easy it is to get confused with one's words and ideas; and how much more difficult it must be for people who know nothing about economics. It has occurred to me that the trouble is perhaps that people either know how a man gets a living or know only how much he wants for a living.

For economic sense a man needs to know about the two. Our civilization suffers sadly for want of understanding due to anti-thesis, whereas what we need is more synthesis, and I think that in several ways we are winning, and that there is room for real economic thinking.

It must be difficult to understand how the Political Parties are divided here. A number of them are associated with religion, so we have:-

A large Catholic Party	.. .. .	42	members
Four Protestant Parties (15, 12, 13, 1)	.. .. .	41	"
A Socialistic Party	.. .. .	37	"
A Pacifistic Party	.. .. .	4	"
A Liberal Party	.. .. .	17	"
A Conservative Party from small farmers and shopkeepers	7		"
A new Democratic Party (6)	.. .. .	7	"

Total: 150

The Catholic Church no longer requires their members to vote Catholic; a lot of their young people voted Democratic. (160). This party stands between the Socialist and Liberals nearer I think to the former, but perhaps they don't have real principles - that's a way of winning more votes.

Now the ministers and the prime minister have to form a government. A couple of parties will have to come together and as things are now it means that the three religious parties and the Liberals will join together, and that means a Conservative couple.

The problem of the price of land is getting worse and it had a bearing on the formation of the government. We are writing to all kinds of papers. Only this week I was lucky in getting two letters in an agricultural paper "The Farm". Price of land has risen very much and it is nearly impossible for a young farmer to make a start on his own farm.

A number of young farmers arranged a meeting and asked for a forum of five men from the main parties. My father was at the meeting and one of the men said that he wanted the land tax abolished. My father answered

that the price of land would go up by that method, but not one of the five expressed any opinion.

The editor of "The Farm" wrote a Leader, free from politics and dogma, on the high price of land; and so I sent in an article explaining that under the taxation of land values the rent of land would go to the community and the price of land would come down and that article was published.

Just a few minutes ago a man telephoned to say that he had read the article in "The Farm" and had found in a book that Ricardo and George were in favour of the nationalisation of land. That is the misunderstanding we have to fight against, so I have sent him Progress and Poverty.

To another paper I sent an article on population and space. With us in this country there will be twenty million people in the year 2,000, it is rather a problem. The editor wrote me that they had just requested an article on the land question from our old prime minister, Professor Schermerhorn. I decided to send my article to this man and I had a letter from him asking for further information. I wrote a letter but, in this, I referred him to my father for confirmation.

As I mentioned, I am still learning so I think the Newsletter is a very good idea.

ON THE WAY TO BECOMING A BEST SELLER AMONGST GEORGIST BOOKS

F R E E D O M - T H E

O N L Y E N D

by F. McEachran

This book which has sold widely and has had an enthusiastic reception inside and outside Georgist circles is now available in Swedish. It is hoped also to translate it into Spanish. If you have not already got a copy of this book, then order one now.

Mr. McEachran conceived this book as a natural extension of the philosophy of Henry George. It is not a book of practical politics, nor of practical policies. Nor is it a book on economics. It does, however, indicate the ultimate significance of freedom. George was once asked whether the single tax was a panacea and replied no, but freedom is.

Price £1. 1s. plus postage or USA \$3.00

SPECIAL OFFER ! With every order a set of three books - Social Problems; Protection or Free Trade? ; Condition of Labour - will be sent free!

-----  
S P R E A D I N G   T H E   W O R D

Leonard A. Tooke, Portsmouth, U.K.  
-----

SURELY the greatest problem facing Georgists is the problem of communication. The Henry George Schools do magnificent work in this respect, but often fail to attract the people it would be most beneficial to convert. Our attempts to convert are usually confined to discussions, letters to newspapers (not always published), etc., but Georgists who attempt to explain their points of view too briefly are often misunderstood. In Britain, if you are not clearly a Tory, Liberal or Labourite, you are, very often, dismissed as a Communist - or (an unforgivable sin) an idealist.

It would be interesting to hear about the difficulties others have in propounding Georgist principles. Do they join in political arguments? Do they attack political parties? Do they vote? What, do they find, is the most effective course of action to take?

When I receive my Local Government tax demand, when I read of Vietnam and the resurgence of Fascism, I wonder whether we are doing enough to spread our views. What about a modern, statistic-filled, version of Progress and Poverty? What about concentrating our efforts on a particular place - say Denmark - or even trying to set up our own Georgist society somewhere? These may be impractical ideas, but at least they are ideas.

