

THOMAS JEFFERSON

HENRY GEORGE

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

democracy

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

9321 with the small "d"

1165 Broadway
New York City

Vol. IV - No. 82

6 Issues—25c

13 Issues—50c

26 Issues—\$1.00

February, 1947

GOOD NEWS FROM LAND AND TAX REFORM MOVEMENTS—WORLDWIDE

JERSEY, ENGLAND AND ROME ARE AGITATING FOR RADICAL CHANGE IN LAND TENURE AND TAXATION

BASIC OR FUNDAMENTAL REFORM IS WHAT MANY of us know we must have to get out of our ONE-WORLD-MESS. And it's comforting to have the following messages from at least the *THREE-quarters of the globe*: for this is indeed one Global Question—*Land and Taxes*.

Land is all our subsistence, employment and production. And taxes make all those necessities almost hopeless.

The monopoly of our source of life could not for a moment exist if taxes could not be spread over the things our labor and its twin, capital, manufacture.

By taxing ourselves—EVERYONE that buys a dollar of anything—we EXEMPT the monopoly and let our PRECIOUS PARASITES corner over half of all our 'wealth'.

We do two insane things:—(1) We let product taxes double prices on every consumer which halves employment of both capital and labor. (2) And we leave all our Natural Resources in possession of racketeers to extort double prices from our producers.

Now when we get these messages from Jersey, England and Rome we can be assured that people in many other countries besides in U.S.A. are THINKING RADICALLY. Which means that they are going to the root of such issues as monopoly of the earth itself: and doing it by impoverishing every consumer with A SALES TAX.

negative or NEUTRAL position on this TRIPLE FUNDAMENTALISM. (No 83 'democracy' will extend these comments).

A SYNTHESIS OF FUNDAMENTALISM

AS IMPLIED IN MY OPENING words, it is not my purpose to be hypercritical either of the past or present of these three 'attacks'. I am only reciting the tripartite history to show and give full credit for present distinctions from the past even if only going as far as verbiage.

And I will, before going to close examination of the respective reports, in fewest words restate the ECONOMIC interest of each:—(1) The English people, some 45 million, are, if Lloyd George was truthful, 'made trespassers on their own soil', except for, I would guess, not over 1 in 100, who monopolize that soil.

(2) A governor of a small state faces practically the same situation, the N. J. is several hundred years less SUNK and 9/10 less in population and perhaps in land value and product taxes. If the governor will notice the resemblance in G.B. and U.S.A. news, he will be sure his demand for a 'single tax' is justified.

(3) There is little to be added to the church position EXCEPT that the greatest credit must be given it if its position is WORTH-RIGHT: because, in common with most other churches, they are the biggest land speculators and monopolists. So if they advocate shifting taxes from products to land their financial self-sacrifice will be a great test.

NEW JERSEY EDUCATED IN ECONOMICS

ASSEMBLYWOMAN OLIVE C. Sanford introduced bills in the sessions of 1938-39 and 1940-41 of the N. J. legislature providing exactly for the single and simple tax principle. Gov. Driscoll now demands as the only alternative to ruination in which he bravely speaks the literal truth. This 'Sanford Bill' is so clear and simple that it needs only a few lines to state it all.

It permits any taxing district, by referendum, during 5 years, to vote all taxes off of improvements, buildings, personal property, etc. and onto land, according to its value. This bill passed by comfortable margins both the '38-'39 and the '40-'41 assemblies and was being pushed in the Senate when the war panic seized Senators and everyone else.

This bill was originally written by Geo. L. Record and was the basis of a circulating almost life-long activity of every kind, by Alfred N. Chandler; also Gladwin Bonton and A. L. Bonta helped by John H. Allen, myself and many others.

The last campaign with Mrs. Sanford's direction, represented 12,000 miles of travel in my chevy by Horace J. Haase and myself largely in visiting senators at their homes (including Senator Driscoll at Camden). The Senator was obviously and favorably impressed.

THE BRITISH LAND QUESTION

THE GREAT HISTORIC events here should enthrall the 'SOCIALIST OR labor government' leaders in the Greatest Basic Reform. And this will be the test of

THE ESSENTIALS OF ECONOMICS

A FUNDAMENTAL GEORGIAN ECONOMIST

HOW MANY IN THE U.S.A. can qualify under this designation? Asking this is not because I want to suggest any kind of purge or raise any other class-distinctions, as I am strictly of the opinion that the most useful persons in helping the economic movement might be largely devoid of technical knowledge.

Further, sound Political Economy consists of so few and so simple tenets that FUNDAMENTALISTS need no unusual mental qualifications and still less any academic marks, to qualify. Rather 'commonest of sense' and fixity of a principle-purpose are the requisites.

