

Committee on Taxation, Resources and Economic Development

574 A Bolton Hall

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Telephone: 414-228-4402

WELD S. CARTER, Executive Secretary
125 Oakwood Drive, Antioch, Illinois 60002
Telephone: (312) 395-3884

CHAIRMAN:

ARTHUR P. BECKER
Professor of Economics
University of Wisconsin -
Milwaukee

PAUL E. ALYEA
Emeritus Professor of Finance
University of Alabama

KARL FALK
Professor of Economics
Fresno State College

M. MASON GAFFNEY
Professor of Economics
University of Wisconsin -
Milwaukee

HAROLD M. GROVES
Professor of Economics
The University of Wisconsin

DANIEL M. HOLLAND
Professor of Finance
Massachusetts Institute
of Technology

RICHARD W. LINDHOLM
Dean
School of Business Administration
University of Oregon

ARTHUR D. LYNN, JR.
Professor of Economics
Associate Dean of Faculties
The Ohio State University

CARL McGUIRE
Chairman
Department of Economics
University of Colorado

WILLIAM S. VICKREY
Professor of Economics
Faculty of Political Science
Columbia University

February 5, 1968

Dear Frances:

How much difference does it make whether taxation is on production or on land values?

A small group of professors who thought this difference important met in New York in 1960. Their purpose was to consider how more academic attention might be focused on it.

The group concluded that both scholars and policy-makers have need of a modern literature exploring the contrasting effects of these two taxes in the context of present-day economic and social problems. It recommended that this literature be developed through conferences in which experts would be asked to investigate the pros and cons of these alternative tax methods.

The original ad hoc group evolved into a permanent steering committee - TRED - whose distinguished membership only begins to reveal the latent sympathy and support the venture has enlisted. TRED's major work thus far has been the holding of annual conferences on various aspects of its basic theme.

Out of these conferences now come, through the medium of The University of Wisconsin Press, two books:

Extractive Resources and Taxation edited by Mason Gaffney
and
Property Taxation--USA edited by Richard W. Lindholm

The enclosed Press announcement describes the contents and structure of these books. It also suggests why scholars and policy-makers alike will be interested in them. An order blank and a postage-free envelope are also included.

TRED commends these to you as worthy increments to the literature it is continuing to foster.

Sincerely,

Weld S. Carter
Executive Secretary

Committee on Taxation, Resources and Economic Development

(T R E D)

Conference Procedures

The purpose of these conferences is to produce scholarly literature on natural resource taxation related to economic development. The conferences are three-day events. Panels are limited to about fourteen participants and a few selected auditors and discussants. Each participant is invited to make a 30-minute exploratory presentation, to introduce his topic. This is followed by informal discussion.

Participants are expected to bring their papers to the conference in substantially final form and in sufficient quantities to distribute to conference members. However, in order that the papers may reflect the influence of the conference itself - to whatever extent such influence has been exerted - the editor of the proceedings will accept revisions for a four (4) week period following the end of the Milwaukee meeting.

All panelists are asked to attend for the full length of the conference. Generally we gather for supper the evening before the opening, to meet each other and to be on hand for the start of the conference. The final afternoon is devoted to a Conference Summary designed to highlight important findings. Participation by all conferees produces an effective opportunity for a real synthesis of the ground covered.

The conferences are problem-oriented, but the quality of participation assures attention to theory and the interplay of theory and fact have made these spirited and stimulating events.

Editing of papers for publication is held to a minimum. However, the importance of adhering to the conference theme and purpose must be emphasized, since the objective is to publish, not mere proceedings, but a related book whose preface and summary can depict these relations and conclusions to whatever extent reached.

The conference is limited to morning and afternoon sessions. A family picnic and an off-campus dinner party are among planned diversions. The conference is held at Kenwood Hall, conference center of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. This is a gracious estate on a bluff overlooking Lake Michigan. It affords complete facilities: sleeping quarters, meals and conference hall in excellent conference atmosphere. The address is 3230 East Kenwood Boulevard; telephone: 414 228-4634.

All expenses of conferees are met by outside support. Where requested, major transportation expenses will be advanced before the conference by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. An exemption certificate will be provided to obviate the transportation tax. For those coming by car, the Foundation will allow the equivalent of aircoach fare - the class of air travel it asks you to use - or 10¢ a mile for points within about 250 miles of Milwaukee.

To the limit of Kenwood's facilities, guests may bring members of their families, for which they will be billed direct by the University's Housing Department.

250/12.50 plus actual travel
4/67

APR 3 1968

March 29, 1968

TRED meeting
1968

A REPORT

to

TRED Members and the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

from

Weld S. Carter

This report consists primarily of the minutes of the TRED meeting of January 19-20, 1968.

However, it also includes other closely related material, necessary for the record - especially for those not at the meeting. This related material will appear, single-spaced, in appropriate places throughout the report, to make this as clear as possible to the readers. The actual minutes will be double-spaced.

On January 19 just before the TRED meeting, Tom Webb of the University of Wisconsin Press telephoned your secretary to announce Press acceptance of the '67 TRED proceedings. But the terms and circumstances surrounding this acceptance were unusual and, when reported to each member on his arrival, were to affect the meeting strongly.

In his telephone call, Tom had explained that Art Lynn's manuscript had originally been sent to two readers, both economists. Both had approved it, and in quite glowing terms, and it was so reported to the Publication Committee at its December meeting.

But one member of this committee, who had also read the manuscript, raised objections: 1) both reviewers were economists; 2) both had leanings sympathetic to TRED; 3) as the conference had dealt with administration as well as economics, it should also be reviewed by a property tax administration political scientist.

The committee so deciding, the manuscript was resubmitted and this time the judgment was negative.

The basis was that the manuscript contained nothing new in the field of administration. Significantly, the reviewer put his finger on the word "administration" - a matter to which I shall later allude.

At its January meeting the Publication Committee probed this review in detail. It was felt that TRED might be running out of steam, might be calling on the same people to say things already recorded at its earlier conferences and elsewhere. It required the intercession of Tom Webb for the manuscript finally to be approved by a 5 - 4 vote.

Naturally, we were elated that a third volume was now accepted - and so promptly - and Art Lynn was commended for his fine achievement; but we were concerned at the divided vote and at the challenge this carried to TRED. There was a definite urgency in TRED's subsequent meeting. Specifically, the response of the meeting was that TRED has only begun its twin tasks of exploring the unique characteristics of land value taxation and of attracting fellow economists to this exploration.

In this sense, Tom Webb's report proved highly constructive. For it made us all realize that, despite our successes, we cannot rest on our laurels.

The meeting had been called to take up a submitted agenda and such other business as suggested at the meeting. The submitted agenda included:

1. Past Business: disposition of papers from old conferences ('61-'63, '66)
2. Current Business: report on '67 papers and '68 conference
3. Future business: selection of topics and a chairman for '69; consideration of long-range goals and their implementation

Arthur Becker, Mason Gaffney, Dick Lindholm, Carl McGuire and your secretary arrived Friday, January 19. They met over dinner and through Friday evening. Art Lynn and Bill Vickrey arrived after the Friday meeting and participated throughout Saturday's session.

At the outset Friday, Dick suggested that the members participate in TRED's budget-making, so that TRED may plan its affairs more intelligently and further into the future than a few months ahead. The committee agreed and hereafter the secretary will submit such a draft to the members.

Dick also announced his appointment as Program Chairman for the 1968 Annual Conference of the National Tax Association, to be held in San Francisco September 2 - 6. He solicited suggestions for participants and subjects.

Carl reported on the Third Congress of the International Economic Association - once every four years - to be held this year in Montreal. Carl pointed out that this is an unusual opportunity for TRED to have easy access to foreign economists: to discover those with common interests and to acquaint them with TRED. Carl suggested a cocktail party or any other activity that would attract those with latent or active interest in us. This idea was approved as in accordance with the current practice of TRED to

cover association meetings where possible and to meet, formally and informally, with key individuals or groups.

(Various of us have attended meetings of the AEA, the NTA, the Western Economic Association etc. Dick, for instance, has hosted small groups at breakfast and dinner.

Something else we might try at Montreal is having a TRED table in the book display section, with a placard, brochures and publications. The newly formed Evolutionary Economics Association had such a table at the AEA in Washington last Christmas. When I saw it, it was unattended.

The Montreal congress has international trade as its theme, with top US economists on the panel. A drawback is that this congress conflicts with the NTA conference, both being scheduled the week of 9/2 - 9/7. I hope each of you will tell me as promptly as convenient which of these events you intend to attend and how you think TRED can best be represented at these. WSC)

The balance of TRED's Friday evening meeting was devoted to the papers from old conferences.

Arthur Becker's papers. Arthur reported that last year he had selected a few relevant papers from his '61 and '62 conferences, added them to the '66 papers and, with introductions, shipped them to the Press. By early December one reviewer had commented at length and, based on this review, the manuscript was withdrawn from further review pending Arthur's adaptation to the suggestions made.

One was to shorten the work. Another was to subordinate the editor's role. Another was to sharpen focus and get more unity and structure.

Gratifyingly, the reviewer acknowledged the need for a book "on this topic nobody has yet done a good thorough work on the relationship of the property tax (and especially the land value tax) to economic development."

Arthur outlined his plan to TRED: to eliminate four weak papers submitted at the '66 conference; to eliminate three of the four chapters he had writ-

ten; to add one paper recently received; to restructure these for unity and focus.

(Although now on leave in Mexico City, Arthur has already largely completed his revisions. He has retitled the book and separated it into three major divisions: one consisting of three papers on theory; a second composed of four on the relationship of the two kinds of property taxes to specific problems of urban development; the last presenting four case studies on Australia/New Zealand, Chile, Colombia and Jamaica. He has rewritten his Chapter 1 and completely revised his Introduction, to fit the present contents. It is close to ready for review. WSC)

The committee then took up the disposition of 9 papers not previously rejected or withdrawn - 1 from '61, 4 from '62, 4 from '66. It was suggested that these be published in the American Journal of Economics and Sociology, if they proved acceptable to Will Lissner. But it was decided this would be presumptuous in respect to the authors. Dick then proposed that TRED ask the Foundation for payments of \$50. apiece to these authors, to accompany the return of the manuscripts, along with the suggestion that they might be submitted to the Journal. The committee so approved.

