

IU NEWSLETTER

IULVTFT

NO. 8

MAY 1969

AN I-YOU CHAT

Recently a student of Henry George said to me: "It seems like a very good idea and I can find nothing wrong with it. But I do not know enough about it. If it is really so good, why has it not been accepted, and why aren't our leaders for it?" I can only give a few considerations to this question, which vexes me, too.

1. Could it be that George and we are wrong? We have been told so frequently. But it has usually been a matter of waving it away, not refuting it. The few attempts at refutation have been so unsuccessful that they have only added to our conviction that we are right.

2. The Georgist philosophy points out things that are not immediately visible without a little analysis. It requires thinking, and most people do not like to take the trouble. People are more easily moved by the obvious and by emotions.

3. There is also a "law of inertia" operating in human affairs. People do not want to change their habitual ways of doing things, even if bad, and will resist change, thinking up dozens of reasons why nothing should be done.

4. People are swayed by authority. It needs a charismatic leader to make new ideas palatable and acceptable. On the other hand, such leaders are not willing to crusade for unpopular ideas. It is a circle that is difficult to break.

5. People most often think in terms of their individual welfare rather than the welfare of society. If you tell them the price of land is sky-rocketing, they will think of cashing in on it rather than correcting the situation. If taxes get murderous, they will think of dodging them rather than reforming the system.

6. We cannot overlook the power of a vested interest that is the oldest and strongest in the world - the private collection of the unearned income of land. It has a pervasive influence in education, journalism, legislation and business. And it awes people who have no stake in it into defending it even though they are victims.

The above deals with powerful factors ranged against us. But we have something going for us: the still small voice of reason and morality. There are people who will think things out, who are willing to question authority, who are concerned for the fate of society. We will find them if we keep trying.

So there is hope. But the heavy odds against us will explain why our progress has been so slow. There is, however, such a thing as an acceleration factor. Once our ideas get a good grip somewhere, they will tend to move faster and faster.

Robert Clancy
Editor

The IU NEWSLETTER is distributed to members of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade. (Minimum annual dues, £1 or \$2.40 or equivalent.) For articles and letters to the Newsletter, write to: IU NEWSLETTER, P.O. Box 52, Jackson Heights, N.Y. 11372, U.S.A. For membership and other matters relating to the Union, write to: IULVTFT, 177 Vauxhall Bridge Rd., London, S.W.1, England.

MESSAGE FROM ASHLEY MITCHELL (Huddersfield, England)

President of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade

At the recent Conference of the International Union at Caswell Bay, Wales, I was elected President in succession to Joseph S. Thompson of San Francisco, who wished to retire after giving yeoman service for about ten years. I am the last surviving officer of these who were appointed when the Union was instituted in Copenhagen in 1926, I have been one of your treasurers since that time, and I feel honored now in being elected President. We have had some grand Georgists as President: Senator Charles O'Connor Hennessy of New Jersey; E.J. Craigie, M.P., South Australia; Bue Bjørner, M.P., Denmark; J. Rupert Mason of San Francisco; Judge Frank Lucas of South Africa; and last but not least, Joe Thompson.

What a different world it would be now if the messages of those eminent men, and hosts of other dedicated Georgists, had been adopted, even in those countries where the policy has been partially adopted. Great benefits would have ensued. What a wonderful thing it would be if one of the leading countries where there is democracy and some measure of freedom, were able to say to nations like India or South Vietnam, "Why don't you collect the economic rent as we have done? Look how it has made our problems so much less. There is no color problem now, because there is real opportunity for all!" Now people are born into a world where land is barred to them, whereas it is a necessity for life itself. Then these miserable people are told to reduce the birth rate. And we talk of ourselves as civilized!

The International Union exists to make a world cause for Georgists and to help any of our brethren in any country where they have a chance to make progress. For that effort we need hosts of additional members. If people agree with our objects, they can join us and help to give us the necessary extra strength. Friends have sent us some good ideas on organization, but before we can think of them we must have more members. Ask your friends everywhere!

