

democracy

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

9328

with the small "d"

1165 Broadway
New York City

Vol. IV - No. 88

6 Issues—25c

13 Issues—50c

26 Issues—\$1.00

August, 1947

"WHAT MAKES WORKERS WORK?" JAMES F. LINCOLN—AND A QUIZ

A REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE INCENTIVE SYSTEM OF INDUSTRY

WHAT ARE THE PRACTICAL MEASURES TO BE followed which will put in motion business and industry: to have good and uninterrupted volume: and avoid the let-downs of the past? And what are the MEANS easiest and surest to secure such progress?

One of the best answers is to select the man or committee in your organization to obtain, study and 'expound' the literature bearing most directly on the particular subject as here described, even down to such humble sources as 'democracy.'

But, of course, specially such authorities as Lincoln Labor Experience. The tendency may be to let some popular but mistaken ideas interfere with vigorous action because the proposals encountered are not new, novel or spectacular.

First getting peaceful or friendly relations and then starting to build up income that will mean SECURITY for all concerned is the highway to be travelled. The rate of travel will be the measure of acquisition of knowledge and the amount of wisdom along with it.

The 'literature' to be had as referred to, while probably by no means complete, especially where a favorable attitude of both divisions has been reached, should serve the initial stages of incentive development very fairly.

INCENTIVE SYSTEM AND SIMPLIFIED ECONOMICS

I AM MAILING TO A NUMBER of faithful readers of 'democracy' the Lincoln booklet on 'Workers Working' with daily marked extra copies of our Nos. 87 and 88. I do this because of 'Incentive' being so in harmony with this paper's demand for Greater Simplicity in Our Fundamental Master Science of Political Economy.

The first problem in Economics is that of Wages and Labor. While Economics is the only defense of Wealth, Capital and Industry, its defense of these is by way of setting up prosperity for ALL people, notably the working class. The principle involved here is the Consumer Universal Mass Buying Power.

This, at the maximum, is what gives to labor—every one—a job at highest wages. And concurrently it does two other things which are INTEGRAL with every Economic Science and Philosophy. It prospers the second factor in industry, capital, as it does labor. AND it lowers consumer prices and increases their buying of products.

The fact that gains to economics do not at present include all the incentives that may eventually come to this wonderfully receptive and expansive system is all in the philosophy of this publication, and especially its determination to SIMPLIFY.

WHEN INCENTIVE STOPS EXTENDING—

WHICH WILL BE NEVER—but to fill out the line—it would mean that the 'returns' in wages, profits and benefits had failed. In other words that INSPIRED WORD 'Incentive' means ENDLESS growth.

And to the three basic factors concerned in the industry which produces everything everyone needs and consumes: namely, (a) the workers who are nearly all the adults, more than 75,000,000 in the U. S. (b) all the capital, which also comprises nearly all the wealth and which supplies all the tools and organization to MULTIPLY the labor's product. And (c) the Resources and Land supplying the raw materials.

Mr. Lincoln, in explaining his increase of employees from zero to 1000 in a few years and in wages, 500%, to nearly \$6000

UNLIMITED PRODUCTION REQUIRES UNLIMITED EDUCATION

THE LINCOLN BROCHURE "What Makes Workers Work?" follows some comment on failure of education or development of workers in industry with a narrative of 15 years of contrast to this educational vacuum.

It tells how thru self-developed leadership: the Lincoln Electric Co. has organized a system which might be called Adult Education which has found the way and 'sold' it to 1000 workers of lifting themselves by one stage after another 'til they are in such perfect harmony and cooperation as to produce the results in the prosaic business of producing wealth or 'making things' as almost to defy description.

One of the most obvious contrasts this system produces is in what I like to call 'CLASSLESSNESS.' In this comparison we are favored by the Karl Marx doctrine of 'class-consciousness' actually taught and instilled into the same class where Lincoln doctrine declares no class exists.

He finds no place to draw any real line between the humblest worker, an overseer, job-boss, superintendent or president of the board of directors. In the Science of Economics this has been so for generations—all are producers. And the invasion of industry by such aliens as Marx-constructed Unions is no credit to the education of employers—or those that educated them.

each a year, remarks that there is literally no limit to a man's ability to grow when his ambition is stimulated by the certainty of reward.

This Incentive System is mostly concerned in standardizing and stabilizing that 'certainty of reward' to industry's No. 1 unit, Labor. But unlimited GROWTH and stability is just as necessary and certain to the wealth and the Organizers of Co-operative Industry (labor and capital). So Unlimited Growth is the Greatest Feature of the Incentive Process.

★

WE HAVE TWO-WAY PRODUCTION of wealth, by labor and capital; and three-way division of the products: among labor, capital and monopoly.

WHAT KIND OF INCENTIVES—AND HOW MANY?

ONE OF THE FINEST PERIODS in 'What makes workers work' is where Mr. Lincoln so completely expounds this theory. While it may be obvious that 1000 people whose wages had multiplied by four under a Lincoln Regime, must be at near 100% in Spirit, Morals and Mentality:—

Mr. Lincoln enlarges on the delicate point that the gains to the MASS of co-operators in industry, as important as they are in cash, are spiritually as much greater than the latter as those are greater than the old wage level. This is in fact the whole principle of incentive.

All the study, care and industry of the 1000 has been a GREGARIOUS movement, a contribution to SOCIETY; and one which has given them all a consciousness quite apart and above from work-day affairs in which they also are so exceptional.

As a picture of a society which ideologists are trying to portray, this 5 minute offhand sketch might be called a piece of artistry which Mr. Lincoln may not realize the power of. And especially as our great Individualistic concepts have left 'Social' for SocialISTS to interpret.

HOW A'SO TO MAKE TEAM-WORK WORK

LINCOLN GENIUS DROVE incentive into the sports world with no strain, because of its content of human interplay, emulation and perfect organization. The achievement of getting labor committed to cooperation with fellow-workers and employers is one of the first vital steps.

The greatest service rendered by all these Lincoln works is in the lifting of human nature, as typified by the workman, to unmeasured heights in TEAM-WORK. This alone, as contrasted to the warfare and hatreds engendered in the class-system should make Incentive universal.

The narrative of the social and spiritual development of these educated and trained associates is as effective in those lines on page 19 as if they were a studied piece of writing instead of an offhand forum answer.

It is a parallel to that oft repeated Scripture-quot (page 15) which deserves a whole volume to reveal both Lincoln and his 1000 co-workers:—

"What is man that thou art mindful of him? And the Son of Man, that thou visitest him?"

