

We have made a start.

The most influential opinion molder of the nation, The New York Times, increasingly is quoting our research. This is symptomatic of our society's search for valid answers communicated in a meaningful and responsible manner.

This association with the media has been cultivated over a two-year period. It is the consequence of our research program. The basis for the program was agreement among Georgists to establish relevant dialogue with the influential elements of the community. The program evolved naturally and logically once we determined that objective.

There are other programs that can be developed and carried forward under the aegis of a Georgist historical perspective. Undoubtedly they would present fresh answers and insights to a responsive. In turn, these programs would substantially impact upon and improve the basic educational efforts of our school.

Si Winters

WITHER THE STATE

I have taken a few course at the Henry George School and have tried to read *Progress and Poverty*. Surely, it is a Christian idea that everyone is entitled to share the use of our God-given earth. But the clarity of George's economics and the details of his politics remain a bit beyond my grasp.

How do we translate his abstractions of "rent, wages and interest" in today's income and outgo business world without getting confused? Probably those who are smarter than I can untangle this, but unless it is straightened out, I and probably many others will have trouble following George's explanation.

Maybe it is not necessary to understand the economics to see the underlying justice in freedom of access to nature's gifts. We can take George's prescription for securing this freedom on faith. Suppose we do? Does this solve the political problem of our time? That problem is to find a way to prevent government, which is supposed to be the servant of the public, from becoming a parasitic bureaucracy encrusted on the community.

Perhaps George was more clear-sighted, or more honest, than Marx. George did not promise that "the state will wither away." He did, however, want the state to run utilities, railroads, and by extension we can assume telephones, radio, television and airlines, provide public baths and plant fruit trees with the tax-rent it collected.

Where then is the champion against the welfare state?

James T. Malone

ON BEHALF OF TRADE

The new Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs has suggested that the US give up its efforts to negotiate an internationally agreed ban on many subsidies that governments give their exporters.

Former professor Richard Cooper, who now serves the Carter Administration, was expressing these ideas at a George Washington University meeting of European trade experts before he officially joined the Carter Administration. If his views are followed, they would bring about a major shift in US policy toward export subsidies and affect the current round of negotiations at Geneva.

Countries may be permitted to subsidize their exports to make themselves more competitive in world markets, but their introduction should be gradual, Mr. Cooper said. If a country were to subsidize its agricultural exports, he said in offering an example, its currency would strengthen on foreign exchange markets. This should result in an offsetting decrease in its exports of industrial goods because currency appreciation would have made them more expensive.

Few believers in free trade would object to buying farm commodities, for instance at a discount when the cut rates are financed by taxpayers of other countries. One cannot but wonder, however, why a country would be willing to give its farmers a boost if it has to take the benefit out of the hide of its manufacturers.

Lancaster M. Geene