

**Candidate Questionnaire for
San Francisco Democratic County Central Committee
Primary Election, June 7, 2016**

Please return this questionnaire electronically to contact_us@phdemclub.org **no later than Monday, April 4th**. Candidates who do not return the questionnaire by the due date will not be invited to appear at our April 12th endorsement meeting. Questionnaires will be made available to our members online.

Candidate name: David Giesen
Contact person: David Giesen
Email address: info@TheCommonsSF.org
Phone number: 415-948-4265
Web site: <http://www.TheCommonsSF.org>

Please write a brief response (≤200 words) to each question.

1. Why are you running for the DCCC and what do you hope to accomplish if elected or re-elected?

I wish to assist in educating the electorate regarding the determinant role land values play in politics. When fully aware of real estate dynamics, voters will be able to effectively fix many of the most daunting issues facing San Francisco, including housing issues and the wealth divide. The DCCC is a wonderful vehicle for engaging in this educational process because it is relatively free of the lobbying interests afflicting legislative bodies.

2. Please describe your current and past community activism.

1) I have directed a fee-free school of adult continuing education, the Henry George School, since 1996.

2) I have led a weekly walking tour of San Francisco social movement history (with relevance to today's issues) since 1997.

3) Since 2006 I have hosted an occasional neighborhood forum, Red Hill Jumps, featuring arts and politics.

3. Would you support closing the campaign finance loophole that allows candidates running for their party's Central Committee to raise unlimited funds, while other candidates for local elected office are limited to \$500 per donor? Why or why not?

Sure, I support closing that campaign finance loophole. But building on my wholistic social philosophy that recognizes that land values arise with the emergence and presence of community, I would advocate for public policy that most fully socializes land values. Genuine and full-fledged campaign finance reform must, at last, remove unearned income from the pockets of private parties. Unearned income derived from monopoly—private ownership of land values being the most harmful to society's interests—is the greatest corrupter of politics.

4. Please name the 3 endorsements of which you are most proud.

When I get yours, I'll proudly place that in front.

Continued on next page

5. Please indicate, and explain, your position on the following past ballot propositions.

- Proposition G (2014), Additional Transfer Tax on Residential Property Sold Within 5 Years of Purchase
 - Supported____ Opposed____ Why? I believe I voted in favor of this well-meaning but kooky proposition. In the absence of socializing land values through an ad valorem tax that collects upwards of 50% of the potential rent of land, ideas like this get floated. The long-term effect of such transfer taxes is to concentrate land ownership by discouraging sales; in the end it means more unearned land rent in the pockets of fewer owners.
- Proposition F (2015), Short-Term Residential Rentals
 - Supported__X__ Opposed____ Why? This one I know I voted for,

but it is kooky too, and for similar reasons as noted above. As long as there is RENT-SEEKING to be done, owners of land value will seek it out. The only way to discourage, even eliminate, master tenants and owners alike from trying to game the short-term rental market at the expense of long-term renters is to socialize land values completely, and thus cut off rent-seeking at the knees. Anything short of this will only redirect rent-seeking into new paths. Still, sometimes it's better to slow the express train of rent-seeking down a little bit rather than to haplessly do nothing. Perhaps in the brief respite of time we may find time for profound education.

5. The population of SF is up, but Democratic Party registration and turnout have mostly been down in recent years. What specifically will you do to improve the Party's registration efforts and organization in District 10?

By taking up real estate economic dynamics education in an honest fashion, the Democratic Party stands a good chance of regaining the trust of the electorate, a trust long broken by talking about how taxes on work are preferable to taxes on monopoly. Bad taxes are those on work such as income taxes on earned income, business taxes, and sales taxes. Good taxes are those levied on monopolies such land values, taxi medallions, and radio frequency rents. The Democratic Party in SF as elsewhere has abandoned the working person to sales taxes and business taxes while pandering to the real estate land value rent-seeking class.

Thank you for your time and your commitment to public service. Pending timely receipt of your questionnaire, we look forward to seeing you at the Potrero Hill Neighborhood House on April 12th.

Executive Committee, Potrero Hill Democratic Club