

IT DOES MATTER By DAVID A. MacMURCHIE (Dundee, Scotland)

Re the article "Does It Matter?" by V. H. Blundell in GJ No. 39, I believe him to be entirely wrong. In Political Economy we must get the terms right and be consistent. And, contrary to what Vic says, the dispute is in course of being settled.

Taxes are an impost and if a person is led to believe he has a possession likely to be taxed, he will resist strongly any impost that reduces the benefit derived from his possession. As regards land: we say in this country, there is no such thing as absolute ownership: "the king only, therefore, hath absolutem et directum dominium... A subject hath only the usufruct not the Absolute property of the soil." Consequently, the highest possession a person may have is a tenancy in fee simple!

This therefore is where we start: the land belongs to the community and any person who wishes to use it pays the community - no taxes involved! Put another way: "Community living," says Shirley-Anne Hardy, "is natural to man", and each settled community spontaneously generates a fund for its growth and maintenance: no taxes involved!

However, if Dick Turpin or the "Duke of Pork" steals that revenue, a substitute is improvised - that something is taxation and taxation, corrupt and corrupting, has the power to destroy! Why then should natural revenue be confused with taxation?

* * * * *