

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

177 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, SW.1

No. 5

MARCH 1968



ASSOCIATE MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONFERENCE

IF YOU cannot attend the International Conference in Wales this year, (and there is still time and some accomodation left) then do the next best thing, register for Associate Membership of the Conference.

This will entitle you to a complete set of conference papers and reports prior to the conference, together with the Conference Souvenir Handbook. Associate membership of the conference is £1 sterling.

Please register early so that your name may be included in our published lists.

Write to : Conference Secretary, International Conference
177 Vauxhall Bridge Road, London, S.W.1. England.

I M P R O V E
O U R
J O U R N A L I S M

W.H. Pitt
Victoria, Australia

THE importance and justice of the Georgist message demands that we who speak and write for it should do so with clarity of thought and economy of word.

Neither is readily attained, nor easy to practise, yet, surely each is a 'must' if we are ourselves to illustrate the first premise in political economy - that man seeks to satisfy his desires with the least expenditure of effort. This becomes apparent if we consider the matter merely from our own viewpoint.

But, consider it also from the newcomer's and the outsider's viewpoints! When the newcomer first spots the word "raising" in connection with our suggestion for reform in governmental revenue methods, he, as I know from repeated personal experience, immediately thinks we are plugging for additional taxes etc. It is only as he reads on that he realises we mean "collecting". When the enemy outsider sees or hears us use the word "raising", he immediately throws up his hands in practised mock horror and diverts attention to himself.

Georgist type journals have existed now for up to a century, and surely it is time we developed a defence against the above sort of thing and against the non-sequiturs that all too frequently sully our presentation of the Georgist idea. These are to be found even in the "Summary of Views" that our Editorial Pages customarily present.

A 'style-book' such as is used in newspaper offices, certainly seems called for. It might well provide the defence mechanism that I consider our movement needs. It might materially assist our movement in attaining the objectives which the founders of this Newsletter had in mind.

But such a style-book will take quite a time to produce. (I would be happy to collaborate in the task) so in the meantime, I suggest we each pay the greatest possible attention, in all our writings, to the manner in which we express ourselves.

In doing so, I think we would not only benefit the newcomer, but also reduce to essentials those matters of terminology and thought over which we now battle amongst ourselves.

* * * * *

Miss N.S. Ives

** W O R D S **

Alva, Oklahoma, U.S.A.

WORDS tore like bullets into the public mind of 1879. They were words that every newspaper reader knew, in a way, but the author of "Progress and Poverty" used them in such ways that they had feeling behind them. True, one combination, 'economic rent' was new to most readers. But it was used in ways that stirred emotion.

The gold seekers who rushed to California some thirty years earlier hadn't all been successful. Some made immediate fortunes, some managed to hold onto land which eventually made them fortunes, but the eastern states were deluged by totally unsuccessful forty-niners returning to their home states disillusioned because they couldn't make a living with a spade or any other way. They just couldn't make a living ... period. The reason, obviously, was that first-settlers held all the desirable land locations - and charged a ruinous fee for their use.

So the words describing the situations weren't new, by any means - they were just placed in combinations that burned.

It is a lesson that people working for economic freedom sometimes forget. There, for instance, are a couple of the words which were so effective in 1879 - 'economic' and 'freedom'. Combined, they made quite a splash in the years immediately following 1879. They will always be good too, but now, almost a hundred years later, the combination is somewhat dulled by age.

It is a case of the sort faced by modern advertisers of breakfast cereals and headache remedies. Passing over the advantages of any one product, it is instructive to watch how language is handled by the advertisers of any of them. It changes. No matter how potent the promotion phrase, it doesn't last indefinitely. At least not as a headline.

True, a very good word or phrase continues to appear down in the left-hand corner of magazine layouts, year after year. But the highlight of promotion changes.

So, considering that 'economic rent' is a good phrase and one to be retained - in fine print and a secluded corner - why not highlight the idea with something like 'location value'? Or, if we want to be really colourful and appeal to mass psychology, call the thing "footprint gold".

