

The Georgist Journal

Now in its Fifth Year

Number 17

Autumn 1977

GUEST EDITORIAL

There have been articles in the Georgist Journal criticizing the Georgist movement for not making more progress and proposing another approach.

George Menninger in the Spring issue says, "We should be selling the idea that the land belongs to the people." I do not dispute this; however, most people with whom I have come in contact firmly believe that the land belongs to whoever happens to hold title to it and that he should collect and keep all he can get for the land.

I admire Mr. Menninger for his spirit and hope he will continue. However, I must ask him how many converts he has made out of each 100 contacts. I think it is only fair that any one who tells us what we should be doing should support his recommendations with some record of his success.

I have tried all sorts of approaches as I am sure many others have. When an article by Winston Churchill supporting our views appeared in the Reader's Digest, I felt sure this was a breakthrough. However, those to whom I gave the article remained absolutely unconvinced, despite its logic and persuasiveness.

The followers of Henry George have presented the doctrine in thousands of ways. Why is it that some, like ourselves, accept it, while others, just as intelligent and humane, have rejected it?

This is my theory: A different concept of justice than ours prevails in the world - a concept that justifies the private collection of rent. Another point is that concerned people who take an interest in public affairs have their own axe to grind and are not much impressed with another point of view. The rest of the population are either too indolent or too deeply absorbed with their own troubles.

I continue writing letters and articles because, although most people remain unconvinced, I do get some good responses. An article I wrote for the United Methodist Reporter, "Poverty Solution Readily Available", resulted in an encouraging letter from a minister; and letters of mine to Miami and Fort Lauderdale papers continue to be printed. I usually mention Progress and Poverty or some other work so that interested persons may look further into it.

- J. Bruno Eichert
Fort Lauderdale, Fla., USA

Contents of this issue

Organizations and members 2
Differential Assessments 3
Non-shiftability of LVT 4
A Change of Title, W.Costerus ... 5

Inflation, J.J.Pot 6
Land Value vs. Rent, L.Boorman .. 6
Recent Literature 7
An Odyssey, J.Busey 9
News of H.G. Institute10

THE GEORGIST JOURNAL, Rm. 462-A, 55 W. 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036, USA.
Robert Clancy, Editor. Readers are invited to submit suitable articles, letters, news, etc., for publication.

NEWS OF ORGANIZATIONS AND MEMBERS

A WEEKEND SCHOOL was held by the ESSRA School of Economic Studies at Pendley Manor (Tring, Herts., England), July 8 - 10. The theme was "How We Are Governed." Talks included "The Lords and Legislation" by Lord Douglas of Barloch, "The EEC and Parliamentary Sovereignty" by Richard Body, M.P., "The Commons and Legislation" by Roy Douglas, and others. This successful Weekend was attended by 50 residents and about a dozen day visitors.

EDVARD HOUGAARD sent us from Denmark a dossier of interesting material on land value tax news, assessment maps and Georgist activities (see p. 8). DAN BJØRNER of Copenhagen sent us a late but generous and welcome contribution toward the restoration of the Henry George grave.

J. TED GWARTNEY, for some years property tax consultant to the Assessment Authority of British Columbia, has won the position of Assessment Commissioner of that Canadian province. Assessment techniques are being perfected and the Authority has pioneered in removing assessment from political control.

HARRY POLLARD delivered a paper on "Land-Use Patterns: Influence on Transport" at a meeting of the Pacific Division of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in June.

NOAH D. ALPER has issued the 26th annual report of the Public Revenue Education Council, wherein we learn that thousands of pieces of literature by Prof. C. Lowell Harriss, Perry Prentice, the late Prof. H. G. Brown and others were sent to colleges, libraries and the media.

ROBERT CLANCY was recently elected to the Board of Directors of LEAF (Land Equality and Freedom); and re-elected to the Board of Trustees of the Henry George Foundation of America.

HARRY A. EIGENRAUCH is campaigning as a Republican for the City Council of Pittsburgh, Pa. and is using as his slogan, "Less tax on house - More tax on land."

BENJAMIN F. SMITH has on request reproduced on a smaller scale the set of placards he used in connection with his talk at the recent Georgist conference in Wisconsin. It is entitled "What Every Georgist Should Know," and contains basic statements and formulas on land and taxation. If interested, write to Mr. B. F. Smith at 8253 E. Fulton Rd., Ada, Mich. 49301, USA.