* * *

WELCOME TO IULVTFT!

* * *

Many friends have recently joined the International Union and we welcome their participation. Among them are:

GEORGE L. COLLINS, Director of the Philadelphia Henry George School and custodian of the Henry George Birthplace. He has recently appeared on radio and television programs and participates in neighborhood improvement programs.

E.C. HARWOOD, Director of the American Institute for Economic Research, Great Barrington, Mass. A recent Economic Education Bulletin of the Institute was titled "How to Make Slums and Create Barbarians," which showed that our present system is doing this, and pointed to LVT as the way to reverse it.

WILBUR JOHNSON, civic leader of Chicago, who writes a column, "The Needle," for The Chicago Gazette. Mr. Johnson offers a prize of \$2,000 to any one who can refute Progress and Poverty. He upped it from \$500 as there were no takers at that price!

STAN RUBENSTEIN, Director of the Long Island Henry George School. He went to Washington recently to testify before the House Ways and Means Committee on reforming the income tax. Guess what he wound up advocating. Stan also conducts a lively series of radio programs on Long Island.

PERCY R. WILLIAMS, Executive Secretary of the Henry George Foundation of America, Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Williams was recently interviewed by the Courier-Journal Times of Louisville, Ky., on how Pittsburgh's Graded Tax (taxing land at twice the rate of buildings) is a potent weapon against urban decay.

News of Caswell Bay is filtering through to this Antipodes, some 12,000 miles away. Old friends and new friends met, it seems, but what, apart from the emotional aspect, arose from the Conference that was of real value?

The following resolution was passed unanimously (*); I am informed: "That the equal right to land be secured by requiring of all landholders the payment of an annual tax on the value of the land held whether it is used or not and excluding the value of the improvements thereon; and that such taxation, national and municipal, be based on a valuation showing the true value of the land, this valuation being made public and being kept up to date by periodic revision." All the old jargon!

1. Who wants an equal right to land? Very few that I know would be interested. I want rent collected for administrative revenue - that enables the abolition of taxes - that means better buying power for the workers. That has appeal.

2. The little word "rent" is not mentioned.

3. The word "secured" conjures up the image of a white man about to be burned at the stake by Injuns.

4. The choice of verbiage brings to mind Lord Kitchener for some reason.

5. The quantity of verbiage is excessive: "requiring of all land holders the payment of an annual tax on the value of land" and "taxation...based on a valuation showing the true value of land," is repetition.

6. How much tax on the value of land? 10% or 100%?

7. Annual value of land or "unimproved capital value of land"?

8. If 100% of the annual value of land is intended, then who is to decide what is "the true value of land," and by what method?

Rolland O'Regan of New Zealand, not present to support his case, has a point, too. The days of hundreds of miners each digging his own hold in a hillside are gone. In my experience, a large mining enterprise of today assumes the whole area containing the ore-body, after surveys, then it gears its program to the ultimate clearance of the whole lode. Beyond its perimeter is virgin bush, available "for a song."

Now how will it be valued for "Georgist purposes"?

1. Using the methods employed at, say Whitstable, the valuer ignores the improvements on the area and considers the value of the site in the context of the surrounding sites. Answer - a nil value.

2. Will the valuer take into account the potential value of the seam? Only the mine-owners, surveyors and engineers know that, and would they tell him? He might engage his own team of surveyors and duplicate the work. This would be a powerful discouragement to prospectors and miners.

3. He might levy a royalty of so much per ton of output. This frequently happens at present and is a tax on production and thus is in no way Georgist.

And what of the off-shore oil wells? What would "land value taxation" yield for public revenue from them? These questions have "bugged" me for years and Dr. O'Regan obviously, too, but I have no sympathy whatsoever with his remedy - "public" ownership. What is the answer?