'Land' was a very good word in 1879, but look what has happened to it's prestige! Uncounted millions couldn't care less about land.

A recent cartoon showed a vagrant shrugging his shoulders at the use of the word 'property', which shows how far public consciousness has grown away from interest in that combination of letters. And yet economic progress needs the vagrant. It needs words to make him aware

that his mere passing along a path adds value to the path - a value he could collect.

'Land', 'rent', 'taxes', etc., need never be lost to admirers of "Progress and Poverty", but as words they should be treated like spent word-bullets, and the headline space reserved for something with fresh powder behind it. Week to week study of newspaper, magazine and broadcast advertisements show how the trick works. It could work as well for progressive public thought as it does for throat lozenges.

Let's try 'footprint gold' and a few other new phrases.

* * * * *

MORE
ON
RENT

by

B. Donohue
N.S.W. Australia

IT IS pleasing to have John Tetley supporting the concept that rent is "part of product representing excess productivity" and also the view that there is no production on residential sites and therefore, presumably, no rent. Incidentally there has been no acceptance, as yet, of the invitation to Mr. Hutchinson or any reader to explain precisely how there can be a distribution of rent and/or wages and interest where there is no exchange of products, and hence no price to be distributed.

Mr. Tetley, however, still leaves me puzzled as to how he can reconcile the above concept with his further statement "rent may be considered as return for use of this natural resource" (land). It was emphasised by Henry George that rent, the excess product, attaches to particular sites without payment by anybody. When landlords are legally empowered to appropriate the excess, the tenant obviously does not make "payment" of it but merely relinquishes the privilege of retaining it for his own enjoyment, by transfer to the landlord.

If the surplus attaching or adhering to sites is confused with payment for use of land, we must end up like Mr. Gilchrist with the utter fallacy that "rent results from the privilege of periodic use of a site", when the real privilege is the confiscation of the surplus product arising from human association. Not surprisingly, Mr. Gilchrist is then lead by this confusion to reject the idea of speculative rent as distinct from normal rent and as Book IV of P & P contains a precise demonstration of how recurring industrial depressions are caused by speculative rent I would suggest that he examine it carefully.

Mr. McGahan deplores our concern with theory and the fact that "our people have had no practical acquaintance with government at any level", but what he should be deploring is the fact that government, everywhere, is in the hands of people who know no theory. It is true as he says, that some Georgeists in N.S.W. are unhappy with unimproved rating for local Government for the simple reason that it only succeeds in skimming off some of the speculative rent, leaving the economic rent untapped, so making government a sharer with landlords in the plunder of wages and interest.

T O W H O M

by R.C. Grinham

D O E S R E N T

London, England

B E L O N G ?

MRS. HARRIS keeps on saying that a government based on economic justice has the exclusive right to all economic rent, but she never brings any argument in support of it. What I want to know is why does economic rent belong to government? My assertion that rent belongs to the people, and I mean people equally not just a few, is based on sound moral argument. The Kimba League's contention that rent belongs to government is based on no argument at all.

Artificial does not mean fictitious, it means "made by art; not natural," and this is exactly what any government is - something created by man. (Incidentally I am beginning to wonder whether all this terminological wrangle with the Australians is due to the fact that they must use different dictionaries out there!)

What we so strenuously oppose today is the system by which a few people collect nearly all the rent of land and the others collect nothing. What we are fighting for is equal rights to land, not government rights to land.

What advantage would there be in the government spending the whole land rent instead of handing it back to the people to spend as they please? This would only be a continuation of the present socialistic system. Mrs. Harris should remember that a just government could only spend money on projects that would benefit all its citizens equally (to favour some more than others would certainly not be just). This would limit government activity greatly; it could not possibly spend all the land rent on such projects.

* * * * *

BERNIE DONOHUE'S illogic amazes me. If the body politic is an outgrowth of the body economic, and the body politic is artificial, why on earth must the body economic also be artificial. It doesn't follow at all. Every artificial institution grows out of something natural, but it doesn't in any way affect the naturalness of what lies underneath.