We are glad to see FREEFOLK revived after a lapse. This publication is edited by E. A. Bryan, 25805 Fraser Highway, R.R. 5, Aldergrove, B.C. VOX 1A0, Canada. \$2.00 a year.

We are sorry to hear that the office of the Boston Henry George School suffered damage from a fire. Director M. S. LURIO will continue to operate the School from his residence, 25 Griggs Terrace, Brookline, Mass. 02146.

MICHAEL SILAGI (Munich, W. Germany) has won his second doctor's degree, a Law doctorate (LL.D.). His thesis in international law will be published under the auspices of Munich University. His first doctoral dissertation was "Henry George und Europa", which we hope will be published in English.

MAX H. FLECHNER (Southbury, Conn., USA) finds that his letters to local newspapers are arousing interest and he is distributing literature to inquirers.

DIFFERENTIAL ASSESSMENTS VS. DIFFERENTIAL TAX RATES

In the Spring Georgist Journal, Earl A. Hanson asked this question: "Is there any merit in moving toward land value taxation by the use of differential assessment ratios rather than differential mill levy rates between land and improvements?" Following is a discussion on this question.

Critique by SAMUEL SCHECK (Long Island, N.Y., USA)

There is no merit at all in differential assessments. As a matter of fact, differential assessments have been a major inequity in property assessments to date.

Most states have laws stating that all property assessments should be made annually on the basis of 100% of market value. By the simple expedient of not abiding by this law, the assessment ratio of 100%, which was necessarily equal between land and buildings to start with, rapidly turned into a partial assessment due to inflation of property values - particularly the land values - with the result that we not only have a partial assessment today but a differential partial assessment. The land value assessment today is generally only 40% of the building assessment. In Nassau County, New York, where the last 100% reassessment was done in 1938, the average assessment is 17% of market value, whereas the land assessment is between 5% and 7% of market value. The statement that differential ratio favoring buildings will do more to eliminate speculation than maintaining 100% assessment is not true. The benefit of the former can be more than negated by not keeping the latter up to date.

In order to arrive at a differential assessment, one must first arrive at the 100% assessment. Isn't it simpler to just use that alone and avoid confusion which can only benefit manipulators? The greatest boon to the Henry George movement has been the adjudication of the courts, as in the Hellerstein decision in Fire Island (part of Long Island, N.Y.) that 100% assessments must be made and maintained. With that as a basis, we can then go on to differential assessments favoring buildings, as in Harrisburg, Pa.

Reply by EARL A. HANSON (Cedar City, Utah, USA)

Dr. Scheck's objection to differential assessments is certainly valid if all we propose to do is to make a fragmentary shift in the incidence of the property tax. But would not the practice of assessors in underassessing land also tend to negate a tax shift attempt by applying differential mill levies?

When the property tax is totally phased off from improvements and personal property it can fall only on land values and the pressure will be on assessors to do a job that is fair and equitable on all properties.

Whether the transition to a total land value tax is made in 5, 7 or 10 years the need is for a gradual and uniform change rather than having any large transition in a single year. By the time a state has passed the necessary constitutional amendment to make the transition there would be a better understanding of property taxes and the work of the assessor would be closely observed by interested tax payers.

Are we proposing a change that is too drastic when we work for the removal of all property taxes from buildings, improvements and personal property? I think not. The rental value of land (or 9/10ths of the rental value of land) certainly ex-

ceeds the present property taxes and personal property taxes being collected. Sales taxes and state and local income taxes need reduction and removal, but why move in that direction before the property tax has been changed to a land value tax?

Comment by STEVEN CORD (Indiana, Pa., USA)

Dr. Scheck objects to differential assessment ratios for land and buildings, although he approves of differential tax rates. But theoretically they are equivalent. If a 10% tax exemption is given to buildings but not to land, it is the same as taxing land at a higher rate than buildings.

For example, if in a taxing locality all land is market-valued at \$1,000,000 and all buildings at \$2,000,000, then a 2% tax rate will raise \$60,000 in revenue; give all buildings a 10% tax exemption and then you will need a tax rate of about 2.142% to raise the same revenue. Now, with a 2% no-exemption rate, you raise \$20,000 from land and \$40,000 from buildings; with the 10% building tax exemption, you will get \$31,420 from land and \$38,556 from buildings ($\$1,800,000 \times .02142$), for a total of \$59,976. Surely we can devise differential tax rates that will raise \$21,420 from land and \$59,976 from buildings; they are 2.142% and 2.998% respectively, according to my figuring.