Review of Conference Papers. In order to obviate the distressing possibility of finally rejecting inferior or irrelevant papers long after the close of conferences, the committee decided to ask all committee members attending conferences to remain for an immediate review of papers just delivered so that such rejections may be made promptly, and in the name of the committee. This would obviate the need for future payments for such papers.

Carl McGuire's '63 Papers. With the stress the Press is currently laying on promptness, your secretary expressed little likelihood that the Press will now accept these papers. But he was promptly overruled: the subject of land and tax reform in less developed countries is so current and still so hot that these papers are not necessarily out of date and can easily be updated.

Dick emphasized his technique: write a covering introduction and sub-

mit it with the papers to the Press; when the reviewer or the Press makes a comment, act on it promptly and resubmit; keep doing this until the work is published. Authors should be given 10 - 15 day deadlines for making suggested changes.

All but one the Carl's papers were strongly defended as valuable by different members of the group. All agreed that an important book could and should be produced from these papers. Carl is still the most ardent advocate of publishing them.

There was, accordingly, no final disposition yet by TRED on Carl's papers. Tacitly, such action was again deferred indefinitely.

This concluded Friday's session. Art Lynn and Bill Vickrey arrived later that night, to join us in Saturday's session.

The '68 Conference on "The Property Tax and Urban Transportation" was Saturday's first business. Bill had five possible participants and fifteen more prospects from property tax/transportation people canvassed. Members suggested many more. (Mason has since sent an additional list. Other such lists will be appreciated. WSC)

It was suggested that Bill draw up an outline of his conference. Bill thought that premature: the conference would acquire its structure from its participants. Mason urged that the conference have a strong opening "lead" as an aid towards an integrated and relevant conference. It was suggested that Bill brainstorm himself as to topic possibilities, mimeographing such a list for prospects, to stimulate and focus their thinking as well as to get their suggestions, as to the subject and as to other participants.

The group then suggested the following topics:

Effects of Transportation on land values (Sherman Maisel,
Winston Churchill)

Benefit/cost analysis of transportation improvements -
the Thorndike "double count"

Financing of transportation - subsidies & taxes vs. user charges
(marginal cost pricing?) ("land value taxation not a user
charge, but a building tax would be in the long run" - Hotelling)

Transportation of things: water, electricity etc.

Vertical transportation (high-rise elevators, VTOL)

Rental of airspace - air corridors (peak hour demand), air waves

Incidence of taxation on transportation - property (and excise) taxes

The topic "Vertical Transportation" was deemed especially useful as
a way of relating transportation to the property tax (the owners of high-rises
paying property taxes on their elevators vs. the subsidies in public subways,
buses, etc.) Other topics were seen to serve as this bridge also and it was
emphasized that the bridging of this gap is the main conference objective,
that transportation is an excellent way to get at land taxation.

Bill expected to have the program completed in April.

'69 Conference Program Chairman: This was expected to be one of
our knottiest problems. But with his usual genius for getting things done,
and quickly, Art Lynn suggested Dan Holland.

The only question in anyone's mind was: will Dan accept? Art
seemed to have a reason for thinking that Dan would. Dan was immediately
chosen. We all hope Art is correct.

'69 Conference Subject: among the many ideas for future conferences suggested both at and prior to the meeting were:

Property Taxation and Population (effects of growth on rents)

Property Taxation and Farm Size (divergent effects in the context of the rural revolution)

Tax Capitalization

Property Tax on the Urban Fringe

Taxation of new forms of "Land" (Space, Radio & TV channels, Air rights) etc.

Rights to Non-reproducible Property

Effects of Land Speculation (role of speculator - socially beneficial or harmful? - "ripening land ")

International Integration

As the discussion of these various subjects progressed, one fact increasingly stood out: the great, immediate job for TRED is to reveal the practicality of land value taxation by demonstrating how land values can be accurately assessed. If, as so many say, land rents should be appropriated for public purposes, it is all-important that TRED show the way to assess land values, the market expression of these rents.

Therefore, subject to Dan's approval, the assessment of land values was chosen as the subject for '69.

The objective will be to cover this broadly and in depth, to produce a definitive book. It will contain such sub-topics as the assessment of the "new forms" of land value (as well as of the old!), the inclusion of spillovers from both public and private improvements, how to handle demolition costs (the Babcock way vs. "appraisers' residual") and how to assess minerals in place. Such a book should advance the case for land value taxation a long way, breaking much new ground.

Previews of Conference Papers: The committee reviewed our practice of offering draft copies of conference papers to our mailing list. This list has now grown to over 2200 names. A few participants have objected because the response has been so large, calling for large runoffs and mailings by them. (Last year Harold alone had over 200 requests!)

On the other hand, this is precisely the result we hoped to achieve: a wide-spread awareness of our conferences and, for the authors, a wide distribution of their papers. (Can we have succeeded too well?)

The committee decided that future participants should be fully alerted as to the extent of their possible commitment before inclusion in future offers.

Conference Hour Discussions: As previously noted, the committee is especially impressed with the section of Property Taxation USA, titled "Conference Hour Discussions," comprising the last 40 pages of the book. Out of the raw material of the transcripts of these three discussion periods has been distilled their essence, organized by topic, yet in the words of the discussants. It is an eloquent and important part of the book.

So far, this is the only direct use we have made of transcripts. It is so constructive that the committee recommends the adoption of this precise technique by future program chairmen.

TRED Manpower Problems was the subject of the remaining hours of the meeting. TRED now has achieved a distinguished membership. It need no longer concern itself with prestige. Its problem now is its work-load. And the very prestige of its members increases the other calls on their services. Steps must be taken to economize greatly on the use of these men. Only by

so doing can we elicit the highest order of their talents in the limited time they can give to TRED.

Three recommendations were made:

1. The employment of an Editorial Assistant
2. The use of Conference Researchers
- 3 The grooming and admission of junior TRED members

1. Editorial Assistant The committee reiterated its endorsement of Tom Webb's suggestion that the Foundation provide TRED with a part time editorial assistant. Whereas Tom's primary purpose is to expedite delivery of conference papers to the Press, the committee sees such a person as providing great leverage on high-priced professors, lightening the load on those serving as program chairmen/editors by taking over much of the detail work. Furthermore, as she gains experience in TRED's activities, she will increasingly help novice chairmen/editors with short-cuts.

2. Conference Researchers. Further in pursuit of time-saving economies, Art Lynn suggested that each conference chairman be provided with a researcher to lay a thorough groundwork for his conference. This is one of the great ideas proposed to TRED. It immediately drew enthusiastic response from everyone present.

As tentatively worked out, a knowledgeable person will be hired for the summer preceding each conference to examine all facets of the conference subject and all possibilities of participation. He will outline all implications of the subject. He will winnow out the peripheries and non-essentials. He will assure the inclusion of all that is needed.

Our researcher will also have canvassed the profession to find those who have done significant work in the field, and what they have done. Thus he will save us from re-hashes by pointing out what has not yet been done that needs doing and by suggesting those best able to do it.

The resulting economies will be enormous. Simplifying the work of the program chairman is but the first. Surpassing this will be the matter of upgrading the participation and therefore the book which will follow. The quality of this book will be of the highest order. Its focus on land value taxation will be assured. Its unity of structure will have been built in from the start.

The committee urges the Foundation to underwrite such research.

3. Junior TRED Members. At the beginning of the meeting, Mason brought up the case of Nicolaus Tideman. Nick is top man among the senior graduate students in economics this year at the University of Chicago. As such, he has had job offers for next year from Michigan, UCLA, Princeton and Harvard. His field is urban land economics. He has been reared on land value taxation.

Mason proposed initially that we try to help him secure tenure at the university of his choice by inviting him to deliver a paper at a TRED conference as soon as possible; that we also include him in TRED events even when he is not delivering a paper.

As the meeting progressed and the name of Nick recurred, the idea of reciprocity - of what Nick and other such young people might do for TRED - began to take shape.

There was no formal action taken. But as TRED's man-power problems were discussed, it seemed that perhaps the future expansion of TRED might

well be drawn from promising junior members of the profession. They would, for instance, be better able to take on some of TRED's work. For they would not have the commitments which are the concomitants of prestige.

So it is suggested that we watch for juniors who give promise of future greatness, and that we make places for them at our conferences, to observe them and to imbue them with our purposes and our methods.

Certainly Nick Tideman is preeminent among this group.

As the meeting ended Saturday afternoon, the members present felt satisfied that the problems revealed in Tom Webb's report will all be resolved if the actions recommended at this meeting are put into execution. They urge the Foundation to act accordingly.

.

Since the meeting various things have occurred on which I wish to report.

1. The Executive Committee of the Foundation met and made certain suggestions regarding the selection of an editorial assistant. They will reconsider this at a later meeting. The door is ajar.

2. They voted unanimously to rescind any commitment which may have existed on the part of the Foundation to finance publication in book form of TRED papers emanating from institutes prior to 1964.

3. In reading a copy of the critical review of Art Lynn's proceedings by the political scientist, I noticed the sentence "One of the difficulties is in the very word 'administration' ". It occurred to me that the ambiguity this reviewer found in the use of this word had begun with us when we chose it as the subject of our conference. We had called the conference "The Property Tax and Its Administration". But what we had wanted was "to consider whether and to what extent administrative problems, including the assessment process, are obstacles to land value taxation. "

So, we had misstated our conference subject and, in doing so, had misled our participants and, alas! our reviewers.

- and worse, if we stick to it, our ultimate market!

So I tried this idea out on Arthur in respect to his conference on "The Property Tax and Economic Development", where the reviewer had said ". . . nobody has done a good thorough work on the relationship of the property tax (and especially the land value tax) to economic development" and Arthur agreed immediately that, again, we had misstated our conference objective in the title we had chosen.

Shortly after, I went to Madison to call on the Press. So I raised the question with both Miss Krager and Mr. Webb. Each, independently, agreed that our titles had misled the reviewers and that a more precise title would have produced a different response.

I then showed Miss Krager Arthur's (Becker) new index listing his papers under a title that will really spell out what his conference was about - such a title, say, as "Land and Building Taxes: Their Effect on Economic Development". Miss Krager said that such a title change would have an appreciable effect on the reader.

