

Subscription 50¢ a year

Single copies 10¢

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
The Pons Asinorum of Political Economy -- J. Novicow	2
The Agrarian Question in Korea -- M. J. L.	3
The "Overburdening" of "Real Estate" -- Ernest J. Farmer	7
"My Neighbor's Landmark" Republished	9
Mrs. Robert Wynne	9
Meeting in Hamilton -- Robert Wynne	9
Why North Korea Went Communist	10
Who Is It Pays the Rent? -- Edmund Vance Cooke	11
The March of Bureaucracy	12

--oo00oo--

A bad man can build a good car if he uses the laws of nature rightly. We can have good houses with men as bad as they are. We can have good social conditions with men as they are now if only we will use the laws nature has provided in the social field. We can insulate greed and cunning and set them to work for the betterment of all if only we stop private appropriation of the common funds which are the rent which a community causes to attach to certain areas of land and at the same time to stop the government's appropriation of wages which belong to the individual. -- Commonweal, January 1950.

The Marxian philosophy is in fact a brilliant collection of half-truths. It is half-right on points which powerful interests would totally obscure. It is brilliant in the manner in which it welds these into a powerful and polished whole. Therein lies its danger. The Georgian philosophy, on the other hand, with its grasp of the all-important truth, appears shallow to those who are unable to plumb its depths.

Vested interests will forget George and slate Marx as long as they are able. They realize that on the one hand silence is golden, while on the other they can rely on the other half of the truth to carry the day -- for a time. -- Max Hirsch.

THE SQUARE DEAL

Authorized as second-class mail
Post Office Department, Ottawa.

Published bi-monthly by the Henry George Society
Ernest J. Farmer, Editor
48 Fulton Ave., Toronto 6 Ont.

THE PONS ASINORUM OF POLITICAL ECONOMY

J. Novicow

(Terre et Liberte, as similar in name as in aim to Land and Liberty, was founded by Sam Meyer in 1925. M. Meyer was taken to Germany and probably murdered by the Nazis. The journal was revived by M. Daude-Boncel and others in 1947, at first in mimeographed form, the last two numbers in print. We translate two paragraphs from an article, "Absurdite du Commerce National" in the Oct-Dec. 1950 number.)

Today, the Parisian finds it advantageous to trade with Bordeaux, without tariff. Suppose that tomorrow Bordeaux were annexed to Spain. From the economic point of view, relations between the Parisian and the Bordelais would remain the same. But the Parisian would consider the Bordelais as a foreigner. This is a political matter which has nothing to do with business. If a tariff would be harmful between the two cities, when they formed part of the same State, it would be so to the same extent when they formed part of two different States. If a tariff were of use in the latter case, it would also have been so in the former. It ought to have been established, in spite of the political unity of the two cities.

In the economic domain there are no foreigners or compatriots; there are only good and bad transactions. The individuals who make the former enrich themselves; those who make the latter impoverish themselves. When a great number of persons make profitable ventures, the general wealth of the country increases. But it matters little with whom they make these transactions, whether with a compatriot or with a foreigner. If one is robbed by one's own brother, that does not prevent one from being harmed. Not only citizenship, but even relationship, has nothing to do with economics.

A FRENCH PREMIER ON PROTECTION

The policy of raising prices artificially inside France has had as its result that we find ourselves in possession of the most out-of-date plant imaginable. Such has been the last word of this policy of malthusianism. It has corrupted both masters and men. The masters have found it convenient to apply to the State, and to ask it to raise round them an ever higher tariff wall, under which they will be able always to be selling less and less products at an ever higher price. It is thus that a nation inflicts ruin upon itself. -- Paul Reynaud, when Minister of Finance, Dec. 28, 1938.

THE AGRARIAN QUESTION IN KOREA

M. J. L.

Behind the Korean war, as is true of every war, is the land problem. Korea has a population of 29 million people, with three out of every four families engaged in agriculture, if that is what one calls it when 63% of all farm households have less than 2.4 acres (1938 figures) while half of them have less than 1.2 acres. Absentee owners own most of the land in Korea, the largest of these being the Oriental Development Co., a Japanese-controlled corporation.