"For thou hast made him a little lower than the Angels and hast crowned him with Glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet."

THE OPPOSITE INCENTIVE OF FEAR, FORCE AND IGNORANCE

EVEN MARX WAS JUSTIFIED in devising the deadly class-war, so long as he was unable to see any other help needed by the proletarian and industrial slave. And now if management can only see legislation as a remedy for Unionism, the Marx theory of Force in mass attack may prevail.

But when management turns all its organizing brains and facilities to helping labor to finding its way to its own best achievement,

BEST RULES FOR THE INDUSTRIAL FAMILY

THERE'S A UNIQUE WAY OF describing these rules: the nearest to it seems to be the 'Human Family.' Mr. Lincoln believes in strict observance of industrial rules, but the greatest rigidity does not always mean stable production. Because husband and wife never limit their sacrifice for their children.

Other rules which some day 'conditions of labor' may make enforceable and which the quality of the 1000 Lincolinites will hurry that day, will be the ending of child labor and practically do that with female-labor: not by law but by making MAN self supporting.

Incentive certainly means freedom: and time will tell whether women want what are called 'careers.' Or whether after a few decades of Incentive and after everyone who wants a home has it (my guess is 100%) whether the job and career habits won't be cured.

But for Incentive this crossroad might be a long way off as home-owning is now at low ebb. In 1918 I poured 100 Edison-Ingersoll concrete houses on a cost-basis, in mass production of \$1000 for 6 rooms complete. In all the subsidized enterprises today I hear of nothing below \$4 or \$5 thousand.

OFFICE WORKERS AS PRODUCERS

IN FITTING INCENTIVES TO 'ordinary office people, it seems not difficult to make plain the economic fact that 'the production of wealth,' which is what completely engages both man and management, is not limited to machinery or turning out product for people to consume.

So this answer says far more than that incentives may be just as successful in the office with the same time and determination. The Lincoln answer to impediments always seems to be that the Incentive thrives on obstacles.

They offer greater opportunities for more ability and intelligence. This appears like a rather one-sided case of competition which it would not take long to get everyone into, as people do like to out-smart each other if the choice is fair. There's the point:—organizing everything on the fair competitive basis with 'men' to keep it going that way.

I notice Mr. Lincoln usually refers to workers as men when especially in our 'war years' half may be women. Perhaps this may be an unconscious prophecy Incentive is entitled to, that in time the cradle may come back to woman's hand. Ruling the waves and its industry of providing cannon fodder may be ended.

it will not take long for labor leaders to recognize that as the right way to organize and to become an integral part of a NEW CLASSLESS SOLIDARITY.

If management will but take full note of what it has done to deserve that new name, in organizing labor, in the miraculous production of everything humanity needs, (and even of things for humanity's destruction). And that has been accomplished under the circumstances of class-war:—

It should not hesitate for an instant to take on the job of Anti-Class-War Organization.

HOW THE QUIZ WORKS OUT

IT'S INCENTIVE IN A BIG way. The whole Lincoln extensive literature is in the nature of a Questionnaire because it is presenting novel information to the twin producers in the simplest and most complete form. But we here refer especially to two actual quizzes, that of Toronto and another received from Sydney, Australia.

In talking to over 1000 meetings across this country and Canada in the years '32 and '38 on economics and taxation, I invariably spent more time answering questions than talking, because that method brought into play a multiplicity of active minds.

And here in those remarkable series of answers are some highlights new even to the author. And in Sydney in prosperous Lincoln Australian branch expertly handled by Director Ronald Mason, the great objective in both cases is to break down shyness to what seems radical.

Every answer, however, erases all excuse for doubt from either side so far as perfect work-out is concerned if plain and simple procedure is followed. This labor is most largely with management because this is ORGANIZATION and IT is the organizer.

MORE AND MORE INCENTIVES

HERE'S WHERE A QUIZ-question develops the biggest kind of an incentive—not by any means new to Mr. Lincoln but to this audience and the industrial world at large:—STOCK OWNER-SHIP.

The purchase of stock in the incentive concern by the rank and file of workers is so natural a thing as to have added OWNER-SHIP of the majority interest, to these producers. This I call natural because of the fact that capital itself (now being called 'management') is the outgrowth of labor.

Lincoln, in his long business experience, has found his own great success not in starting at the top and looking after the big investment of wealth, then the active wealth or capital and then his partners in production, the workers.

He found the greatest security for big business was in reverse of this. He found the greatest security in the combined and co-operative work of all. And that the INCENTIVE to all was doubled thru the doubled demand of the consumer for what they were making at around half the former cost.

'OLD ED. HOWE' POTATOE HILL PHILOSOPHER

I'VE JUST RUN ACROSS A copy of his monthly:—'A Magazine of Information and Indignation.' I much admired his iconoclasm, his low price, 25c per an. and didn't mind the pulp paper, but this number, dated Dec. 32 won't stand much handling.

Ed was honored not only at home, Atchison, Kans., but throughout the universe, for clever writing and clean-cut opinions. I always insisted that he needed a philosophy, a religion or at least a hobby to make him 100 per cent. But I could never start him worrying.

There are two kinds of Democracy: Political and Economic.

VOL. IV
No. 88**democracy**August
1947CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher
1165 Broadway, New York City

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL

50 years an industrialist and student of Scientific Economics. Co-ordinator, in 1892, of the 'watch that made the dollar famous', 500 million sold. Record broadcaster and lecturer, Economics and Taxation, nearly every State. President National Tax Relief Association. Ed. 'democracy', 1165 Broadway, New York City.

CULTISMS, HERESIES AND FALLACIES

I SHALL IN DUE COURSE start a methodical listing of the essentials of Political Economy. And incidental to that, another listing—of the ERRORS encountered in my rambles thru the maze of literature circulated under the title of this relatively new and fearfully important MASTER SCIENCE.

One of the popular confusions in economics is relating to RENT and most obviously because the word is misused as a name for the income from, or charge for use of, any kind of property or premises; whereas in economics it is income derived only from land. 'Land-rent' or 'Economic-rent' is required to differentiate it from what is not rent at all, but INTEREST.

But more tragic from my viewpoint is the fact that if this confusion could be erased, our various economists would still disagree as to what ECONOMIC or LAND RENT, or 'RENT' is and what it does. This I deem 'tragic' because it seems OBVIOUS (to common-sense) that rent is payment for use of land and must be paid only to society, which only makes land worthy of rent.