If one accepts the necessity for some government (and I am not seeking to abolish government entirely) obviously it needs a sufficiency of revenue for the effective performance of its duties. But it cannot follow from this that the government has a right to the whole of the land rent. The government should receive what revenue the people consider it needs, and no more.

Land rent belongs to the people, not to the government, and any rent not granted to the government should be returned to the people. This may be only a pious hope of theoretical perfection but the principle is impregnable.

Stephen Martin

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

V A L U E ?

Hants, England

IN his work "Science of Political Economy" Henry George pointed out the many misleading interpretations of the word, value, and in this respect Mr. Dowe may be right to insist on the use of the word rent, but surely this word has many false connotations. For my part, I find I cannot avoid using "value", when describing how the economic rent of land would be ascertained.

What concerns me most is Mr. Dowe's interpretation of George's theory of value arising from production. It is seriously incomplete. For example, George did not merely show that "economy of effort reduced economic value to a minimum". He went much deeper, he analysed exchange value showing that it was not the amount of labour that has been exerted in bringing a thing into being that determines its value, but always the amount of labour that will be rendered in exchange for it. It does not matter, Mr. Dowe, whether "high values are economically bad and vice versa", so long as they can be proved equitably just.

Neither can I accept that "value arising from obligation forms no part of economics". What George said was that "the right of exacting rent for the use of land is proof that the value of this right is in reality, a value from obligation". The maintenance by successive governments of this right in the hands of private owners of land is unjust, but it does not alter the fact that value from obligation arising from an agreement between individuals to defer exchange of the results of labour, is definitely a part of economics.

Surely, the important point is to distinguish between values which add to the stock of wealth and those that do not, such as arbitrary privileges, patent rights, franchises and any other obligations of this nature.

Finally I cannot see that there can be any misunderstanding in the use of the words "Unimproved site value of land".

SITE TAXATION by S. S. Gilchrist
New South Wales, Australia

IN HIS ARTICLE in the No. 4 Newsletter, Mr. Dowe is right when he says rent is a good thing provided only that it is collected by the community, and privilege and disadvantage are removed. A just community is the happiest and most prosperous community. Payment of rent has a useful economic effect as an incentive to the full use of all sites for the purpose each is most suited. Mr. Dowe is right when he says the taxation of land values is a most convincing argument, and again that taxation causes land prices to diminish.

But then without any evidence, he suggests that land tax will defeat itself! Land tax has been used in Australia and other countries for many years, and it has not defeated itself at the moderately low rates imposed. Mr. Dowe must tell us at what rate of tax (if any) that he would expect such "defeat" to occur. I respectfully suggest he cannot. I would agree that in trying to collect the full amount of anything where value judgments and the market are concerned, any system is subject to the shortcomings of humans. If we can assess the rent within 10% of the correct "theoretical" figure we will be doing well, and major benefits will result. Note, Mr. Dowe does not deny that site taxation collects rent and nothing but rent. It certainly is not related to the reward for effort. It has been suggested that changes in site taxation cause wild variations in land prices. This is not so from experience; land markets, although affected by inflation, etc., are in equilibrium. Prices tend to an equilibrium so that :-

Land price = capitalised net rent
= capitalised full rent less tax

A table follows, using 5% as the interest rate in calculating capitalisation, and showing land values and rates of tax. However, any rate of interest could be used. At higher tax rates we can neglect the effect of land being held for speculation or as a hedge against inflation, as such "investment" would be quite unprofitable. Rental then becomes the measure of the market value of the privilege of holding a given site as compared with a marginal site. The table considers a site with a full yearly worth of £100 per year in the market before tax. This is what it might be leased for. From the table it will be seen that about 90% of rent will be collected at a rate of about 10s in £1 of remaining selling value.

We should, therefore, steadily increase the tax rate with frequent reassessments so as to take 15% more rent every two years. After twelve years roughly 90% would be collected. Of course, in Australia we are about 30% along the way in some areas, but there are lots of exemptions. When 90% of rent is collected, I would be happy if anyone could devise an assessment which could be closer to 100% without risk

of being excessive in some cases.

