

# Letters to the Editor

## TAXES: ABILITY AND BENEFITS

**SIR,**—The socialist/communistic doctrine of "taxation according to ability to pay" has so infiltrated the minds of public officials and much of the general public that even the property tax has been made over into a form of "income" tax, with taxes on un-used vacant land, or even deteriorated slum property, being reduced because the "owners" presumably lack the "ability to pay."

The correct concept of public revenue would be to allow the principle of collecting revenue in accordance to benefits received or privilege enjoyed.

Facing a prospective business investment, the usual pitch of real estate agents is to point out all the advantages to a business, including water supply, transportation facilities, sewerage, labour supply, school, church and public services in general. The high price of land is a direct reflection of the above mentioned public facilities made available by the general taxpayer and presented as a gift to the site holder.

*Yours faithfully,*

WOODROW W. WILLIAMS  
Columbus Grove, Ohio, U.S.A.

## COMMUNITY FOR EXPLOITATION

**SIR,**—*The Observer* has been running a "Europe for Beginners" series, in part 6 of which, by Frances Cairncross, one comes upon the somewhat odd comment that: "It could pay the British worker, if we join, to go off to work in, say, Holland and leave his family at home"—full stop. Surely it must go without saying, in any civilized society, that a community in which the uprooting of a man from his home and family is proposed as a feasible answer to the earning of his daily bread, is a community not fit to work in at all.

The Articles of the Treaty, read by any layman, make it unmistakably clear that the entire set-up is based on a policy of exploitation of labour. We do not need any political or

economics expert to tell us that. And as all such "expert" comment nowadays seems most oddly to hide it up, one begins to get rather a nasty taste in one's mouth when one ponders again Gaitskell's words on the EEC in 1962:

"We are now being told that the British people are not capable of judging this issue—the Government knows best: the top people are the only people who can understand it; it is too difficult for the rest. This is the classic argument of every tyranny in history. It begins as a refined intellectual argument, and it moves into a one-man dictatorship: 'We know best' because 'I know best.' We did not win the political battles of the 19th and 20th centuries to have this reactionary nonsense thrust upon us again."

*Yours faithfully,*

SHAN SANDERS

London, S.W.11.

## POLLUTION AND THE COMMON MARKET

**SIR,**—A writer in the national press in an article on the environmental crisis points out that one of our most pressing needs today is to "abandon the idea that what matters most is consumption, or the flow of commodities." He ends with the conclusion that our "only" hope is "that somehow the extraordinary seriousness of Spaceship Earth's plight will rouse in its passengers an equally extraordinary response."

Would it be too extraordinary a response to hope that Britain might resolve to steer clear of the European Economic Community, whose Article 41 paragraph (b) (Treaty of Rome) provides precisely for "common action for the development of the consumption of certain articles?"

Indeed, anyone reading through the text of the Treaty of Rome, cannot miss the point that pollution is in every way most satisfactorily provided for. This is a point which our various environmental organisations, whose main task must surely be to alert against the further legalisation of pollution, seem to remain in entire and blissful ignorance of.

## DEMOCRACY VERSUS DESPOTISM

**IT IS better that the will of an ignorant electorate prevail, than the will of educated or benevolent rulers be exercised despotically.**—ANON.

The July issue of *Span* reports approvingly on the EEC's current anti-pollution facemask in pride of place on its front page. This, while the Brussels Commission has already embarked on a policy of deliberate adulteration of foodstuffs, in its attempt to force West German breweries to permit the addition of certain foreign bodies to their beer.

The first job of those who pretend any concern for our environment at all is, surely, to get hold of a copy of the text of the Treaty of Rome, and make some intelligent study of the Articles upon which this Community in Pollution is based, at first hand; and then to help raise an outcry against our Government's determination to thrust Britain into partnership with so criminally anti-environmental a set-up.

*Yours faithfully,*

SHIRLEY-ANN HARDY

London, W.11.

## A VALID POINT?

**SIR,**—One can understand your opposition to Britain joining the EEC particularly in the light of your paper's known policies. However, what worries me is that you do not have a single good word to say for the European Common Market. Can it be so wholly bad? Although I think that the case for Britain's entry into the EEC falls a long way short of being made, it does no harm to let the pro-Europeans have a point or two where justified.

The presentation of the case against Britain joining is not enhanced by not conceding valid points. On reflection, perhaps the other side is equally guilty of the extravagant claim that *all* will be well if we join. Perhaps this is why some of us are getting a little bored by the whole debate.

*Yours faithfully,*

GEOFFREY HARKER  
Surbiton, Surrey.