Well, Mr. Beckwith is the man who has written books, published blankist-tracts for 25 years and broadcasted to the universe, largely around this single word. And he assumes the rather arbitrary position that he can't waste time on anyone or topic, without a prior agreement with his rent dictum.

So I take it, if he himself is wrong about any phase of rent, his obligation to one setting him right would be unlimited. And tho he may not have the prestige of the H.G.S.S.S. (Henry George School) he is well worth this attention.

REVIEWING A FEW RENT IDEAS

STOCKING TO OUR TEXT: the popular notion is that the higher the rent the higher the price. Mine is the farthest extreme, and positively reverses this. Henry George, 'the School', the Cultists it breeds and doesn't disown, teach that rent increases prices, causes poverty, lowers wages, etcetera.

And tho Beckwith has disowned George and his 'School', he seems to have spent 25 years more or less defending and lugging along this notion which I want to have corrected or declared at least a cult, or a heresy. And he adorns his own notion that 'rent' is expansive to humanity with such

THERE IS A DRUGLESS-FAITH

WHILE THE MAJORITY OF people are beguiled by a drug-faith taught by an Educational System which does not even pretend to teach the truth, there is quite a decent majority of more intelligent ICONOCLASTS who adhere to what has come to be known as the DRUGLESS faith. Like all heterodoxies this faith has its CULTS, for some of whom, in spite of their resorting to drugs 'when needed' are having monuments promoted for them. In another words, the 'popular' rebels from 'drug-addiction' only partly abandon the habit (that's what taking medicine is).

Dr. J. H. Tilden of Denver was for 50 years the prophet of the Science of Health which has now come to be called Hygiene. Passing at nearly 100 he is quite ably succeeded by Dr. Herbert M. Shelton of San Antonio who, like Tilden, has been thru the drug mill and operates an institution for Teaching Health.

He has written a score of books and publishes the 'Hygienic Review'. Hygiene is in the same pitiful situation as are economics and some other great truths, in having the full force of the organized status quo against it. Truth calls in the wilderness.

EDUCATIONAL FAKERY OUR FEARFUL DISEASE

THE PARALLEL OF THESE two sciences, Economics and Health, is so complete that they can scarcely escape being merged as a Cause for Reform Propaganda. This parallel is notably at the point of CORRUPTION of education, in its failure to follow the principle of Removal of Cause.

The parallel is also obvious, of the Human Body and the Body Politic: their ailments being respectively what is (mis) called disease; and poverty and war. The respective causes being bad habits largely of eating; and robbing of people by monopoly and taxation.

Fakery of our teaching system, in 1500 colleges and 12,000 high-schools, tho in both cases to be accounted for by financial corruption, as with our political system, is most directly seen in the monopoly of and speculation in land.

Geo. F. Heilick, a prominent industrialist of Easton, Pa., proclaims as the title of a pamphlet that 'Land-Grant Colleges are Destroying the Roots of Democracy.' 'democracy' in No. 78, July 46, demonstrates that our colleges and universities have disqualified themselves from teaching ECONOMICS by violating its First Principle Relating to Unearned Increment.

other notions as that land does not have value and hence cannot produce rent!

Now the simple fact is, as I have stated, that rent arising only as it does, from valuable land, is a measure or yardstick of INCREASE—not diminished—production. So ALL these allegations against it are UNDISPUTABLY untrue. Yet Beckwith boldly claims it adds to price just as labor and capital do!

I single him out because (1) he discards other seasoned economists as heretics; and (2) boldly sets up his own novel ideas on the subject. These other offenders either feign ignorance of what their accepted authority has given them; or its bearing on the whole economic scene—that there are TWO rents which must ALWAYS be differentiated.

WE HAVE CONSUMER, OR sales-taxes, because we don't collect rent and royalties due us from basic monopoly.

The MARSHALL PLAN: The Ruhr and the Saar

MCGRAW HILL AND THE SOCIAL PHASE OF INDIVIDUALISM

MCGRAW-HILL AND THE RUHR

JAMES H. MCGRAW OCCUPIES a vantage place from which he should be able to tell us what way to turn: he has a 50 story office at the head of 50 trade and other business papers. If a hundred billion of industry of the U.S. can have representation it should be in the McGraw Tower. AND this Ruhr broadcast to EVERYONE is the 60th of its kind.

'Valley of Decision' is part of his headline. His argument backs this perfectly, even to insisting that we are the only ones capable of rebuilding the Ruhr. His 'A' says plans for Socializing Ruhr. I should be quickly shelved. I would suggest this be submitted to AN ECONOMIST since the word Social can only be handled on a par with 'Individual.' Hence the decision—

The trend of this full page No. 60 is properly, favorable to our American System which is individualistic. But the SOUNDNESS of the decision depends on whether the individualism is so RUGGED as to EXCLUDE social; or so wise as to include the only element of social that will save it from present difficulties.

Every Individual is also automatically a Member of Society and if his rights and interests therein are not fully protected, his loss is such that his individual property is jeopardized, as it now is.

THERE'S NO WAY TO EXCLUDE THE SOCIAL

HIS 'B', SUMMONING AMERICAN skill, and genius is perfect when associated with 'D' relating to INCENTIVES, making this statement too powerful to tolerate any other weakness. The humane and sound 'C', placing the Germans properly, doubles this power.

This brings everything fairly up to the American Individualistic Industrial Status; and Mr. McGraw closes with a quite definitely emotional appeal on behalf of our children and their children. This I think is quite in order: it applies the final reason for waiving no particle of accuracy in this conclusion.

This conclusion so far as involving industry in socialization, I do not consider subject to further question. And I am so confident of the McGraw straight-thinking as to believe that is what is meant in the non-socializing of the gigantic Ruhr industries. This should be at once determined, negatively.

That would dispose of the variety of collectivist, socialist, fascist and fellow-traveling confusions and leave individualism industry to work out its full solution of this 'tough job' for the normal interests of Germany and its millions depending on Ruhr, for Europe and its peace and prosperity and for world-friendships.

SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE OR ISM?

THAT'S A QUESTION individualism should have answered many generations ago. Letting SOCIALISM (that of Marx and Engels) occupy this definite and vitally important field has been a tragic default that has thrown our industry and wealth production into utter confusion.

The very essence of social philosophy is found in the interplay of individuals in what is often referred to as their GREGARIOUS character: which is their determination to live happily in community of their equals.

Such a people cannot be represented by anyone denying the social or society or any of their real interests. Nor, of course, can individualists be represented by any who in their name let some of their tangible interests become entangled with those of Society, as do Socialists.