We will never obtain a revolutionary quick change from no rent for revenue to 100% - not without violence! People are used to steady increases in taxation (e.g. income tax). In this regard Mr. Haxo does not need to move quite so slowly. Municipalities in Australia have changed overnight from rating on land + improvements to rates on sites only. Mr. Haxo is right when he says that very high land tax rates indicate the amount of rent, but this is only at the time concerned. If rentals are then fixed, there is no simple way of reassessing them without reference to sale prices of sites; land tax would automatically collect 90% of the new total rent.

The first step is to get a government valuer appointed. Then concentrate on getting municipal rates on U.C.V. in some areas, then expand. Even if site taxation did "defeat" itself at 80%, let us go to 75% for the happiness of all.

TABLE OF SITE VALUES AT VARIOUS TAX RATES
(Assuming 5% interest, equivalent to a capitalisation factor of twenty-times)

Top line shows symbols and method of calculation.

A	B	A - B	L.V + 20(A-B) Capitalised value of rent remaining with site holder. = Land Value	$\frac{B}{L.V} \times 240$ Rate of site tax required for equil- ibrium on <u>capital value</u>
Value of yearly rent privilege. <u>If untaxed</u>	Site tax- ation per year	Value of rent remaining with site holder.		
£	£	£	£	<u>Pence per £1</u>
100	NIL	100	2,000	NIL
100	10	90	1,800	1.1/3
100	20	80	1,600	3
100	30	70	1,400	5.4
100	40	60	1,200	8
100	50	50	1,000	12
100	60	40	800	18
100	70	30	600	28
100	80	20	400	48(4s.0d)
100	90	10	200	108(9s.0d)
100	95	5	100*	228(19s.0d)
100	99	1	20*	About £5

*At the highest tax rates, site value would become difficult to assess as it would be hard to distinguish from small variations in price of improvements. Column B can be read as the percentage of rent taken as revenue.

(Why not simplify it all by abolishing the concept of the capital or selling value of land for land taxation purposes and tax rental values which, other things remaining equal, are unaffected by the land value tax. Eds.)

* * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *

THE development of the Newsletter has certainly shown some areas of furriness in our ideas and the November 1967 issue has several matters that can do with further light.

Mr. Dowe contributes to the confusion by treating the term, land value, as meaning only the selling value. In reality, land value is a general term equally applicable to the rental-value or to the selling-value derived from it. It was treated by Henry George as such a general term applicable to both. That land transactions in Australia and America more commonly involve sale, than renting, does not justify Mr. Dowe's restriction of the meaning to selling value only. The validity of most of his argument depends on acceptance of his restricted definition.

As pointed out by several contributors, the selling-value of the site would disappear when the whole of its rental-value is taken for public revenue. Hence selling-value is not a stable basis when a high proportion of the rental-value is collected. It is sounder to frame legislation to base land taxes on the gross rental-value of the site since this is not affected by the rate of tax levied.

But it is most important to realise that this is only true of the gross rental-value. If tax rates were based on the net rent remaining, after meeting outgoings which include land taxes, it would have exactly the same problem of reducing tax base as with the selling value.

This needs elaboration because it seems to have been overlooked in discussions so far. There are the following simple connecting relationships :-

- (1) Gross Site Rent minus Land Tax equals Net Site Rent
- (2) Gross Site Rent equals Land Tax plus Net Site Rent
- (3) Net Site Rent capitalized equals Selling Value

When Land Tax in these equations grows large enough to equal and absorb the Gross Site Rent then the Net Site Rent falls to 0 and so also does the Selling-Value based on it. There would thus be no advantage in using Net Site Rent instead of Selling-Value as tax base since both would be equally affected by the tax-rate. And unless legislation specifically provides for Gross Site Rent to be the tax base as defined in line (2) above, the probabilities are that Net Site Rent would be used as a base, since this is already used by valuers and estate agents in their normal operations.