My concept of the sole object of these economics is to end two public evils which largely impoverish practically EVERYONE. These are (1) Labor-Capital Product Taxation, caused by (2) Social Value or Natural-Resource exemption from taxes. Or, ending Product Taxes and Basic Monopoly.

I maintain that there can be no dispute as to the quality of the headlined economist if the above 11-word description be accepted. And I am equally certain that it and the following 6-word alternative are INDISPUTABLE as to Economics, as being the code of production and distribution or division of wealth, the product of industry.

As an example of many tests which may be applied under this simple formula:—a certain 'cut' (as I call it) insists that Henry George proclaimed the 'making of land common property'. I deny this since at least, and neither product taxes nor land monopoly. It is nothing but common sense, the OPPOSITE to economics.

SIMPLICITY DEMANDS GREATEST LEADERSHIP

ASSUMING LEADERSHIP IS demanded to bring about change, no matter how simple and obvious, then this word FUNDAMENTAL becomes significant despite any concession that technique is unimportant to the layworker.

The fact is that in this economic

the proportion-sense of this kind of socialism. Whether it can in its novel task, distinguish between socializing social values and socializing 'everything'.

Back in the middle ages the feudal land system grew up there, which with landlordism, has given our Mother Country a black eye. However, not before it had set up a precedent this present 'attack' is trying to restore and perfect.

This was a substantial collection of 'feud' or ground-rent for public service. Other events in English land history were the 'fencing' act when a large part of the limited land area was expropriated from common use to private monopoly.

Then came the 'Single Tax' movement inspired by Henry George and prosecuted by Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, Campbell Bannerman and many other real statesmen. This was only to impose a measly 'penny in the pound' (or about 1/6 of 1%) on land values. This, however, was the first SPECIFIC move in Christendom to try and have tax-legislation reflect natural law.

field of teaching, as in the vast open spaces of our 1500 colleges and 12,000 high schools SIMPLICITY is the most difficult to grasp. So the tendency to OVER-EDUCATION, the greatest bar to soundness of sense quality in Political Economy.

Henry George learned his economics as he went along: writing 100 or so 'essays' from which his great 'Progress and Poverty' was built. These 600 pages 'ad-libbed' about everything bearing on all the highways and byways. But the 600 pages BOILED DOWN to the two prime objects, just as I've stated them.

That is why George is the greatest economist: because he examined and talked of everything and synthesized it all into a workable conclusion. Now to QUIBBLE about words or meanings in the George text is not mere sabotage, it is TREASON to the greatest writing of the greatest author in humanity's supreme cause.

Let us again marshal COMMON SENSE to express in fewest words Political Economy's Complete Purpose:—First, to rid all people of the tax on all they consume so they may have double the amount and quality at the same cost. Second, to do this by shifting ALL this tax onto Land Values, which will free resources to the doubled production of industry, ending their present tight MONOPOLY.

WHAT IS THE COMMONEST OF ECONOMIC SENSE?

I BELIEVE THE FEW POS- sibilities of these (above) two paragraphs are self-contained and self-proving. If they are, they should be made the basis of an Economic Activity which would be positive and rapid in the progress toward making 'Our ENEMY the State' into a FRIEND.

By self-contained I mean that the possibilities do not have to go outside of Economics for VERIFICATION. And more important, NOT OUTSIDING OF HENRY GEORGE'S ECONOMICS. Let us see:—will anyone attempt to take issue with the 'postulate' that the world, in its valuable content, should NOT be privately monopolized?

Who will dispute (successfully) that the SIMULTANEOUS killing of the tax-exemption that causes its COMPLETE monopoly — and the killing of the product-tax the world-monopoly right-hand, that makes nearly EVERYONE poor is a paramount public objective?

Who can undertake, from the writing of George or any other Economist, to demonstrate in reason, logic or common sense, that if these two objects, ending land monopoly and product taxes are attained there will be remaining any important economic wrongs to correct?

My point is to help George and every other economist philosopher and statesman, by restatement of their theories until all the obscurities and misstatements are shaken out. Then repeat them in the simplest terms are found. And then start to find the various and diverse MEANS whereby these really may be planted in our average '35-year-old mentality' including all the others in College Economic Chairs!

GREAT ATTACKS ON THE EARTH'S MONOPOLY

AND THE COME FROM THE four-quarters, and almost lay's front page headlines, the attacks have not the economic soundness, which would be consistent with their paramount importance, they still must be hailed with exultation by 2 1/2 billion 'tenants' of the earth, if only for their publicity value.

Attack No. 1 is from the House of Commons and is phrased: 'Land Owners in Britain face Severe Curbs.' No. 2 is delivered by new Governor Driscoll of N. J. The headline reads, 'Favors Single Tax Program.' He says "we are headed for ruin unless a single tax program is substituted for the 49 programs of the states and federal government."