Japanese in Korea

We've long heard of Japan's overcrowding -- though its density of population is only half of Belgium or England. What we don't hear much of is that half of the arable land in Japan is owned by 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ % of her population. Thirty-three million Japanese get their living on rented and taxed plots of an acre or so apiece. No wonder Japanese farmers are ready and willing to "colonize" other lands. There is always a possibility it might be better some place else.

After the victory of Japan over China (1894-95) Japan sought to transfer farmets to Korea, which was an unwilling pawn in that war. Korea being already so heavily populated with the land divided into tiny plots per family, Japanese farmers could not settle Korea unless Koreans were driven off the land. For that purpose, the Oriental Development Co. served nicely. An act of Japan's Imperial Diet in 1908 granted ten million yen to this company for "improving agricultural conditions by settling Japanese farmers in Korea."

A Chinese expert, Hoon K. Lee, wrote of this corporation in 1936: --

"Of the authorized capital the old Korean government was required to pay half. Since the government had no alternative but to obey the dictator, the request was promptly complied with. The Korean government, however, had no funds from which to pay, and so it paid its share in land."

"Interest" Takes its Toll

The Korean Government thus turned over the best lands to the Oriental Development Co. and was also required to pay 300,000 yen per year to guarantee at least an annual 8% dividend to private shareholders in Japan. Soon the fiction that it was a joint affair between the two governments was abandoned and in 1917 the Korean government was forced to give up its claim to any past or future dividends.

The Oriental Development Co. expanded rapidly. Its high

rate of interest appealed to foreign banks. Fifty million francs were loaned it from France, \$2,000,000 from New York banks at 5%. The interest rates charged Korean tenants and Japanese colonists. Opposition developed and feeling was bitter against this corporation. Armed rebellions broke out. But the Oriental Development Co. continued to expand. Between 1918 and 1938 Korean tenant families increased 45 per cent.

In 1947 U. S. financial journals estimated its assets at one and a quarter billion, which included 64% of Korea's dry lands, 80% of its rice land, 350,000 acres of forest lands, and extensive industrial holdings. The National City Bank of N. Y. was fiscal agent for the Oriental Development Co.

High Rents

According to documented study in September Facts for Farmers (39 Cortland St., New York City) U. S. State Department experts put the average Korean rental at 60% of the crop. But in his book Modern Korea, A. J. Drajdanzev (1944) says the rentals amount to as much as 90% of the crop. Generally the Korean tenants had no written contracts, and the landlord or his agent handled the settlement of accounts as well as the marketing of the crops. Land -- the gift of nature -- is absolutely essential for life. With both Korean and Japanese peasants competing for its use, the Oriental "Development" Co. could fix its own terms. Most of the peasants were subject to eviction at any time. Such is the power of him who "owns" the earth.

So little of the crop was left to the tenant families of Korea that even in a good crop year they suffered "spring hunger" during which they ate grass and bark and roots of trees. In a UNESCO report of 70 countries, Korea is at the bottom of the list in a rating of diets. Japan took 50 to 60 millions of rice out of Korea annually. In Korea Today, (1950) George M. McCune says: "Per capita domestic consumption in 1931-35 was 45% lower than in 1916-20. Yet in the same period the percentage of the rice crop exported to Japan had increased from 14 to 48%.

Help from U. S.?

In World War II the Koreans aided the Allied cause; resisted the Japanese in their own country, sent thousands of men to aid China and Russia in Manchuria. After Japan surrendered in August, 1945, the Koreans thought to throw off the Japanese yoke and settle the score with their own feudal landlords. A "People's Republic" was launched in September of 1945 and agreed to redistribute the Japanese-held land among the sharecroppers. According to William L. Shirer (New York

Herald Tribune, Sept. 16, 1945) members of the U. S. Military Government who took over South Korea ignored the people's representatives. But there was no question that the big issue it had to face was land reform; yet for two years the U. S. forces postponed action.