Social Science must intervene on behalf of the individual himself

WHAT SETTLES DISPUTE AS TO SOCIALIZING?

DISPUTES BEING SETTLED in the field of logic or reason. Well: you socialize social things do you not? Or do you adhere to the idea of having social things (say billions of dollars of values) privately 'owned' or possessed? Or to the socialist doctrine that everything belongs to society?

In these few words the Individual-Social position is made perfectly plain:—whereas wealth and social values divide the total estate about in the center, the Rugged Individualist concedes none of it to society and the Rugged Collectivist concedes none to the individual!

Obviously, we say, the socialist claim is ridiculous! And he may concede that: and continue—"what will you do about it? Can you fight us? How do you like what you are now getting?" That's about the world-situation today.

Our McGraws and other leaders should be eager to square individualism with its social obligation. If they please as blackmail if they can't see that this is the only way to make INDUSTRY FREE. That the only way to do that is to free every worker in, and customer of, industry.

"BY SOME PROCESS OF SOCIALIZATION"

THE ESSENCE OF THIS brief discussion is found in the above words because THERE is where the Marshall or any plan for peace or human betterment will meet the only organized opposition. This is 'THE SOCIAL QUESTION' that never has been popularly solved.

These MINES—coal and steel—are MONOPOLY. Marx called the mines and the coal and the steel—INDUSTRIES monopoly. And progressives and liberals are now advocating taking over or socializing the whole Ruhr. This would be a gigantic contribution to USSR Communistic Socialism.

Then what is the Marshall American way of settling this greatest of European problems so it will at the same time settle 101 other lesser ones? The easy slick way is how American good sense tackles everything. It takes all the gray and leaves behind all the headache.

This is the crossroad. Democracy + Communism. Democracy draws the line between monopoly and industry and takes ALL of the monopoly and NONE of the industry. Communism keeps them MIXED and adds both to its bureaucracy. And keeps them fighting in class-war.

THAT'S NOT ALL OF AMERICAN SMARTNESS

SOCIALISTS AND COMMUNISTS have had the grace (or lack) haltingly, to attend to monopoly first. They are trying it now in England. They expropriated all the land in Russia (and expropriated their only worthwhile people, the Kulaks or Farmers). 'Social' with them is bureaucracy, politics, corruption, dictatorship, SERFDOM.

America has a scientific, economic definition of SOCIAL. It is to take the profit or royalty or rent out of ALL monopoly AND leave all the wages to labor and income to capital. And do it with a simple shift of taxing power.

Buying and paying for monopoly with bonds as they do in England leaves the people just where they were. Expropriating it as they do in USSR, the crudest method, only builds bureaucracy. It makes complete the monopoly instead of complete its destruction as our scheme does.

and the same individual and every other one. In their social grouping. This synthesis can only be the interest of individuals or society only exists in and for individuals, so there can be no reasonable dispute.

'THE PROBLEM OF THE RUHR'

THIS PROBLEM COMES nearest to threatening the Marshall or any other peace plan because it not only contains the biggest single monopoly values but also the biggest element of industry; and it also symbolizes the whole monopoly network.

So far the Marshall plan has been treated optimistically by its friends who are nearly everyone. Naturally and normally this plan meets the approval of the 95 to 98% of people who directly and otherwise get their living from production VS the 5% whose major interest is in some form of basic monopoly.

Ruhr, as I know it, is about like our Pittsburgh, or geographically, western Pennsylvania. It's natural or basic, monopoly is COAL and IRON which typify all Natural Resources. It's industry is mining the coal and refining the iron into STEEL.

So if, as I believe, BASIC MONOPOLY is our only worldwide and domestic problem, at least our first job is solution by some process of socialization, this coal mining monopoly, coal and iron of the Ruhr and Pittsburgh. We can't offer or advocate for one what we do not offer for the other, even tho Pittsburgh has not been captured in world-war.

THE PROBLEM OF THE WHOLE WORLD

IN PRESENTING THIS STATEMENT, I have immediately before me two alternative proposals:— (1) E. A. Jackson's plan to pool all natural resources by carrying them to the first stage of production, thru some such office as U.N. (2) Dorothy Thompson's plan to socialize both the resources and industry.

These, omitting all detail, must be acknowledged to be socialization, in possibly widely varying degree. And economists are apt not to allow any distinction between these two various meanings, such as Communism, Socialism, etc. And neither of the authors are rated as collectivists.

So these are compromises with monopoly when faced with the ancient question of asserting people's natural rights against it. And is that the way to win with Marshall? Or is it the first lay-down which will be the entering wedge to all the myriad of lesser problems which would easily solve, with this out of the way.

This will bring all our biggest parasites out of their hiding; and with their CONTROLS in action, they will sound like a majority. These controls are not only financial: they are corruptive of all our agencies of education, communication, press, radio, platform, etc. But monopoly is morganized; and may not be now IN COMMAND.

★ WHAT PENALTY FOR OUR DUMBNESS?

MY FRIEND, H. A. JACKSON, has been criticized for his plan for world peace printed in 'democracy' for its advocacy of pooling all natural resources at their first stage of production as tending toward communism.

He defends himself and opposes Nock and Spencer in their attack on the State with the observation that 'if the people are too dumb to use a razor without cutting their throats, how can they blame the State for providing razors?'

How's that for an Economist of individualism? Remembering that the two rather anarchistic authors premise their attacks on evidence that it's the State and its uniform favor for privilege which has not only made us dumb enough to cut our throats, but so dumb that we have permanently lost our RESENTANCE. Will the Jackson argument hold in logic and economics? Next, if the argument is good enough to sustain the size job proposed, how would any limit be ascertained beyond which Natural Law or any other authority would put its foot down?

THE INCENTIVE WATCHWORD—KEEP EVERLASTINGLY AT IT—NEVER STOP

JUST AS EVERY DAY, MONTH, YEAR MUST INCREASE WAGES, PROFITS AND VALUES, SO TIME MUST EXTEND THE INCENTIVE

Incentives Concluded

YES, MORE UNIONS. NO, NOT THIS KIND

LINCOLN SENTIMENT toward union leaders and organizers does not affect his convincing collaboration with them for the cause of INDUSTRY, the greater element of which is the workingman. Union is a splendid word and there can be no higher meaning than in its service to MAN—ALL men.

This gives that word the most ALTRUISTIC service and meaning of any in the language. So when that word is dusted off and scrubbed up, as it now needs, it not only must be 100% in ethical and economic service, it must provide that service to every single person who works.