Is there a lesson? Have we been too timid, lest we alienate by stating our real focal point? By trying to demonstrate our objectivity by using the inclusive term "Property Tax", have we actually diverted our audience from what we really want discussed?

I ask your counsel.

4. In connection with Nick Tideman, it seems to me that he is the prime candidate for researcher of our 1969 conference - ?

With the Foundation copies of this report, I am urging action that will endorse and implement our goals and methods fully.

Respectfully submitted,


Weld S. Carter
Executive Secretary

REPORT OF CALLS to August 24, 1968

Attendance at the 43rd Annual Conference of the Western Economic Association, held at Oregon State University, Corvallis, August 22 and 23. The first person I met as I was registering was Ervin Zingler, of the University of Houston. In the course of the meetings we had several casual and very cordial meetings with him, in the course of which he urged us to stop by Houston on our way home and visit him at the campus again. Ervin is president of Omicron Delta Epsilon, an honor society in economics which has evolved from Omicron Delta Gamma and Omicron Chi Epsilon. The purpose of Omicron Delta Epsilon is to establish closer ties between students and faculties of the same school, to provide recognition of scholarly attainment, and to publish an official journal, The American Economist. This journal serves as an outlet for essays and papers written by graduates and undergraduate students. These papers would not normally be solicited by professional journals, but they are of sufficient interest and merit to warrant publication. On the final day Ervin proposed that the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation sponsor a Henry George award the details of which I shall write you when I have some further information, and also after I have had an opportunity of discussing it with the TRED members who will be at San Francisco next week. It looks attractive. ODE has 28,000 members overall, including 5,200 who are listed as active. And it has chapters, as of August 1, in 169 colleges and universities, including Harvard, Yale and Princeton, and most other ivy league colleges.

Dick Lindholm held his dinner for his panel on "State and Local Tax Developments" at a nearby hotel, the Towne Hotel, Wednesday evening before the conference sessions began. Dick had kindly invited me to attend. The six guests were Robert W. Beckstead, of New Mexico State University; Herbert E. Newman, of Hood College in Frederick, Maryland; Robert M. Kamins, of the University of Hawaii; Glen W. Atkinson, of the University of Nevada, Wilma G. Mayers of Sacramento State College; and Robert C. Haring, University of Alaska. Dwight M. Blood, of the University of Wyoming, was delayed by car trouble and did not arrive that night, but was on hand the next day and delivered his paper accordingly. Dick graciously explained that the RSF was the host of this dinner party, and that I was its representative. (Dick and I were both gratified that the dinner bill came to only \$48.25. The hotel is sending that bill, with Dick's signature, direct to the Foundation for payment.)

Dick also included Walter Mead, of the University of California, Santa Barbara, as a dinner guest, inasmuch as Walter was chairman of the program committee which staged this conference. As chairman, Walter is automatically the president-elect of the Association for this coming year, and he assumed the presidency when the outgoing president turned the gavel over to him at the final dinner. Walter had been on Mason's panel at Milwaukee back in 1964, and I had attended a lecture that he gave to graduate students at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee a year and a half or so ago, driving him to the Milwaukee airport after a dinner following his address. Walter was most cordial to us throughout the meetings. He ate at the table with us the night of the salmon barbecue, and he joined us at breakfast the final day, Saturday morning. I am to stop in and visit with him at Santa Barbara after the NTA meetings are concluded.

Of those on Dick's panel, I particularly enjoyed Mr. Beckstead, Mr. Kamins and Mrs. Mayers. Mr. Beckstead was the last one on my right at the dinner, and he and I got along swimmingly, even in the rugged field of politics. He is a youngish 40, and has that fine quality of always carrying at least the suggestion of a smile on his face. He is already on TRED's mailing list, as are many of the others whom I shall discuss. On our return we shall go over all these names carefully and send, or rather, get out a list

of new additions to our mailing list—but for the most part, we already have these people.

Mr. Kamins is slight and quite short, but with a compensating full beard with a slightly reddish cast. At the dinner I was suddenly aware that he was talking about Hawaii's graded tax plan while Mr. Beckstead was telling me something else. So I later button-holed Mr. Kamins and got him to repeat what he had said to the group earlier. He confirmed the impression I had gained when I originally read the graded tax law that Hawaii had passed—that it was an extremely complex law, filled with many loopholes, and one that would be quite difficult to implement. He told me that at the present time in Hawaii there is already a movement to have this bill repealed. But inasmuch as so little has yet been done with it, and in view of the fact that it provides for an almost endless series of delays in the transition from one stage to the next, it seems almost useless to undertake its repeal.

Mr. Kamins says that there is one outstanding paper available explaining the graded tax in Hawaii. This has been put out by the Tax Foundation of Hawaii. (From his description I judge this to be about of the quality of the Texas Research League.) He suggested I write the Foundation for a copy of this paper, and he dug into his briefcase and parted with his only copy of Government in Hawaii, a Handbook of Financial Statistics 1968, 15th edition, published by the Tax Foundation of Hawaii.

Mrs. Mayers teaches public finance at Sacramento State College, and we later talked about Irene Hickman. She says that a movement has been afoot to have Mrs. Hickman recalled, but that the people of the city seem solidly behind Mrs. Hickman, as they have defeated that movement. Mrs. Mayers knows of Mrs. Hickman's interest in Henry George. Mrs. Mayers and I both audited the Public Finance section of the final concurrent sessions Friday afternoon. This had to do with Social Security taxes. On the long walk back to the residence hall after this meeting, she and I discussed congenially the many anomalies of this program. Mrs. Mayers had never heard of Dr. Ramona First. Mrs. First, a former student of Harold Groves, had been teaching public finance at San Francisco State when I called there eight years ago. Perhaps the whiplash from which she was suffering at that time may have finally produced permanent disability for her. Mrs. Mayers is one who, after her children were nicely started, went back to school, completed her graduate studies, and is now a full-fledged professor.

As was the case a year ago, the first professor we met after we were in our room, was James S. Earley. Jim was teaching history of economic thought at the University of Wisconsin at Madison when I called there in 1957. Harold Groves had sent me to see him. He was one of those who had commented—and favorably—on my "Introduction to Henry George" back in those days. Last year at Boulder he and his lovely wife, Betty, had a room down the hall from us. This year they were only two rooms apart from us. Jim had done a stint as chairman of the department at Madison, where there were about 70 in the department. Last year they stopped at Boulder on their way to California at Riverside, where Jim was to start as chairman of the University of California there. Betty and Jessie had struck up an instant friendship last year, and they promptly renewed it this year, attending "women's activities" together. Betty's first husband, an M. D., had died, leaving her with two children to raise. She and Jim have been married for seven years. She apparently has had extensive editorial experience. The Earley's and the Thompson Webb's had been close friends during the Earley's stay in Madison.

Jim spoke approvingly of a talk Mason had given to a group at the Riverside campus during his stay in California last fall. Jim inquired as to Mason's present relations with his

administration. I think Jim would like to hire Mason. We sat with the Earley's at the presidential banquet Thursday night. We served them cocktails before the barbecue Friday evening. We had breakfast with them and Walter Mead Saturday morning. They hope we will stop by to see them at Riverside later in September on our way home.

From my worm's eye view, the conference was poorly organized. There were ten concurrent sessions Thursday morning, a plenary session from 1:30 to 3 o'clock Thursday afternoon, ten more concurrent sessions Thursday afternoon from 3 to 5:15, the annual banquet at 7:30 that evening--ten more concurrent sessions Friday morning, a plenary session from 1:30 to 3:15 Friday afternoon, and eight more concurrent sessions Friday afternoon. This was bad in two respects: (1) one could not begin to cover all the sessions that he would like to attend, and (2) the concurrent sessions were poorly attended, having, in most instances, almost no pure auditors, merely those delivering papers, plus the discussants, plus a handful of auditors.

Bill (B. Hughel) Wilkins was chairman of the local arrangements committee. Bill is on the staff at OSU at Corvallis, as is Floyd B. McFarland. These two had been graduate students at the University of Texas when I visited there, and they had been part of that informal seminar which Mrs. _____, the departmental secretary, (the one who, years before, had briefly been in a French class along with Agnes de Mille at UCLA) had arranged for me. Professor Wilkins told me of the special attention he always paid to Henry George in his classes, attributing this to the influence I had exerted in those earlier days. At the presidential banquet he brought his beautiful young wife over and presented her to us, and she, with true Texas charm, said that she felt that she had known me down through the years because of Bill's earlier description of me. This was gracious and gratifying, even as it was incredible. At the barbecue Friday evening, Professor Wilkins went out of his way to bring Mrs. and Dr. Lafayette G. Harter, Jr., the chairman of the department at OSU, over, and introduced us. The Harters, in turn, invited us over to their home to spend the evening with them after the barbecue was concluded, something I wish we had been able to do.

At the barbecue I also spoke with Dr. Charles Friday, who had been chairman of the department when I visited Corvallis in 1961. Dr. Friday was most friendly, immediately recalling the lecture I had given at his invitation to one of his classes in advanced theory. He is program chairman for the Western Economic Association conference next year, and so will succeed Walter Mead as president the following year.

Early in the conference, I came upon George Melton, of Everett, Washington. Back in 1959 I had met George's brother, Dr. Melton, at North Texas State University at Denton. He had said to me: "If you ever get to Everett, Washington, look up my brother, George." At that point, Texas looked pretty far from home, and I thought there was little chance I would ever reach the northwestern part of the U. S. But, as we had approached Seattle shortly before Christmas 1960, I put George down mentally for a visit and looked him up in the middle of December. He had been delighted to see someone who had been through Texas, and he and his wife and their four lovely children had entertained Marjorie and me at supper one evening during Christmas week after a conducted tour he had given us that day through the Arboretum at the University of Washington grounds in Seattle. Last year George was at Boulder, and we had many warm meetings together, and it was a delight to see him again at Corvallis. On this occasion he had brought Mrs. Melton and all four children along for a vacation trip, and he made a particular point of our meeting them before they took off for home.

