

To the Editor:

Within Professor von Mises' own argument lies the refutation to his objection. He opposes the interests of the individual farmer to those of society, saying that it is to society's interest that agriculture should shift to the best available land and "should be discontinued on land which . . . *on account of the fact that previously inaccessible land is made accessible, has become submarginal.*" (Italics mine.) What does this mean but that, as land becomes accessible, the margin of production is improved? And if the margin is so raised, wages, which are determined at the margin, are also raised. Hence the public collection of the rent of land — which will open more land for use — will *not* absorb the *whole* advantage.

People (including farmers) are constantly on the move looking for locations where they may improve their conditions — even today, when there is precious little opportunity to improve themselves. Why assume that there will be no such movement (except by force) when better land becomes more accessible, as Professor von Mises himself admits it would?

—ROBERT CLANCY  
New York