In my opinion, we are taking a very worthwhile step forward with the publication of the International 'Newsletter', for this makes us realize we are not the only ones who cry in the wilderness. If the 'Newsletter' could help us to cry more effectively, it would be even more worthwhile.

\* \* \* \* \*

F O G   A N D

M U D D L E

Dr. T.G.S. Cameron  
Heywood, Lancs. U.K.

-----  
+ + + + + + + + +  
-----

I was interested to read the Newsletter and baffled by the confusion over terminology. I must confess that I thought the letters of John T. Tetley and Ashley Mitchell brought a refreshing gust of common sense to disperse the fog and muddle of some of the previous writers' making. Although not a newcomer to the ideas of Henry George, I cannot consider myself an expert on the subject, but I have long considered that in Progress and Poverty lay the concise, definite and accurate terminology necessary for economic argument. I look forward to reading future issues.

REPORT FROM THE HENRY GEORGE SCHOOL

NEW YORK, U. S. A.

by C. Matthew Ossias - Head of the Correspondence Division

IN the February issue of the IU Newsletter the German language work of the Henry George School was discussed. This article will tell about our activities in the French, Italian and Hebrew languages. (The Spanish work will be reported in a future article.)

In the six years since we launched the French course in Fundamental Economics we have had about 200 graduates in France, 300 in Haiti, and those in Africa, the USA and Canada total approximately another 100. The course is not only offered by correspondence but also in class, in New York and Montreal. Members of African Missions to the UN often register in our classes. For the correspondence course we advertise in Paris newspapers, such as Le Monde and Combat, also in papers of French-speaking African countries. The response is great - and often African students express a longing to come to New York to study our course if we offer them a "scholarship" - but alas we can only offer it to them by correspondence. For Haiti we used to advertise in the leading newspaper, but news of our course has spread so much by word of mouth that it is no longer necessary for us to advertise. Students send us long lists of other prospective students, and inquiries keep coming in from Haitians who have heard about our course. Economic conditions are bad in Haiti, but at least the people there want very much to learn how to improve them.

A newsletter in French, Bulletin Georgiste, has been issued, and an annual subscription from the School is available for 20 cents. A copy of the first issue was sent to General de Gaulle, since mention was made of him therein, and his office cordially acknowledged it. The first two issues were sent to all our graduates in French, and almost 200 subscribed. The French edition of Progress and Poverty first appeared in 1926, and has been reprinted by the Schalkenbach Foundation. A French Protection or Free Trade? has also been published, and we now can offer this as a second course in French.

Since the Italian course was launched five years ago we have had about 300 graduates or more by correspondence. The course has also been taught in class in New York and in Milan at the "Istituto Ethos", headed by Dr. N. Pulvirenti, who is also our representative selling the Italian Progress and Poverty to correspondence students. He has been active in promoting Georgist ideas by writing articles for various periodicals, and he started a Georgist newsletter, Notiziario Henry George. This has

been taken over by the New York School, and Dr. Pulvirenti continues to write for it. Subscription is 20 cents a year.

Those who came to the International Conference in New York in 1964 will recall that Dr. Pulvirenti attended. When we attend our Conference in Montreal this year we hope to see not only Expo 67, but also another of our Italian graduates - Mr. A. Sabino, who is the Italian consul in Montreal.

Another helpful collaborator in the Italian language is Mr. Manni of Milan who teaches classes and writes articles. He has also begun working on a modernized translation of Progress and Poverty. The present Italian translation dates from about 1880, and has been much criticized, although it serves our purpose for the time being.

Besides Milan serving as the most active Georgist center in Italy, it is also the most fruitful source of correspondence students, through advertisements in the Corriere della Sera.

About two years ago we launched the Hebrew course, shortly after a translation of Progress and Poverty was published in Israel. (This was based on Arthur Madsen's condensed version, as with the German translation). We placed advertisements only once in two Israeli newspapers and received a flood of inquiries, which still trickle in two years later. We now have about 50 students in various stages of completion of their lessons, and a few graduates, but the work has suffered from a lack of enough Hebrew-speaking teachers to handle lessons. I am in the process of studying Hebrew myself - a difficult language - and prospects are improving for gaining other Hebrew teachers. The only other piece of literature we have in Hebrew is a translation of Henry George's "Moses".

Israel was selected as the venue for the 1968 International Union Conference originally but later, for various reasons, this was changed to Wales. Perhaps we shall go there at a future date - and I hope that by then we shall have a great number of Georgists in Israel.

If only we could have translations and courses in many other languages! This is the best way to penetrate the various countries. Meanwhile, we have advertised in such countries as Brazil, Norway, Sweden and Greece, advising readers that we have the course in English, French, Spanish, Italian, German and Hebrew - and the response has been impressive.