We also ran across Dale O'Bannon (Norman D. O'Bannon). Dale had been a discussant on Dick Lindholm's program in 1965 when his wife, Joan, delivered a paper. At that time, Dale was with the Federal Reserve Bank in Atlanta, while Joan taught at Agnes Scott College. Now Joan is home baby sitting two children for the most part, while Dale teaches at Lewis and Clark College. Nothing would do but that we call on them on our way north after the Conference, so Saturday morning we telephoned them and arranged to see them in their charming home that afternoon on our way to Seattle. It appears that Joan is not altogether a baby sitter. She taught part time last year, and this year will have a rather full schedule at the University of Portland, a Catholic college in town. The babies, two and four, are entered in a Montessori school. Joan anxiously inquired as to the sale of Property Taxation--USA in which, of course, she has a chapter, and I was glad to be able to report the fact that the edition is rapidly running out, and that the prospect of putting this in paper is under serious consideration. She, too, thought that this would have a markedly increasing effect upon sales, particularly for classroom purposes.

My lapel name card carried the affiliation "TRED." A surprising number knew TRED, but those who did not were prone to inquire as to what TRED stood for. This always afforded an opportunity to explain briefly about TRED.

One such inquirer was Professor Robert Carr, with whom we breakfasted Thursday morning. It quickly developed that Professor Carr hailed from Fresno State College, so it was a simple matter to identify TRED with Karl Falk. I also asked Dr. Carr if Grady Mullennix was present. Professor Carr was much interested in learning that I knew Grady, and brought the sad news that Grady and Pat had been divorced, Grady taking unto himself a new spouse from the college. I later learned that Professor Carr is the president of the Western Finance Association at this time.

Dick Lindholm was also at the breakfast table with us Thursday morning. In fact, it was he who introduced us to Professor Carr. He had brought with him a young student from Washington State University named Kottke, whose father, Frank J., is a professor at the same institution and was in Corvallis to deliver a paper in a session on industrial organization. Young Kottke was a nice, but overly serious young man, who brought the report that Reed Hanson, also of the economics department at Washington State, is currently in Chicago serving as a delegate to the Democratic convention. Reed is the one who had delivered the paper on Henry George at Dick's conference in 1965. As young Kottke seemed to have strong views on the Democratic convention, Jessie and I inquired as to what odds he could quote against the possibility that LBJ would be the next Democratic candidate for President. This provoked a lively discussion throughout the balance of breakfast.

The plenary session Thursday was on the subject: "Should the Dollar Be Devalued?" The speaker was Robert A. Mundell, a professor from the University of Chicago. Professor Mundell possesses, in addition to brilliance, an outstanding manner. His only equal, in my experience, in academic ranks, is Kenneth Boulding. Singularly enough, each of these two has a slight disability, which both use to their advantage, thereby converting what should be a liability into an asset. Almost equally brilliant was William A. Allen, from the University of California at Los Angeles, who was one of the two discussants. It was interesting to see that he and Yung-Ping Chen sat side by side during Mundell's address. Quite evidently Yung-Ping Chen is well up the pecking order at Los Angeles. Yung-Ping also has a chapter in Dick Lindholm's book.

As the annual banquet was being held at the Memorial Union Ballroom on campus, and as liquor, of course, cannot be served at such a facility, a group of booksellers had arranged a cocktail party at a local motel preceding the banquet. Generally I avoid booksellers' events because of obvious reasons. However, in this instance, inasmuch as this was the only way we had of mingling freely with a large number of those in attendance at the Conference, I put aside my scruples, and Jessie and I wandered over there somewhat after the thing had started. Our purpose was to get glasses in our hands, and then wander around and see whom we knew and whom we might meet. But at the foot of the stairs we were greeted by a Professor Edward I. Sapiarz, of the University of Toledo. He had never heard of TRED, and over the din and uproar of the crowd in this basement, he had some difficulty understanding what TRED was.

I explained briefly about the tour, the RSF, and its relation to Henry George. With that he expressed amazement that anyone should be at all interested in Henry George. However, as I explained the composition of TRED's membership, he moderated somewhat and supposed that perhaps there might be something to some of George's ideas that related to the world of today. But he expressed most emphatically his opinion that, "The single tax, of course, is dead, dead."

The thing that seemed to amaze him most is that such people as these outstanding men who compose TRED's membership, should have associated themselves in such an endeavor as this. He kept talking about "respectability." At one point he wondered, half-humorously if we were hippies, or pinkish!

Throughout he spoke in a joshing manner, but was not unfriendly, not antagonistic. In fact, at the outset, Jessie thought that perhaps we had known each other at some time in the past. He spoke of having gotten a late start, due to the Depression. I imagine his education had been interrupted and he had taken a job, then gone to war, and not gotten into his graduate studies until after the War. He spoke of having studied at the University of Wisconsin and having taken courses under Harold Groves.

✓ I alluded to an article by Ursula Hicks in the current Western Economic Journal, in which Miss Hicks had set up two criticisms of site value taxation: (1) valuation, and (2) yield. I cited our 1969 Conference on the "Assessment of Land Values" to show how we were trying for an answer to the first of her objections, and I brought up Mason Gaffney's statement before ex-Senator Douglas' Commission at Pittsburgh to show that there were two sides to the question of "yield." That led us into a discussion of Senator Douglas in particular, and politicians in general, and what we might expect from them. He wound up saying something to the effect that, through the principles Jessie and I had been espousing, perhaps we had quite a lot in common with him. In any event, he wants us to send him information concerning TRED, he wants to be on our mailing list; he wants information about the two books we have so far published, and he wants a copy of Mason's statement at Pittsburgh. I shall also ask him if I had already offered him complimentary copies of any of George's works that he might desire. He and we parted just as the first warning light was dimmed to mark the end of the cocktail party.

In the preliminary program I had seen David Dale Martin listed as a discussant of the paper to be presented at the second plenary session which was held at 1:30 Friday afternoon. I had called on David at Indiana University back before Mason's program, and David had subsequently appeared and presented a paper at that Conference in 1964. David is a great anti-monopolist. He is currently on leave from Indiana University, serving on the President's

Cabinet Committee on Price Stability. David had written Mason earlier this year, requesting suggestions as to how his work might further be financed. It so happened that two days before we left Antioch, Mason had called me about a correspondence he was having with the Provost of the State University of New York at Buffalo. The Provost had evidently solicited suggestions from Mason for candidates to work on a "special privileges" project. As soon as Mason started to describe it to me, I asked him if he had included David Martin in his list, and he said he had not. He was surprised, however, that he had overlooked him. So I asked if I might take this up with David when I saw him at Corvallis. Mason not only agreed to this, but offered to send me a copy of the letter he had written the Provost, commenting on the project.

Jessie and I reached the hall where the lecture was to be given shortly before the scheduled time and found David in conversation with another professor outside the hall. David broke the conversation to extend a hearty greeting to us and I asked him if he would have time to see us following the meeting, because of this correspondence, I had from Mason, describing a project in which I thought he might be interested. It seems that he is intensely interested, especially in view of the uncertainty of his tenure on the Presidential Cabinet Committee after the national election. So we arranged to meet at the barbecue that night so that I could show him Mason's letter to the Provost, and he could be better informed as to the nature of this project. David joined the Earley's and us at the table for supper. Walter Mead likewise drifted over and ate with us, he and David having first met at the TRED conference where they both presented papers four years ago. Then later David and I sat down together and he read the letter Mason had written the Provost with great interest, and I am to so report to Mason when Mason gets to San Francisco on Labor Day.

The plenary session on Friday was disappointing except for David's performance. The principal speaker was William G. Shepherd, of the University of Michigan, and the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. He was speaking on "Conglomerate Mergers in Perspective." He was a great let-down after the tremendous performance that Mundell of the University of Chicago had put on the day before.

Fred Weston, of the University of California at Los Angeles was the first discussant, and he was so far right wing as to be ineffectual. David dismissed him beautifully and presented a very fine paper in discussion of Shepherd's and Weston's comments. Unfortunately, his time was short, as the other two had overrun theirs, and his reading of his paper was very rapid, militating against his usual very good presentation.

I suppose the high spot of the Conference for me was when Wallace F. Smith, in the Department of Business Administration at the University of California at Berkeley, presented his paper: "The Class Struggle and the Disquieted City" in a session on Urban Economics Friday morning. I had met Professor Smith at Berkeley when I traveled through there. His name had been given to me by Professor Patterson at Corvallis on my way down, and Professor Smith had seen me on two different visits, trying to arrange for me to meet Professor Ratcliffe, then visiting at Berkeley from Madison, and to whom Harold Groves had earlier referred me in 1957.

In his presentation Friday morning, Professor Smith opened with a reference to Henry George, saying how relevant many of George's ideas were to the current urban economic scene. He ranted somewhat over the fact that he had apparently wanted a copy of P&P to work up this paper, and in going to the book store, had been unable to find it in the paperback section. Then he had gone to the hard cover books and had not even been able to buy a copy there. He spoke very approvingly of George's contribution to urban economics, and he

associated him with John von Neumann. Then facetiously, he immediately apologized for this association, saying that it was analogous to the idea of the Pope marrying Liz Taylor! He also referred to von Thunen's ideas on rent theory as part of this synthesis. He was somewhat vague as to the sense in which he was referring to George, which, incidentally, he did on two other occasions in his presentation, and I had thought that he was referring to the part in Book X, dealing with how modern civilization might decline. Afterward, however, when I looked at his paper, I discovered at least a page and a half of direct quotes from George's story of the savannah. Really, what he was talking about was how cities come into being. On this score he was quite sound. He had a fine feeling for the part population alone, without benefit of capital improvements, plays in the increase of productivity, and in the magnetism this increase exerts on immigration into the city. As I read his paper, however, I realize that his perceptions of George leave considerable to be desired.

I had a nice visit with him at the conclusion of his paper. He had not recognized me in the audience, and I joshed him on the fact that he had not written me for a copy of P&P when he was in this sorry state at the book store. He reiterated his wonder that we had never published P&P in paperback. I explained it on the basis that we had P&P so low-priced as to not warrant publishing it in a special edition in paper. But his feeling is that students buy paperbacks, and if they do not find a work on the shelves in paper, they will not look further. This may be something for us to consider. He had shipped a number of copies of his paper direct from Berkeley, and these had been lost in transit, so he dug down in his briefcase and gave me one of the two or three last copies he had brought with him.

Floyd McFarland was sitting a few seats across in the same row with me, and when Smith started his presentation with this praise of George, McFarland looked over and smiled approvingly at me. Later he told me that Random House, in their display of books in the basement of Bexell Hall, where the various publishers had their displays, had a copy of P&P on their shelves.