Unions as a SOCIAL (not socialist) affair is probably all there will be use for when we get the labor, and economic problem that lies behind it, straightened out. Rightly organized, they might do much of the most delicate and constructive incentive work.

Did you ever think of the logic of having a 'happy family' of 1000 or 10,000 or 100 (or even 10) well behaved brothers, sisters and sweethearts sending for a delegate from No. 4-11-44 to come in to quote Union law to them and assess the right dues to each?

HOW ABOUT THAT AFL QUESTION?

A QUERY HAPPENS TO hinge on the federation's disapproval of incentive and tells how rapidly piecework spreads when it once starts by way of competition between workers when earnings rapidly increase. But this does not show AFL in any different attitude than CIO.

With the domination of either union workers may be prevented from taking any first step in improving their condition. This becomes the most serious problem in extending incentive—how to get past Union prohibition. Undoubtedly in time pressure of worker demand will break down organized resistance.

It would be a natural thing for AFL to initiate since it is rated as the most conservative and least dangerous. And there are signs already of its yielding to the peaceful way, leaving the Communist class-war behind them.

This first 'sign' is 'The Labor Journal' of Pittsburgh. It discards labor matters without the bias usually found in any class papers and seems aware of the need for change in labor organization and gives several pages to the Incentive Event at the Dredy Tractor plant at Solon, Ohio.

SCIENCE BEHIND THE INCENTIVE SYSTEM

MR. LINCOLN'S COMPLEteness of understanding of the psychology in this case is perhaps his greatest gift, in the task he has taken on. Just as psychiatry is a new science, so the science of Wealth Production or Economics, is relatively new; and neither is very generally understood.

Production CAN NOT advance without free play of incentives to the two only factors in industry, labor and capital, who do all this producing. This is as much a science as is the FACT that those two factors must be in as good psychological as physical accord. This is why Lincoln puts so much vigor into his plea for labor to let go the fallacy of hoarding work or lagging. And the equivalent error of employers that they need special protection, such as lowering piecework rates to insure their profits.

Neither of the principles behind his position might be offhand acceptable to either factor if a half century of Lincoln successful experience had not proven it. With this proof, adoption of the system can hardly be logically resisted.

IT'S SO SIMPLE! PAYING PEOPLE ALL THEY EARN

BUT THE BIGGEST ELEMENT in it is showing them how to earn more. Yet both these stages of progressive management are so far carelessly attended to as to demand the 'Incentive Revolution.' Guesswork is the present system of measuring earnings.

Helping co-producers to greater earnings is mainly done and only incidental to increase of capital earnings. And these, with limited incentive to labor, are far short of the possible. The two weaknesses are: a lack of an exact valuer of labor, lack of spur to produce a maximum.

The employer may say he is not the objector to piecework. But he cannot so truthfully say he is the organizer of Incentive. This brings us to the real status of both. Piecework has not been the incentive to production it should have been if expertly handled.

The failure of piecework to be incentive is considerably physiological in lack of security of the piecework contract: in fact the worker has often failed to consider it a contract. This, of course, is partly a result also psychological of fear of an employer to get prices too high. And both psychologies the Incentive System has clear enough answers to.

INCENTIVE NOT STEREOTYPED

THE SERVICE FOR INDUSTRY, which is man and management, in the Lincoln System, is, at the moment, of a strange type to the majority of both elements of industry: labor which wants wages and capital which wants profits—both plenty. So does INCENTIVE.

And that is a system which does most for the two producers by having them do most for the consumer. Mass consumption is the automatic incentive because it means mass-production and mass-wages. Then you must have mass-buying—to make this chain ENDLESS and PERPETUAL.

Once there was someone said there was over-production. In fact some of our biggest political steals were built on such hysterics. And they are almost as busy robbing us suckers now as ever. But all there was was poverty of people being robbed so they couldn't buy what they needed.

When such crimes take such reprisal from 145 million consumers who pay all the cash for everything all industry (labor and capital) makes, is it to be wondered that someone is demanding INCENTIVE SYSTEMS? And should there be any question raised about fast work in setting up some incentives to honestly doing over some affairs of the State?

★

YES, WE HAVE INFLATION!

NOT YET AS BAD AS THE Japs, Chinese or even French. But much worse than implied by our President's timid references to the delicate subject. The A.P. — Associated Press — presents quite an assortment of reports from cities, states and sections, to support a headline that the DOLLAR at present yields us 50c.

This compares now with 1939 and for the 'ordinary necessities.' And I estimate this tells us about half of the real story. My reason for thinking that the present value is nearer 25c than 50 or 100, is that in '39 we had about 50% inflation that no one realized.

We had become so used to high prices which had been piling up on us for decades since our economic system had been busy UN-taxing monopoly and taxing the consumer, the worker and the boss.

IS THIS A QUESTION OR A TRICK?

A FRIEND ASKS HOW THE collection of land values vs. product taxes can improve economic conditions when the money so collected all goes to a government conceded to be of doubtful character? Answer—Government is of such character BECAUSE it robs people of their earnings instead of collecting land values.

Just as government reforms its economics in this particular way will it become worthy of our confidence and veer toward FRIENDLINESS where now it appears so largely as our ENEMY, as represented by Albert J. Nock, Horbert Spencer and Ernest J. Kooser in their famous books.

Then what does my friend say to this almost automatic answer to his seeming unanswerable let-down? Why he defies me to produce a civilization which has so yielded to a reformative measure. So he ties to the doctrine of pragmatism.

Whatever is, is Truth. Everything else is not! Let me have a few of his pet proposals, in which he is deeply involved and see how many of them will stand this test. In other words, to what level of pragmatism have we all descended at this moment?

LET'S TAKE SOMETHING EASIER

LET'S MANEUVER OUR friend into the admission that even if we admitted our inability to produce the proof he demands, would he not favor our scheme, if by reasonable evidence or logic we could demonstrate that taxing ones enemies was better than taxing his friends or himself?

In other words, is he not seeking to force a theoretical issue while refusing to consider an entirely practical one of far greater import? No one cares whether a revolution may be won, but everyone cares whether he is robbed every day.

Like another friend, an industrialist, who seems to laugh off UNTAXING INDUSTRY because I can't prove the existence of enough land values to absorb all taxes that now double the cost of industrial products and thus halve volume, profits and employment.

Since I realize I have already 'lost the prize' in this debate with such keen friends, I'll tell the story of the fellow buying a horse, who complained that the biped had a terrible spavin. Finally the horseman responded (with animation):—"Well! what will you give for him—spavin and all?"

