Agrarian structure, both the conditions of land tenure as well as the conditions of land operation, within a specific period of time and in a specific place is the combination of man, land, and technology under the prevailing economic, socio-cultural, and ecological conditions. As these are changing, agrarian structures have to frequently change and adjust to new conditions and requirements. The absence of such a change has consequences for agricultural production, rural development, and the political and social order in the society.

In this world, there are quite different land tenure systems. These tenure systems have developed under the influence of natural factors (climate, soil conditions, topography) and sociocultural factors (value systems, political ideologies, technological levels, population development, changes in price/cost relation, etc.). As these factors vary from country to country and from time to time, and are so intrinsic parts of cultures, in the case of land tenure issues it is very difficult to transfer experiences from one country to the other.

Keeping this limitation in mind, the first part of the paper briefly discusses changes in the relation between man and land in Germany during the period of transition from a rural to an industrial society. Part II reviews the historical development of the relation between man and land in Korea. Having merely the task of indicating the broad differences between the German and Korean historical backgrounds, it neglects minor controversial opinions on the history of land tenure in Korea, of which the author is aware. Part III outlines a number of current issues in the relation between man and land in Korea as seen by the author.

PART I. MAN AND LAND DURING THE INDUSTRIALIZATION OF GERMANY

The process of industrialization in Germany lasted about 100 years and resulted in a thorough change from an agricultural to an industrial society. This transition caused considerable changes in the man-land relationship.

1. Man and Land at the Individual Level
The main change in the relation between man and land at the level of the individual farm household relates to changes in the size and type of farms. In Germany, traditionally, farms were of different sizes, family farms predominating. Farms of large sizes were few in the part of Germany which now constitutes the Federal Republic. They were mainly estates owned by the nobility, or public domain. Already during the pre-industrialization period, many farms were of a smaller size than a family holding, especially near cities and in regions where it was the custom to bequeath the farm to several heirs. Some of these small farmers were able to specialize in satisfying the needs of the urban dwellers; others became part-time farmers occupied mainly in agricultural work or handicrafts.

The early period of industrialization until World War I brought little change in the farm-size structure of German agriculture. The man-land ratio was more or less constant. The increasing demand for food in the emerging cities improved the prospects for small holdings because of the greater demand for animal products and vegetables. In general, the biological-technical progress with the utilization of manure, the results of research on breeding and feeding, and the improved cropping pattern led to an increase in the production per area. This intensified production, together with the low risk because of diversified farm organization and the fertility of the soil on account of the high animal ratio, resulted in the conditions of livelihood of the farming population developing at the same pace as that of the rest of the society.

Between World War I and II, the man-land ratio still did not change very much. The increasing demand from the cities made it possible to intensify production, especially animal production which, alone, provided 80 per cent of the income of small and medium size farms. Mechanization was still limited to mower, seed drill, and similar equipment which increased yields rather than saved labour. The process of increasing production - 3 per cent in the long run - continued, and the more economic, market-oriented management of farms led to some regional differentiation in agriculture.

The thorough change in the size and type of farms occurred within the last 30 years. Starting around 1950, Germany experienced a rapid industrialization which resulted in migration from agriculture as an occupation, and, later, from the village to the cities. The decrease in the agricultural labour force was possible only because of an increase in the size of farms, substitution of capital for labour, and increase in labour productivity. This outmigration was caused by a number of factors. The higher wage level, even for unskilled labour, played an important role.
Especially the younger generation was attracted by the so-called better life in the cities as well as by independence from the strict social control in the village. Differences in the level of schools and training facilities and generally better opportunities also played a role.

The substitution of labour by capital was a very rapid process. While, in 1949, 75,000 tractors were operating in German agriculture, this number increased to 1.4 million by 1974, and other investments showed a similar increase. On small farms, this mechanization was difficult to justify from an economic standpoint, and various forms of joint use of machinery developed. In the case of small farms, the increase in yield through the utilization of machinery was more important than the labour-saving effect, and, frequently, a small farmer could prevent his son from migrating only by purchasing a tractor so that the son no longer had to be a "cow farmer."

