in full effect, the revenues produced by collecting land values alone would suffice to meet all legitimate public needs. This may not have been true during the Cold War, with its staggering burden of nuclear defense. But with this burden lifted, and with the need for welfare of all kinds evaporated because of the full employment and other social benefits that the system would naturally engender, and for other reasons, which time precludes my going into here, I really think that we could dispense with taxes on incomes, improvements, sales, imports, and all the rest. If I am unduly optimistic in this belief, and the public appropriation of site-values were insufficient, this would be no argument against using it as far as it could go.

There are two things which a government can never do and still be just: The first of these is to take for public purposes what rightfully belongs to private individuals. The second is to give to private individuals what rightfully belongs to the public. All wealth which is privately produced rightfully belongs to private individuals, and for the government to appropriate it is unjust. But ground rent is publicly produced, and for the government to give it to private individuals is equally unjust. He who thinks himself prepared to justify in principle the private monopolization of ground rent, must also be prepared to justify in principle the jobbery of the Tweed Ring and the scandals of Teapot Dome.

In closing, I will summarize with a quotation from the late Dr. Viggo Starke, for many years a member of the Danish cabinet. “What I produce is mine. All mine! What you produce is yours. All yours! But that which none of us produced, but which we all lend value to together, belongs by right to all of us in common.” This, in a nutshell, is the philosophy of Henry George.

**Liberation Theology and Henry George**


The wonder includes multidisciplinary reflections in history, economics, philosophy, theology, Hebrew and Christian culture and ancient languages, and political science. Consequently, the book is vulnerable to professionals who have written multi-volumed studies of areas blithely water-skied over in a chapter, or indeed, a paragraph by our present authors.

The book is an application of single-tax, or better, land (site) value taxation to the agenda of Latin American liberation theology. Another subtitle for the
book could be "Progress and Poverty in Latin America." The contents of the book mirrors the moral outrage in the rhetoric of both the great Hebrew prophets of social justice, and of Henry George. The dismal science meets the prophet Amos citing "a preferential option for the poor" in Republican Alabama.

This reviewer found the book to be a stimulating and complete introduction to land (site) value taxation applied to Latin America. In the context of liberation theology, it gives succinct coverage of the history of Latin American colonialism, varying scenarios for economic and land reform, religious leadership and/or its idolatries, the scriptural foundations for social justice, economic patterns of free trade and dependency theory, Marxist illusions, the interrelations among national, populist and individual ownership, contemporary land value taxation in several US states and in various foreign countries. It appends a chapter on the life and thought of Henry George. And all of this in 120 pages! Surely this is two Davids taking up arms against a sea of Goliaths!

They are to be commended for the sheer chutzpah of leaping into an arena either suffocated by the sumo wrestlers of specialized learning or, oppositely, an arena stark empty because all fear to tread into areas demanding such vulnerable breadth. Among the book's implications: 1.) Republican ideology of minimal disincentive taxation/maximal freeing of labor and capital, mixed with Democratic ideology of enfranchised populist welfare for the dispossessed through redistributed wealth. 2.) EnthusiasticCongregationalist and Methodist use of papal documents. 3.) Single paragraph summaries of the economies of Japan, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand.

Apropos of such brevity, the present reviewer does object to the apparently literalist use of Hebraic scripture accepting Israelite domination of the Promised Land. In the text of scripture, that domination occurred through genocidal holy war (berem) which legitimated a history of crusade and jihad: Deus lo vult! The authors' listing of putative Canaanite sins, which presumably legitimate genocide, sadly mirrors the rationale of any religious elite seeking moral or theological justification for its atrocities. The authors of the present book do disclaim any use of their material to justify expansionist Zionism. A forceful disclaimer would also seem to be in order which recognizes exclusivist Hebraic hegemony as allegory and metaphor. Thus all humankind, even Canaanite farmers, deserve social justice.
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