CAPITAL IS ALL DERIVED FROM LABOR

THIS SAME FRIEND, WHO seems to be in a critical mood just now, raises the question of soundness of my oft-repeated statement that capital is derived from labor: and of course its many variations such as 'it is a sub-division of labor', 'it is saved-up labor', 'a partner of labor', 'a twin of labor', etc.

Serious question of ANY of the tenets of the Political Science and Philosophy of Henry George which these two challenges happen to be, is so rare that such question should be welcome for educational reasons. And I have such confidence in the George soundness as not to hesitate in accepting the opportunity.

To sustain his negative position here my friend must deny that labor has any part in the process of producing wealth or that when producing wealth may, by being put at work producing, become capital.

He must deny that if a worker labors a week on a tool which in the next week doubles his production, becomes a 50% capitalist. Or if instead of building the tool himself, he deposits his wages in the bank, he becomes equally a capitalist.

Since the multiplication of both

HOW MANY KINDS OF ECONOMICS?

I AM OLD FASHIONED AND think that nature has but one law and does not shift. So I have got the Economic law as to the Earth or land and Taxation carefully arranged in my mind and have for over a half century watched this field and seen no reason for any change in it.

There are many AUTHORITIES I could cite for the Economic formula I will quote, but for the present I will let Ricardo, Mill, Dove and George rest in the by-line and cite only one—Common Sense.

It tells us that as Nature provided the Earth for the service of all of us, and as we all, in our activities gave the land a value exceeding all wealth built on its surface, that whatever governments we have should get its support from that land, leaving everything we make and do free of all tax burden.

So with my friend Alfred N. Chandler and some other kindred spirits, I have tried to get this formula written into the statutes of New Jersey where we live. We have spent a good share of 50 years in this endeavor. Chandler, however, has become discouraged with our progress and thinks a change in formula is needed. So we must have an umpire!

UNIMPROVED AND UNDERIMPROVED LAND

OUR SANFORD BILL PASSED the house twice, 1939 and 1940; but our Senate also is stand-pat. This bill permitted any tax-district to strip its improvements of taxes and put them all onto land—all land according to value. Now Chandler wants to make this shift only to un-used or vacant land, and to class UNDER used as UN-used land together.

Years ago (in No. 44 'democracy') I exposed this scheme as a reversal of Georgian Economics known as the Single Tax. It was then being pushed by Walter Fairchild and Henry Maguire in the N.Y.C. Council under the name Graded Tax. It is an appeasement of people who can see the evil of a vacant lot but not one with a skyscraper built on it.

To discourage vacant lot owning by taxing it as much as if a skyscraper adorned it, is obvious. To apply the same drastic cure to a lot struggling between profit and loss with a building BANKRUPTED by our present thieving tax system is quite a different matter.

As my No. 44 showed, a \$10,000 lot and \$9,000 building now paying \$370 would be rushed up to 780, an increase of \$410 probably causing bankruptcy. And doing this in the name of Henry George and his Single Tax. And by men highly credited in the movement. Just another item in the area of HALF BAKED ECONOMICS.

★

U. S. ENVOYS APPEASE FRANCE ON RUHR

MARSHALL PLAN MUST have its politics. So when so many of our Envoys are floating around Europe they must do some appeasing. France, of course, won't soon get over a yen for such prizes as what our Pittsburgh would be. But especially as the war is over, we should help France to forget.

It may be a serious fault of nature to put Ruhr where it is. But it is where the biggest job of rebuilding must be done. And Mr. Marshall, the no dictator, saw pretty clearly the vital facts of available resources and how to get them delivered where most needed by the most people to be aided by themselves and the U. S. A.

argument and illustration is ex-haustless, I will rest here and await further opportunities from this particular quarter.

'SHOW ME ANY OTHER COUNTRY'. BETTY KNOWLES HUNT

IN BRIEF: A PERIODICAL by the Foundation for Economic Education, Inc., Irvington on Hudson, prints this challenge of a housewife and mother to a leading American Socialist, with some old-time indignation behind it. Spilled first in the Bridgeport Post it has become notable.

Mrs. Hunt's greatest service has been to unmask two of the most devastating ISMS in the tearing down of Americanism. They are, Fellow-TravellingISM and United-FrontISM. She may not realize that this concerns potentially a large majority of 50 million American voters.

As she says, those who give the biggest boost to the Marx Foreign ISMS are not those wearing the names and labels, which never have gained any good will or influence: but those who have gone along with their doctrines and devices.

So as her 50 million neighbors' greatest need, Mrs. Hunt goes at work to supply them with a BRIEF of what it is they are bringing on themselves under a myriad of guises, falsehoods, doubletalk, emotions, sentiments and charities.

UTOPIA ON PAPER. THE CURE THAT KILLS

MRS. HUNT DOESN'T FIND a description of socialism automatically but finally gets it placed somewhere between communism and capitalism with a mixture they ask us to accept on their say-so, as a paper Utopia.

This challenge is not pessimistic but factual and insists on proof that government has ever even suggested a possibility such as they so freely guarantee.

Government has its merits but it has never yet efficiently and steadily got beyond such services as dog licenses and other commonplaces. So how dare it promise anything even slightly Utopian?

The pretense that Socialism is in (lack of) principle different from Communism and several ISMS hatched by K. Marx, merely shows how true is class-consciousness as illustrated by regular behaviour of these collective folk: or such different UNIONS as CIO and AFL.

I am thankful to Mrs. Hunt for mentioning MONOPOLY, as the word seems getting obsolete and before many understand it. And her point is tremendous that whatever it is it is at its very worst as state monopoly.

And she forces that question too: England—how its people keep from starving when LANDLORDS, as Lloyd George said, have made 50 million people TRESPASSERS on their own soil.

★

FROM WHEAT TO PICKETS IN MICH.

RAISED UN CLINTON CO., Mich., I doubt that I would have sought my fortune in N.Y.C. had I been advised of the Wolverine State's industrial program. Up to 15 years my occupation was mostly wheat-raising, using cradle and hand-rake and binding by a twist-of-the-wrist detailed by Mark Sullivan in the H-T.

But it now seems that the wheat fields must have been turned over to motor factories. Yet I'm told that while none but old men remain on farms, tractors and other machinery enable them to grow more wheat and everything else—another economic problem solved.

The idea of a labor row in this purely agrarian county wherein pickets and workers sieged it out in a tempo that got them the front pages of metropolitan papers—again proves that our One-World DO MOVE.

WHAT MUST INDUSTRY DO TO SAVE ITSELF FROM SELF-DESTRUCTION?

