

## 13. Taxation

“Taxes are compulsory government levies on private units for general public purposes.”

“Taxes as a badge of freedom, rather than a mark of bondage, are a modern phenomenon.”

*Encyclopaedia Britannica*  
Vol. 21 p.837 1956 edition

Of all the institutions of human society, taxation is probably, after government, the oldest. In the earliest, most primitive organisation of men in groups larger than the patriarchy, the authority of leadership was supported by some form of contribution from individual members or families if only for the purpose of establishing recognition of that authority. The contribution could be in the form of food, utensils or personal service, including — and this soon became its most important form — that of arms.

Gradually, as man's aggressive instinct expanded and warfare became the common preoccupation, taxation took the shape of tribute exacted from the beaten enemy. It is in this form that taxation has become traditional through the ages, throughout the long history of conquest, of the spread of empires, even in the erstwhile periods of peaceful internal development of nations; the tribute has been exacted from the slaves, willing or unwilling, of despots and benevolent princes alike, until in modern times the tradition has become as fixed as that of government itself, on which indeed the latter depends for its existence. And the great and shining swindle of the Welfare State has assured its permanence. You do not bite the hand that feeds you; instead, you feed its owner to sustain his ability to go on biting *you*.

There have been periods in man's history during which the tribute had a sound and logical basis, within the accepted system of authoritarian rule which has characterised most of that history. The military tenures and the church tithes of the feudal system provided, in principle at least, a balanced support of both the king's maintenance and his suicidal dreams of conquest and for the religious arm which gave its blessing to both and paid its bribe in the form of education of the lowly and the sustenance of the sick and the poor.

The records of the gradual divestment of obligation by the so-called

nobles of England and the transfer of the burden to the backs of those who, being at the bottom of the pyramid, had no alternative to bearing it, reads like any authentic story of gang warfare since the days of Al Capone.<sup>1</sup> Richard Cobden put the story in succinct form in a speech to Parliament in 1845:

“Honourable gentlemen claimed the privilege of taxing our bread on account of their peculiar burdens in paying the highway rates and the tithes. Why, the land has borne those burdens before Corn Laws were thought of. The only peculiar State burden borne by the land was the Land Tax, and I will undertake to show that the mode of levying that tax is fraudulent and evasive, an example of legislative partiality and injustice second only to the Corn Law itself . . . For a period of 150 years after the conquest, the whole of the revenue of the country was derived from the land. During the next 150 years it yielded nineteen twentieths of the revenue: for the next century down to the reign of Richard III, it was nine tenths. During the next 70 years to the time of Mary it fell to about three-fourths. From this time to the end of the Commonwealth, land appeared to have yielded one half of the revenue. Down to the reign of Anne it was one fourth. In the reign of George III it was one sixth. For the first thirty years of his reign it was one seventh; from 1793 to 1816 (during the period of the Land Tax), land contributed one ninth. From which time to the present (1845) one twentyfifth only of the revenue had been derived directly from the land. Thus the land, which anciently paid the whole of the taxation, paid now only a fraction, or one twentyfifth, notwithstanding the immense increase in the value of the rentals. The people fared better under the despotic monarchs than when the powers of the State had fallen into the hands of a landed oligarchy who had first exempted themselves from taxation and next claimed compensation for themselves by a Corn Law for their heavy and peculiar burdens.”

And it is profoundly significant that taxation is uniquely associated, today as ever, with the worst aspects of human nature, with bribery and corruption, with injustice and skullduggery and selfishness, ruthlessness and crime of every description. As J. S. Thompson, in his *Taxation's new Frontier*<sup>2</sup>, says: “Taxation is the social power that most affects the comfort or misery of everyone; that destroys the incentive to create, save and produce . . . that fines the industrious and thrifty . . . fosters fraud, creates privilege and acts as a constant drag on human progress.”

It is strange indeed that so little thought appears to have been given to alternatives to such an unsatisfactory system of governmental support. Those who have given their minds to this quest may be counted on the fingers of two hands.<sup>3</sup>

Adam Smith gave the world a set of principles (canons) of taxation<sup>4</sup> — every one of which is violated by the forms of taxation with which every taxpayer of today is familiar. Taxation, he said, should be borne “in

proportion to the revenue which they (the subjects) enjoy under the protection of the State"; the tax "ought to be certain and not arbitrary"; every tax ought to be levied at the time and place most convenient to the contributor; every tax ought to take no more from the people than is received into the Treasury. And he listed four ways in which taxation could contravene this rule: by the cost of collection, by obstructing industry, by encouraging smuggling and tax evasion.