Please advise me as to whether they have published this themselves, or whether these are copies they secured from us.

Professor Smith's paper aroused considerable controversy, especially among the two formal discussants. These two discussants were Robert J. Allison from Fresno State College, and John R. Wish, from the University of Oregon. I was especially interested in Professor Wish and his criticism. He is an extremely likable and personable young man, with great assurance, fine physique, auburn hair and full beard. In his discussion of Smith's paper, he brought in Friedenborg's article in a recent issue of Harper's which I had called to the attention of TRED members and the Foundation. He criticized Smith on the grounds that Smith did not go sufficiently into taxation. Later in an interchange with Smith, he again referred to Friedenberg, saying that slums are profitable under property taxes as they are now set up. I let this go as long as I could, but when no one else commented on this, I finally broke down and violated my principles by asking Professor Wish if he would elucidate on that point and tell us what reconstitution of the property tax might change this situation. He explained that what Friedenborg had recommended was a lowering of taxes on improvements and a corresponding increase in taxes on land values. So when I went up to Smith at the close of the session and spoke about providing him with a copy of P&P, Wish came upon it very strongly, asking for copies of any of George's works which we would supply him. He seemed extremely interested in George's ideas and quite obviously wants to know more.

Will you please, therefore, send him a complete set of Henry George's works.

At one point in his discussion of Smith's paper, Wish had painted a very frightening picture of Oakland, California, saying that the most violent type of class struggle is

Wrote
Wish
10/9/68
They
used our
photos

Wrote
Landsham
for
letter
address
for Prof
Wish.

544
Oct 18, 1968
61K

developing there. Again, referring to Friedenbergs, and saying that not only are ghettos profitable, but that we have taxes that make them so.

I had several brief visits with Yung-Ping Chen. I think he is a comer, so I attended the final session on Public Finance Friday afternoon, where he was giving a paper on: "Social Security Reformers and General Tax Revenue: Do They Have a Case?" For the last few years he has been carving out a place in this field for himself, but I believe that he will go further than that in a short time. I think that he has a very good mind. This session was chaired by Kenneth D. Patterson, the one who had referred me to Wallace Smith back in 1961. Dr. Patterson and I had a nice but brief visit at the end of Dr. Chen's paper.

I also had brief visits with Professor William Clark, of the School of Business Administration in the Department of Finance at the University of Oregon. Professor Clark had sat directly opposite from me at the President's Banquet Thursday evening, and knew of my association with Dick Lindholm, and I think I had met him at Washington last Christmas at the American Economic Association meetings.

Thursday afternoon I had also attended the session on Public Finance at which Don Seastone had presented a paper: "Possesory Interests Taxation: Its Relationship to Revenue Sharing and Payments in Lieu of Taxes on Public Lands." But I had left before the discussions began, because I wanted to attend the tag end of another session. So, as Don had been reading his paper, and not talking to the audience, he had not noticed me in the audience. We met him and Lorraine briefly at the cocktail party before the President's Banquet, and he was surprised to know that I had been at his session. He is with the Public Land Law Review Commission in Washington. He has one more year to go there. He had resigned from Colorado State University at Fort Collins a year ago, and he will be in the job market the end of this coming year. They have no desire to return to Fort Collins. It was nice seeing them, but they were on their way off campus at the end of the cocktail party, inasmuch as this had been a business trip, so we were unable to get further together with them. However, I told him how much I had enjoyed his informal discussion of the Vietnam War at Milwaukee two years ago, and in parting he said: "Thank you. I haven't changed a bit." This was reassuring to both Jessie and me.

There were a few more listed on the program in various roles whom I knew from years gone by, but whom I was unable to get to on this occasion--but that always happens where they have such large numbers of concurrent sessions. Among those was Joel Sailors from the University of Houston, to whom I sent a message through Ervin Zingler. There was also Theodore Rupprecht, from Humboldt State College, and his colleague, Professor Dickerson. There was Professor Orzech, from Corvallis, and Roy Sampson from Eugene, and Professor Halley from Portland State, and F. W. Morrissey, whom I first met at Michigan State in 1957, and later discovered at San Francisco State in 1961. And, finally, there was Albert Dehner, from Portland State.

But we certainly crowded a lot into two days, and I think we gained a lot for our effort.

REPORT OF CALLS to August 31, 1968

Dr. Robert L. Monahan, Professor ^{of} Geography in, I think, the Department of Economics at Western Washington University. My visit with Professor Monahan back in 1968, just before Christmas (see pages 267 ff. in my Report of Calls) had uncovered a real interest on his part in land value taxation. In the years that followed, he has maintained a lively interest in the work of the Foundation and the activities of TRED. He has written me at least two highly complimentary letters, praising TRED and the Foundation for what he apparently believes to be the great work we are doing. So, after completing my dictation on the report of the Western Economic Association meetings, I telephoned Professor Monahan and asked to see him. He was very glad to hear from me and came up on the suggestion warmly.

During our meeting he spoke very favorably of the high quality of participation we are getting at our TRED conferences. In connection with this year's conference he mentioned Professor Garrison, who had formerly been at the Transportation Center at Northwestern University, and is now at the Circle Campus of the University of Illinois. He suggested I look up Professor Garrison, particularly if the latter is not already on my mailing list, which I think is, unfortunately the case. Professor Monahan definitely has a feeling of loneliness--isolation--in his interest in land value taxation and Henry George. He was delighted to hear of Wallace Smith's presentation and the way in which Professor Wish had discussed it. Professor Monahan has a great appreciation of location value. He feels it is, in his words, "as real as the value of improvement." Yet, he finds extreme difficulty in presenting these ideas to his students, and he is searching about for things that will make this easier. He wished we had a movie that, would, for instance, show slums, and the effects of alternative taxes on these. He was, of course, delighted to hear that we do have a film, and hopes that Vie will send him full details on it. He thought that visual aids would be extremely helpful in this connection for high school students, and also for college students in the introductory course. So I described briefly my experience in using the materials that John Monroe had developed, especially in the sessions on definitions, on the Hoyt curve, and on Malthus. As and when he next gets to Chicago, he will get in touch with me ahead of time so that he, John and I may sit down together and go over some of this material.

He was much interested in our choice of topic for next year's Conference. He believes that land can be assessed and he is much interested in seeing what we are able to do to develop a presentation of the ways in which this can be accomplished. In connection with assessment, like so many others, he cited instances of the low relative level of assessment of lands in areas with which he was familiar in his neighborhood. As a horrible example, he told of one property which had been held by the owner at an asking price of \$35,000, which was subsequently condemned for public purposes at \$21,000, on which the owner had previously been paying taxes of \$17 a year, this despite the fact that taxes, theoretically, were at 25% of value. There is apparently a 40-mill limit on tax rates, but this can be gotten around by voting special levies for special purposes, but only for two-year periods. He recommended that I get in touch with Phil Cartwright, a dean at the University of Washington, who is currently working on an overhaul of taxes, his field being regional economics.

In addition to his great interest in and real feeling for land value taxation, Dr. Monahan also seems to have strong leanings toward zoning and planning. He deplores the fact that we do not rigidly enforce our laws in these respects. He had spent a year recently in Finland and was much impressed with the way the Finns carry out these parts of their programs. Variances are well nigh impossible, according to him. He showed great respect for the whole way in which law was respected and administered in Finland. But his classic example was enough to bring fear and trembling to any right-thinking young American. Apparently the Finns have a law against drinking-and-driving. To enforce this, they have empowered the constabulary to stop traffic periodically for spot checks, and if they find any evidence of liquor on the breath of any driver in the line, they can pull this driver out and send

him to the hospital for a confirmation test. If the test substantiates their suspicions, he is then automatically condemned to three months at hard labor breaking rocks! This goes for any and all who are so arrested and convicted.

Professor Monahan was much interested in my report on Mason Gaffney's appearance before the Douglas Committee and has asked me to send him a copy of the statement when I get back to Antioch.

In the meantime, I hope that Vie will please get off a note to him, thanking him for his warm interest in both TRED and the Foundation, and giving him as much information as she has on the film that the Foundation has to offer.

Dr. and Mrs. Lafayette G. Harter, Jr., of Oregon State University at Corvallis. The Harter's had been so gracious in our brief meeting with them in the salmon cook-out during the Western Economic Association meetings, inviting us to their home, that we telephoned on our way to San Francisco and arranged to have cocktails at their home, and dinner with us as hosts that evening.

Dr. Harter is a very young 50. He did his under-graduate work at Antioch, his graduate work at Stanford. His doctoral dissertation was entitled: "John R. Commons, Institutional Economist." (Inasmuch as the interest in Henry George shown by Wisconsin professors in 1957 was attributed so largely to Commons, perhaps this explains, at least in part, Dr. Harter's warm and sympathetic manner.) His fields are labor, theory, and economic history. His wife, Charlotte, most attractive, 40ish, is also an economist—a Wellesley graduate, with an M.A. from Stanford. Her fields are economic history, theory, and money and banking.

The Harter's had three house guests: John and Diane Farrell, and their infant son, Michael. The Farrell's had arrived that day in a U-Drive-It truck from Madison, Wisconsin, where both had about wound up graduate studies, she in history, and he in economics. Her work was at the Master's level, his at the Ph.D.—although neither has his degree yet. Dr. Harter is chairman of his department, and he had hired Mr. Farrell sight unseen. The Harter's offered their home to the Farrell's until the Farrell's could find housing, which, by some miracle, they did that evening, in a faculty apartment house.

The Harter's moved to this campus right after my visit in 1961. That was during the chairmanship of Charles Friday, who is still in the department. Both of the Harter's taught economics until the time about a year ago when Dr. Harter became department chairman, which, by University rules, precludes Mrs. Harter's employment by the University. She is enjoying having more time to devote to their three charming children and their pleasant home in its rich, Oregon arboretum-like setting.

Mr. Farrell is tall, heavy, very dark, saturnine, with a woebegone, droopy black mustache, which well befits his character and personality. Mrs. Farrell's field is history, her dissertation focussed on the economic status of the central European peasant in a particular period of the 19th century. The Farrell's had spent considerable time in Poland. They both have a good grasp of Polish, and he also speaks Russian. While in Poland, he made a special study of central banking, and also an extensive study of Soviet economics. He is one of the few in the west who have concentrated in this field. (I was surprised, however, that he did not know even the name of Murray Polakoff.) He was hired because Corvallis apparently is starting something of an interdisciplinary program in Russian studies.

