

February 4, 1983

Mr. William W. Newcomb 531 West Pine Road Melbourne, FL 32901

Dear Bill:

Thank you for your thoughts and the challenge to convince you of the worth of concentrating on Philadelphia as a target for land value taxation. What you say cannot be simply discounted, and I hope this letter provides an acceptable response.

As to Philadelphia, then, I believe the following points are significantly in its favor and worthy of support:

- Philadelphia is home to what is presently the most successfull educational operation in the movement. Despite problems of location, George Collins has developed a solid faculty (as well as several others) who have been and are willing to devote considerable time and personal expense to Georgist activities;
- While the City of Pittsburgh has been the primary recipient of acclaim as a "land value tax" haven, establishing a direct correlation between economic growth and its differential rates is severely hampered because its property tax is levied by three individual jurisdictions (city, school district and county) and only the city has the land heavy emphasis. Philadelphia has one unified system of property taxes and is administered as a city/county in one;
- Links to the city's political structure have increased markedly during the past two or three years, both in the Republican and Democratic parties. Evidence of support for land value taxation by the Philadelphia Inquirer has resulted in periodic articles in support of the measure;
- The primary use to which funds would be utilized here would be to purchase a modern, microcomputer-word processing system. This equipment is vital for conducting meaningful parcel studies and for producing professional-quality news releases, analyses, etc. (Similar studies could also be performed for other communities as the opportunities arose.).



Mr. Wiliam W. Newcomb Page Two February 4, 1983

Bill, I hope you will eventually agree that Philadelphia is much much more than simply the most recent city to entertain our measure for property tax restructuring. The difference between our "organization" here and in New York, or elsewhere, is that the school represents a real mechanism for developing activists. To be sure, the process is slow; but the achievements are real. Additionally, not only are those of us living in metropolitan Philadelphia involved, but we are working closely with Mike Curtis, Frank Nelson and others in Delaware.

There are limitations to what we can do, however. Even George Collins has an active career in the theatre. This is true of everyone involved. Acquiring some capital in the form of a microcomputer will definitely improve our productivity, perhaps enabling time and effort to be spent on many of the smaller communities.

A few comments in response to the book on newsletters. No, I have not had the opportunity to more than glance at the book. Besides the demands of my career, I am constantly writing articles and letters, etc. as well as working on research for the type of book you and I have discussed. What I have done is pass the book on to someone else in our group who has a marketing background. You may be correct in your assumption that apathy exists in the movement. I can assure you there is none here in Philadelphia. Frank Nelson is still working on the latest issue of Equal Rights, so I have not yet seen your letter directed to our little publication.

You are probably correct about Robert Chitester. Prior to ever learning of his membership in the International Union I wrote to him on the subject of land monopoly and he responded with absolutely no understanding of economic issues. He is obviously a libertarian and unread.

Sincerely yours,

Ed Dodson

EJD:ah