

## UPSIDE DOWN THEORIES AND VALUES

SIR, — With reference to the cartoon of the March & April issue, you may be pleased to know that I have always asserted that "It's the traditional theories that have enduring values" or words to that effect.

What upsets me, (and I write more in sorrow than in anger), is the wide acceptance of new fangled theories that manifestly will not stand up to unprejudiced examination and common sense.

For example, most people seem to have allowed themselves to be brain-washed into no longer believing the traditional theory, that the sun goes round the earth. Indeed, it is not so much a theory but more an observable fact, for as Bernard Shaw's St. Joan asked of those who questioned it "Couldn't they use their eyes?"

Not only is it asserted, in contradiction to simple observation, that it is the earth that goes round the sun, but against all logic it is also asserted that the earth is round.

Anyone who can believe that will surely believe anything. For obviously if this were so those on the top half would be right side up, but those on the bottom half would be upside down and *ipso facto* would of course fall off.

I am sticking to traditional theories and remain,

Yours faithfully  
London, N.W.1

## JUSTICE THE OBJECT TAXATION THE MEANS

SIR, — John M. Kelly's discussion of the basic issue of who owns the face of the earth in his article on *National Land Use and Land Rights* (March/April LAND & LIBERTY) is well put and to the point. It is obvious that justice demands—indeed the hope of carrying out the American dream requires—that all men have equal access to the biosphere. (In case women's libbers are reading this, be it noted that "men" refers to members of the species, Homo Sapiens, without regard to gender).

I wish to point out how clever and viable Henry George's solution is. His solution takes the problem out of the realm of basic land tenure philosophy and places

it in the realm of tax philosophy. It accomplishes equal access without the necessity of disturbing a single land title. For it is already established that, whether my land title takes my claim back to the divine right of Charles II or only to the fact that my great grandfather cleared the land and made his payments to the land office, in either case my title is subject to seizure by the government if I fail to pay taxes levied against the property. The mechanism for operating a land tax system is there and waiting. My land title is secure as long as I pay my property tax, be it based on the land value alone or on my buildings, too.

The problem is that the consequences of full land-value taxation are best understood by those who stand to lose their gravy train: the land speculators and the natural-resource exploiters.

One further note: the Georgian plan will work well only if there is a government that is truly "of the people, by the people and for the people" to collect the land rent on their behalf.

LAWRENCE D. CLARK, SR.  
Massachusetts

## THE NEW MONOPOLISTS

SIR, — Our countries seem to be torn asunder by selfish elements—even unions fighting each other. They are supposed to be very hostile to monopolies, but in practice they are the most jealous monopolists in existence. Their only concern is who is to enjoy the booty.

It would seem to me that industrial monopoly is much less wasteful than that of the unions, with their disruptive practices.

ERIC STANDRING  
Western Australia.

## FRANK McEACHRAN

SIR, — As I was flipping through the pages of LAND & LIBERTY this morning the first thing that caught my eye was the familiar picture of Frank McEachran. I met Kek in 1968 at the International Union conference in Wales.

I was privileged to converse with him and obtain his autograph in a copy of *Freedom the Only End*.

The convergence of our philosophy gave me a particular feeling of kinship for this great man. I remember well the sensation I experienced when I originally read the serialized book in LAND & LIBERTY. What I read were my own thoughts which I, had I the ability, would have written with my own pen. The book gave me something more — hope and encouragement. He wrote that "... there is a structure (to the economics of man), a beautiful one, friendly and helpful to mankind, and the world is a garden, not a wilderness." And for those of us who share his philosophy but despair at our apparent lack of progress he wrote, "I am spurring men on not to revolution, but to evolution. History cannot be hurried. Philosophers are needed who will work slowly but surely towards an end that is not near but remote, and yet one that will come only if they work towards it."

Yes, I believe Frank McEachran was a truly great man. He did not need to write voluminously to express his ideas. He did it quite well in a little book of 126 pages.

In the last chapter of *Freedom the Only End* he writes a few lines which embrace an enormous philosophical and economic concept: "All that is needed is a mechanism to collect the rent of land and redivide it among the community. Can we credit a prosperous and active society with enough gumption to perform this last service; to create a mechanism with no power but to follow the market—with just arrangements for leases, with no function except to return the rent to the public; with ample wages to remove temptation? This is the ultimate problem."

And it is the problem which we must address ourselves to solving. We do not have now any government so structured which can perform without dangerous unchecked power. There must be other ways in which society can act in concert which we have not yet found.