To quiet unrest, the Military Government proposed a Homestead Act in February, 1946, which was to change peasants in 15 years to landowners, provided they paid one-fourth the crop each year. But this measure was not put into effect. In late December a South Korean Interim Assembly was finally organized (in many cases only landowners voted) but was representative mainly of landowners. The Military Government stipulated that "landowners must receive adequate compensation. The Koreans argued that most landowners were either Japanese or collaborators; their land should be confiscated. Finally in May 1949, a conservative, compromise land reform law was passed. The Rhee Administration promptly put it aside. Indignant legislators returned it to President Rhee, 97 to 19. The Rhee Administration remained unsympathetic to the peasants' cry for land; such confusion developed that legislators were jailed or fled; hostilities broke out; military officials suppressed farmers' organizations which were trying to work out a solution. In this stalling, landlords arranged fictitious sales of their holdings, compelling tenants to buy on unfavorable terms or be evicted.

Realizing that the Rhee regime offered no hope in land reform or a unified Korea, 40 South Korean parties went to the Northern capital and entered into a loose political alliance with 16 Northern organizations in the summer of 1948. These conducted the election which AMG declared illegal in the South but which seemingly received the sanction of 77% of 77% of all the Korean people, and on Sept. 8, these groups proclaimed the People's Republic of All-Korea, with its capital at Pyongyang. Most of the cabinet posts and a majority of seats in the Assembly went to South Koreans. The ballots, complete with names and thumb-prints, according to Facts for Farmers, are reportedly available for scrutiny, but the UN has made no move to check its validity.

Who Should Own the Earth?

The struggle in the Far East is not one race of people against another. It is not a rising of the Brown against the White Man except insofar as the White Man has taken his land or supports the group that holds it away from those who want to use it. It is not actually a war between Communists and Capitalists. Newspapers report that the North Koreans are distributing land to the peasants in their newly won territory. This may have something to do with the zeal with which these forces fight this war; to a peasant his land is his life. Any

power that will deal justly with the land will be welcomed, and any that seeks to reverse this defeudalization will have tough going.

How many of these and other back-stage facts do radio-listeners get? If instead of the countless details of what river has been crossed or which town besieged, or how many planes are in use, the people were given the history of the case as relates to land, and were instructed in the fundamental principle that "land belongs to the users of it", there would be reason for hope. Even in the United Nations there is no mention of these basic issues. There too, the controversy is misdirected to minor matters as to whether the Northern or Southern forces took the first step.

And when we get to the bottom -- to the land problem -- we do not need to go the Korea to begin the solution. We have but to look at the land beneath our own feet. We can begin at home to implement right principles of land ownership.

-- The Interpreter (Brookville, Ohio) Sept. 15, 1950.

--oo00oo--

No conservative Government could more zealously preserve the interests of the land monopolists than the present Government. It kept land values high because of its restrictions, built up a black market in land sales. High prices for primary products are also putting up land values, not for the benefit of the people but for the benefit of the land owners.

So Australia drifts towards Communism because neither party has a policy to remove the evils, for which communism is put forward as a remedy. It is a false remedy but we submit that it can only be successfully opposed by true remedies -- the abolition of taxes and the collection of the people's natural public revenue -- the rent of land. -- The Standard, discussing the present Australian Government.

Miss Margaret Higgins, reporting to the Herald Tribune (New York) on conditions in the German Ruhr, writes: "The peasants live on little plots of land on the 1250 acre estate of Alfred, Prince of Byck, in circumstances reminiscent of feudal times. The prince, an absentee owner, lives in Bonn. A farm superintendant collects the rent. -- The Standard, July, 1948.

A Federal Grand Jury has indicted six corporations for allegedly monopolizing the \$10,000,000 a year street lighting industry. How about "indicting" the monopolizers of the land we all have to live on? -- Sydney Meyers in Henry George News, Dec. 1948.

It is impossible for this or any other country to enrich its landowners and not suffer the consequences. -- The Standard.

THE "OVERBURDENING" OF "REAL ESTATE"

Ernest J. Farmer

Current newspapers give the impression that it is practically impossible for two or more Ontario reeves or mayors to meet without agreeing (1) that "real estate" is overburdened with taxes; (2) that the municipalities must have additional sources of revenue, and (3) that the Province and/or the Dominion must assume a greater part of the cost of municipal administration, especially costs of education and social services.

