



The Annual Reports of Assessed Valuation of all California counties issued by the State Controller shows the following for land and for improvements in billions of dollars:

Fiscal Year	Improvements	
	Land	on Land
1960-61	\$ 8.85	\$16.17
1969-70	19.77	26.30
Increase in value:	124%	63%

In 1960-61 land represented 35% of the total, but in 1969-70 it represented 43% of the total. Is this not reliable statistical support of George's thesis that rent consumes an ever increasing portion of wealth? Comments from Dr. Cord would be welcome.

ROBERT D. GOODIER
Sacramento, California

Mr. Goodier's statistics (above) refer to one state during a decade of extraordinarily rapid population growth. I wouldn't want to generalize too much from them.

I think he's correct to say that recently land values have been increasing faster than G.N.P., but if the land value percentage goes from 5 percent to 8 percent (my *guesstimate*), then it is still possible for the purchasing power of workers and stockholders to increase.

If my figures are correct, then a land tax could yield \$80 billion, no piddling figure. But perhaps we Georgists ought to sponsor a study which would come up with a more defensible figure.

Good old Manny Choper is always thinking. I'll grant his point (Dec. HGN) that assessed values of real estate are only a fraction of market value, but this fact is manifestly inadequate to prove that "rent is consuming

an ever-increasing portion of the wealth produced." Nor does he prove that rent is a major portion of G.N.P.

But I will say this: it is my guess (unfortunately, hard figures are not available) that a full tax on land rent could pay for all the *rational* expenses of government, meaning those necessary expenses exclusive of society's need to defend itself from criminals within (i.e., police and most court expenses) and enemies from without (national defense). Quite obviously, such irrational expenses could assume monumental proportions far greater than the land rent fund. To this extent, Manny and I stand shoulder to shoulder as 100% bona fide Henry Georgist single taxers.

STEVEN CORD
Indiana, Pennsylvania

Despite the statistics, that rent does not absorb an ever increasing proportion of the wealth produced, my experience seems to indicate that it does.

When I moved to Connecticut in 1954 I worked in non-union shops that employed numbers of semi-skilled people. In 1911 I started work in a machine shop and remember what wages were then. Multiplying them by the percentage of increase in the cost of food, clothing and housing costs I could see little if any improvement.

When I think of the wonderful improvements that had been made in manufacturing and transportation, the great expansion and strength of unionism resisting the reduction of wages and the volumes of legislation passed to presumably help labor, I believe that Henry George was correct in his analysis.

My observations may not be scientific but with all the advancements in knowledge should it be necessary to appeal to statistics to show what the tendency is?

ANDREW P. CHRISTIANSON
Chester, Connecticut