There are many things to be discussed and clarified - and answers found.

(*) This was part of a resolution passed at the 1949 Conference, reaffirmed in 1968.

LAND RENT AS PUBLIC REVENUE

ERIC STANDRING (Claremont, W. Australia) writes:

In Allan Hutchinson's paper for the Caswell Bay Conference, his statistics are already out of date. For instance, he gives mining royalties as \$291,000, whereas last year they were \$5,200,000 in Western Australia, and this year will show a very large increase on that. Things are moving at a great rate here, so statistics of three years ago are ancient history.

ALLAN R. HUTCHINSON (Victoria, Australia) replies:

It is true that the mineral royalty position is rapidly changing and that the public treasury in Western Australia is benefiting more than other States as a result of these changes. For that base year I used, fiscal 1964-65, the mineral royalties received by the Western Australian Government were \$291,354, but for the year 1967, mineral royalties received by it were \$5,166,463. This is an enormous increase and in the right direction. The result is that taxes upon labor and its products in that State are so much less than otherwise, to produce the same public revenue.

However, this great change has no appreciable bearing upon the value of the statistics in my paper and the conclusions to be drawn from them. The figures for mining and forestry royalties were shown in my paper in separate columns to give a complete picture of the extent to which public revenue was drawn from natural resources in Australia at that common date for the various States. But these royalties were excluded from consideration in the tables on pages 13 to 15 which arrive at the proportion of the site rent potential collected as public revenue. This is clearly indicated in a footnote to the table.

The proportion publicly collected is the sum of the amounts shown under land-value taxes, land value rates and land rents, divided by the site rent potential of the land in private occupation subject to these charges.

The revenue under these various headings does not vary greatly from year to year as does that from mining and forestry royalties. The one other element that has increased rapidly since the base year in Western Australia is the price of land. Unless further extension of land value taxation occurs in that State, the proportion of the site rent potential collected for public purposes may show a fall when similar checks are made in later years.

In a note accompanying my paper it was indicated that the proportion of the site rent potential collected for public revenue in South Australia and Western Australia would be a little greater than shown. This was because several rating authorities for irrigation and drainage services had not submitted their returns at the time of preparing the report.

These returns are now available and show the additions for South Australia for 1964-65 to be \$532,602 in water rates for irrigation areas plus \$52,408 based on the unimproved value of the land in irrigation towns. The first figure mentioned is a rate based on the irrigable acreage held. In addition, the Southeastern Drainage Board levied drainage rates of \$58,737 and betterment rates of \$13,590. These are both based on the unimproved value of the land. In all they add \$657,337 to the portion publicly collected, making the total for South Australia \$19,321,000; and the percentage of the site rent potential collected becomes 23 instead of 22 as shown on page 13.

Similarly, the Western Australian irrigation charges add \$306,188 to the previous total for that State, making its new total \$15,534,000 publicly collected. In this case the proportion is unaltered.

RENT AND PRICE

By GASTON HAXO (St. Petersburg, Fla., U.S.A.)

Does economic rent enter into the market price of labor products? It would be hard to believe that this question was never discussed by the followers of Henry George in the early days of the movement; no doubt it was. But if so, it was not settled to everybody's satisfaction, for in 1931, when a book by Emil Jorgensen came out, in which he asserted that rent is part of price, a controversy arose which threatened to split the Georgist movement into two factions. The two opposite views were hotly debated, but the question was not definitely settled at that time, nor since.

Fortunately, the matter is of small consequence, inasmuch as it is taken care of by the natural law and our opinions cannot have any effect. However, for those Georgists who have undertaken to set the people right on these matters, it is of the utmost importance that they be ready with an answer and it had better be the correct one.

Let us begin by stating briefly the arguments advanced by those who took the negative side:

"Rent is merely a differential."

"Rent measures the advantage which attaches to a location because the cost of production there is less than it would be at an inferior location."