The thinking of these men is totally unrealistic. As for "real estate" being overburdened, Citizen's Research Institute showed recently that between 1938 and 1948 real estate taxes in Canada increased but 44 per cent. As prices increased by about 50 per cent in the same time, these taxes, in terms of a dollar of constant purchasing power, actually decreased, and are still diminishing. In Toronto, present taxes on land are 15% less in ordinary dollars than in 1938, and 45% less measured in constant dollars. Rents, except for the small part still under rent control, have increased about 200%, and even under rent control most landlords have had their incomes increased in much greater proportion than their taxes. There never was a time when Canadian workers paid so large a part of their incomes merely for the use of the land on which they live and work, nor when the landlords paid so small a part of their unearned incomes in taxes on land, as at present. The income tax does indeed take a considerable part of income from land, which mostly goes to persons with large total incomes; but it does not, like the direct land tax, act as an incentive to make the best use of land -- quite the reverse.

While "real estate" taxes increased 44 per cent in dollars and decreased in constant dollars, the Dominion sales tax (one of those which presses hardly upon the poor) increased 242 per cent; import duties (which take still more from the poor in proportion to the revenue gained) increased 136 per cent; gasoline taxes increased 170 per cent; and the total of all public revenues increased 279 per cent.

In Alberta the greater part of improvements and buildings are untaxed, so that the land is more heavily taxed than in Ontario. Yet taxes there are but a small part of land rent. Mr. Fred Pease of Milk River mentioned that he was renting some farm land at \$2.00 per acre plus tax of 25¢ per acre. In this case the tax was one-ninth of the economic rent, or a little more if the \$2 included payment for improvements of any kind. (Mr. Pease mentioned some Government exactions which weighed upon him not only more heavily than the land tax, but

more than the whole land rent.)

The situation in the United States is no better. In Tax Digest, June 1949, it is shown that in 1935 60 per cent of all taxes (federal, state and local) raised in California were raised as ad valorem taxes on real estate. By 1945 this proportion had dropped to 8 per cent, and a further decrease has taken place since.

The statement that "real estate" is overburdened is one of those big lies which people will believe more easily than the little ones. Our slum landlords understood this principle long before Hitler announced it in Mein Kampf. It is true that buildings and improvements are taxed far more highly than either justice or the general welfare demands; but so far as that particular tax is concerned the situation is better than ten years ago. Equally injurious taxes, as well as the landlords' exactions, have enormously increased.

As for "additional sources of revenue", one must believe in fairy godmothers and Santa Claus to believe that there is any source of revenue other than the useful labor of the people. Imposing fresh taxes, such as those recently advocated by Toronto public officials, merely means making tax collection more complicated and wasteful and increasing opportunities for fraudulent evasion. It also means reducing the revenue collected from the unearned incomes of the landlords, those best able of all to pay more without hardship.

For the Province or Dominion to assume part of present municipal costs means, in the first place, again increasing the unearned incomes of the landlords. In the second place, it means removing taxation further from the immediate control of the people. Except for the income tax, forms of taxation open to the Province or the Dominion generally weigh more heavily upon the poor than even the tax on buildings, besides being more expensive to collect. And there is such influential opposition to the income tax that except in case of war it is more likely to be further reduced than to be increased.

One of the big lies often believed is that expenditures on education do not benefit the landlord. Schools do not increase the value of buildings, but they are responsible for a large part of the value of land. The late J. H. L. Patterson, one of the best informed of men on Toronto land values, stated that when the Northern Vocational School was built at a cost of \$2,000,000 land values in the vicinity increased by \$3,000,000. Revenues from land are regularly higher in localities where educational services are good than where they are poor, and the difference is greater than the difference in the cost of building and maintaining the schools. With only the rarest exceptions, landlords collect from their tenants the whole value of all public services including schools, available at the site.

