

MANY WAYS By J.J. POT (Slikkerveer, Netherlands).
IUN NEWSLETTER APRIL 1971

In reply to D.B. Ascher ("Our Ultimate Goal" IUN No.13), indeed there are many ways of achieving our goal:

- (a) Giving away land as the Shah of Iran does so wholeheartedly.
- (b) Cranking the tax machinery by taxing, taxing, taxing the land.
- (c) Buying the land as proposed in New Zealand in the nineties.
- (d) Confiscating land by a dictator or a revolution.

Perhaps the ultimate method will be a mixture of more or less of the above methods, depending on whether the country is agrarian or industrialised, valuable or not, densely or sparsely populated, etc.

Commenting on the discussion "Pro and Con the Term 'Land Value Taxation'" in IUN No.13:

Mr. McCarthy, please avoid the term "value" for it is time and again confused with "price." "Site rent" is much better. But may I ask, has "rent" something to do with produce? If so, it is wrong, for a duty must be levied irrespective of produce. Perhaps "site duty" is better.

Mr. Hickok, indeed I wrote "no value left" purposely, to stress the general confusion. To explain the notion of "value" (price), you need 9 lines, twisting our brains around rates, limits and infinity. So please avoid the term "value."

Henry George in Progress and Poverty, page 405, writes: "By leaving to landowners a percentage ... etc." Unbelievable how George could spoil his principle by leaving a percentage! Apart from the fact that his opportunistic reasons are not valid, nobody should spoil his case by deducting a "percentage" of his moral principle!

As I see it, Mr. Hickok, your point is: LVT requires no change in the form of government and it embraces the institution of title deeds to land, the right of private property and the preservation of free enterprise. But the wrong of taxation is thereby continued, also the wrong of the institution of title deeds to land and the wrong of private property in land.