"If the rent-payer, the producer, could transfer the rent to the selling price of his product, he would be getting back what he paid for the advantage that nature, location, and the presence of the community gave him. In such case also, the purchasers of the commodity would be paying for advantages of location and fertility. This they are spared, however, for they can buy in an open purchasing market."

"If the rent could be transferred to the price, it would give the producer the advantages of recouping for the payment of a privilege that is peculiarly his and that only he should pay for. The user of the site would be paid for what the community produced and thus establishing another form of unearned increment. But nature is wiser than its creators and rent cannot be transferred to price."

All agree that rent is a differential which measures the advantages attaching to a location, where the cost of production and/or distribution is lower. We all know that the landowners collect it, but the point at issue is, who pays it and how is it collected?

A producer on land having a rental value produces at a lower cost than the producer on free marginal land, yet he gets the same price in the market. Is it not obvious that he collects the rent, which is his as a landowner, and which he must pay to the landowner if he is a tenant? How else could he collect it?

Those who argue that rent is not part of price, claim that the producer on rent-bearing land enjoys a privilege for which he alone should pay and not transfer to the buyer of his product. They forget that this privilege is the lower cost of the product, hence it is enjoyed by the producer, only if he consumes his product; but when he sells it, the buyer becomes the beneficiary of the lower-cost privilege and must pay for it. This he does when he pays the market price, which is the lower cost plus rent, plus wages. A simple illustration should make this clear:

Farmer B on marginal land produces cabbages at a cost of 4 cents, which he sells in the open market for 10 cents, realizing a profit of 6 cents (his wages).

Farmer A, on a better location in town, produces similar cabbages for 2 cents. Because of the greater fertility of his land, nearness to market, etc., plus com-

munity services, his land has a rental value. When he sells in the same open market, he realizes a profit of 8 cents, i.e., 2 cents more than B. This extra profit represents the advantage of location expressed in the rental value of his land. Therefore, the 8 cent profit is not all wages, but 6 cents wages and 2 cents rent. When the consumer buys his cabbages for 10 cents, he is paying 2 cents rent, unaware of it, of course, but paying it nevertheless. And why shouldn't he? It would have cost him exactly the same had he rented the land and hired A to do the work.

When we buy a labor product, we are in effect exchanging our product for that of another producer. What we get in exchange, i.e., what we buy, is truly our own production; Henry George taught us that in the first chapter of Progress and Poverty. Thus we are virtually using the land on which it was produced, and if that land had a rental value, that rent or part of it is included in the market price. And that is as it should be. If the market price did not include the rent, the consumer would be buying at a lower cost than the buyer of the marginal product; hence he would be collecting the rent instead of the landowner, and how could we ever recover it?

In the operation of the free market we see two forces at work: the profit motive and free competition. The profit motive prevents the landowner from selling below the market price, thus forcing him to collect the rent. Competition prevents him from selling above the market price and collect more rent than the differential relating to the cost of production. Thus we see the wisdom of nature in including rent in the priceis that it remains with the landowner from whom it can be collected and returned to the people. The customary demonstration of the Law of Rent shows rent and wages as so many units of wealth, rent being the "excess produce" which may or may not be sold, but assuming that it is sold, the price would most certainly include rent, for as a matter of fact the price thereof would be nothing but rent. Thus:

	A	B	C	D	
Produce	30	25	20	10 Margin	
Rent	20	15	10	0	(All rent - no wages)
Wages	10	10	10	10	(All wages - no rent)

But to see that rent is part of price it is necessary to show rent as a factor in the cost of production. Thus:

Ratio of cost	1/3	2/5	1/2	1
Total sales	\$60.00	\$50.00	\$40.00	\$20.00
Rent	40.00	30.00	20.00	0.00
Wages	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Rent per unit	1.33	1.20	1.00	0.00
Wages per unit	0.67	0.80	1.00	2.00
Market price	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00