This rapidly developing mechanization was made possible by relatively favourable product prices for agriculture. But it went along with little adjustment of farm sizes to the requirements of mechanized agriculture. Until the 60s, the combination of biological-technical and mechanical-technical progress caused an increase in productivity which - even with difficulty - made it possible for agriculture to follow at some distance the progress achieved in other sectors.

But when increasing labour shortage, increasing capital requirements and interest payments, and every rise in the income levels in industry put more and more pressure on agriculture, far-reaching changes occurred in the size and type of farms. Between 1949 and 1976, not less than 760,000 farms = 50 per cent ceased to operate. Regionwise, the process differed with regard to the time at which it started and to its intensity. The degree of industrialization, the type of industries, and the prevailing agrarian structure played a role.

For those who remained in agriculture, the type of farming underwent drastic changes. Farming, in the first place, ceased to guarantee subsistence to every owner of a family farm. Farming was no longer a way of life but an economic enterprise requiring managerial skill of a high degree. Not every farmer was successful in adjusting to the new conditions, and there was an important differentiation within agriculture. Income per farm worker showed a difference of as much as 1:6 between the upper and lower fourth of holdings, and a much greater one between the richest and the poorest farms.

The ever increasing capital requirements brought about a tendency to
increase the size of farms by taking over the land of those who had
given up farming. In addition, a trend to simplify farm organization by
giving up the traditional diversity developed, and, especially
production for self-sufficiency was discontinued. Specialization in
certain types of production reduced the necessary number of machines
and different forms of cooperation became popular with a view to
reaping economies of scale, or to enjoying cost depression. In some
cases, specialization included processing and, especially in the case of
animal production, production on the basis of purchased fodder.

The whole process did not only reduce the number of farms by 50 percent
and increase the average size from 8 to more than 30 ha over the 30-
year period, but led to distinctly different types of farms. Today,
German agriculture consists of about 400,000 full-time farms
95,000 farms with an additional income of less than 50 per cent
320,000 farms with an income of less than 50 per cent from agriculture
815,000 farms of more than 1 ha.

In addition, more than 1.5 million households have homesteads with
agriculturally used areas of less than 1 ha.

Thus, while the size structure and organization of holdings underwent a
considerable change, the ownership and tenancy situation remained
rather constant. German farmers usually own their land. Tenant
farmers are few, and, in such cases, the land is either owned by the state,
or by a farmer who died and whose family feels unable to manage the
farm. Renting plots is more common, especially in the area where the
farm is divided among the heirs. This serves the purpose of adjusting
farm size to different farm types and to the availability of labour and
machinery. With the phasing out of many small farms, this type of land
lease has increased, and rented land now makes up about 22 instead
of 12 per cent (in 1949) of all agricultural land and is increasing
further.

2. Labour Force on the Land
The development from an agricultural to an industrial society brought
changes in qualitative and quantitative terms for the people working on
the land. Urbanization and industrialization have been causing a
reduction in the share of agricultural population already since the last
century, while the absolute number of agricultural labour force
increased until 194B. This means that the population increase has
mainly been absorbed by the increasing non-agricultural sector, a
process which led to an increase in the demand for food, gave
possibilities of intensifying agriculture by biological-technical pro-
gress, and of increasing agricultural income.
Especially after 1950, the boom in industry and the increasing non-agricultural income caused an important outmigration so that agriculture had to further increase the labour productivity, mainly by capital input in the form of mechanization, in order to be able to cope with the situation.