No. 3 should be the most important as it seems to commit the whole Roman Catholic Church to freeing every nation from its monopoly of vital natural resources, the obvious first cause of every war; AND of even more immediate importance to peace, to complete FREE TRADE between our 67 nations.

These 3 jumps from such evil conditions that statesmen, or even politicians, are driven to at least talk favorably of the only radical remedy for them—radical in the correct sense of going to the root—these moves cannot be expected too rapidly. If we find in synthesis of these proposals good faith and determination our exultation is confirmed.

BRIEF REVIEW OF BASIC AND SECONDARY ELEMENTS

BASIC IS NOT COMPLETE IN details. And more important first, are the general circumstances. These various statements array all phases of this most fundamental and vital of all human questions. Obviously the basic issue is the private ownership for speculation and monopoly of the earth itself from which the 2 1/2 billion 'people of the earth' draw their subsistence.

Yet more presently devastating, as Gov. Driscoll says, are the PRODUCT-TAX SYSTEMS, which are linked to, and in fact cause the land MONOPOLY EXEMPTION, by which only can that monopoly

keep on growing, after absorbing the bigger half of all our substance—the \$400 to \$600 billion total U. S. A. estate.

The grand-strategy here (everywhere) is to end product-taxation because it doubles product-cost and consumer-prices, so business volume and labor employment are halved. So the object is to UN-TAX everything labor and capital make:—And to do that, say \$25 billion a year, a place must be found for those taxes.

That cannot be another forced or defenseless place such as an income or sales tax: it must be a natural, economic and self-sufficient source of which there is but one—THE SOCIAL VALUES of the country which are natural resources, city lands, and franchises. Natural because of the simple law that social activity—government—shall only be paid from social values.

THE CHURCH RECORD ON LAND MONOPOLY AND CONSUMER TAXES

THIS I PHRASE AS HERE BE- cause in many discussions of over 40 years I have insisted that this vast world-wide popular church with perhaps 50 to 100 million humble adherents was above all others committed to full wages and WIDEST USE of the Earth, just as implied in the present and previous pronouncements.

The first controversy over this dual principle was when Father McGlynn, probably the country's most popular priest, took up the Henry George doctrine and started the Anti-Poverty Society. For this he was excommunicated and the restored some years later, his movement, career and life, were ended.

And the Church, while reporting he had not violated church policy, has never made clear its position on the three economic vital principles, wages, monopoly and free trade, unless in the present 'attack' which can be more verbal than factual.

Outstanding in these verbal attacks have been the writings of Most Rev. John A. Ryan, late head of the Georgetown (Catholic) University, and the extensive Bishop's Statement of a few years ago, all of which have left the church in a

There are two kinds of Democracy: Political and Economic.

VOL. IV
No. 82**democracy**February
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.

JACKSON'S WARNING A Friend's Comment

"Jackson has GOT THE FACTS JUST RIGHT. The U.N. as organized and operated so far is Fascist and Totalitarian, and represents, NOT THE PEOPLE OF ANY NATION ANYWHERE, but the APPOINTED AGENTS and DIPLOMATS and POLICY STEERERS of the SMALL BUNCHES OF BIGS called the GOVERNMENTS.

"Jackson is RIGHT about the CAUSE of the last TWO WARS and the possibility of another one. WHO OWNS THE EARTH is bound to be the NEXT GREAT QUESTION in POLITICS, and STALIN'S SOLUTION is SWEEPING THE WORLD, though the DEEP-ROOT PHILOSOPHY of it so far has only reached the stage of NATIONALIZATION.

THE EDITOR'S LECTURE

At The Henry George School, February 7, '47

RECAPITULATION OF THE WAGE-LAW

THIS TIME WE SHALL POSE our wage-law with its 'Partner-Laws' as composing the PRODUCTION-LAW. The labor law is that all the product of labor must go to labor.

In this division, when class-war ceases and capital is in its true relation to labor, as a sub-division or twin-brother in production, labor will have ALL the product. For the present, however, let us consider capital as a separate factor in DIVISION of wealth as well as in its production.

But Land, in our law, while the first factor in production, NATURALLY reduces the cost of product in two distinct ways—(a) by supply of raw materials on special terms (b) by displacement of all product-taxes with its vast rent-fund.

Our Law imposes no limit on wages. The Law of Wages is that wages must equal all the wealth the worker produces. The Law includes the exact division of this product with the laborer's only co-worker in production according to what each does. Such division must exclude two present interferences: (1) taxation of all products: caused by (2) the exemption of basic monopoly. The Law is enforced at this point by Shifting the Taxes from Products to Monopoly.