NEW ERA (Nairobi, Kenya), edited by Kul Bhushan, has started in its January 1969 issue a series of articles on International Trade for secondary school students. In the introductory article it is stated: "Kenya does not make any motor cars, yet Kenyans can buy them without difficulty. Britain does not grow any tea, yet Britons can buy any amount they like. America does not produce any sisal, yet Americans can order any quantity. How does this happen?... The answer is International Trade. It is this trade which keeps the exports and imports moving from country to country and earns money for us all. NEW ERA starts a new series of 'teach yourself' lessons in International Trade which is what the newspapers are full of every day of the year."

سید علی

Iran has many problems, including the land question, with which the Shah has been trying to grapple. Large holdings were ordered to be distributed to peasants, but they were not exactly given away, as peasants had to pay either in a cash price or in installments.

A law was passed in 1962 establishing the maximum limit of ownership for landowners. Any landowner may keep ownership of one village which is defined as a residential area for a number of people whose main occupation is farming. The area of land is not taken into account.

Some landowners, under this law, had to give up 49 of their 50 villages. However, there is no limit to the size of the one village they may keep. It is said that landowners consented to this law because of the fear of Communism.

The 1962 law also deals with land appraisal and payment of price. The Ministry of Agriculture first determines a standard conversion index for each region. The distance of villages from cities is taken into account, also village revenue, and the manner in which the crop is divided between tenant farmer and landlord. The result of this index and the land tax of any estate determine the value of that estate. For example, if the index for a region is 120 and the land tax of that village 20,000 Rials, then the price of the village is $120 \times 20,000$ or 2,400,000 Rials.

There is a new Property Reconstruction tax act for the taxation of real estate according to assessed value. A property valued at 10,000 Rials will pay a tax of 8.35 Rials. This includes both land and buildings.

The land reform and new tax law fall far short of the effective type of land and tax reform we want, but at least it is some kind of start.

+

MAXIME TOUBEAU: 1883-1969

Commandeur de la Légion d'Honneur

Directeur Honoraire au Ministère de l'Agriculture

Président de la Ligue pour la Réforme Foncière, Fiscale et le Libre-Echange

Le 21 mars 1969 est décédé à Meudon, France, M. Maxime Toubéau, fils d'Albert Maximilien Toubéau, l'auteur de la répartition métrique d'un impôt foncier sur le sol, destiné à remplacer les autres impôts, tant directs qu'indirects.

C'est autour de celui-ci que se rassemblait un petit groupe qu'on peut qualifier de "Néo-Physiocrates Français," et c'est lui qui organisa en juin 1889, lors de l'Exposition Internationale du Centenaire de la Grande Révolution, le Congrès Agraire de Paris que présidait l'illustre théoricien de l'Impôt Unique, Henry George. Le fameux livre de celui-ci, Progrès et Pauprété avait fait tour du monde, traduit dans la plupart des langues. L'ancien secrétaire du Comte Léon Tolstol, Victor Lebrun, cita à Maxime Toubéau les paroles de Tolstol, "Pour lutter contre l'idée de Henry George, il n'existe que deux moyens: la dénaturer et la taire."

Dans cet ordre d'idées, Maxime Toubéau a non seulement conservé la mémoire de son père, mais il s'est voué à la propagande de ces principes, autant que possible, même pendant ses fonctions d'employé du Ministère d'Agriculture, jusqu'à un haut degré, et surtout, quand ayant pris sa retraite, il se chargea du travail de secrétaire, et après la mort de Daudé-Bancel, de la Présidence de la Ligue pour la Réforme Foncière, Fiscale et le Libre Echange, avec le journal, Terre et Liberté. Un géorgiste très pur et très dédié nous a laissé.

— PAVLOS GIANNELIAS (Lyon, France)

LVT IN OLD JERSEY By BENJAMIN F. SMITH (Grand Rapids, Mich., U.S.A.)

