

To the Editor:

Professor von Mises (February News) speaks of "an antagonism between the concerns of the individual farmer and those of all other people." Here one has to distinguish between the farmer or leaseholder on one hand, and the landowner at the other. The position of the farmer remains the same in either case. If there is no antagonism nothing changes for the farmer. What changes is the position of the landlord. The government will be the landlord. And indeed: "Then the government is forced to take care of these things." But why compare the farmers with soldiers or pawns? Are they pawns with the landlord? Is there any difference? The farmer pays the rent to the treasurer—and the treasurer pays the dollars to the government instead of to the individual landlord.

No, Professor von Mises, farming does not become socialized. The soil, the fertility, the unpersonal gifts of nature will come to the benefit of us all and should be socialized. But the effort of the individual men will be liberated from all possible fiscal brakes and government intervanance, so will be liberalized.

It is not just that the whole benefit of the fertility of a piece of land goes to the landlord—this ought to go to the government. This is the Georgist aim. The land and the fertility of land is of God, is for us all, is not of an individual landlord. One has the full right of property of all he makes with his hands and intelligence. But no one has any individual right on the gifts of nature. It's a shame that one bargains the Lord's gifts for money.

—J. J. POT  
Slikkerveer, Netherlands