Pirates and Widows

By PETER TRACEY

BRITAIN'S newest pirate radio station, Radio Free Yorkshire, went on the air in early July. It was operated by John MacCallum and John Crawford, Liberal Party prospective parliamentary candidates for Bridlington and Howden, Yorkshire.

Before you throw your hat in the air and rejoice that the Liberal Party has so returned to liberal principles that parliamentary candidates are prepared to invest money in "pirate" radio stations to fight for the freedom of the air, I should point out that these two gentlemen set up their radio station, not to fight for commercial radio, but to campaign against it. Their broadcast was a once-and-for-all effort and lasted only half an hour.

"Something has got to be done," said Mr. MacCallum, "to demonstrate the dangers of pirate radio and to protest against the conditions which allow pirate stations to exist. They need to be controlled; yet the only attempt which has been made is by Liberal M.P. Jeremy Thorpe."

It is a sad fact that the only man who should try seriously to ban "pirate" radios is a Liberal M.P.

What a liberal world we live in!

I have just been reading The Life of Henry George by his son, and I strongly recommend it as a book for enjoyment and as a suitable means of getting biographyloving friends into the Movement. Tell them that this is one book they shouldn't miss, and whether or not they show any interest thereafter, I am sure they will agree with you.

The plight of the poor widow—the unfortunate woman who lives right in the centre of town—is a familiar objection to the introduction of site-value rating, but I did not realise before reading the life of George quite what a perennial problem this is.

Touching on the subject of possible hardship occasioned by the restoration of the land to the people, in his great speech at St. James's Hall, London, George referred to "the helpless widow," whose case was constantly being brought forward. That speech was made in 1884 and the widow argument is still with us.

While on the subject of hardship, do any of you know personally of a widow in Whitstable? I do, and without going into details I can tell you that from the Report her assessment under site-value rating would go down from £78 to £35. A reduction is of course to be expected—the majority of widows do not live in High Streets—but it is useful to have an actual example when confronted with this question.

The Fundamental Error

From a speech by Enoch Powell, M.P.

HERE IS A NATION that lives by capitalism: which by means of capitalism has achieved standards for its people exceeded only in one other country, the United States; which depends for its existence on satisfying the demands of customers throughout the world in competition with all and sundry.... Yet the same nation will stop their ears and turn the other way if they hear mention of the very word capitalism; and even the various synonyms or euphemisms — "market economy," "free economy," "competitive private enterprise" etc. — all share to a greater or less degree in the same denigration.

One reason at least for this paradox is the widespread idea that there is something modern about the planned economy, that it is some new discovery which has superseded capitalism and that consequently any country that wants to be "with it" must abandon capitalism and free enterprise as incurably "square."

But the idea of the state-controlled economy is not modern at all. It is very old; and not only very old, but refuted and superseded long ago.

It is quite true that the great principles of capitalism and free enterprise were expounded and explored around the beginning of the nineteenth century. Newton discovered gravitation in the seventeenth century. Copernicus proved in the sixteenth century that the earth revolves round the sun. But these truths are not thereby "out-of-date." They are not refuted by the lapse of time. The errors which they replaced are errors still.

It is the socialists and the economic planners who are the Ptolemaics and the flat-earthers of the modern world. They have not moved on beyond capitalism: they have moved back before it. In order to find the parallels to their faith in state regulation and control of the economy you have to go back behind Adam Smith and his contemporaries to the elaborate management of trade in the guilds and boroughs of the Middle Ages or to the French bureaucrats of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The present-day socialist would be perfectly at home in the France of Louis XIV, where officials decided what industries should be created and located in what part of France and her colonies; minutely regulated the imports and exports; subsidised and controlled prices; and managed the economy even down to prescribing the patterns which were to be woven in the state-owned tapestry works at Aubusson. There is the spiritual home of the socialist planner

What tragic folly it would be if modern Britain were to cast away the subtlest and most efficient system mankind has yet devised for setting effort and resources to their best economic use, and were to go right back to the clumsy methods and crude fallacies which our fore-fathers thought they had left behind for ever.