Of course, I agree with Dr. Scheck's objection to the all-too-common practice of assessing buildings at a greater ratio to market value than land, which then means that they are taxed more than land. The simplest and best way is to assess at 100% market value, then tax land at a higher rate or grant tax exemption to buildings.

Incidentally, Harrisburg taxes land at a greater rate than buildings (2.9% and 1.6% respectively); assessments there are supposed to bear the same ratio (30%) to market value. In some states, differential tax rates are unconstitutional, but differential assessments are not; so from a political point of view, the differential assessment approach would be good strategy.

WHY THE TAX ON LAND VALUES CANNOT BE SHIFTED

Miss G. E. Read of Horsham, Sussex, England, writes asking for an article explaining why the tax on land values cannot be passed on. The following explanation is from the Supplement to Lesson VIII of the HGI course based on Progress and Poverty:

Can a Tax on Land Values be Shifted? That is, can a landowner who is taxed on his land increase his rent to his tenant so as to pay the tax and still get the same net rent as before? Suppose land is not taxed and a tenant is paying \$100 annual rent for the land. Suppose a tax of 20% is now imposed on the rent, i.e., \$20; can the landowner now demand \$120 in rent, keep \$100 and pay \$20 in tax? This is what is done with commodities - an increased tax increases the price.

However, the case is different with land. Land is not produced by labor; it is fixed in quantity and its price is a monopoly price (all the traffic will bear). A tax on labor products increases the cost of those products and this is reflected in the price. If the new price meets consumer resistance, the supply of that product is checked.

But a tax on land does not affect either its cost of production (it is not produced) or its supply (which is fixed). Thus its price is not increased (the owner is

already getting all the traffic will bear), and the tax falls directly on the owner. The rent of land is determined by the margin of production and it is a certain amount whether taxed or untaxed. A tax on land is simply a division of the rent between the owner and the community. Thus the landowner in the case cited above would pay \$200 in tax and keep \$800 in net rent, as the total rent is still \$1000.

A CHANGE OF TITLE By W. COSTERUS (Amsterdam, Netherlands)

In the Spring Georgist Journal, James MacMurchie proposed to change the name of the Scottish League for Land Value Taxation to the Scottish Movement for Ground Rent for State Revenue. I fully appreciate this, but in my opinion this could be understood as if ground rent should be an additional source of public revenue. Maybe we would avoid this hazard if we chose the title, Movement for State Revenue from Ground Rent Only.

But I would prefer a term which would show clearly and unequivocally that the community should revindicate its own property - the total site value of all land within its boundaries. I feel that most of our own expressions in our publications point out only the preferability of letting the ground rent flow into the community chest.

It is true that in our literature we read that the site value is a purely social product created by the community. But (1) the Declaration of the International Union spoils this by "favouring the raising of public revenue by taxes and rates, etc."; and (2) the Henry George Institute proposes that "the rent of land be taken by the community, etc.", which hints more of state pressure than the right of the community to recapture this rent.

Another correction in the Institute's Statement of Purpose would be: Strike the words "on labor and the fruits of labor" in the second sentence, because in our system all taxes will be abolished, even those on landed property. The next sentence is superfluous in my eyes, just a "belief"; and even if true it is wholly irrelevant to the moral rightness of our principle. Morality and justice cannot be measured by economic advantage.

By the way, whoever would argue that it is not only the community but also Nature which creates site value, should realize that Nature cannot be recompensated, and that it is human beings who evaluate the natural site values.

I believe that a formally legal approach to our common cause is easier to understand - and hopefully, to accept - than other arguments which have a sentimental value.

(The statements of the International Union and the Henry George Institute referred to above appear on the back page of each issue of the Georgist Journal. The Scottish League is canvassing its members about a change in title. We plan to report the results. - Ed.)

* * *

ONS ERFDEEL (Our Heritage), Dutch Georgist bi-monthly, has been discontinued. The Georgists who kept this publication alive (especially S. Sevenster, J. J. Pot, Wim Born and W. Costerus) now devote their efforts to GRONDVEST, the organ of Stichting Grondvest (Land Trust Foundation), which is more politically oriented and seeks a wider audience. A newsletter will continue to be sent to the members of the Georgist organization, Recht en Vrijheid (Justice and Freedom), who number about 60.

