



"Philosophy of Freedom *Versus* the Single Tax" by Oscar B. Johannsen (June) is, so to speak, "the return of the native," i.e., the return of Henry George's original "law of justice." The native certainly expects a solid wall of opponents, but I am not a brick in that wall because I understand him only too well. As an appraiser I used to ask only one question—how will it work? Henry George himself didn't know, and therefore he recommended an "expedient," as second best.

One may demand that the former owners will not get a single penny for their "token" rights, but imagine a country like Israel were everybody, even a beggar, buys a piece of land as a hedge against inflation. All these will cry shame upon so predatory a government, and they are in the majority—how would you answer them?

Or, consider that you own a piece of land. You erect a building on it. "Your" piece of land will now be put up for auction. I offer the highest rent, \$1,000. As I am a professional extortioner, I shall sub-let it to you for \$2,000. Can, and will, the "Henry George government" do something against my demand? Or should it give the owner of the building a preferential right to take the land on lease? And what will we do if there is a boycott against the lease and no one, not even the owner, will buy it?

In Israel 95 per cent of the usable land is owned by the state or the National Fund and given to farmers and builders on lease, for a revisable ground-rent only. The lessees have learned to speculate with these exactly as they speculated with the lands themselves. What expedient, sorry, I should say what

remedy can you propose against these speculations?

Both Sun-Yat-sen and our friend Geoghegan of Malta have proposed to take ground-rent, not on the strength of assessments, but on the owner's assessment and declaration, giving the state the right to purchase the land for the thus declared value, plus 5 per cent. Does Mr. Johannsen know about any enactment of this plan, and what happens to the buildings and plantations if the state takes the land in this way?

DAVID B. ASCHER  
Haifa, Israel

Jamaica is busily preparing for political independence, after 300 years of British rule. Slogans, such as "Jamaica is yours—love it and work for it," are everywhere.

Jamaica is *whose*? People are not likely to love a country that keeps them in poverty. Does not the prosperity of all its individuals make up the prosperity of the whole country? How can one work for one's country when one cannot get work?

The people of Jamaica think they've gotten rid of colonialism by attaining "political independence." But the land and resources are still dominated by a small minority, and natives are thus compelled to work at a subsistence level. And is not the same thing continued after so-called "independence," when a few landowners control the economic life of the country?

Now that there has been a change of government, Jamaicans are faced with the condition that even the little land value taxation we have is in jeopardy.

We have yet to learn that true independence comes not alone through political independence, but also through economic independence.

PHILLIP WALLACE  
Kingston, Jamaica