The process of migration greatly varied. Often, it was more a migration from agriculture rather than from the rural region. Former agriculturists continued to reside in the village where they had social relations and a plot to build their house on, if they did not choose to continue operating a small part-time farm. It was easier to remain in the village in regions where industry was located right in the rural areas – which is quite common in Germany. If outmigration as is often the case - did not take place with the change of generation but in the course of a small farmer's life, the risk which this change involved quite often induced the peasant to continue farming. This allowed him to go back to the old way of life, if life in the industrial areas did not come up to his expectations. During this trial period, two important changes took place: the family usually did not invest in agriculture, with all the consequences this involved. Secondly, the situation led to an increased workload for the women and family members who had to manage the farm. Thus, while on the larger family farms, over the last two decades, farmers' wives and children ceased to be farm workers and reduced their workload, on the smaller farms, the situation was disadvantageous, especially for women.

Remarkable changes took place under sociological aspects. In the agrarian society, land tenure determined the individual's status and functions. Nowadays, the inherited status is of limited importance for the social structure, and the level of income is the main status-determining factor. But this is only loosely related to inheritance and the land tenure situation. While in the agrarian society status determined personal relations, agriculture in today's industrial society has accepted contracts as the factors governing relations between members of the society. Modernization has waved the determination of husbandry by customs, i.e., the famous village opinion, and increased individual control over the production process. At the same time, this increased chances and risks, and was soon overcome by new dependencies on markets, integrators, etc.

All these changes have been painful experiences, and not everybody succeeded. In the long run, incomes have been increasing, especially for farmhands, but also the general income per worker in agriculture. But there is a great difference in income between regions, production systems, and between more or less successful farmers. Many gave up, and not a few at the cost of considerable economic and psychological
3. Man and Land at Society Level
The shrinking number of farms and agricultural labour force, the ever decreasing share of agriculture in the national income, and the increasing penetration of industrialization into our life often lead to the notion that the importance of agriculture for economy and society is diminishing. Instead, it is suggested that the goals set by society for agriculture and the functions of land in the society are changing as compared to former times.

Providing food for the agricultural as well as non-agricultural sections of the society has always been one of the main tasks and plays an important role even in times of international trade. The latest events have brought to everybody’s mind the importance of producing the basis of nutrition within the country, i.e., under its own control. But, in earlier times already, a number of other goals for agriculture have played an important role.

During the depression and again in 1945-53, it was important to provide a maximum number of job opportunities to guarantee subsistence for as many people as possible. From 1934-55, a maximum of self-sufficiency in food constituted the core of agrarian policy. As from 1956, the focus of attention was on reaping, for the agricultural population, an income comparable to that earned in industry. In 1958, other goals started to attract attention: agriculture was required to secure a beautiful landscape, a place where city dwellers could spend their vacation, and rest from the noise of the town. The last decade with its focus on pollution, the preservation of nature, etc. brought new goals set by society to agriculture.

The changes in the relation between man and land are manifold, but change is a natural thing in industrial society, and agriculture has to adjust to the norms of industrial society. While these changes have been a cause of friction for many families, for the first time in history, these very changes have demolished the barrier between city and country and made of the rural society an integral section of the society at large.

PART II. DEVELOPMENT OF MAN - LAND RELATIONS IN KOREA

1. Ancient Societies - Group Control of Land
Early life in Korea was seminomadic. Clan communities organized life collectively to guarantee livelihood and protection. Fishing, hunting, and agriculture in the river valleys provided subsistence. Around 500
B.C., bronze and iron were introduced from China and had a great influence on agriculture. The metal made iron ploughs, sophisticated reservoirs and embankments possible. Oxen, cattle, rice, and silk production were introduced at that time.

The increasing productivity in agriculture allowed the emergence of a small family system instead of clan communities. It created a surplus, and some families became richer than others. To control more land meant more wealth. Individual families united in tribal communities which tried to conquer land and take prisoners to work as slaves. The chiefs could secure more land and became richer. While land was controlled by groups, the technical development in agriculture and its consequences brought differences into the former egalitarian society. Some were in control of more land; some had to submit part of their product to the more powerful; and others were slaves and did the work.

