



I am the happy owner of a portrait of "The First New Yorker," a fine old painting from 1688 portraying the unhappy King James II of Great Britain and Ireland. In 1664, when he was still the Duke of York and Albany, the English took over New Netherlands and New Amsterdam from the Dutch. His brother, King Charles II, gave the district to James, and both the state and city of New York received his name: York. The state capital, Albany, was also named after him.

This painting is in the middle of the Atlantic now, on its way to the World's Fair. It was painted by Sir Godfrey Kneller, Rembrandt's pupil, who was painter to the Court of five English regents. It will be exhibited in the Danish pavilion in 1964-5. Go and pay homage to him, for even if he was not a great king, New York is a great thing.

He will be reproduced in colored postcards, and the American public relations director who visited Copenhagen a month ago was quite enthusiastic over the idea of exhibiting him in New York during the 300th anniversary of the city. I hope King James will feel at home over there. He will take my best wishes, greetings and compliments with him to all of you who attend the International Henry George Conference.

VIGGO STARCKE
Lyngby, Denmark

Mr. Hair, in his letter appearing in the March HGN expressed his belief that my views on value, prices and wages are at odds with those of Henry George, and "would like to see the

confusion cleared up by someone who is an authority."

If Mr. Hair will accept Henry George himself as an authority, I refer him to George's work *The Science of Political Economy*, Book II, Chapter XI, page 232. Here he will find George saying that the higgling of the market must be the real measure of the toil and trouble of exertion. In other words it is what you get in the market for the stuff you produce that constitutes the value of your labor, assuming, of course, that you are producing for sale in the market. This is a far cry from saying that wages are an element in prices. And it must apply where money is used as a medium of exchange, as well as where trade is on a barter basis. Of course "what you get for the stuff you produce" is usually subject to a rent deduction, but this has nothing directly to do with the selling price per unit of product.

Mr. Hair's view that goods do (or should) exchange on a basis of equal amounts of incorporated labor is strictly Marxist. It is also to be seen, with a little thought, that the view is incorrect. Of what concern is it to a producer-trader how hard or how long the party with whom he trades, works? How can he even know? But each party will seek to get the most of the other's goods for the least of his own. Each has the alternatives of trading with a third party or not trading at all.

RICHARD T. HALL
Boston

By way of commenting on several letters in the December HGN, the owner of a shoe shop on a corner of the main street pays, say 25 times as much rent as the owner of a similar shop in the suburbs. But if I buy a pair of shoes there will be little difference in price, though they are sometimes more expensive in the latter shop. Clearly rent is *not* passed on (added) in the price of the shoes!