INFLATION: THE STARTING POINT

By J. J. POT (Lunteren, Netherlands)

W. H. Pitt ("Inflation - Is This Correct?" in the Spring Georgist Journal) is perfectly right in stating that "the immediate cause of inflation lies in deficit budgeting." But this is only a small fraction of the whole problem. The general formulation of the cause of inflation is the destruction of confidence. This can be done in many ways - deficit budgeting is one of thousands.

Inflation is "something for nothing." If, for instance, tomorrow you have to pay more for the same human exertion as yesterday, that one dollar more has no value. Mixed among the whole supply of currency, all dollars are proportionately devalued.

If you follow the chain of wages, prices and the rest, somewhere you'll end up at the printing press - printing dollar notes not backed by wealth, consequently bearing no confidence. So the printing press is an effect, not the cause of inflation.

If you ask for the beginning of inflation, searching around and around for all instances of "violation of confidence," without tracing the starting point of inflation, I would advise you to ask why. Why does one ask something for nothing? The kernel of the answer is, because the other fellow is doing it (price-wage, price-wage, ...). And if we keep asking why, we indeed get to the starting point: land. Every dollar paid for a gift of nature is not backed up by wealth produced by human exertion. The capitalisation of the rent into the price of land is the first "something for nothing," prompting all others to play the same trick - all the way to deficit budgeting by government, and to the printing press as a final consequence of the whole story.

LAND VALUE VS. RENT

By LIONEL BOORMAN (Eastwood, N.S.W., Australia)

I was intrigued by Benjamin F. Smith's statement ("More on Math and Single Tax," Winter Georgist Journal, No. 14) that Julian Hickok erroneously assumes "that the value of land equals the price of land, thus the value and total rent both drop as land prices drop with land value taxes."

Both Mr. Hickok and Mr. Smith seem to be making simple things complicated by a wrong assumption that rent arises from value. As Henry George points out, "Value arises from rent and not rent from value", and I believe that not even Albert Einstein could have worked out a formula showing the effect of the Single Tax on rent.

It is true that the public appropriation of rent would raise the margin of production and raise wages at the expense of rent, but the resulting increase of production and the overall effect of the abolition of taxation would be incalculable.

Land value, which is a social evil, arises from the failure of Governments to collect their true revenue, and if the Single Tax were applied to rent and not to land value, all difficulties in the quantum of assessment would disappear as land value began to disappear. Land value is not a capitalisation of rent. It is a capitalisation of privately appropriated rent, and if the community takes the rent there is nothing left upon which to capitalise.

We must recognise that land value is a social evil and that rent is a natural phenomenon - the former to be destroyed by the public appropriation of the latter.

RECENT LITERATURE

BRITISH COLUMBIA SERIES

Mason Gaffney, now at the University of California, until recently headed the British Columbia Institute for Economic Policy Analysis, associated with the University of British Columbia. The purpose was to foster research in public policy. Several symposia were held and the results appear in a series of books published by the University of British Columbia Press, Victoria, B.C., Canada - much as was done with a similar series of symposia conducted by TRED (Committee on Taxation, Resources and Economic Development) - with which Prof. Gaffney was also associated - and published by the University of Wisconsin Press.

The first in the B.C. series was on forestry. The second, recently received, is Local Service Pricing Policies and Their Effect on Urban Spatial Structure, edited by Paul B. Downing. As explained by Prof. Gaffney, this deals with "the problems of cross-subsidy" which "occurs in large systems where the rates or prices charged to various consumers are not graded according to their respective costs of services." Special attention is paid to consumers working at high density subsidizing those at low density. This results in people moving prematurely to low-density areas, or "urban sprawl." Prof. Gaffney proposes to charge each location the full marginal costs of providing services to that location. Several of the participants agree with this approach, others disagree, feeling that the benefits of the subsidy outweigh the disadvantages. This is one of the very few studies in print on this subject.

The third in the series is Natural Resources Revenue: a Test of Federalism, edited by Anthony Scott. The question is posed by Prof. Scott, "Who should get natural resource revenues in Canada?" The emphasis is on minerals and oil and the question revolves around provincial vs. national (federal?) taxation of these resources, which is further advanced in Canada than in the U.S. The evident answer is that the revenue should be shared by the different levels of government and the participants in this symposium explore viable means for doing so.