The trend to organize larger regions led, in 57 B.C., to the formation of three kingdoms, actually alliances of tribes with the chief of the strongest tribe as the king. This so-called Three-Kingdom Period lasted until 668 A.D. The distinction between classes became more marked: conquering tribesmen above conquered tribes, chiefs above petty peasants, etc. In time, this division was elevated to the "Kolpunje" bone-rank system, according to the individual's rank and social position at birth. The advent of Confucianism around 350 A.D. strengthened this aristocratic class system.

This structure of the society influenced the system of control over land. But power was always held by groups and not by individuals. Land was controlled by the state, i.e., the ruling community, not by the king alone. He only effected control on behalf of the group. Much land was under his supervision. The ruling class obtained land grants as a salary for services, not as property, but merely to be used for cultivation with the labour of slaves and for reaping the yield. Peasants were given plots of land to cultivate against the payment of taxes, and villages or clans had the right to use communal land. Thus, while groups and not individuals controlled the land, the class consciousness and separation of rich and poor fostered the emergence of large estates in the hands of an aristocratic class. Their right was limited to usufruct - all that was necessary at a time when much land was available in comparison with the limited population.

2. Unified Silla - Centralized Control of Land
Population increase required the transition from a tribal alliance to a central state. This unification took place in 668 A.D. and led to
the development of a sophisticated administration with ministries for functional fields and hierarchical offices for provinces, kuns, and hyons. This weakened the tribal chiefs and strengthened the state and its bureaucrats who were selected not according to qualification as in China, but according to the bone-rank system. They did not prove to be very efficient.

The effect on the land was the nationalization of control over land instead of group control, and, in time, a continuous transition to private control by the king’s followers and bureaucrats. They became wealthy and powerful and exploited the peasants. Actually, when the king allotted land to his followers, this only meant the right to manage the land and collect the tax, but often the king could not control encroachments by the aristocracy against the peasants. The system collapsed when, in exceptional cases, full private control was granted, i.e., tax and land rights. This was granted for merit and, in the case of newly cultivated land, to the cultivator. These exceptions opened the door to illegal actions, and the aristocrats brought more and more land under their control thus reducing the revenue of the state. The peasants were oppressed and lived in misery so that, at the end of the Silla period, in 918, many left the land, and production came to a standstill.

3. Koryo Dynasty - Temporary Private Control of Land The new Koryo Dynasty (918 - 1392) tried to reestablish order by reducing the tax paid by peasants to 1/3 of the harvest. As in former times, the king’s loyal followers received land (actually, land tax) grants, which led to the emergence of wealthy families, whose wealth was based on the controlled land, and, later, on moneylending as well. As a precautionary measure, the king concentrated all aristocrats in the capital. They became dependent on the king because only he could grant land, basis of their wealth. Thus, the preservation of the dynasty was in their interest. In theory, all land belonged to the king, but the administrative control was in the hands of the aristocrats who increased their estates by appropriating public lands, thereby undermining the basis of the state, the ownership of all land, and the right to divide income from the land according to its needs.

The fourth king therefore implemented a land reform and redistributed the land according to rank and grade. But he was not successful. Because of the small group of aristocrats, in practice, offices became hereditary. In addition, the fact that land was granted according to rank and status often allowed a retired official to retain the land he held because of his rank, now because of his status. Consequently, large estates were under the permanent control of officials, which made them independent from the state. Loss of office had no immediate effect, and that had consequences for loyalty. Aristocrats used their independence from the state to illegally oppress the
peasants, who again left the land, and the end of the dynasty just as its beginning was marked by reforms to reduce the peasants' hardships.

4. Yi Dynasty - Permanent Private Control of Land
The new Yi dynasty (1329 - 1910) destroyed the material basis of the Koryo elite by confiscating their estates. This land was given to the new elite, but with careful steps to prevent them from becoming too powerful. Officials were never posted in their home area, were transferred every three years, and central government officials were given land only near the capital in the Kyonggi province.