Although both the Farrell's had been educated and supported in their graduate studies by foundation grants, which had enabled them to live abroad, she, in particular, seemed to have a feeling of having been under-supported. Her dominant interest in their foreign

experience seemed to have been how hard it had been to get along on so little.

On the other hand, the Harter's were charming extroverts, and our evening with them was a delight. We no sooner arrived than Mrs. Harter wanted to know about TRED, and she fed me, through a very perceptive question, a fine opening by which I was able to state very briefly the major criticisms of the property tax as currently administered: (1) at the local level--the damaging effects of taxes on improvements; (2) the failure to avail ourselves of the constructive advantages of heavy taxes on land values; and (3) at the Federal level, the effects of the capital gains tax.

This was a most successful visit, both socially and professionally.

TRED meeting, held Monday, September 2, 1968, at five p.m., the day preceding the opening of National Tax Association 61st Annual Conference in San Francisco. (For those of you who did not previously receive it, I am enclosing a copy of a memo to TRED dated August 15, 1968, for background on this Committee meeting.)

The six TRED members I had expected to attend all showed up. They comprised the complete quorum for the meeting. Arthur was on hand at my special urging as TRED's chairman, and Bill Vickrey was on hand as Governor Rockefeller's official representative from New York. All the others were at San Francisco in official capacities with the NTA: Art Lynn as the sole nominee for the vice presidency; Dick Lindholm as Program Chairman of the 1968 NTA Conference and nominee for the Executive Committee; Dan Holland as editor of the NTA Journal; and Mason as a discussant of Wednesday morning's papers on property taxation, a session chaired by Art Lynn.

It was a narrow squeak with Bill. Shortly after we checked into the hotel, I had a phone call from him from Menlo Park, where he has been living during his sabbatical, which he has spent with the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioural Sciences at Palo Alto. Bill had just gotten back from a protracted trip and had gotten to his stack of mail, finding a postcard I had fortunately addressed to him from Corvallis, reminding him of our meeting. Apparently his copy of my memo of August 15 was buried down at the bottom of the pile--so this postcard was the first word that had actually reached him as to this meeting. He had already made a dinner date for Monday, but in fine spirit, he broke that, hopped in his car, arriving just before five o'clock, as requested.

In the meantime, various other members had telephoned, indicating that they were on hand and would be at our room at the designated time. Knowing how much they have to discuss when they get together about TRED matters, as well as other things of mutual interest, I was disturbed at the fact that we had only one hour between five, the earliest time we could call the meeting, following the meeting of the Executive Committee of the NTA, and the beginning of the official reception, scheduled for six o'clock. So you can well imagine how delighted I was that Art Lynn, when he telephoned, wondered if we were going to continue our meeting at dinner afterward. I had not been bold enough to suggest this in view of the fact that Art was cast in so important a role at this forthcoming Conference. His nomination to the Vice Presidency automatically means he will be elevated to the Presidency a year from now. So, although our meeting was interrupted at six o'clock for Art and Dan, who felt an obligation to appear at the reception, it was resumed over dinner shortly after the reception was concluded at 7:30, and went on until 11:30 that night. And Dick, Mase, Arthur and Bill were so preoccupied with the discussions that they passed up almost all of the reception.

I reported on the fine sales of the Gaffney and Lindholm books, as reported by the Press as of June 30, the end of the first six-month period, at which point both were well ahead of anticipated sales levels. My recollection is that Mason's had sold 720 copies, and Dick's had sold 1,270 by that date, out of printings of 2,500 each. According to Tom Webb, by early August the Press was already up against the question whether or not

to reissue Dick's, and, at Dick's suggestion, relayed by me, they were considering also the advisability of getting out a paperback edition of this. All this was heartening news to the Committee.

Dick reported that he had received and read all of Carl McGuire's papers. He had made notes as he read and had addressed letters to each participant, inquiring as to whether each one would be willing to update his manuscript, and giving a November 1 deadline for these revisions. Dick feels that there is potential merit in this group of papers. He visualizes a book of perhaps 200 pages. After November 1, he will make his final evaluation of them and advise TRED accordingly.

Art Lynn could report that his Conference Summary section of the 1967 papers had been delivered to the Press, and that copies of the completed manuscript were to go out to printers for bids the week of September 2. He also announced that a decision had been made to forego galley proof and send out only page proof to his participants. I judge this is on the recommendation of the Press in the interest of expediting the publishing.

But the main subject of our meeting, and that which occupied us on until almost midnight that night and, as you will see, as this report progresses, through parts of the days that followed, was Dan's 1969 Conference on "The Assessment of Land." In a telephone conversation I had with him before San Francisco, Dan had stressed how important the definition of our focus was to him, and how rigidly he intended to adhere to it, and how rigidly he intended to have his prospective participants adhere thereto.

As an aid to getting this focus, I had recommended to him an article I had discovered in the June issue of the Western Economic Journal, which arrived early in August. This article was by Ursula Hicks, of the husband and wife team, J. R. and U. K. Hicks, of Oxford. The current article is entitled: "Autonomous Revenue for Local Government." It discusses at some length the recent books by Dick Netzer and Richard Heilbrun. Along toward the end of her article she says that, in principle, there is one obvious way by which the unfortunate disincentive effects on property improvement could be avoided: by altering the base to site, or unimproved, value. But she then says that there are two fundamental difficulties in the use of site value: valuation and yield. So it seemed to me that the next year's Conference was already scheduled to answer the first of Mrs. Hicks' two objections. And it was in this spirit that our subsequent discussions proceeded. Indeed, as the discussions continued, it seemed to many that the importance of this subject was so transcendental that the future of TRED might well depend on whether or not land values could be determined for assessment purposes.

There was early consensus that our program should be broken into two parts, papers by (1) assessors and (2) theoreticians. The assessors are to be chosen from those most knowledgeable in the field. The idea is to uncover those who have a real feeling for land value taxation and who have attempted to get at these values for assessment purposes. Through them we shall seek to find out how they have done it. Included among these is the third generation of the Olcott family from Chicago. I had previously borrowed from John Monroe a copy of the 1965 Olcott Blue Book to loan Mason in connection with his Milwaukee study, and he kindly brought it on to San Francisco for Dan's inspection.

I also was able to report on Paul Corusy's 1968 Conference which is coming up in the middle of October at St. Louis. Paul was a participant on the TRED program in 1967 and is the executive director of the International Association of Assessing Officers. The subject of the IAAO's annual event this year is tax administration. The Conference runs from October 13-16. I have joined the Association and have signed up for the Conference. On October 12 there will be a special seminar to study land valuation for assessment purposes. It will be sponsored jointly by CAE and MAI (whatever those initials stand for). Paul

has kindly made spaces available to us for this seminar and I have already accepted for myself. Dan has a conflicting date on October 12, but is going to try to change it so that he may have the benefit of this seminar in connection with our conference, and Arthur, too, will probably attend at least that session, if not the whole of the Conference which follows. (Ron Welch tells me that Robert H. Gustafson, whose name I included in my memo of August 15, will be on the subsequent program at St. Louis, so that we shall have a chance to observe him in action and judge as to his possible usefulness.)

Dan brought to our meeting a feeling of the importance of having someone present from a country, or countries, which have had direct experience with land value taxation, such as Australia, Denmark, New Zealand, or South Africa. However, I believe that Dan now feels that there are better uses for scarce funds, and that the same purpose may better be accomplished in a way which will shortly be revealed in the following paragraphs.

The other portion of the program will comprise academicians of the highest standing in theoretical economics for the purpose of evaluating in the most penetrating manner possible the findings and statements of the assessors. Dan has already committed our own Bill Vickrey as one to undertake this task. In addition, he has also signed up Lowell Harriss. (At dinner with the Harrisses Tuesday evening, Jessie and I learned that Lowell will be on sabbatical from teaching this coming year, and that he contemplates a study of Australia for the Lincoln Foundation during this period. So I later suggested to Dan that Lowell's role at our Conference might be to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses he will observe in land assessment practices in Australia.)

At the Presidential Reception before dinner on Wednesday evening, Dan told me that he had been thinking a lot about our '69 Conference and he was wondering if there was enough content to warrant ten papers. So he was considering the advisability of taking up the other half of Mrs. Hicks' objection: the possible inadequacy of yield. He was wondering about inviting one of the NYU team which had made the Lincoln study ten years ago. I pointed out that their approach had been static, in that they had overlooked the effects on land values of the lowering of taxes on improvements. I urged, if he did this, that he use Arthur or Mase, both of whom had this insight so clearly.

At breakfast the next morning with Arthur, Art, Mason and Harold McClelland, (Dean of Faculty at Claremont), I tried to interpret what Dan had said to me the night before. It developed that Art had been one of those with whom Dan had discussed this, and Art had a different impression as to Dan's intention. So the feeling at the breakfast developed that Dan was still mentally experimenting with all sorts of ideas, and that at this time he should have a very free hand in developing the structure of his conference. We were all sure that this would in no way interfere with any plan to pursue the topic of yield exhaustively in, say, 1970. Later Mason and I suggested that Arthur make himself available to Dan before the week's end, to "listen" constructively, emphasizing the need of unity and structure for Conference success and Press approval. Arthur and Mase spoke of the great progress Dan was making in lining up the '69 program, beginning with the great names of Lowell Harriss and Bill Vickrey. They would be tremendous assets in attracting others of stature. Arthur remarked that some of the younger men would find it hard not to be able to participate more fully in TRED. He referred to his earlier suggestion of forming some kind of junior auxiliary group to meet this demand. We both agreed that such an association would be valuable, even as we saw the danger that the objectives of TRED might get diffused, as well as that TRED might get bogged down in organizational matters.

