

RE FRANK BRENNAN:

A Legal approach for site value collection. (*Progress*, March 1992)

Mr Brennan states that fee simple confers land ownership upon the person so favoured. While agreeing with Mr Brennan that a jurist is likely to favour this opinion, nevertheless land is nature given and is the absolute property of no one; although one may possess or hold it. At most, the incumbent owns a land title. A covenant between the holder and the state, which defines the rights and privileges the former obtains and the duties he has to perform in order to hold the land.

A state depends for its power upon the use of, or threat of force. Without such it could not function. For instance, who would pay taxes? However, the legality of land possession contract depends upon many possibilities, and the matter of ownership is open to debate, with many diverse cases. For instance: a traitor may have his titles abrogated without compensation. Hence ownership is not absolute.

Why concentrate on the opinions of legal authorities arguing about moot points? Why favour this course over the welfare of millions of frustrated people who suffer and die of starvation and disease caused by injustice, while a whole civilization slides down the drain?

The imperative obligation is that we should put justice and the welfare of the living and posterity before the old and unsatisfactory statutes of the dead. Our efforts would be much better concentrated upon swelling the numbers who agree with us. The most promising group are the disillusioned young people, particularly those in the higher secondary colleges who see no worthwhile future for themselves in the present system.

In a few years we, the older generation, will be dead and gone, while the young are just coming into adult life. They are the hope for the future.

We should try and create a substantial body of propaganda with them that will be an influence in politics. Assuming they gather enough strength to make our land policy popular, the jurists are likely to change opinion and see the question of land holding from our angle.

If the ancient custom of landholding as a tenancy was altered by cunning persons trying to escape their obligations, why can it not be altered back again?

Arthur Cannon,
Kennington, Vic.