Mr. Haxo correctly points out that addition of the capitalised land tax to the selling value will maintain the tax base unaffected by varia-

tions in the tax rate. Personally I prefer this first alternative as more likely to be acceptable to public administrators than his second suggestion. These are matters to which valuers need to be alerted since it is their advice that will be followed by Government in framing legislation. In normal argument to secure public acceptance of the principle these details will only confuse the issues. Some of us need to be informed on them but generally I agree with Mr. Evans that simple advocacy of the principle is more effective than a mass of detail.

Messrs. Ralph and Gilchrist both discuss speculative land value or rent as distinct from normal rent. It is true that the rental and selling-value of land is inflated because speculative withholding of land from the market causes premature extension of the margin to inferior lands.

I agree with Mr. Gilchrist that it is neither practicable nor desirable to try to separate out the normal from the speculative content of land rent. Mr. Ralph appears to think we should so distinguish but it would be practically impossible for the valuers who implement our system to accurately separate the two parts even if it were desirable.

Whether we tax rental-value or selling-value our basis must be the level as established by supply and demand in the open market. If this is done, as the tax is raised, the speculative element in the figures will be squeezed out and we will be left with a new level which approximates to normal content.

* * * * *

M E R E S P E C U L A T I O N by S.J. Tredgar, Manchester

E n g l a n d

I CANNOT see that all this talk about speculative rent is all that important from a tax point of view. It is important from the point of view of pricing land out of the economic market and contributing to slumps.

Thus the sooner we put paid to speculative value the better, and the higher the rate of tax on land, the more effective will it be.

On the other hand it is a quibble to talk of a land tax taking only the speculative element of value.

Suppose for example the economic value of a piece of land were 100 and the speculative value put a further 20 on to this. Then a tax of 5% on £100 economic value could be met by putting a tax of 6% on the total value (economic + speculative value).

Let's push for a land-value tax (and I make no apology for my choice of words) as high as the traffic will bear and leave speculative value to take care of itself for nobody can tell what proportion of speculative value is taken by any given land-value tax - it alters even as the tax falls.

* * * * *

London

England

T A N G L E D by P A U L K N I G H T

MR. DONOHUE has really got himself tied up in knots. He cosily limits the meaning of rent to just what he wants it to mean (part of production and nothing else) - because he knows what conclusion he wants to reach with his logic - and then triumphantly says you can't have rent where there is no production.

Mr. Donohue has no monopoly of definitions, nor a monopoly of wisdom. If I define rent as the annual market value of any piece of land excluding buildings or improvements on it, then I include residential sites and observe that these sites have rent - which can be taxed for community revenues.

I do not claim that my definition is right and Mr. Donohue's wrong but let readers judge for themselves which is the most accepted definition among those who are concerned with these matters generally.

Further, let readers ask themselves which definition Henry George had in mind and what definition we have in mind when we discuss our reform.

Our basic premise is that "men have equal rights to land", not "men have equal rights to land except that upon which houses stand". Nor for that matter "men have equal rights to land only where production takes place".

This makes nonsense of Henry George and of our reform.

Mr. Donohue separates market values arising from the location of a house, from the market value arising from the location where production takes place. For what reason? Only it seems, to defend the private appropriation of market values arising from home sites.

We divide circulating capital from fixed capital, but do we say that because a machine actually produces the goods it is therefore alone entitled to interest - and that the goods and stocks of goods produced (which are also capital) not to be considered of any account in allocating interest?

Presumably, if a man has a cinema on a site he is not entitled to interest on his building because no wealth is produced.

If Mr. Donohue remembered that "the idea precedes the definition" he would not tie himself up in such knots.

Let me now ask Mr. Donohue a straight question. Does he believe that men have equal rights to land, and that no man should claim exclusive use or possession without paying the rest of the community for the privilege. If his answer is 'yes' then why does he contradict it by wanting to exempt home sites? If his answer is 'no' then he is not a Georgeist. Well, Mr. Donohue?

M I S D I R E C T E D E N E R G Y
* * * * *

L.W. Brown, Bentleigh, Victoria, Australia.