Elsewhere<sup>5</sup> he shows, when discussing the effects of protectionism, how the imposition of taxes on domestic production justifies equivalent taxes (tariffs) on imports, thus doubling the tax burden. So you have one of the worst effects of taxation — of the one evil leading to another.

J. A. Schumpeter, in his *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, in the section: 'Can Socialism Work?'; uses the wastefulness of taxation under capitalism as an argument in support of the socialist state. However strange the logic of this may be, there can be no denying the facts as he presents them: ". . . ever since the princes' feudal incomes ceased to be of major importance, the State has been living on a revenue produced in the private sphere for private purposes and had to be deflected from these purposes by political force. On the one hand taxation is an essential attribute of commercial society . . . and, on the other, it is almost inevitably in the nature of an injury to the productive process. Until 1914 roughly that injury was confined within narrow bounds. But since then taxes have grown, by degrees, into the dominant item of business and family budgets and into a *major factor of unsatisfactory economic performance* (italics ours). Moreover, in order to wrench ever-increasing amounts from an unwilling organism, a huge administrative apparatus has come into existence that does nothing but struggle with the bourgeoisie for every dollar of its revenue. That organism has in response developed organs of defence and does an immense amount of work in self-protection."<sup>6</sup>

A major factor in this modern acceleration of taxation is, of course, the process described in a further passage in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* article on Taxation, previously referred to: "Though generally thought of as an instrument of revenue, taxes are recognised also as a major instrument of national economic policy . . . taxes to subdue inflation . . . tax reductions to stimulate private (sic) markets and employment . . . play a crucial role as a balance-wheel in the economy." This national economic policy, product of the Keynesian 'revolution', is self-exposed as a ghastly failure by the very fact of this acceleration of taxation, on the one hand and, on the other, the phenomenal increase in inflation wherever it has been adopted.

A recently published Australian economics textbook<sup>7</sup> presents the official macro-economic line on taxation as follows:

"The significance of taxation as an instrument of policy is not that it provides the government with funds with which to meet expenditure commitments; after all, the credit facilities of the Reserve Bank are

always available should the authorities simply require finance. The government chooses to rely primarily on taxation because the withdrawal of money from the private sector by this means has certain desired effects on the economy. First and foremost, taxation cuts down spending power in the private sector. Hence, on those occasions when the retention of spending power in the private sector would precipitate inflation, higher taxation is warranted, whether or not the funds so raised are used to finance government spending. Where the funds are actually channelled into government spending, the basic purpose of taxation is best viewed as a means of assuring the effective transfer of resources from the private sector to the public sector without inflation — or as a means of ensuring the effective transfer of resources from one part of the private sector to another, if government spending is not on goods and services but on cash transfers. Transfers within the private sector touch on two other major purposes of taxation. First, in conjunction with government spending, taxation has a very important role to play in reducing extremes of wealth and poverty and ensuring a more equitable distribution of income than market forces tend to produce. Secondly, taxation may to some extent be intentionally designed on social and economic grounds to discourage particular forms of production or consumption — or alternatively to encourage them through tax concessions. Finally, it is worth noting that in as far as taxation helps to regulate the overall level of aggregate demand in the private sector in the manner already explained, it constitutes an important balance of payments instrument as well as a counter-cyclical device.”

The very opening chapter of the book: 1 THE ECONOMY AS A WHOLE, makes full obeisance to the Keynesian origins of present Australian taxation policy and its continuing Keynesian character:

“Keynes’s *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* published in 1936, brought people quickly to realise that they could control their own economic destiny through government action. Keynes’s immediate objective was to demonstrate on the one hand that *there was no natural tendency for economic activity to move towards a level that would satisfy the socio-economic objective of full employment* (italics ours) and, on the other, that government could, through budgetary and monetary policies, influence the level of spending in an economy so as to move the level of activity closer to that objective. This breakthrough in economic thinking led on to the realisation that government policies could be applied towards many other socio-economic objectives in areas such as the rate of economic growth, the distribution of income, the rate of change of prices and the disposition of expenditure between consumption and investment, between the public and private sectors of the economy, and between overseas and domestic markets.”