"MY NEIGHBOR'S LANDMARK" REPUBLISHED

The Land and Liberty Press have republished "My Neighbor's Landmark", a 140-page volume of studies in Bible land laws. Mr. Verinder, the author, was elected Secretary of the English Land Restoration League (since renamed the English League for the Taxation of Land Values) and held that office from 1884 until his death in 1948, at the age of ninety.

Among many passages we should like to quote is the following: --

There are few tracts on the Land Question so thought-provoking as to the first principles of just social relationships as the little leaflet which has floated down to us through the ages, and which we usually refer to as the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus. .. We have here at once one of the most ancient and one of the most modern treatises on the Land Question; for it is based on the fundamental truth that private property in land is private property in man; that landlordism is slavery; that Land and Liberty are both essential to the well-being of a Nation.

MRS. ROBERT WYNNE

We greatly regret to hear of the death on September tenth of Mrs. Robert Wynne, of Hamilton. While health permitted, Mrs. Wynne as hostess made delightful many meetings of Georgists at her home; but failing health compelled her to avoid much activity during the last two or three years.

MEETING IN HAMILTON

Mr. Wynne writes: "On November 19th we had a meeting at my house with an aldermanic candidate for Ward 2, a Mr. Farewell. There were present: -- A. C. Ross, John Wilson, Frank Greensides and myself. I knew that Mr. Farewell was interested in taxation reform and in more equitable assessments. I called him up and invited him here. He had a superficial acquaintance with the theory of land value taxation and vaguely endorsed it. I believe we succeeded in clearing all doubt in his mind as to its justice and practical value. We are now organizing a party of canvassers for him.

--oo00oo--

It is a remarkable fact that when he began to write Progress and Poverty George struck exactly the same note as Jesus did when He met John at Jordan. George said, "The object is justice"; and Jesus said, before the baptism, "It becometh us to fulfil all justice." -- Francis Neilson.

WHY NORTH KOREA FIGHTS FOR COMMUNISM.

In a broadcast talk in Wellington, N. Z., Professor R. S. Parker (Political Science, Victoria University), said, on July 15, that: "No one seems to have worried very much so far, over what the fighting in Korea is all about. . . . We read of the high morale of the invading armies, their skill and cohesion, their refusal to surrender even when forced in burning clothes out of crippled tanks Twenty thousand South Koreans unable to organize even a delaying action against an invading force based a population of about four million. . . .

During their four years of occupation of Northern Korea, the Russians not only created an efficient army, but also energetically, even ruthlessly, promoted the major social reform needed in most East Asian countries, namely, breaking the grip of the extortionate landlords and money lenders (often contained in the same person) and redistributing the land to the peasants. . . . The Americans argued that social reform was none of America's business; it was a matter for decision by the Koreans when they had a democratic government of their own. . . . The Provisional Constitution that resulted was none too democratic, so we can't expect that land reform has progressed very much since that time, or that the South Korean peasant should necessarily want to fight for his government, or for any foreigners, against his Communist countrymen from the north. Of course, we may have our own opinions about the nature of the Communist rule. . . . But the attitude of the illiterate, downtrodden Korean peasant is not so sophisticated as ours. Land and rice mean something to him; Democracy is just a foreign word.

At bottom, the North Korean invasion is, I think, correctly interpreted by various observers as a probing movement by the Communist group of powers, to test out the anti-Communist group's willingness to defend its premiters with blood. . . . We can't afford to give away positions like that. The whole situation reminds us too grimly of our experience with Hitler before the war." -- The Free People (Johannisburg, October 1950.)

--oo00oo--

Land reform is the greatest of all anti-slavery measures. Abolish chattel slavery tomorrow and land monopoly would pave the way for its re-establishment. -- Gerret Smith (abolitionist) in 1885.

There is no gain to society at large from the rise of (ground) rent; it is advantageous to the landlords alone and their interests are thus permanently in opposition to those of all other classes. -- David Ricardo, one of the earliest scientific economists.

WHO IS IT PAYS THE RENT?

Edmund Vance Cooke

You may Hooverize the produce and make some simple gains,
 You may organize the labor and industrialize the brains,
 You may penalize the profits, causing plutocratic pains,
 But the Mother of Monopoly is laughing as she reigns.