I THINK Mr. T.O. Evans has got something in his reaction to the hair-splitting wrangling on definitions and academic discussion in the Newsletters. Some such discussion is useful but too much will divert into internal arguments the energies and talents that should be used to put our principles before the public.

I question whether this has not already happened with our colleagues in New South Wales. Six of the fourteen contributors to Newsletter No. 4 come from that State. This is a high proportion of the workforce desperately needed to counter attacks on the measure of land value taxation won for them by an earlier generation.

In common with the other Australian States, New South Wales has a State Land Tax. It originally applied to all properties with an unimproved land value of \$2,000 or more. Year after year, exemptions have been raised by successive governments in their State, until now properties up to \$35,000 are exempt from land tax. This position could have arisen because our colleagues have been too busy in other directions, or internal arguments, and failed to campaign either for extension of the tax, or to defend it, as each successive whittling away occurred. At the recent State election, both major parties promised further exemptions.

The precedent of New South Wales is being used by opponents in other States to try to emasculate the system in them. This pressure has so far been resisted by the Parliaments in Victoria and Tasmania.

In Victoria we have waged repeated campaigns for Parliament to extend land value taxation and establish a State Development Fund financed by a development rate on the unimproved value of the land. But it makes our task hard and encourages the vested interests which oppose us, when the system is allowed to go by default in a neighbouring State. Let us remember the historical allusion that "Nero fiddled while Rome burned".

(SUMMARY OF THE MUDDLE)
*
(In Newsletter 4)
*
(J. J. Pot Holland)
*

RENT

1. Rent is payment for the privilege, not a part of product (Ricardo), but a disembodied concept. Tetley, P.16.
2. Rent is the market value of privilege. Gilchrist, P.17.

VALUE

1. Value is (1) Selling value.
(2) Capital value. Haxo, P.5.
2. Value is (1) Capitalised rent.
(2) Speculative value. Ralph, P.6.
3. Value is (1) Value arising from production.
(2) Value arising from obligation. (George) Dowe, P.11.

RENT IS VALUE (4)

Rent is the value of location among people. Thompson, Newsletter 2.

STOP MUDDLING !

Stop muddling about rent and value. Ask instead: How much should the occupier of land annually pay to the treasury? Answer: The price he offers in the market. Carver, P.14.

ENOUGH SAID.

Now let's drop it. Evans, P.20.

Beware! We spoil our case, when broadcasting nonsense. Fortunately our Newsletter is our educational platform, to clear up the minds of those who advocate our principle. Admitted: adapt ourselves to our audience, but not, by Jove: by talking nonsense.

Henry George School

INTERNATIONAL
WORK IN
ENGLISH

New York, U.S.A.

Robert

- AND A BOOBY TRAP

Clancy

After reporting on our correspondence (and class) work in German, French, Italian, Hebrew and Spanish, we ought to say something about what is after all our most basic language work - English. Naturally, class work in the U.S.A. is done in English, as well as in Canada, England, Australia and New Zealand, also Jamaica, Kenya, Formosa and Hong Kong. In addition, correspondence courses in English reach people not only in the U.S.A., but in many countries throughout the world.

Overseas students hear about our course through advertisements in periodicals which have world-wide circulation, such as the Christian Science Monitor and The Guardian.

From time to time we also hit particular areas. Once we concentrated on Honolulu papers - and who can say whether the resultant study of our courses may not have had some influence on current land value tax reforms in Hawaii?

We have advertised in English-language papers in such countries as Israel and Japan with good response. We also reach U.S. Armed Forces - who certainly are all over the world, for better or for worse! - with advertisements in the Army Times, etc.

Another type of advertisement we place is in countries of other languages in which we have no available course. We let these people know they can take the course in English (or one of the other languages). In this way we have gained numerous students in such countries as Norway, Sweden, and Greece.

Every once in a while we glance at the Iron Curtain and wonder if there is any way of getting our message through. One thing Matthew Ossias (Head of the Correspondence Division) did was to write to the principal library of Russia to find out what works of Henry George they had there. We received in reply a surprisingly long list of works both in Russian and other languages. Now we are puzzling over ways and means of following this up.