Another recent work, on the recommended list of at least one Australian

university economics department<sup>8</sup> — a book, by the way, with carefully ‘unbiased’ but actually blantly partisan leftist presentation of ‘radical’ views (for ‘radical’ read socialist) — lists more than thirty-five references to Keynes and Keynesian economic theory in its index (references to Marx are roughly equal in number.) In common with most economics textbooks, the fundamental economic term Rent does not appear anywhere in the indexes of either of these works. Needless to say, neither does the name of Henry George.

Taxation in Hunt and Sherman’s book is indexed under the following headings: Tax-free bonds; tax loopholes; taxes and British imperialism in India; taxes and economic inequality; and government policy; and imperialism in Belgian Congo; and inequality of income distribution; in Keynesian economics; in mercantilistic Europe; in U.S.-Canadian relations; in Yugoslavia. The reference to ‘economic inequality’ contains this interesting information: “It has been estimated that the total loss of (U.S.) government revenue from all loopholes in the income tax laws is about \$40 billion a year.”<sup>18</sup> So much for the effectiveness of the tax in the sphere of ‘redistribution’. Further, an analysis of taxes other than income taxes shows that 60 per cent of all taxation is regressive in effect, and the general conclusion expressed in this section is: “The whole taxation system redistributes very little, if any, income from rich to poor. It certainly does virtually nothing to mitigate poverty or reduce inequality.”<sup>19</sup> Elsewhere, a ‘recognised authority on taxes’ is quoted as having found on analysis that “families with income below \$2,000 a year (described as representing ‘abject poverty’) paid out one-third of their income in taxes, whereas people on \$10,000 to \$15,000 paid a proportion of their income nearly one-third lower than those on \$2,000.”<sup>10</sup>

Discussing ‘the economics of Keynes’ (Keynes being described as “one of the most brilliant economists of this century”),<sup>11</sup> the authors present some of the well-known Keynesian fatuities on the subject of saving and investment, including the classic reference to Egyptian pyramid-building and the burying of bottles full of bank-notes in disused coalmines, arriving at the general conclusion that proof of the efficacy of Keynesian theories is very difficult because of certain complications. The (U.S.) Employment Act of 1946 was Keynesian in concept in that it “legally obligated the government to use its taxing, borrowing and spending powers to maintain full employment.”<sup>12</sup> (Readers may find a familiar ring in this injunction, which recalls the preamble of the Australian Act setting up the Reserve Bank.) Yet “Unemployment for the 1950’s and early 1960’s averaged 4.6 per cent.” (At the beginning of 1975 it was around 9-10 per cent) and “inflation has been a persistent problem since World War II.” The major ‘complication’ is described as the growth of ‘the warfare economy’, in which the role of ‘pyramid-building’ has been taken over by the Pentagon and the ‘military-industrial complex’. A frighteningly unhappy

'justification' of the Keynesian ethos.

Under the index heading 'taxation and government policy'<sup>13</sup> Chapter 27 ('Government: Welfare or Warfare?') has an opening statement which includes this significant sentence: "Since 1941 the government has become far and away the largest single source of income flow." And the instrument of that income flow is, of course, taxation.

Turning again to *'The Australian Economy'*, the picture presented in Chapter 3 ('Government Intervention') is equally illuminating — and depressing, except only in that Australians have so far been spared the horrific growth of the American war industry. (Which is not to say that the Australian equivalent is not significant in terms of population and income: Government defence spending in 1974/5 represented the largest departmental expenditure — \$1337 million of a total budget of \$15,000 million<sup>14</sup>) Section IV of this chapter: *Government Revenue* opens with this statement:

"The government exercises control over the economy not only through its spending and regulatory activities but also by the manner it goes about raising revenue. The man in the street is rather apt to think of revenue in passive terms; money has to be found to finance government spending, and if it is not forthcoming then public expenditure must be curtailed. This, however, overlooks two crucial things. In the first place — and this harks back to what was said at the beginning of the chapter — the government is not constrained by finance in the same way as a private individual or firm: its taxing powers give it much greater freedom, and in any case it can always turn to the central bank for credit when it wants more money. If the government does reduce its own expenditure, this ought to be because the cut is deemed to have a beneficial effect on the community and not because funds are hard to come by. In the second place, the level and pattern of revenue-raising have a significant impact on the performance of the economy — probably as much impact as government spending itself. To ignore the receipts side, therefore would be to ignore a range of policy weapons capable of playing a very positive role in shaping the economy."<sup>15</sup>

Government income is then analysed under three headings: business and property income, net borrowing, and taxation. In the sub-section IV. 3 *Taxation*, following the passage quoted (note 15) above, the authors continue thus: "In judging the efficacy of taxation as an instrument of policy, however, it is not sufficient to consider only the intended effects. Thus, although for the most part taxes are not deliberately designed to alter the pattern of resource allocation in the private sector, they inevitably *do* alter the pattern — often unfavourably. A good tax must thus be judged not only in terms of how far it achieves its primary objective but also in terms of any incidental harmful effects."