Even in the languages we do handle there is more of a demand for literature and courses than we can satisfy, and we hope to build this up. One useful piece of literature is the Declaration adopted at the 1949 International Conference in Swanwick, England, which was translated into all the languages we work in (except Hebrew), and which we send to all our graduates.

We are most encouraged by our growing international work which is adding to the rising Georgist tide all over the world.

\* \* \* \* \*

P L A N N I N G

---

Mr. A.N. Kemsley of Melbourne, Australia takes up Mr. Stephen Martin of Fordingbridge, U.K. on his article in our previous issue, and Mr. Martin replies.

---

MR. KEMSLEY: I have been a believer in the principles for which your Journal and your organisation stands - and directly and indirectly a financial contributor, ever since my father's teachings before the First World War.

I have been associated with the governmental administration of town planning since 1923 and a member of The Town & Country Planning Board of Victoria since 1946.

Therefore I was surprised at the article in your No. 2 issue by Mr. S. Martin of Hants, England, decrying in a devastating way the zoning of land by planning authorities. This cannot go unchallenged. At least I have never felt in all my years of town planning administration that the part I have played in zoning of land is inconsistent with my adherence to Henry George's principles.

Let me assume Mr. Martin has a nice stone home in a chosen residential or rural area. May I invite his comment as to the way he would view it should the owner or occupier of land adjacent to him on one side elect to build a series of wooden cottages and the owner on his opposite side use the property as a motor car junk yard. Perhaps opposite another property would be developed as a poultry farm. It is just this sort of thing that Mr. Martin desires to permit because he believes the planners "have frustrated individual initiative."

Planners do not prevent the erection of cottages or junk yards or poultry farms. They merely protect each type of land use by ensuring as far as practicable that the individual interests do not cause avoidable detriment to the local community in general.

MR. MARTIN: In reply to Mr. Kemsley, oddly enough his assumption is correct. I do have "a nice stone house in a chosen rural area," but the amenities I enjoy are to be despoiled not by private land owners' actions, but at the dictate of the local planning authorities. Recently they have produced a town plan in which an adjacent area is scheduled for industrial development and the land is now up for sale. Objection to their plan is almost hopeless. The undeniable fact is, that, laudable as their objectives may be, the planners are having no more success in assuring the "best type of land use" than private enterprise achieved under plan-less conditions.

What is vitally pertinent is the multiplying evidence that the planners' ideas of land use have to be amended from time to time through the pressure of population. Land previously allocated for preservation becomes "junk yards and poultry farms."

The motto of the Movement includes the words Free land, Free men,

and if they mean anything they mean freedom for the individual to the use of land provided he pays to the community the economic rent of his holding. The planning authorities certainly have a real use as advisory bodies but no man can tell me what to do with my land, the full force of natural economic laws will dictate my destiny.

C o r r e c t i o n

Mr. Philipp Knab of Austria, whose article VALUE PRICE AND THE UNITED NATIONS was published in our second

issue, has asked us to print the following paragraph which is a correction to the one originally inserted. The paragraph which appeared in his article was edited by us as we thought the original was not perfectly clear. However, Mr. Knabb feels that in so editing it, his meaning has been lost. We are therefore glad to accede to his request and publish this paragraph in its original form.

"Its (LVT's) greatest advantage, however, which the late Siegfried Sitte, of Vienna, was the first to point out, would be that it would adapt the burden of taxation, which is now destroying many natural opportunities, to the actual possibilities of net proceeds to be derived from the use of land, and thus widen the sphere of productive activities 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' the latter being only the remainder left for private profit after public charges".

\* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \* - \*  
\* \* \* \* \*





Caswell Bay

Trips to places of beauty and interest are to be arranged and visitors wishing to extend their stay in the United Kingdom will be in easy reach of London with all that it offers.

We are pleased to report that we have had an excellent response from members in reply to our letter asking for preliminary reservations for the Conference in Wales.

If you have not already made a tentative reservation and you hope to be able to attend, please let us know as soon as you can - it does not bind you in any way - as we need to get a good idea of the number likely to be coming so that accommodation arrangements are adequate.

1 9 6 8

INTERNATIONAL  
CONFERENCE

\* - \* - \* - \* - \*

CASWELL BAY

Sept. 8th - 14th

. . . . .

THE Conference Hotel is situated on a cliff top overlooking the sea and sandy bay but is easily accessible and is only six miles from the modern town of SWANSEA. Thus for our conference we have all the advantages of sea and country air, surrounding peaceful countryside, combined with all the amenities of town life within very easy reach.

- - - - -