The questions raised in these two symposia are important matters that will have to be tackled in any land value tax system. Prof. Gaffney has made a significant contribution in bringing them to light and discussion. These works, though academic and technical in nature, will constitute valuable reference works for practical Georgist work.

We expect to see another in this series in the near future.

SERIOUS BUT SPRIGHTLY

Civilization on Square Wheels by W. Stuart Morrell. Vantage Press, New York. \$5.95.

The subtitle of this book is "The Misuse of Land, Religion, Money, Education," and a series of engaging chapters on these subjects shows that the author has a humorous, humanitarian and down-to-earth approach. In the course of a quizzical look at the foibles of religion, government, the monetary system and human nature, Mr. Morrell outlines the Henry George philosophy, the law of rent and the benefits of land value taxation. Near the end he offers some salty advice: "Well, what to do? Just keep on obeying the laws of life, seek the truth, and by patient persuasion give to and take it from others." The book is enlivened with clever illustrations by Frank Manno and interesting diagrams.

FROM DENMARK

Henry George by Ebbe Kløvedal Reich. Forlaget Tranehus, Denmark.

This booklet of 32 pages (in Danish) is written in a lively style. It is attractively illustrated with old photographs, woodcuts and cartoons with dates ranging from 1620 to 1910. Included is a seldom seen full-page photograph of Henry George. The text combines biographical with ideological information and comment. The biographical outline is rather brief. The commentary is reinforced by letting George speak for himself; interspersed throughout the text are quotations from George's writings, more than a third of the text. The closing page gives an interesting history of Georgism in Denmark. This little book should be useful in spreading the George philosophy. (Reviewed by Joseph Jespersen)

A DECENTRALIST APPROACH

Special Henry George issue of Green Revolution (Vol. 34, No. 7), York, Pa. \$1.00. (Available from Henry George Institute)

Green Revolution is a magazine published by the School of Living which is devoted to the decentralist movement and a natural way of living, based primarily on the teachings of Ralph Borsodi. This issue features the philosophy of Henry George. There are articles on the subject by Mildred J. Loomis - with a good explanation of the law of rent - and Jubal, both of whom attended the recent Georgist conference in Wisconsin, which is reported as well. There is also an extensive excerpt from Progress and Poverty, other quotations, and a two-page list of Georgist organizations and individuals who may be contacted for more information. There are articles as well on aspects of the decentralist movement, solar energy, the land trust movement, etc. Interesting illustrations are sprinkled throughout. This is a good item for reference and to show to friends who are interested in ecology and alternative ways of life.

HOUSING CONFERENCE PAPER: Low Income Housing - Technology or Policy? by W. O. Ranky

Mr. Ranky is chairman of the Better Cities Committee of Illinois, and he submitted this paper to the International Conference on Low Income Housing held in Bangkok, Thailand in June 1977. The paper's abstract is as follows: "To alleviate the world-wide shortage of low-cost housing, land value taxation seems to be the only remaining untried and undiscredited measure. A little known model legislation, which introduced a land value tax system successfully is described in essential details."

The "little known model" refers to a statute devised after World War I for Budapest, Hungary by Dr. J. J. Pikler who was Chief Evaluation Officer at the time. The model clearly defines the job to be done, how land is to be assessed, the records to be kept, etc. Although it was instituted and worked well, internal disorders thwarted this beneficial reform.

Those interested may write to Mr. W. O. Ranky, 339 Barry Ave., Chicago, Ill., 60657, USA.

* * *

ROBERT A. KING of Chicago proposes that efforts be made to get a U.S. postage stamp issued in 1979 to commemorate the centenary of Henry George's Progress and Poverty. A good idea which should be followed up.

AN INTERNATIONAL ODYSSEY

JAMES L. BUSEY, back at the University of Colorado after a sabbatical leave, travelled extensively during his leave. Among the places he visited was New Zealand and he reports as follows:

"My impression is that only a very small effort is going forth in New Zealand; but that our people are exercising some influence in Wellington. In that city there are absolutely no property taxes or improvements - it is all on land values. I spoke with Dr. Rolland O'Regan and asked him about all the construction and improvements going on in Wellington, and he said all this is undertaken under private enterprise without government grants or other public subsidy behind it, and that it is made possible by their system of exempting improvements from the property tax. The property tax system of Wellington is far in advance of anything in the U.S.