In pursuance of this injunction, the sub-section: *counter-cyclical*

*considerations*, has this to say:

“Whatever the merits of a tax in terms of discretionary or built-in flexibility, what finally matters is the actual impact of the tax on the level of activity in the economy. In this sense both income taxes and commodity taxes are unquestionably important instruments of counter-cyclical policy. Per dollar of taxes raised, the latter taxes probably have a greater restraining effect on private spending than the former since income taxes are likely to be financed in part from taxpayers’ current income which would otherwise have been saved whereas virtually the whole of commodity taxation probably represents a cut-back in consumer spending. It would be wrong, though, to make too much of this distinction; particularly in times of high activity, when business men have a strong urge to invest but not necessarily the financial means of doing so, the amount of saving diverted to taxes may serve to curb private investment, in which case income taxes will tend to reduce aggregate spending in the economy to roughly the same extent as commodity taxes. Also, one cannot overlook the possibility that income taxes will reduce the *incentive* to invest.”<sup>16</sup>

The significant thing in all this talk of ‘counter-cyclical’ operations, the accepted purpose of taxation within the macro-economic concept of Keynesian theory still dominating the minds of Australian public and professional economists, is the calm indifference implied regarding the taxpayer as an individual and, instead, his treatment as a mere cypher in the national accounts. This is, of course, the chief characteristic of socialist theory and practice, despite all the protestations of concern for the ‘underprivileged’ in the speeches and writings of socialist politicians, and it exposes the drift in Australian economic thinking, inevitable once the Keynesian mythology was embraced as the only alternative to the divisiveness and confusion of the neo-classical school.

It is astonishing that this should be so in face of all the evidence daily being produced and displayed in the public print of the ruinous effects of taxation policy, not only on the life of the individual taxpayer but on the very corporate life of the economy which the policy is designed to benefit. Here are a few samples culled from the press of Australia, Britain and elsewhere during 1974/5.

Writing in *The Australian Financial Review* of 2 July 1974, Brian Toohey refers to the vast sum which was to be released into the economy within the ensuing three months in the form of refunds of taxpayers’ over-payments under the Australian P.A.Y.E. system, amounting to approximately \$1,000 million. The whole trend of his article is a speculation as to how the release of this huge sum will affect the general ‘liquidity’ in the ‘the current inflationary situation’. He discusses the possibility of recipients of the refunds repaying loans and the effects of this on the liquidity of banks and building societies. A sentence typical of

the macro-economic thinking is this: "Colouring the total liquidity situation arising from the flow-through of tax returns will be the attitudes of individual income-earners towards future economic prospects." Not even a crocodile tear for the 'income-earner' as an individual with problems which the refund of his over-paid tax — a forced loan to the Treasury carrying no interest — will only partially relieve.

In the (London) *Sunday Times* of July 7th, 1974, a regular columnist, Peter Wilsher, under the pungent heading: 'Soak the rich, drown the poor', discussing the official Liberal Party proposal for 'regulation and redistribution of the national wealth', reports the case of a highly-paid company executive on an annual salary of £36,000 of which, after paying income tax, he actually receives a 'take-home' cheque of just under £11,000. Wilsher uses the example to show that the Liberal Party's arithmetic is cock-eyed. He makes no comment — possibly because it is no longer 'news' — on the stupid situation in which salaries are deliberately inflated in order to cope with the vicious spiral of taxation, one of the major effects of which is the inflation of prices.

Yvonne Preston, writing in *The National Times* (Australia) of 15-20 July 1974, describes the plight of the American taxpayer who has "anything up to 28 pages of detailed, cross-referenced complex calculations to wade through" in order to complete his income return. Apropos of this, the 1974 Australian Federal Income Tax Act occupies a volume three inches thick. The cost factor in each of these examples represents an enormous deduction from the actual receipts of the tax. An interesting reflection: at what point in this vicious spiral will the law of diminishing returns apply?<sup>17</sup>

Yvonne Preston had another article a month later in the same paper with the succinct headline: 'How to get your tax money back: a guide to the Canberra grant mills.'