Rent! rent! who is it pays the rent?

A dozen days in every month the worker's back is bent;
 Figure it in dollar bills or work it by per cent,
 But with his dozen days he pays just rent, rent, rent.

You may "minimum" the wages, you may let the women vote,
 You may regulate the railroads with a legal antidote,
 You may jail some Rockefeller, or get a Morgan's goat,
 But the Mother of Monopoly is laughing in her throat.

Rent! rent! who is it pays the rent?

A hundred days in every year a business profit's spent;
 Figure it in "overhead" or state it by per cent,
 But all your hundred days are gone for rent, rent, rent.

You may institute Foundations, you may educate the duds,
 You may liberalize the Bread Line, and establish Slummy
 Clubs;

You may ostracize the Demon Rum and eugenize the cubs,
 But the Mother of Monopoly is smiling at your snubs.

Rent! rent! who is it pays the rent?

A score of years in life you spend to get one document;
 From your cradle to your coffin you must bow to its
 assent,

And that's your little old receipt for rent, rent, rent.

I look across the rented world and idle land I see,
 Whose owner doesn't work it, for he's working you and me,
 And on the first of every month all tenants bow the knee,
 And pay the rent of vacant land, in great or small degree.

Rent! rent! who is it pays the rent?

The worker's hands are busy and the business back is
 bent;

The idle lands advance in price and every single cent
 Of that advance is paid by us in rent, rent, rent.

--oo0000--

Poverty is the penalty we pay for our ignorance of
 fundamental laws, the first being that the earth is the
 birthright of all. -- The Commonweal.

The favors of Government are like Pandora's box except
 that they rarely leave hope at the bottom. -- Thorold Rogers.

THE MARCH OF BUREAUCRACY

Here are just a few of the government agents who drop in to see us, sometimes in twos and threes, sometimes like small hordes of locusts: State Sales Tax, State Labor Department, Factory Inspectors, Federal Unemployment, State Unemployment, Revaluation and Conversion, Internal Revenue, War Assets, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Government Auditors on Contracts, Renegotiation Representatives, and last but not least, Wage and Hour Representatives. -- Carl S. Gray, in "Why Does Uncle Sam Pick on Us?", Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 1, 1949.

At present the average "law-abiding citizen" commits about twenty offences a week for which he could be imprisoned for months or fined some hundreds of pounds. -- A. C. Hunter (Skelmorlie, Ayrshire, Scotland) in a letter in the Toronto Globe and Mail, Oct. 3 1949.

There is an element of humor in my own experience. The most courteous Government officials I have encountered, apart from the farmer's friend, the county agent, have been members of Mr. Hoover's F. B. I. In FBI files are letters from criminals, whom the FBI has efficiently landed in jail, saying: "I want to thank you for always treating me like a gentleman. Signed, One-Eye Mike."

I hate to think that one has to rob a bank to be treated with respect by Government officials. -- Dorothy Thompson, in "A Gripe About Officials", a syndicated article.

Recently a Detroit baker was haled into court and charged with unfair competition. There was no complaint against the quality of his bread. His "crime" was selling loaves 4 ounces heavier than his competitors were selling at the same price. The court ordered him to reduce his loaves to the standard size. -- Toronto Globe and Mail, July 20, 1950.

Lord Beaverbrooke, who opened the 1950 Royal Agricultural Winter Fair in Toronto, related something of the difficulties of a farmer under Socialist administration. He operates a dairy farm in Surrey and Somerset. A drain pipe broke and flooded his dairy sheds. He applied to the proper Ministries for a permit to buy some new pipe and employ men to install the same. Applications refused; he was warned that if he proceeded without permits he would be prosecuted. Then an Inspector from the Ministry of Health ordered him to cease selling milk until the stables were drained. Soon a Food Ministry official warned him that if he didn't market his quota of milk he would be prosecuted. In all ten different inspectors called at the farm, including a pest inspector. "The Beaver" considered that the only pests of any consequence from which the farm suffered were the ten inspectors. (We hope he told the pest inspector so.)