The success of these measures varied as time went by. Especially after the Hydeyoshi invasion, 1592-98, more thorough changes took place regarding the control of land in connection with the development of the yangban class. According to the rule, only officials could obtain grants of land. To be appointed, one had to pass an examination, mainly in Chinese and Confucian classics. Accordingly, devoting oneself to intellectual pursuits opened the way to control of land. To remain yangban, each family had to have at least one member in office, while the rest could live on the estate and engage in leisure activities with feasts, poetry, music, etc. Hereditary land grants became more common and finally led to private land. The former tax collector became landlord, and the tax-payer became tenant. From this time onwards, something similar to land-ownership developed from the grants of tax rights, even if illegally in the beginning.

The development of the yangban as literati-officials into landlords is a contradiction in itself. As officials, they were supposed to work for a strong government based on Confucian virtues. But these very virtues included obligations to their families such as increasing the family holding and wealth, which was against the interest of the state. The institution of hereditary grants brought about a more stable aristocracy and made it easy for the yangban family to give priority to their family interests.

While former tax receivers developed into bureaucratic landlords, a class of farmer landlords emerged as well. The state encouraged the reclamation of uncultivated land by granting tax exemption over ten years. If it was discovered that the cultivated land already belonged to somebody else, the tiller had to pay 1/3 of the yield as a rent to the legal owner. This regulation established a tenant relationship. People who cleared much land and rented it out became farmer landlords, and fixed or share rent became widespread.

Thus, the period of the Yi dynasty brought permanent private control
of land, even if the rights on land consisted of usufruct and tax rights and not full private ownership. Landlord-tenant relations emerged; absenteeism, various forms of tenancy, exploitation, and insecurity were reported, and while not all yangban were rich people, a wide gap existed between yangban and the peasantry.

5. Japanese Rule - Private Property of Land
In 1905, Korea became a Japanese protectorate and was annexed in 1910. The Japanese administration immediately started a land survey which, in 8 years and with 3,400 surveyors, covered 4.8 million ha. The purpose was to establish the land value as a tax basis, the existing rights on land, and to identify the topography. At the same time, the legal basis for the sale, mortgage, and exchange of land was prepared. Then, a report system was used to establish private ownership rights and to bring land into Japanese hands. Whoever reported as owner was acknowledged as such. This system was known only to the Japanese and some members of the Korean upper class, and they took advantage of their knowledge. For the first time, full private property of land with the right to sell was legally established.

As a result, the Japanese and Korean feudal ruling class became landowners, usually absentee landlords, while the hereditary tiller on the land, who, hitherto, had to pay a tax only to the feudalist, became a tenant. This new dependency was exploited, and, in addition to the rent, gifts had to be given in order to avoid dismissal. The rent, together with the value of gifts, equalled 50-90 per cent of the production. Deteriorating prices as compared to input prices also caused many small peasants to become indebted. Many of them migrated to other countries at that time, or lost their rights and became agricultural labourers. Under these conditions, all the plans to increase rice production failed, as did the projects for land reclamation in spite of subsidies. Landlords found it easier to exact higher rents from tenants than to take the risk of investing in land clearing. Altogether, in 1945, half of all farms which had 70 per cent of paddy land was operated by tenants. Their misery only increased when, during the war, more food was exacted from Korea.