The strangling effect of taxation policy on industry is well portrayed in an article in *The Sunday Times* (London) of 6 October 1974, entitled: 'The Doomsday Machine'. A synoptical note says: "British business is wrestling in a scissors-grip of price control and the taxes it is forced to pay on the illusory profits of inflation." A table: 'How the machine eats up the profits' discloses the progressive dis-incentive to industry and commerce:

Gross U.K. profits of companies (1973)	£10,284 m.
Less interest, depreciation and inflation of stock	£ 7,620 m.
Pre-tax profit	£ 2,664 m.
Tax (net of grants)	£ 1,839 m.
True net profit	£ 825 m.

A similar article in *The National Times* (Australia) of 2 November 1974: 'Profit Squeeze is Costing Jobs', says: "the tax man is taking an increasing cut of non-existent profits", and that as a consequence companies are laying



off staff. One large company is shown as having had an increase in cost of purchases over 12 months of 10 percent. (\$15,600 on a total of sales of \$155,000). Yet company tax paid, at just under 50 percent, is based on the cost-inflated gross 'profit'.

A phenomenon indicative of the universal trend to desperation among the victims of the taxation system is the story of the Danish Anti-Tax Progress Party, led by Mogens Glistrup, which in 1972 won 28 seats in the 179-member Parliament and forced its inclusion in the government coalition. Mr Glistrup's personal battle in the courts over his tax-evasions over four years is an interesting, if cynical reflection on the general insanity of the system. (Source: *The Economist*, 12/10/74.)

The desperate ends to which governments are driven by their own inflation-inducing policies is highlighted by articles in the Australian journals, *Bulletin* and *National Times* in November 1974, which discuss the imminent consideration by the Federal Government of a tax on 'excessive' wage increases, first adopted in France and denounced by French industrialists, according to the *National Times* writer, Neil McInnes, as 'a penalty on the most dynamic enterprises and a source of unhealthy distortions in business management.'<sup>3</sup> Apart from the disastrous effects on industry, Peter Samuel, in *The Bulletin*, quotes the Commissioner of Taxation as reporting that "The administration of such a tax would be costly in both money and skilled bureaucrats, even if confined to a thousand or so of the country's largest firms."

And speaking of costs in tax collection, a columnist in *The National Times*, of 9 November 1974, reported how inflation affected the Taxation Department itself. "The cost of processing each return (of income) rose from an average of \$8.87 in fiscal 1973 to an average of \$10.69 in fiscal 1974". In an article in *The Bulletin* (Sydney) of 16 November 1974 Peter Samuel shows how inflation operating on tax returns makes nonsense of the government's budget estimates. He reports tax officials as saying they anticipated an increase of income tax receipts of 40 percent as against the 31 percent estimated in the Budget. That, says Samuel, "would represent a withdrawal of an extra billion dollars of spending power from the community's \$50 billion 'disposable income'." He claimed that after allowing for the 30 percent increase in wage levels over the previous year the increase in tax receipts could be as high as 65 percent.

In the same month the *Sydney Morning Herald* quoted a Melbourne report on the way in which road hauliers were evading "hundreds of thousands of road tax and fines" by setting up 'straw companies' whose sole purpose was to go into liquidation after a stated interval owing accumulated tax and fines with no assets to meet the debt — totalling \$400,000 at the time of the report.

The same paper, on 27 November, reported on the likely effects of the N.S.W. Government's new petrol tax (estimated to produce \$60 million a year) by the flow-through of the tax on other products using petroleum

derivatives. "Women will pay more for their lipsticks" said the report, "Farmers more for their fertilisers and the sick more for their medicines."

*The Economist* of 1 February 1975, discussing the Chancellor of the Exchequer's latest White Paper indicating a total government spending in 1975/6 of £50 billion, has this comment: "Even on the Treasury's unbelievably optimistic assumptions, this means wage and salary earners can keep for themselves only 17p.'s worth of goods and services out of every extra £1's worth they produce in each of six years from 1973 to 1979. That is equivalent to the Treasury taking the entire extra real income of the entire working population at the highest marginal income tax rate (83 percent) at present only applied to the top slice (over £20,000 p.a.) of the highest earned incomes." To paraphrase the old Jewish joke: Do the British people need enemies when they have such (socialist benevolent government) friends?