Following the Caswell Bay Conference, my wife and I visited the Channel island Jersey, on the way to France. We noticed that there were no slums, no poverty, no unemployment on this pleasant island of 45 square miles and 66,000 people. I said to my wife that they had to have some kind of land taxation. Upon inquiry, I was at first told there was no land tax. But I found that there is a property tax and a tax on land is included in it.

Jersey is virtually free of the United Kingdom and has its own "Parlement." All twelve of the parishes have assessment committees for assessing property according to the law.

The law requires that the rating (local taxing) of all property, land and improvements, be related to its "rental value" which "shall be the rent at which it might reasonably be expected to let from year to year." The basic information for the rating is supplied by the "foncier" (owner) and is spot-checked through income tax information, and it is reasonably accurate.

The Jersey assessors make five different decisions, depending on the property: 1st, the annual rent for the foncier-occupier is made reasonably low for improved property, and legal deductions are made; 2nd, if similar property is rented at a different figure, this becomes the assessment of the property in question; 3rd, vacant unused land (of which there is very little) is rated very low; 4th, a legal deduction of 50% is made from the assessment of rented agricultural land; 5th, there is no deduction on non-agricultural land.

These decisions form the basis of the rating of the foncier - and also for the separate rating of the occupier. By deducing that the tax paid by the "rentier" (occupier, if a different person from the owner) is primarily an improvement tax (a tax which can be shifted) and the tax paid by the foncier is primarily a land tax (a tax which cannot be shifted), I arrived at the following:

£360,000 annual tax on land
 £310,000 annual tax on improvements

Taking into account the different valuations of each, the proportion of tax on land is four times that on improvements.

Jersey is fourth in the world as to per capita income. Based on the data I assembled, following is my recapitulation of the distribution of wealth in Jersey, using the avenues of distribution of Fundamental Economics:

	<u>Millions of £</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Wages</u>		
Private - 32.47	} 36.0	67.9
Public - 3.63		
<u>Rent</u>		
Private - 6.2	} 7.0	13.2
Public - .8		
<u>Interest</u>		
Private - 6.8	} 9.2	17.4
Public - 2.4		
Tourists' share of impôt (tax)	.8	1.5
	<hr/> 53.0	<hr/> 100.0
Less £8 mil. imported income	- 8.0	
	<hr/> 45.0	

HOW TO UNDERSTAND THE SINGLE TAX ON LAND RENT

By PERCY R. WILLIAMS (Pittsburgh, Pa., U.S.A.)

The Single Tax is a tax on land value or rent. And if we are to correctly understand the Single Tax it is essential that we understand both the nature of rent and the nature of taxation.

We find that there are different concepts of rent and different concepts of taxation and as a result the Single Tax may be misinterpreted even by those who profess a strong belief in its merits.

Land rent has certain unique characteristics that appear like magic. But there is nothing mysterious about rent. Rent is simply one of the categories into which the wealth produced from time to time is distributed.

Rent is not a free gift; it is a tribute. Rent is wealth, and like any other wealth, it is usually measured in dollars or other currencies. In the language of David Ricardo, "Rent is that portion of the produce of the earth which is paid to the landlord. Rent is the sum paid to the landlord for the use of the land, and for the use of the land only."

Private property in land tends to produce land monopoly and land speculation, and this fact led the author of the Single Tax to the conclusion that "we must make land common property."

Henry George declared that private property in land is the robber who deprives labor of its fair share of the product. And because landowners have a degree of monopoly power, they demand and receive not merely all that the land is worth to the user because of superior productivity, but in addition, much excess rent. This excess rent is called "monopoly rent" or "speculative rent." The Single Tax is intended to eliminate speculative rent by increasing competition between landowners.

As a realist, Henry George reached the conclusion that it is not necessary to confiscate land to combat the evils of private property in land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent. And he was confident that this could be done effectively by using the power of taxation. Furthermore, the method of taxation was admirably adapted to gradual or partial application. And it took into account the possibility that partial application of the land value tax might prove sufficient to achieve as much land reform as is actually needed.

