



I am much impressed by the front page article in the November HGN by Perry Prentice. Why is it that municipal councils everywhere seem unable to move in this matter of the municipal taxation of land values? The terrible housing shortage is universally recognized and amply publicized, but the obvious remedy is never even mentioned. The national and provincial or state governments do not hesitate to impose unpopular taxes, but municipal governments seem to be frightened to the point of paralysis by the influence of the land speculator and the land interest generally. Perhaps some of your readers who are familiar with municipal politics can give me the answer.

A. W. ROEBUCK
The Senate, Canada

(The Toronto Daily Star, at a banquet celebrating its 75th anniversary, featured Senator Roebuck as its oldest living former employee. He was a reporter from 1900 to 1905. For many years he has been, and we hope will long remain, Canada's beloved Senator, esteemed by many from the U.S. who have heard his eloquent addresses and have known him as counselor and friend.)

Nils C. Oesleby in the October HGN suggests "ground rent" as a term preferable to "land value taxation" because single tax is admittedly inaccurate. "Ground rent" would limit the application to the surface of the earth, and as commonly used might exclude water. It would definitely exclude air and all its forces—a natural resource increasingly used in production.

The main objection to royal or real rent is the derivative implication in the word that the land *is owned* by a po-

litical institution. The infringement of economics and politics on each other is already confusing. The meaning would have to be constantly explained. Land value taxation also has to be explained, but the meaning is simple and clear.

ETHEL H. VAN BUSKIRK
New York, N. Y.

At the meeting in Oslo last summer of the World Association of World Federalists, a declaration was adopted which continues its strong endorsement of the United Nations and orders as a first step "specialized units for communications, logistics and police duty." "Logistics" is translated as the "art of moving and quartering troops."

In the eternal conflict between "order" and "liberty" the Federalists seem to be definitely for the former, even though it should be detrimental to liberty. Someone ought to tell them that liberty is one form of justice, which is one thing they call for.

I am afraid they have in mind some kind of planned economy through a world state and not world-wide application of a natural law that would include liberty for individuals to organize with congenial spirits anywhere. This would prevent most of the difficulties that are now harassing mankind.

The new declaration advocates "a greater effort of solidarity in the world . . . a better distribution and more effective utilization of international resources, and the inception of an efficient policy of world economic development free from national self-interest."

The safeguarding of justice, including liberty, should be the aim of the world organization, and should set the limit for its powers. Was it not part of the scheme of the U.S. Constitution as originally drafted that the enumeration of the duties of the federal author-

ities was also the negation of powers going beyond those necessary for fulfilling these duties?

They call for more aid to developing countries. If the rights of the populations of these countries to their part of the value of the earth's resources, and most especially those of their own countries, were secured, would it then be necessary to provide the help now being doled out, which seems to be reducing them to perpetual pauperism, undermining their self respect?

As regards universal allegiance and the "sanctions" necessary to bring it about, I do not think that very great force would be needed for the exercise of these powers. Economic sanctions, including stoppage from international trade and from participating in the global rent, would no doubt in most cases be sufficient to make a recalcitrant see reason. Did not North Carolina and

Rhode Island hold back, and were they not reluctant to join the Union until they were threatened with complete exclusion? And even New York, I understand, was unwilling to give up her right of imposts on the foreign trade of the other states until the New Yorkers were convinced by Alexander Hamilton and others through "The Federalist."

If the hindrances to free economic activity were removed, and universal justice were safeguarded, there would be free associations based on ethnic, religious, educational and other dividing lines. The national coercive, aggressive, omnipotent state would gradually "wither away," to use a favorite expression with communist authors, but one which also agrees with liberalism.

OLE WANG
Tonsberg, Norway

Alex J. Duris of Henderson, North Carolina, who started a resistance movement to a so-called flood control program which would inundate numerous long-held homes, says "it looks a lot more encouraging now," as community interest has been aroused. He writes, "none of us like the necessity of having to go to battle and we are also determined that we are not going to be pushed around or have our freedom threatened by politicians and king makers . . . there is a need for a limited amount of flood control, but nothing on the scale envisioned by the dreamers who are intoxicated with the TVA pipe dream."

His various letters to the editor of the Times-News have stirred others to action, and the amount of influence that can still be projected by so simple a program as steady, logical letter writing to various news media, never ceases to surprise us. Not all letters are printed, of course, but even if a few are, the writers may consider themselves effective units of initiative in the old American way.