At least three of the overseas schools are results of English correspondence course work - Kenya, which has the Institute for Economic Inquiry under the direction of Kul Bhushan; and Henry George Schools in Formosa, under Dr. Hengtse Tu, and Hong Kong, under Dr. Wong Po-Shang - all correspondence course graduates. Another valued friend, in Thailand, is Suthon Hinjiranan, a lieutenant commander in the Royal Thai Navy. After taking the correspondence course, Commander Hinjiranan undertook to translate "Progress and Poverty" into

Thai, and hopes some day to have it published. Meanwhile he is giving a great deal of assistance in spreading our work in his country. He places advertisements, and he now helps to process the initial inquiries before we take them over as students. We are similarly in touch with other friends in Asia, Africa and elsewhere, but it is too soon to talk about them.

At this point I would like to booby-trap a few remarks. I have followed with much interest the discussions on rent and land value that have appeared in the IU Newsletter. I have also noted that many of the writers express pain and bewilderment that so many different and confusing things should be said about such a simple subject - but they write more about it nonetheless. (I have done so myself).

I have also noticed that no one, to my knowledge, has written about the reports of our international educational work (of which this is the fourth instalment), either to us or to the Newsletter, giving suggestions, criticisms, or offers to help propagate the work. So I can only conclude that, although Newsletter readers are undoubtedly glad that the School is doing this work, and sorry that their colleagues are so muddled about land values, they still find the latter more interesting than the former.

This is perfectly understandable, and even legitimate. We are talking to ourselves through this vehicle. I like the discussions, and I don't at all think that the matter should be summed up in a couple of axioms and then silenced. It is a big thing we are talking about - the biggest thing in the world - the world itself! That is, land and its rent. There are many aspects to it, and each one brings his own understanding to it.

But we should also remember that much of this is "inside" talk, and our refinements of rent and land value and whether it is a tax, and whether it should be single, and how it should be spent, once collected, can have no meaning to the overwhelming majority of mankind who do not know one tax from another.

What I mean is: Let us carry on, let us argue but have respect for one another's views, and not try too hard to have the last word; and let us also realize that this is taking place within a microscopic fraction of the human race; that there is a lot of basic work on a much more elementary level to be done with as much of mankind as we can reach. Let's save some time and mental energy for that task, too!

A PIONEER OF LAND REFORM

HISTORIANS of the Land Reform Movement may be interested to know that Mr. Matthew Ancketill of Port Elizabeth, South Africa, has many early Georgist letters and papers of interest in his possession. These include letters from Henry George, Henry George Junior, Louis F. Post of Chicago, Lewis Berens of Yorkshire, Ignatius Singer (the author of The Story of My Dictatorship, which ran into a million edition around 1890), Sir George Fowlds (a New Zealand cabinet minister), and many others.

Mr. Ancketill is the elder son of the late Henry Ancketill, Member of the Legislative Assembly of the former Colony of Natal 1901 - 1907. Henry Ancketill was by profession a Naval Officer and by nature a reformer, and sprang from a family of hereditary land owners in Ireland. He felt deeply on the land question, on poverty and its causes, and, breaking with his class, joined the Irish Land Restoration League in 1885. That year he left for the United States. He had already read Progress and Poverty and within a short period after his arrival in New York, had met Henry George and his son and other leaders in the Movement. He later worked for over a year on the staff of George's paper The Standard. In 1888 he returned to England and for some years lectured in many parts of the countryside from the Red Vans under the secretaryship of Frederick Verinder.

Emigrating to Durban, Natal, in 1896, Henry Ancketill immediately began a correspondence in the Natal Mercury which he maintained - until his opponents were exhausted - for six months. By the turn of the century the campaign for the taxation of land values in South Africa had won many adherents, not least of whom was a wealthy stock broker, A. Mackie Niven, of Johannesburg. The latter and others were responsible for the Transvaal Ordinance in regard to Site-Value rating. Durban also fell to Ancketill's unremitting efforts.

* * * * *