

A comment, in reference to "Comment" (GJ, Summer '97). You say "we need many, many more people who understand the **corrupting effect of land monopoly**." (Emphasis mine.) I agree that we need more people — but is this kind of terminology not one of the impediments to our progress? Is land monopoly the real culprit? As long as I can pay the rent, could I not still monopolize the land in any given community?

Would we not make more impact if we focus on a philosophical reformation in our attitude to public and personal property? Isn't land monopoly only the means by which the "corrupting influence" is effected? Would eyes not be opened when many, many more people can see how publicly created values are being privatized at the expense of wages and interest? Wouldn't a new social ethic and morality be encouraged to take root quicker with this approach?

— Tom Whittle, Kelmscott, Western Australia