NOT CALAMITY-TALK NOR BLAMING FOREIGN OR ALIEN ATTACK BUT IT TREATS MAN AND MANAGEMENT AS IDENTICAL

THERE'S NO WORTHWHILE DEVELOPMENT AND particularly improvement or reform, in human affairs which does not profit by a knowledge of The Science of Wealth Production, commonly called **ECONOMICS**.

This is not hard to understand because Production (1) provides everything everyone needs (2) occupies everyone's time (3) gains them all their money (4) TAKES away all their money (5- and does other things too numerous to mention.

And to punctuate this short comment with a few spectacular words—there is no imagining the appalling amount of producing, yes, of wealth, there is conducted in indifference to—yes, and in abysmal ignorance of this great game of **UNIVERSAL MAKING OF THINGS**.

Example:—the rule says Capital is derived of labor—taken out of its rib as it were. Then can you believe that labor makes war on capital? That may not be as crazy as that capital doesn't seem to be conscious that it IS crazy by the kind of resistance it puts up—just fighting—not teaching.

Then so what? Seems to me Capital should do some tearing down of things, figuratively, of course, such as 1500 colleges and 12,000 high schools and rebuild with ones that would find out (and teach) what the true economic relationship is between labor and capital, or man and management so at least Marx-instructed labor leaders would not have it their way.

INDIVIDUAL-SOCIAL—WRONG AND RIGHT

THE ESSENCE OF OUR turmoil, culminating in civil and world war is, the not properly stated, between the individual and social; democratic and totalitarian systems. And the reason for the confusion of it all is that that issue is not clean-cut.

Individualism is wrong in not recognizing its own social element. And socialism (a dozen sorts) is wrong in the same attitude toward the individual. And both are right insofar as their respective stand for the individual and social rights are concerned.

The error of the turmoil is therefore **OBVIOUS**—the alternative of Individualism ceding to Society all that part of its estate created by society. OR the Marx Statists calling themselves 'Socialists' (Society-ists) butting out of their demand for private property AND enforcing it on all social values.

Whose job is this? Who is best able to see this objective, which is to divide 'wealth' EXACTLY as it is produced or created by industry (labor and capital, everyone) or society, also everyone? This may look like another KO for Amateur-Economies when everyone gets everything both before and after the 'cure' so what difference about the process?

THEN THIS SHOULD BE VERY INTERESTING!

LET US SEE IF IT CAN HELP to make economics simple—NOW Mr. Rugged I. Patriot hangs onto about 900 billion of titles to social

THE 3D FACTOR IN PRODUCTION

ECONOMICS HAVE BEEN A great football:—From David Ricardo—to Adam Smith—to John Stuart Mill—to Patrick Edw. Dove—to Henry George. And now the ball is bouncing between George Rusby and Leonard Backewitz who might be called 'local' economists, or perhaps bidders for the 'classical' honor.

Much of my comment has been upon **CULTISM** which one accredited Georgian economist has approved but changed its name to **HERESY**. And others have encouraged my critique.

These comments have taken me directly to the two 'local' economists mentioned and indirectly to the heavily financed Henry George School itself.

In No. 88 'democracy', I referred to Mr. Beckwith of Stockton, Calif., Dean of the Western School, publisher of 'The Forum' and Broadcaster of a Weekly Tax Quiz.

But in my attempted abstraction of the essential, simple and obvious facts of economics from all sources, including my own humble judgment, in which I aim to include common sense and common knowledge, I can pick up what are called fallacies of my origin and show them up, so long as anyone will read or listen.

values he did nothing to earn but which we all created collectively as society. So as these resources (including the Earth itself) are the natural source of all taxation—

Mr. Patriot (or Parasite) waves our tax collector over to our labor-products, and 15 or 20 billion a year is piled on them, doubling cost of all (wo) consumers buy: and halving our buying! This of course halves business volume and profits, also all jobs and wages, causing depression and labor-war.

NOW can you trace this shift in process by the simple change of taxing our only enemy, **MONOPOLY**, instead of our only friends, ourselves? It hinges on the democratic principle of the **MAJORITY**: it stands at about 96 (ourselves) VS. 4 (enemy). Yet those 4 monopolists are today collecting or causing loss of HALF of all we 96 producers have!

And this Rugged Socialist K. Marx, paying no attention to our Mr. E. Parasite, is busy organizing all the various mobs our Denial of Economics produces, to tear down our whole Industrial Structure. This is so foolish we can hardly forgive some 27,000-900 New Deal fellow-traveling united-fronters—BUT we are confronted with the Rugged GOP Denial of Economics which brought on both the Marx-Union Civil War and the New Deal Fellow-Travelling.

WHAT A BIG MANUFACTURER SHOULD KNOW

A PROMINENT INDUSTRIAL-ist questions the shift of taxes from industry and labor-products to largely monopolized natural resources or land-values, in this sentence:—"Government now takes more than it could possibly get out of taxing land value. When the total land in U. S. is valued at less than the government takes per year how do you expect to get your income from the taxation on land value?"

This is easy to answer purely from the factual basis as it shows an almost complete ignorance of facts on this subject. Even with an economic system so careless of the **FIRST ASSET**, land values, that every dollar of them is not exactly appraised, recorded and publicized, careful estimates indicate that there are at least 3200 billions of land value in this country.

SHOULDN'T BE LEFT TO ANY GUESSEWORK!

MOST FREQUENTLY USED in such estimation are the fully authenticated values of N. Y. City land, over \$8,000,000,000, almost the exact equal of ALL (other) WEALTH: and almost exactly enough to give each citizen an even \$1000. This measure, applied to 145,000,000 people of U.S.A. would make a total of \$145,000,000,000 (145 billion).

And this may be considered conservative, because based on tax-records, notoriously undervalued everywhere on land alone. Most important, however, this is based only on **SITE VALUES** of urban land.

Leaving at least as much more in all farm land, all mines, coal, steel, forests, waterpowers and other natural resources, and also franchises of all utilities, at least \$50 billion. The famous lakes inventory listed coal alone at more than \$200 billion.

BUT MORE IMPORTANT TO KNOW—

IS NOT JUST EXACTLY HOW nearly the big shift is justified in this **TAX SHIFT**; but that it is a big steal and that while it is first levied on **INDUSTRY**, it comes out of the hides of the 90,000,000 industrial workers.

And eventually out of 145,000,000 customers of industry, the consumers, from which labor and capital (industry) get all their substance.