But the power of taxation could be used for this purpose only by assuming that a tax on the value of land could not be shifted in any manner. Because if this tax were shifted it would permit the landowner to escape payment of the tax and it would become actually a tax to be paid by labor and capital as land users.

There is no question as to the meaning of shiftability. If the landowner could increase land prices, the tax could be shifted and thus would be ineffective. But if the landowner could not increase the price of land, the tax would be non-shiftable and hence would exert pressure to reduce land prices.

The Single Tax leaves the right of private title to present landowners but is designed to limit their economic power to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the degree of application.

* * *

(Editor's note re next to last paragraph: It is right to say that the land value tax is not shiftable, but the question of what happens to land values when the land value tax is increased is another matter. A small increase in the tax with proportionate lowering of building tax may increase land values, because of more building, etc. If the land tax were increased beyond a certain point, land values would then start to fall. The increase would have to be such that less net rent remains to the landowner after the community improves and gross rent goes up, than the net rent was before the increase and the improvement. - R.C.)

WHAT IS A SINGLE TAX?

By DOMENIC DELLA VOLPE (Delray Beach, Fla., U.S.A.)

Single tax No. 1 is not single tax No. 2, or No. 3, or any other. In Italian it is "unico dazio", the unique tax; in French it is "impôt unique." In both it is the one and only. In English it is not as clear, but Henry George defined it as the one and only and once only, the non-recurrent direct tax on publicly generated site utility value. This is only one of a family of "single taxes":

1. The one and only tax on labor products; the recurrent cumulative tax on producers and consumers. This is the empire-wrecking tax.
2. The one and only tax on everything taxable, a first-class buster of authoritarian and libertarian regimes alike. It is less harmful where people are privileged to make mistakes at their own expense.
3. The tax on that part of the gross national product called site value to confuse its producers. This one is out of bounds in all countries except Denmark.

The public would nail a politician's hide to the barn door at the mention of one direct tax, and all because nobody asked which single tax is under discussion.

So which single tax are you talking about, brother?

* * *

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

By J. J. POT (Slikkeveer, Netherlands)

Land value taxation is not taxation at all. If an individual pays to the community income unearned by him, but earned by the community, how can taxation be involved at all? "To tax" means "to burden," according to the dictionary, and clearly no burden is involved when you give up something that isn't yours!

Land value taxation has nothing to do with value. As soon as you tax away the whole rent, the land is no longer making any money, its price is zero, and how can a selling price of zero be a yardstick for calculating rent?

Land value taxation has not to do with land alone but with all gifts of nature. Yes, I know that it is an academic nicety to explain what you mean by the word "land" in an economic sense, but it is a lot more than "land" in common parlance.

"Land value taxation," then, is the wrong wording. What we aim to do is collect for the community the site rent. But what is the meaning of rent? It is a theoretic term. And the word comes from political economy having been worked out in a system of agriculture. It is misleading - so to avoid misunderstanding, let us avoid the word "rent."

Is land rent a form of royalty? If we grant a license to a mining company, they pay for it with a royalty. We have to extend the royalty idea to all gifts of nature, land included. Therefore our Union should be named the World Movement for Revenue from Royalties.

But while collecting royalties may be the method, it is not our principle. So let us name our movement after our principle: The gifts of nature are for the people. Let us say, World Movement for the Common Property of Terrestrial Bounty.

The gifts of nature are for all; but the services and tangible things that stem from an individual's mind and hands are his. It is this that we call justice. So let's call our Union the World Justice Movement.

On the other hand, from the point of view of propaganda, the abolition of poverty with a basic income may be more appealing. Give people their birthright, their equal share of the world's bounty, their basic income out of royalties from natural and social privileges. So: World Movement for a Basic Income.