The same journal on 1 March 1975 examined the Capital Transfer Tax (CTT) provisions of the latest finance bill (so controversial that it produced over a thousand amendments in the committee stage of debate), gives this example of the effects of the tax as originally proposed: "To transfer, unencumbered during life, a business worth £100,000 (if the donor has made no other gifts) will produce a CTT of £19,500; at death almost £62,000. For a £200,000 business comparable tax figures would be £110,000 and £212,000. Both figures are large enough to make break-up of the business very likely . . . and all this takes no account of capital gains tax which will be chargeable in addition." As P. P. McGuinness, economics editor of *The Australian Financial Review*, writing from London, said: "One of the old bogeys of the heydays of British socialism was the fear of a flight of capital . . . It may be that, inadvertently and with the enthusiastic support of the bureaucratic loophole pluggers, the Chancellor of the Exchequer could be about to achieve just that effect." In support, he quoted the taxation correspondent of *The Financial Times*: "If your ambitions extend beyond £300,000, the message is clear — emigrate."

A fact which may be little known outside Germany was published by *The Economist* on 1 March 1975 in an article on the 'Church tax'. This reported that "In certain West German cities registrars are kept busy coping with queues of people waiting to declare their cancellation of church membership" in order to stop paying the tax, which has been levied since the separation of church and state in 1918, and which currently produces 90 percent of church income. (In 1974 "the tax revenues of the R.C. and Protestant churches totalled DM7,150 million, or £1,300 million"). The rate of tax, incidentally, has doubled since 1930 (from 5 percent of income tax to 9 or 10 percent, depending which State of the Federation you live in). It is ironical to reflect that a large part of the churches' expenditure is on 'charitable work' — despite the huge West German Government social security system. The income-earners are apparently awakening to the situation and beginning to divest themselves of a burden which, under the

old feudal system, they did not have to bear. The real irony lies in the fact that they will doubtless continue to bear it if the tax is absorbed in general taxation.

All in all, then, the taxation system, injustice and waste apart, cannot even be said to be achieving the purpose for which the economic managers claim the right to use it as a tool; everywhere throughout the Western world the costly farce continues to be played out, if with a growing sense of futility, as the calculations and projections of the model-makers fail again and again to indicate the way out of the economic jungle.

This would be bad enough, in all conscience, were there no alternatives to this system of time-honoured brigandage. That an alternative exists, an alternative that fulfils all the requirements of a just revenue system, that satisfies every one of Adam Smith's 'canons', is a matter of simple fact. That it continues to be ignored, not only by the politicians, but by those whose expertise is supposed to guide the latter in their essays in government, is nothing less than a crime, the penalty for which is the imminent submergence of the tentative democracy we at present enjoy beneath the dead hand of Marxist socialism.

#### NOTES ON CHAPTER 13

1. Recommended reading on this subject: *History of England* by G. M. Trevelyan; Longmans, London: 1926-1960. *A Short History of the English People*, by J. R. Green; Everyman edn. Also *British Economic and Social History (1700-1939)* by C. P. Hill; Edward Arnold, London; 1957-1963.
2. *Taxation's New Frontier* by J. S. Thompson; Robt. Shalkenbach Fndtn., N.Y., 1961.
3. Patrick Edward Dove (1815-1873), Herbert Spencer, Tolstoy, Adam Smith, Ricardo, J. S. Mill, Fredk. Bastiat, Silvio Gesell, Henry George.
4. *The Wealth of Nations*, Everyman edn. Vol. II, p.306 et seq.
5. *Ibid*; Vol. I, p.408.
6. *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* by J. A. Schumpeter; Unwin's University Books, London, 1970. p.198.
7. *The Australian Economy: A Manual of Applied Economics* by R. I. Downing (ed.); Wiedenfeld & Nicholson, London 1973 Section on Taxation, p.92.
8. *Economics, An Introduction to Traditional and Radical Views* by E. K. Hunt and Howard J. Sherman; Harper & Row, N.Y. 1972. (This book is frankly stated by its authors to be in the nature of "a political-economics rather than a purely economics text.")
9. *Ibid*. p.291
10. *Ibid*. pp.289-291.
11. *Ibid*. pp.145/6.
12. *Ibid*. pp.133-
13. *Ibid*. p.139.
14. *The Bulletin* (Sydney), 28 September 1974.
15. *The Australian Economy*, p.85.
16. *Ibid*. p.97.
17. The cost factor to the individual taxpayer is also high, e.g., accountants' fees, etc.
18. An article in *The National Times* (Australia) of March 20th, 1978, puts the figure at \$195 billion.