The great puzzle here is how any successful businessman who has soired the enigma of labor-relations and consumer-relations can be in the fog on industry's equally vital **TAX RELATIONS, MONOPOLY RELATIONS, and SOCIAL RELATIONS**.

Must we necessarily at this stage, on a proposal that cannot be questioned in principle nor in common sense, prove that it will forthwith succeed in 100% of its fiscal aims, to get it accepted by those who will get 100% of what ever good there is in it?

SUPPOSE WE HAVE BUT 50% CURE?

THERE ARE THINGS THAT should be held strictly to what they can guarantee financially and these are things, such as the Lincoln Incentive System, that should be done as a matter of course, of judgment, of justice and of business-sense. And that is what we are here discussing.

Does an industrialist extend his neck for more taxation because he can pass it to his customers: and where they already have cancelled their orders and made him lose half his plant and lay-off half his partners-in-industry, his workers?

Is he living up to his profession of regard for co-producers? And even more important, his regard for the customer-consumers who because of these sales-taxes (about all our

WARDEN LEWIS E. LAWES, A GREAT MAN

AND THERE ARE NOT many such because most wardens think only of punishment. But Lawes, warden of Sing Sing for 21 years until his recent death at 63, always tried to help and improve the prisoner. In other words he was an actual **CRIMINOLOGIST** of which there are not many.

Col. Bob Ingersoll and Clarence Darrow, another great lawyer, of Chicago, were in his class. One of Ingersoll's best lectures was named 'Crimes Against Criminals.'

I was associated with Lawes in a Committee for the Abolition of Capital Punishment, of Adolph Lewisohn's Prison Reform Assn. I had previously with Luke North (around 1910) of 'The Great Adventure' for Land Value Taxation (of Calif.) headed the Anti-Capital Punishment League (as Pres., N. Y. C.) which documented the proposition that increase of murder always followed these official killings.

These real criminologists were also real economic reformers who recognized all crime as one of the many diseases of poverty which in turn was the major crime of the inequitable distribution of wealth which now splits our country and our world wide open in two kinds of war. And their cause is the taxation of industry, so that Nature's Resources may be exempted and thus monopolized.

WHAT IS AN ENCLAVE?

IT'S SOMETHING STRANGE—and French. We have a few scattered thru the U. S., notably at Fairhope, Ala., Arden, Del., and Free Acres, N. J., all being to demonstrate the land and taxation doctrine of Henry George which they have not done very efficiently I fear.

It seems France has a dozen of them in India containing but 3 square miles and 2,000 people. They seem to have some social consciousness, as for example in free trade lines with England.

Perhaps inherited from the Physiocrats who, in France, late in the 17th century launched the first formulation of Political Economics. France is now following England's suit and offering to deed her Enclaves to the Indians—or at least their right to trade—showing it is worth-while.

U. S. MIGRATIONS TO AUSTRALIA

WHILE OUR ENGLISH-COUSIN-colony has room for a round million refugees from the land of the Free, nearly a round thousand (mostly GIs) have accepted the cordial invitation.

I remember, over 50 years ago, when that part of this island almost as big as the U.S., called New South Wales, would have tempted almost anyone to settle there. It was when they started to inaugurate a sound economic system in a shift of taxation from industry and labor products to natural resources and monopoly.

But something happened to this movement and from papers coming to me edited by some of the soundest economists in Christendom, I judge that their situation is not far different from their Mother Country—or for that matter the U.S.A.—economically.

taxes) can only buy half what they want and need of his product?

Does he here occupy the position of enlightened management management which has in some notable cases brought transcendent success in immediately putting its own profits at apparently second place to that of the two basic elements—the workers and the customers? There is no appeal on this subject equal in power to that of such an industrialist, because NO ONE can answer it.

WALLACE, ROOSEVELT, ROOSEVELT & CO.

ONE OF THE ODD JOBS H.A.W. has done on his flying trip thru Europe is to launch a third party for little ole U.S.A.). Whether in connivance or deadly competition, there are several others, at home here, working at that same odd job; and oddly, they are mostly in the prolific Roosevelt family.

It's true the U. S. needs another party, whether 3d to do some of the things neither old party will, or 2nd to take the place of the old one that is nearest defunct. It does not need one to either lug along the GOP status quo of basic and other monopoly.

Nor does it need one to project into perpetuity many of the New Deal traditions especially that of not disturbing GOP monopoly. Nor do we need a revival of **FELLOW-TRAVELLINGISM**. There's enough of that left in both old parties to make communistic progressivism easy.

In other words, we don't want any more parties like those we have—either in 'principles' or methods: in economics or politics. Our next party's plan is very simple:—to take all taxes off ourselves, industry and consumer: and put them all on our worst enemy, basic monopoly.

BLACK MARKET STEAL EVEN IN STEEL

THAT'S OUR TROUBLE, WE can't confine black-marketing to the 'markets' (groceries, etc.) when our underlying system is crooked and when our 'biggest and best' citizens don't even dare talk about the realities of that system.

When the earth itself becomes the basis of inflated prices it is a sure sign that everything in the earth is involved and that it will show up 100% (like \$245 steel a ton) when it is ready for the market which before it lost its normal color stood at \$70 a ton.

Inflation or Black Market starts years before war or other emergencies bring on any spiral with prices we call 'normal' because these years have caused our short memories to forget that normal word's meaning. Taxes are the basis. Product Taxes and Resource Tax Exemption.

LOANS TO ENGLAND

LOANS OR AID TO THIS Empire would come along as a matter of course if two basic elements within the control of the British people were normal. And loans—even into billions—need not be questioned, on sound principles, if we had those same elements normal.

These elements are the OWNERSHIP of its own resources and the CONSERVATION of its own peoples' earnings. Quoting one of its great statesmen of a generation ago:—"England's LAND-holds had made trespassers of the people of the Empire on their own soil."

This results in a Tax System which, failing of the natural source of taxes (the Natural Resources), bleeds all industry including every worker and all the consumers (EVERYONE), of their last farthing to support an extravagant bureaucratic government.

So if a lender or AIDER takes even a running view of these two basic facts and is in possession of an average banker's common sense, what could he say but NO! AND YET Uncle Samuel, using the same survey instruments, discovers that we have this same Monopoly and Tax System, which has given us a \$300 Billion Debt: so we have no money to loan or give away.

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION INVITED AT RATE OF 26 TIMES FOR \$1.60

Name _____ Address _____



50 Lincoln St. New York, N.Y.

FILE

146

"Democracy" 116 Broadway Room 504 New York, N. Y. Return postage guaranteed SECTION EDITOR—F. L. & R.