6. Korea - Small-scale Owner-operator
After independence, a number of motives led to a land reform. Political instability and the spread of communistic ideas, availability of land from former Japanese owners, hindrance of productivity increase, because the high rent made investments impossible, and the need to provide subsistence for the large number of refugees were of particular importance. The main goals of this reform, enacted in 1950 and implemented over a long period because of the disruption caused by the Korean war, were of an egalitarian type, like the abolition of tenancy, the limitation of land-ownership, and a land-to-the-tiller policy.
The ceiling was fixed at 3 ha (with the exception of institutional farms and perennial crops). By and large, the law was implemented. About 1.5 million peasants received 530,000 ha of land. The political and social instability caused by the former ownership pattern was removed, and the new owners responded to the increasing demand for food by the cities with a more intensive cultivation, application of fertilizers, expansion of double cropping, and production of fruit and vegetables. Tenancy was never abolished, but substantially reduced. The farms are rather small; only 2 per cent have more than 3 ha and another 5 per cent between 2-3 ha. The majority of the 2.5 million holdings are even smaller. Two-thirds = 1.7 million are less than 1 ha, and about one-fourth = 670,000 have between 1-2 ha of land. The average size is 0.9 ha. While this farm structure met the needs of the post-war period, it has been the object of criticism in recent years with the rapid industrialization, increasing wage levels, beginning mechanization, considerable outmigration from agriculture, especially of the lowincome farmers.

PART III. SOME CURRENT ISSUES OF LAN-D-LAUD RELATIONS IN KOREA

Today, land problems are of a completely different nature than those prevailing at the time of the land reform. While at that time egalitarian goals played the main role, and to provide a meagre subsistence for as many people as possible had the highest priority, the situation is different now. For most people, alternatives have developed outside agriculture. Today, the main problem is how to relate man and land in order to rapidly increase productivity so that the qualitatively and quantitatively increasing food requirements can be met, and the agricultural labour force can reap an income which is attractive enough to meet their expectations.

These problems do not call for a new land reform, but rather require step by step adjustments of various kinds. The problems are not so much issues of land tenure, but, in the first place, of land operation and management - even if both are difficult to separate. As an introduction to the discussion, some issues will be briefly outlined here.

1. The most discussed issue is the 3 ha ceiling which was imposed at the time of semi-subistence agriculture with an ample labour supply. Today, it is supposed to hinder the application of modern technology because of the size of farms as well as the amount invested in land. However, it is doubtful whether waiving the ceiling would be a very helpful policy. Only 30,000 farms are larger than 3 ha, many of these legally because of upland and tide development projects. A rather limited number has between 2.5 and 3 ha, i.e., Hear the borderline. It appears that the high price for land prevents farmers
from enlarging their farm. There is the danger that only rich 
capitalists will be able to buy more than the amount fixed by the 
celling. The problem of adjusting farm size to today's requirements 
cannot probably be solved merely with the help of a ceiling policy. 
Bona fide self-cultivators could perhaps be exempted from observing 
the ceiling.

2. A related issue is the abolishment of tenancy, a policy which has never 
been very successful. Estimates on the amount of tenancy vary between 20 
and 30 per cent. In some regions, it is probably higher if one adds the 
various forms of tenancy in disguise. 'Chonse' is an advance payment for
land handed over against usufruct. This is common among migrants 
who need money to start city life, but want to keep the land as a
security. 'Ko-Ji' is a form of contract labour with division of harvest 
according to performed services. Small farmers cultivate other 
people's fields without payment, but are provided room and board 
for their children in the city. Some peasants ask rich people to buy 
land and take over the cultivation work. Because of its illegality, much 
renting is done among relatives who are considered to be trustworthy. 
Whatever the percentage of rented land, tenancy exists and is 
increasing. However, tenancy, today, is not of the former 
landlord-tenant type, but mainly an adjustment to the varying 
availability of land and labour. The fact that renting is illegal has one 
important side-effect: neither landowner, nor tenant takes the risk of 
investing in the land. It seems that, in Korea as in other countries, 
tenancy is a necessary institution for bringing flexibility into the 
rather rigid farm structure and should be made legal. This is the 
more important since, because of the important outmigration, there is a 
sizeable land market - selling as well as renting - which must be 
regulated. Special measures like limiting the right to rent to local 
peasants, etc., could prevent the misuse of tenancy.

