

To the Editor:

You have kindly offered me an opportunity to reply to the letters of Messrs Hall and Badgley in your May issue. I still maintain that we are justified in excluding "immigration of a type alien to our concepts and ideals." For example, I would exclude such persons as Communists who advocate the overthrow of government by force, those who would supplant our government by a dictatorship or a totalitarianism, or those who would foist upon us a union of church and state, and their opposites, those who would prohibit all the exercise of religion. I am reminded of a young man I met at a Georgist gathering. Despite the fact that he was an immigrant seeking asylum, and the fact that all his family had been butchered because of racial origin, he sneered at the school, saying that economic and political problems were best left to "our rulers" with no interference from "their subjects."

I may differ from Mr. Hall in not accepting George as an infallible prophet, greatly as I admire him, and I do not think I quite "get" Mr. Hall's statement that "the right of the group can not exceed the right of one." Personally I do not believe that the single individual has any right to full and absolutely unrestricted right to the land, but, in my opinion, "the group," meaning society as represented by government has such a right, or, as phrased in the Constitution of New York State: "The people of the state, in their right of sovereignty, possess the original and ultimate property in and to all lands within the jurisdiction of the State."

Probably there is little gained by arguing these matters and an old tag of schoolboy Latin comes to mind: *Tot homines, Quot sententiae*. Perhaps, like horse racing, it all gets down simply to difference of opinion.

—GILBERT M. TUCKER
Albany, N. Y.