"I also spoke with Betty Noble of Wellington who said that the general public doesn't understand the theory behind their property tax system or even know that is particularly unusual. It was adopted so many decades ago that almost every one has forgotten why. There is now a movement afoot to extend the property tax to improvements, so it will be necessary to begin the propaganda program all over again. A continuous single tax campaign is needed there."

Dr. Busey also visited Spain and was particularly impressed by a meeting with Emilio Lemos Ortega of Seville. In a leading article in the Andalusian paper, Tierra del Sur, Sr. Lemos was hailed as one of "the patriarchs", stating that "a rebel of three-quarters of a century speaks out after forty years of silence." The forty years, of course, refers to the Franco regime. A dedicated Georgist, Sr. Lemos has conducted efforts and written books and pamphlets on the subject. He was a leader in Spain's organized Georgist movement of which little remains today. Publicity about Sr. Lemos has also appeared in El Correo de Andalucia.

In England, Dr. Busey felt privileged to meet with the late Ashley Mitchell during his last days. Mr. Mitchell advised Georgists to keep organized and ready for the day when the opportunity comes to introduce our ideas.

FREE ENTERPRISE AMENDMENT

GEORGE TIDEMAN (Chicago, Ill., USA) has prepared what he calls a Free Enterprise Amendment to the Illinois State Constitution, as follows:

"The General Assembly shall provide a revenue as may be needful by levying a charge for land-holding by valuation so that every Person and Corporation shall pay for the Privilege a charge in proportion to the value of their Land-holding or Land-holdings; the Value to be determined by some person or persons to be elected or appointed in such manner as the General Assembly shall direct and not otherwise.

"Franchises and other Privileges shall be subject to such charges as the General Assembly shall direct from time to time by General Law, uniform as to the Class upon which it operates.

"No tax shall be levied on People's wages or manufactured possessions."

Mr. Tideman believes that a specific proposal such as the above would attract interest and support and invites comments, which may be sent care of the Georgist Journal.

NEWS OF HENRY GEORGE INSTITUTE

Recent HGI members include: Inez Tilgner of New York, who has been working on a television play about Henry George; Sam Venturella, Georgist leader of Chicago; M. S. Lurio, Director, Boston Henry George School; Donald J. Bongers of Wisconsin, who heard about us at the recent Conference; Gerald D. McKernan, new Director of the Schalkenbach Foundation; Floyd Morrow, Board Chairman of LEAF; and Richard Matzinger and Dennis Sharp, correspondence course graduates.

Current HGI activities include a class in Current Events in Jackson Heights led by Robert Clany; a meeting at Freedom House on October 6 with Dr. Samuel Scheck speaking on 100% assessments (Dr. Scheck is also conducting a class on Long Island); and a new Progress and Poverty class led by Ben Russell of Yellville, Arkansas.

The correspondence course based on Progress and Poverty continues to thrive and is being advertised in several publications. Volunteer teachers include Gilbert Herman, C. M. Ossias, John Curley, Joseph Jespersen and Roma Bianco. Practically all who complete the course react favorably to its conclusions.

On October 27, educational television stations around the U.S. will begin a historic drama series about New York, prepared by Children's Television Workshop (but cued for an adult audience). Watch for the program on November 10, which will feature the 1886 mayoralty election and will include Henry George. (Check your station for the time - it will be in the evening.)

Notice to HGI Members

In the annual election earlier this year, HGI members voted to discontinue the mailing sent in January asking for nominations, and to keep only the ballot mailing sent in May. In future, the Nominations Committee will select the candidates that appear on the ballot.

However, members still have the right to make nominations both for Board members and for the Nominations Committee, and any nomination made by at least 5% of the members must appear on the ballot. (See HGI By-laws.) At present the HGI has approximately 200 members. Nominations should be made not later than January 31 to be considered.

While there will be no general nominations mailing, any member may request a list of current HGI members to assist him in making nominations.

In May 1978 a ballot will be sent to members for next year's election.

* * *

IN 1802 farmers in New York State paid 10 cents a year as rent for an acre of land. That meant they could raise a crop, some chickens, a pig or two and maybe even a cow. After paying the 10 cents they kept everything. Today they are paying 50% of the crop - half of everything they raise. Does that mean that landholders are getting 50% of the GNP less whatever taxes they pay? In Ethiopia before the 1974 revolution the rent of land was 90% of the crop. Will our landholders get that much too some day?

- Robert Sage
Sun City, Ariz., USA