I got a further insight on this when I called Dick on Friday to say goodbye, and learned from him that he, Dan and Art had hired a car on the free afternoon, which was Wednesday, driven up to the Muir Woods, and spent their time together reviewing with Dan all sorts of

facets of this forthcoming Conference. Dan apparently desired their help, based on the experiences that they had both had in running TRED events. I cite this to show the great attention that TRED's forthcoming Conference is drawing from all members of the Committee, even those who, onw might suppose, were otherwise preoccupied with a national conference of the size of the NTA—one with such three as Art, Dan and Dick were so closely identified this year.

which

Finally, the question of the January meeting was brought up. It was thought that, with the amount of time TRED had devoted to its affairs this week, there might not be a need for a further meeting in January this coming year. Yet, it was recognized that the question of the topic for 1970 and the choice of a program chairman for that time had not yet been explored to any degree, nor do we know what further help Dan may need in the late stages of getting his Conference together. However, it was decided that if there is to be such a meeting, it should occur at Fairhope, Alabama. One reason for this was to give all members first-hand experience with a so-called "single tax colony," and the problems and results to be learned there. Art Lynn had spoken several times at our meeting about the advisability of our updating the history of what he calls "single tax enclaves." By this, I do not think he meant simply such things as Fairhope and Arden. I believe he had a much larger view which would embrace the history of site value taxation from, say, the time of Arthur Young's book down to the present day. A visit to Fairhope would have the further advantage of affording TRED members the opportunity of comparing land leasing to land value taxation as alternative ways of getting at the same objective. I believe the decision as to the January meeting, however, will be held in abeyance until after the St. Louis meetings in mid-October.

Bill Vickrey has not yet found time to complete his part of preparing the 1968 papers for submission to the Press. He has had many loose ends to clen up before the end of his current sabbatical. Late in August he drove one of their two cars back to New York, stopping at Boulder for a series of meetings and visiting Columbia University. He was at the NTA sessions almost all of every day. The following week he was to clean up his desk at the Center at Palo Alto and finish packing for a final departure by him and Ceil on September 13. Following this he will be back in a normal teaching routine and I hope that he will, with a minimum of prodding, get to the editing job with all dispatch.

As for the NTA Conference itself, in my judgment Dick did a remarkably fine job of organization. Labor Day afternoon and Tuesday morning from 7:30-9:30 were given over to business meetings of the NTA and its governing board. The first Conference session started at 9:30 Tuesday morning. This was a general session. Tuesday afternoon there were four concurrent sessions, running from 2:30-5. Then there was a second general session running from 7:30 to 9:30 Tuesday evening. Then, Wednesday morning from 9 until noon, there was a third general session, following which came the half-day off, which is customary at NTA conferences. All these sessions, up to and including the Wednesday morning one, were devoted to state and local taxation problems and topics. Then, beginning Thursday morning at 10 o'clock, after the annual meeting of the National Tax Association, the focus shifted to the Federal area. Furthermore, Dick seemed to have bunched his academicians largely at the early part of the program. This may have been in order to group them so that they could hear each other and still get away without devoting an entire week to the proceedings here. For whatever reason, the non-academicians--the tax administrators, the corporate tax people--largely predominated in the latter part of the week. It was interesting to see the way in which the academicians seemed to have drifted away before the final sessions. Furthermore, there was a fine sense of developing drama in the organization of the first half of the Conference program. Beginning with a dull session on sales taxes Tuesday morning, at which Les Carbert presided, and Murray Drabkin, among others, delivered papers, the Conference really began to get under way with the

address at the formal luncheon by Dr. Houston I. Flournoy, comptroller of the State of California, who was pinch-hitting for Governor Reagan. In brief, Dr. Flournoy brought to the Association a question which was, how to achieve tax reform, at the same time reducing everyone's taxes, and he gave certain requirements for such a tax program. These requirements were that the program should produce adequate revenue, that it should be equitable, and that it should be acceptable to the public.

The four sessions concurrently running Tuesday afternoon were devoted to: (1) "The Problems of State Taxation in the Transportation Industry; (2) "The Anomalous Michigan Business Activities Tax: Aberration or Innovation?" (3) "Taxation for Economic Growth and Development," and (4) "Taxation and the Democratic Process."

The excitement definitely waxed in the general session Tuesday evening, which was devoted to "Tax Equity Considerations," and included an excellent paper by Lowell Harriss, other papers by Lynn Stiles, Ed Mathias, and Lloyd Slater. Paul L. Dillingham, of Coca-Cola, did a fine job as chairman. He seemed absorbingly interested in Lowell's contribution.

Lowell's paper began: "When taxes approach \$1,200 per capita, as in this country today, burdens are not only heavy; they are also highly unequal." Then, without permitting himself to be pinned down, he went on to discuss justice and equity in very broad general terms, mentioning certain aspects. These included enforcement of tax law, gradualness in differentiation, horizontal equity--equals shall be treated equally--vertical equity--how to correlate differences in tax rates with differences in income or other tax status--ability to pay, progression, proportionality, regression, benefits, and recovery of unearned increments. He wound up his paper with some twelve recommendations for improvements on equity grounds the first of which was higher taxes on socially-created land values relative to other property. Under this heading, he recommended both treatment of increments in land values and a shifting of the property tax from improvements or structures to land.

Lynn Stiles, economist at the Federal Reserve Bank in Chicago and on TRED's program in 1965, gave an interesting paper in that it, superficially at least, attempted to apply the benefits-received principle to local taxation. This led him into an application of user charges for services, and he seemed to wind up with a sorting out of all our present taxes and their specific applications to particular types of benefits. Following this principle, he came up with the proposition that, whereas taxes on improvements should be levied to pay for fire departments, site value taxation should provide the revenue for public parks, playgrounds, etc. When the papers had been finished, Bill Vickrey, speaking from the floor, challenged Stiles by setting up a hypothetical case of a tennis court located next to the firehouse. Bill's argument was that the site on which the tennis court appeared had prime potential benefit from its proximity to the firehouse, whether or not it would use it, and that this benefit was represented in the heightened value of the land through its advantageous location; that the fire department served an area all of which benefited from its presence, and that the area should pay for this benefit; and that the site value tax, not the improvement tax, was the proper way to achieve this. (During this discussion period, Jessie took shorthand notes on some of the comments, and one of hers for Lowell Harriss reads: "In terms of equity, it seems to me, society creates certain values which become the property of owners of land. Now the owner gets the benefits. To tax this would be a most appropriate basis for distributing the cost of government. The difference between land and improvements is very significant. Is it straying from equity to tax land more?")

Of course, there was the inevitable question from the floor, though in this case it did not concern itself with the hapless widow, but was about "the elderly couple who have the misfortune to have their land appreciate."

The four papers read at this session were entitled respectively: "Equity as a Goal of Tax Policy," "Is Tax Simplicity Compatible with Equity?" "Criteria for Equitable Business Taxation," and "A Case Study in Equity--The Proposed New York Tax on Selected Expenditures of Transportation Companies." In these titles there is no direct reference to site value taxation. However, I judge that 80% of the spontaneous floor discussion concerned itself with site value taxation and the equity considerations thereof.

Good as this session had been, the real climax and the greatest excitement occurred in the Wednesday morning session. This session was a full three hours long, running from 9 until noon. Its subject was "Property Taxes," with Arthur Lynn presiding. The papers were: "Property Taxes: Aid or Hindrance to Local Planning?" by Clyde Browning, University of North Carolina, "Limitation of Property Tax Exemptions," by Vincent A. Schmit, Tax Commissioner, City of Milwaukee, and "Assessment of Non-Residential Real Estate--Theory and Practice," by John Hogan. John had been associated with Mason and Arthur as part-time economics professor at UW-M while holding down the job of economist for Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, and appeared on the TRED program in 1964. He is now the economist of Nationwide Insurance Company.

The discussants were Dick Netzer and Mason Gaffney. The papers themselves were not particularly worthwhile, except that they provided takeoff points for discussion first by Netzer and Mason, and second from the floor. A stenotypist was on hand and took down all this discussion, and I believe it will be reproduced in the proceedings when they are published next spring. Dick Netzer was charming and was at his very best, and we of TRED agreed that this was Netzer's best presentation from the standpoint of land value taxation. Jessie's notes say: "Mason, characteristically brilliant, brought in welcome humor and was eloquent--persuasive in his most effective and subtle way." The formal papers took about an hour and a half, and the formal discussion perhaps another twenty minutes. The spontaneous and spirited floor discussion then lasted until Art Lynn chopped it off at about seven minutes before noon. The largest amount of floor discussion was directed at Mason, the second most at Netzer; the three authors came in a very poor third. At one point Bill Vickrey, relating the current discussions to Lynn Stiles' paper of the night before, tried to enlist discussion by Stiles of the current topic in terms of his paper. But Lynn declined the invitation! At another point Lowell Harriss made a brilliant analogy in a statement which was really an off-hand comment. He began by bringing up the question of farm subsidies, farm benefits, and in a very dramatic way showed the enormous payments that are currently accruing to large land owners and corporate land owners. And he brought out the fact that these payments are now capitalized into values for these lands. This demonstrated that, whereas these had originally been designed with the object of benefitting the poor marginal farmer, in practice what happened was that they had, by economic processes, been diverted into benefitting the rich. Lowell expressed the hope that the urban poverty proposals as, for instance, in Clyde Browning's paper, would be subjected to rigid economic analysis in order to make sure that the proposals would not turn out in the same fashion as these farm subsidies. I could not help thinking of the section in P&P, "Insufficiency of Proposed Remedies."

Yung-Ping Chen is an associate professor at the University of California, Los Angeles (see also pp. 4 and 8, this report, dated August 24). His special field is social security taxes. He was a discussant at Dick Lindholm's conference, and he later submitted a paper which is included in Dick's volume. He arrived at the NTA sessions Tuesday afternoon and

attended the session Tuesday evening. Wednesday morning he came in promptly and sat down alongside Jessie and me. At the height of the discussion Yung-Ping leaned over to me and whispered: "More and more people are talking about taxing land. This is a real tribute to what TRED has accomplished." Yung-Ping had certainly been right, at least in the first portion of his comment, regarding Tuesday night's and Wednesday morning's sessions.

In addition to the formal Conference sessions there were several so-called social events scheduled for all members. These afforded a fine opportunity to circulate around, renewing acquaintance with old friends and making new ones. There was an opening reception from 6-7:30 Monday afternoon which we were forced to miss because of the long TRED meeting. The first Conference luncheon occurred Tuesday. Wednesday afternoon was the tour period and, following that, from 5:45 until 7, there was the previously unscheduled President's Reception, given by Sears, Roebuck. The second Conference luncheon was held on Thursday, and on Thursday there was also another reception from 6 until 7:30, which was immediately followed by the Annual Conference Banquet.