3. It appears that the "land to the tiller" policy is in danger. There is 
a certain amount of investments in land made by urban capitalists and 
institutions. The reasons vary: speculations, tax evasion, risk reduction, 
or real investment in agriculture as a commercial enterprise play a 
role. Is this in the interest of agriculture and the society? How far 
and for what purpose? The answer might be different in the case of forest 
land which is also purchased by capitalists and companies. This can have 
advantages in comparison with private peasants' forest because of the 
scale of operation, of the capitalists' ability to invest at long term 
which is necessary in the case of forests and because peasants are 
often not interested in their forests, except in having a plot as a 
graveyard. However, here as well, it should be made sure that an 
investor in forest land does not only buy the land, but starts proper 
management within a reasonable time. A third dimension is the 
transfer of agricultural land to non-agricultural use, for example, as 
residential areas, roads, industry, etc., which requires a land policy 
that is only emerging.
4. A change in the ceiling and tenancy legislation to allow for the necessary adjustment of farm size to technology may suffice as far as the plains are concerned. It will not suffice in the case of hilly regions. Here, we have numerous small terraces, some of which only a few square metres, which cannot be enlarged because of the topography, and can only be cultivated by hand. With the increasing shortage in and cost of labour, more and more of these terraces are bound to phase out of production. The question is of importance because, in this mountainous country, these terraces form a sizeable part of the agricultural area, far too much to let them lie fallow without affecting food production. What are the alternatives? The problem is the more difficult to solve since many of the terraces are not only very small, but are not connected with a road. In view of the high capital investment they represent, afforestation would be the least desirable alternative.

5. With the important and increasing outmigration, the villages change in character. Today, some are already homes for the aged and places where the younger generation returns to on holidays to worship at their ancestors' graves. Land is sold to obtain money for educating the children, and, thus, a tremendous capital transfer from agriculture into non-agricultural sectors takes place. But is it desirable that, with the decrease in the agricultural population, the rural areas become depopulated, while some large cities have, since long, exceeded their optimum size? Could this migration from agriculture be changed into a transition from full-time to part-time farming of Japanese style? The observer wonders if job opportunities alone are enough since migration to cities is done less for obtaining a larger income or enjoying better living conditions. Many migrants hardly have a better life in the city than in the village. The most important and real attraction are the educational facilities and thus the chances for the next generation. If this is accepted, it will have important consequences for the required policy.

6. The prevalence of small-scale farming in an industrial society with increasing wages and requirements for increasing productivity raises the question of possible institutional arrangements which allow small farms to be combined into larger operational units. Are there acceptable forms of cooperation not only for services, but for production as well? They could very well be limited to parts of the farm, and examples exist in mechanization, livestock production, etc. This question should be discussed free from ideology. Cooperation in agricultural production is not a socialist speciality; it exists in many forms in many parts of the world. The famous Gezira scheme and vertical integration are examples of this, as well as milk production at village level in this country.

7. The task of increasing agricultural productivity in an industrial society finally requires support from the service institutions which organize extension, credit, marketing, etc. Without going into details here, it should be mentioned that, at short term, improvements in this field could probably have a greater effect than changes in tenure.
8. Finally, I want to mention one aspect which I consider to be the most important issue in the adjustment of agriculture to the situation in an industrial society. Agriculture is rapidly becoming a small sector in economy and society. The more important it is that the interests of this sector be represented against other interests, its voice be raised, and the government be made aware of its interests. We have institutions to represent agriculture in almost every country in the world, whether landlords, large farmers, farmers' unions, cooperative associations, etc. But who represents Korean agriculture?

I suggest that a basic requirement for a successful adjustment of Korean agriculture to industrial society is an institution which is able to represent the interests of agriculture to other sectors of the society and to the government. Without such a representation, I am afraid, there is the danger that Korean peasant agriculture will cease to exist.