



Either I disagree with Harold Inglis (June HGN) or else I misunderstood him. I think he said something to the effect that LVT will cause interest rates to go lower than they are now. This, in my thinking would be a strong argument against LVT, but I don't believe such an effect would follow. With LVT, both wages and the return on productive capital will rise considerably. At any given time—such as now—the rent of land does not pay any higher percentage on an investment than anything else does, since the amount to be invested is calculated from the rent (and anticipated rent). And competition will keep it very close to an amount such that the rent constitutes the normal market percentage of it. But that normal market percentage is determined by the productivity of capital. With LVT, capital will be more, rather than less, for reasons that need not be repeated here.

EVERETT W. GROSS
Crete, Nebraska

"Desire for approbation," quotes Robert Clancy from Henry George (July HGN, p. 2) "is one of the strongest springs of human action."

But many other great figures in literary and ethical history question this. And some modern psychologists say this dependence on approval of others is a *mis-direction* and *mis-use* of human energy. Sure, it's common, but it is not really mature nor personally satisfying. My favorite psychological authors at the moment, Gail and Snell Putney (in *Normal Neurosis*, Harper, 1964) say that healthy action springs from an adequate and acceptable *self-image*. In fact, the basic need of all human beings, and their most potent motivation is this need for an ade-

quate and acceptable self-image. Those "other directed" persons, those acting in terms primarily of approval or approbation of others, constitute the majority of "adjusted" Americans, but their behavior is neurotic, none-the-less.

"The adjusted American lacks self approval," according to these authors. "That is to say, he has not developed a self-image that he can believe is both accurate and acceptable. To do so he would require successful techniques for honest introspection, candid association and meaningful activity." And the book has helpful sections on these "techniques."

Certainly Georgists know that if their reform is to become popular it will be in spite of, not because of, standing in line for the "approval of others." Of course, in a society where making a living was easy and just (where land monopoly was removed) one might find it easier to "live by one's own inner standard, and self acceptance."

While we're on psychology, may I refer to my letter in the April HGN where I said that Henry George was inconsistent. Since he says the norm of human action is to "satisfy desires with the least effort," then he cannot *logically* advocate that we not satisfy our desires by holding land and selling for a higher price. For *this* is surely the height of just what he said was "normal"—getting something for the least effort, i.e. none. Actually, haven't you known lots of people who prefer working, creativity, responsibility, to cheating, lazing, speculation and getting by on the least effort? Isn't that because their "self-image" requires that?

All but one, I thought, misread what

I said in April, and did not deal with this point of illogic in Henry George. Only Oscar Johannsen said this was due to a paradox in human beings. But when there is a paradox—two values from which to act—which one does a mature human choose? By which I am implying that human nature and human action may be too complex to tie down to a set of "scientific" rules or deductions.

MILDRED J. LOOMIS
Brookville, Ohio

Mrs. Loomis refers to "other directed" people and says that mature people develop an adequate self-image. But what is a "self-image"? Is it not largely determined by the social environment? Riesman and his associates developed the term "other directed" to mean that motivation is supplied by other people in the immediate environment. But they by no means made the term "inner-directed" to mean non-social; it is simply another form of social direction, i.e., the drives and values are implanted by one's elders.

Noting that Mrs. Loomis' new book* deals with love and marriage, I think the recent study *Human Sexual Response* by Masters and Johnson may be cited. The authors found that, even in so personal and intimate a thing, the most influential factor was psychosocial, in other words, the motivation provided by the social environment.

Everybody seeks approbation, but may be seeking it from different audi-

ences. What lonely scholar does not dream he will be vindicated some day? The early Christian hermits went into the desert because the people of those days thought it a great and holy thing to do. More mature prophets went into the desert for a while but only to recharge themselves for their mission, which was essentially a social one. And I have seen those apostles of maturity, Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, on the speaker's platform, basking in the admiration of an appreciative audience.

On Mrs. Loomis's other point about the principle of least effort, George does not call it a "norm," but a fact—even an axiom—of human behavior, for good or for ill. He proposes to do away with land speculation as one of the harmful ways people apply this principle, but there are still many productive ways it can be applied. Warfare, oppression and exploitation are, it is true, one side of the coin; but the other side is progress, invention and peaceful trade. We are stuck with the principle, so we might as well see to it that the bad ways of satisfying desires are minimized and the good ways maximized.

It may be instructive to read George's chapter on this subject in *The Science of Political Economy* (Book I, Ch. XII).

R. C.

**Go Ahead and Live!* by Mildred J. Loomis and others, may be ordered from School of Living, Lane's End Homestead, Brookville, Ohio. 200 pp. \$4.15.

CAN YOU ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS?

People do get wealth and services by stealing and gambling — but suppose everyone did. They do get wealth and services by leasing out land for others to use — but suppose everyone did that. And they do get wealth and services by working and providing capital — what if everyone did?

Which way would produce more and distribute it most justly? Is a method of getting wealth and services wrong which treats all alike? Which way makes and which way modifies or ends social problems?

Men also get a rich living by speculating in land or keeping it vacant, but if everyone did, what would be the condition of the country?

These questions originated in a St. Louis class in basic economics.