Special events for the ladies included a get-together Continental Breakfast Tuesday morning from 9:00 until 10:30, and a special lunch on Thursday, which included a very fine oriental fashion show. Jessie attended both of these. At the mixer session, Jessie met Mrs. Broley Travis, of Sacramento, whose husband appears to be an "expert witness," called in by companies and by states as a specialist in utility valuations. He is an engineer and, according to his wife, single-handedly did all the assessing of California utilities, which include two of the largest in the country. Jessie inquired if his assessing included that of land values, and his wife said: "Oh, yes," as though there was nothing to that.

After the Tuesday luncheon Jessie met Mrs. Lowell Harriss (Agnes), and from then on we saw considerable of the Harriss's. Mrs. Harriss attended the Tuesday evening session at which Lowell presented his fine paper. Following this session, Jessie complimented her on her husband's performance, and as a result, Mrs. Harriss invited us to join them for a late dinner, they having not previously eaten. We had, but we went along for the pleasure of their company and, remarkably enough, were joined by them again Wednesday night for dinner, after having found ourselves in the same bus with them during the tour that Wednesday afternoon.

This dinner was a rather unusual event. Mason has friends in San Francisco of whom he is very fond. They are Bud and June Wedon, of the HGSSS there. Mason had long wanted us to meet the Wedon's and he arranged a dinner for us Wednesday night. In the meantime, Sears undertook to sponsor this reception, which I felt we should attend, so I suggested that Mason bring the Wedon's to the reception, and that we go out to dinner following that. As the reception was breaking up, Mason found himself visiting with the Lowell Harriss's, so he invited them to join us for dinner, an invitation which they promptly accepted.

Then, R. Bruce Ricks appeared. Bruce is Assistant Dean and Associate Professor of Finance, School of Business, University of California, Los Angeles. Mason had worked with him last year at UCLA and he and Mase are very good friends. Bruce was on the TRED 1968 program and was to read a paper at the NTA meetings the next day. So--Mason included him in the dinner invitation. The result was that we had a dinner party for eight, instead of for five.

June Wedon is utterly charming. Bud, her husband, however, a surgeon, seems to have antipathy for academicians in general, and particularly for those in economics. I mentally questioned the efficacy of attempting to meld such dissident elements, particularly in view of the apparent forthrightness with which Bud seemed to express himself. Although an ardent freedom person, Bud turns out to be a thoroughgoing defender of the AMA in practically all

Fred Bennion, the Alfred Parker's,
Mabel Walker

its endeavors. Under the circumstances, I considered it fortuitous, if that's the proper word, that the conversation at the dinner table developed into a debate between Bruce Ricks and Bud Wedon over practices of the AMA. As I had been out late both of the previous nights, Jessie and I excused ourselves when this dinner party broke up around 10 o'clock to go to a night spot.

At breakfast the next morning, Mason expressed his disapproval over what he termed the needling to which Bruce Ricks had subjected Bud Wedon. For my part, I thought Bruce handled himself very well. Mason also mentioned the fact that Bud had been offered the job at the New York School now held by Arnold Weinstein. (I imagine what he means is the one held by Bill Hall.) He said that they had offered Bud \$8,000 a year to take this post.

Both Jessie and I were sorry that the Harriss's perforce left the Conference shortly after the luncheons Thursday. We had enjoyed their company. I am personally delighted that Dan has Lowell sewed up for our Conference next year, and I think that Lowell will be able to bring very important insights as to the extent and methods of land value taxation in Australia. Like Dan, Art and Dick, Lowell is a member of the Executive Committee --just rechristened the Board of Directors--of the National Tax Association. He is a power in the profession, and he is a great addition to that growing number who are working toward land value taxation.

At the Wednesday evening reception, Agnes Harriss was wearing a beautiful lei. It developed that a Mr. Fred Bennion had brought this especially for her from Hawaii. Mr. Bennion is secretary and executive director of the Tax Foundation of Hawaii. The Tax Foundation was the outfit that had gotten out the booklet, Government in Hawaii, 1968 edition, which Professor Kamins had given me in Corvallis two weeks before. So when Mrs. Harriss introduced us to Mr. Bennion, I was able to make my request for the paper in question directly to him, and he took my name and address and promised to send it along. While I was visiting with Mr. Bennion, Jessie also met the Alfred Parker's. Mr. Parker is the executive director of the Tax Foundation in New York and Jessie sent our warm wishes to Elsie Watters, who had been a discussant at our program a year ago.

We had several pleasant meetings with Mabel Walker, executive secretary of the Tax Institute, some constructive, as when she made some pertinent comments on the problem TRED has in getting volumes published with any degree of promptness. Some were trivial, as when she approached me to know where on earth she could pick up a starfish to decorate the wall of the new house she has built for herself on the Delaware River. I was able to take care of this with considerable promptness, happening on a gift shop over on the Ocean in Wednesday afternoon's tour, so I brought her back a starfish for the large sum of \$.26.

At another point, following Mason's excellent appearance on the property tax forum, she said that she certainly wanted to see Mason and get him straightened out on one thing he had said at that session. Mason had closed with a stirring description of the fall of Rome, attributing it primarily to the spread of tax exemptions to the rich landlord class and the resulting burdens imposed on industry. But he happened to speak of the fact that there was no birth control. Well, dear Mabel wants to correct Mason on that, and she quoted Will Durant to the effect that the upper class families had practiced birth control to such an extent that they were all but exterminated, and that the lower classes tried to get themselves adopted by the upper class families, which were rapidly going out of existence, so as members of the lower classes were adopted, they were the ones who had descendants, and so that was part of the reason for the downfall!

Arthur Becker, Clyde Browning,
Ken Back, Richard M. Bird, Alfred Buehler,
Murray Polakoff

Throughout the sessions, Arthur did yeoman service in TRED's behalf. When he sent in his registration, he had listed himself as Chairman, TRED. But when he arrived, they had given him a lapel card with the designation, Professor of Economics, UW-M. So Arthur went back and had them retype this thing in the form, "Chairman, TRED." And he was gratified, as I was, at the amount of questioning this evoked from people he met on the floor or in elevators.

Clyde Browning's is one of the Boulder Conference papers which Arthur felt constrained to reject. Good as this had been, it had not had bearing on the subject of the symposium which Arthur has sent to the University of Wisconsin Press, so necessarily it had to be rejected. The question, therefore, was, could it be adapted for use at Dan Holland's Conference next year. This was finally resolved negatively at the Monday TRED meeting. In the meantime, however, Clyde had written me for two of our papers from the 1968 Conference for use in preparation of his paper for San Francisco. I had mailed one of these papers direct to him, along with a letter telling him that I wanted to see him in San Francisco to discuss alternative ways of getting his paper published. So there was a telephone call from him in my box shortly after I arrived, and we arranged a meeting for Tuesday morning while the earlier business meeting of the Association was going on. When Arthur learned of this, he, too, was eager to see Clyde, so we three had a long and very constructive session together for about an hour and a half Tuesday morning.

Clyde pointed out that the paper he had delivered at Boulder, not having been published, had been the basis for the paper which had subsequently appeared in the Journal of Planning, and he has no feeling of responsibility on TRED's part in connection with this paper. He was grateful for our interest and recognized that there was little likelihood that he would fit into next year's Conference.

In the course of our meeting with him, Clyde outlined some of what he was going to say Wednesday. This involved certain recommendations for relief of urban problems in the form of subsidies and things of that sort, and it was interesting that both Arthur and I raised the question, what effect these subsidies might have on rents--in other words, to what extent would they ultimately be capitalized into higher land values, which was, of course, the point that Lowell made next day when he heard the paper.

For the most part, Arthur and I sat at different tables at the luncheons and dinners in order that we might have the widest possible effectiveness in meeting new people. We also schemed as to how best to use our time when there were concurrent, rather than plenary sessions, so that we would not duplicate attendance. Arthur is very effective among his peers. He does not push, he has a very gentle approach. In this way he gets in very telling thrusts.

I also visited briefly with Lynn Stiles, who is going to send me a copy of his paper which was in short supply at the Conference, and I had a couple of brief chats with Ken Back, Finance Officer, District of Columbia, an Executive Committee member of the NTA, and a 1967 TRED participant. He is evidently consulting and cooperating nicely with Dan on our next year's Conference. I also at last met Richard M. Bird, the very brilliant young man from Colombia, who co-authored a paper with Bill Rhoads at our 1966 Conference, which he was himself unable to attend. I also paid my respects briefly to Alfred Buehler, of the University of Pennsylvania, and sent a message through Dick Netzer to Murray Polakoff, who, Dick, says, is now a dean at NYU.

NTA Conference concld
Harold McClelland, Clara and
Douglas Eldridge, Bill and
Ceil Vickrey, VGP

Harold McClelland, who is Dean at Claremont Men's School now, and is on, I think, the Lincoln's staff there, sat down at breakfast with us Thursday morning briefly. But I had a real visit with him at the final banquet Thursday night, sitting next to him at table. Among other topics, he described the qualifications of a staff member he is seeking. I named Mason, who is not available, and Wallace Smith, who might be.

At the fashion show Agnes Harriss introduced Jessie to a neighbor of hers from Scarsdale, Clara Eldridge, who turned out to be the wife of Douglas Eldridge, formerly of Claremont now with the National Bureau. I was sorry not to have met the latter. One of the great things Jessie and Agnes Harriss find in common is that they have both studied painting under Robert Beverly Hale, a grandson of Edward Everett Hale, and a noted artist, teacher and writer in his field, and now a curator at the Metropolitan.

Thursday Bill Vickrey called from his home in Menlo Park to invite us for dinner with Ceil and him Friday evening. We were hesitant about accepting, know^{ing} how little^{time} he had left and how much he had to do, but we finally broke down. They took us for a beautiful scenic ride over the mountain behind their home and down to a lovely spot, the Tally-Ho, in Los Altos Hills. During the evening Bill inquired about the history of the RSF. He was especially interested in our account of the role VGP had played in its progress. The Vickrey's are a great couple: high-minded, fearlessly honest, Quakers, and, in Bill's case, a brilliant scholar at the top of his field.