A MOOT POINT IN ECONOMICS

IT IS OBVIOUS TO MOST economists or studious laymen that the making of everything people want, or PRODUCTS, involves Land for the raw materials, Labor to make them into useful shapes, and Capital to do this COMMERCIALLY.

It is not so obvious that according to the Economic Law (which is our business to translate into Statute Law), only two of those three wealth-producing factors are SPECIFICALLY paid for currently with production. These are Labor and Capital.

Land, being the GIFT of Nature or a Creator the First Essential to Production and the YIELDING a vast Fund of Economic Rent is NOT an item of cost in production, as necessarily are the wages of labor, and the interest of capital which must be paid in full and on the spot. There is no wage-law now in action because we don't enforce the rent-fund law as included in the wealth production law.

THE MANY 'NEARS' TO FREE TRADE

ADDED TO CHURCHILL'S powerful call from Zurich for a 'U.S. of Europe'—or of the World—comes now one equally impressive from his erstwhile socialist government for a 'World Board on Commodities.' All showing popular urge for the only natural relationship between nations, Freedom of Trade.

BOTH these voices for world-wide reform use all of the words which MEAN this first of all freedoms for present needs of world-peace: and more particularly peace that we may have some assurance of lasting. But they shy at the only words that ankly tell what's on their minds.

While FREEDOM is, as in the Atlantic Charter, a multifarious cluster of intriguing things for endless double talk, when it comes to specific plan or action, everyone is mum.

Conceding that levelling all tariff walls is a radical plan (I think it 100% conservative) this does not explain the failure of discussion of so obvious and necessary a condition of peace and amity for 67 nations trying to frame a Code of Peace.

CAN THE UN ASSEMBLY AVOID THIS FREEDOM?

HERE IS ANOTHER 'NEAR' to this biggest issue, from Walter Lippmann: and still others from Stalin, Molotov and those joining issues with them. Even Wallace in his attack on Vandenberg implies this as the real need.

The phenomenon is that with all this suppressed clamor for freedom, 'FREE TRADE' is unheard. This is enough to give the UN a sinister meaning, as a union of 67 raiders of U.S.A. substance. Or as an alternative, a union of basic monopolists of the world's treasures.

How otherwise can weeks and months of discussion go on in avoidance of the only freedom that can hold nations together? Either the 60 assorted smaller nations are muzzled by a world dictatorship 'Called Big Four' or they are in a hopeless political complex, the opposite to freedom.

Free Trade is directly connected to the underlying subject of natural resource monopoly for possession of which every war has been promoted and prosecuted. No one reading only headlines can fail to see this plain fact of cause and effect. This may explain the phenomenon of thumbs down on Free Trade.

Militarism And Monopoly: A Bad Combination

Out of the Frying Pan and into the Fire of Baruch Atomicity, By H. A. Jackson.

Compared to Baruch's atomic control proposal, Hitler's bid for worldwide domination shows up as strictly amateur stuff.

In their frantic desire to escape destruction by atomic weapons, many superficial thinkers are willing to rush blindly into dangers infinitely worse.

The waiving of sovereignty, either by veto or otherwise, furnishes no guarantee of security against economic or military injustice or aggression. In general, the proposition offered is to share atomic secrets when all or a majority of the nations agree:

To denature atomic energy, so that it cannot be used for destructive purposes;

To vest authority in the U.N. to search and seize matter from which atomic weapons may be made;

To outlaw atomic bombs and their manufacture;

After agreement by a majority of the nations, all nations, whether signatories of such agreement or not, shall be compelled by force, to follow the dictation of the U.N. military organization.

This irresistible military force will then have power to search and inspect the most minute details of the affairs of any nation in the world, to see if its will is being observed.

The danger of vesting authority so tremendous, in the hands of any body of men, even our own citizens, is greater than even the menace of the bomb itself. This is true especially when it may be used to cement for all time, the federated power of monopoly as against the unprivileged of the whole world.

AS TO SEARCH AND SEIZURE, the sovereign rights of nations which do not subscribe to the proposed agreement are arbitrarily violated and they can be subjected to a ruthless domination, for whatever purposes the central authority dictates. 'Universality of application'—any point on Earth would be free from the meddling snooping of this power.

Beside this, there being some 197,000,000 square miles involved, what chance would there be of successfully inspecting such a vast area?

As to denaturing atomic energy, it is in novice certain that this can be done successfully.

If the U.N. had been functioning when Hitler was just rising to power, and he wasn't so well known for what he was, how much do you suppose his delegates could have been trusted not to use atomic knowledge for purposes which they have used other power?

There are other Hitlers—perhaps even here. What proof have we that the U.N. doesn't contain international gunmen?

It is a strange coincidence that the present U.N. Secretary's name sounds suspiciously like "Trigger Lee."

Are there those so simple as to believe that a fascist would keep his word, in or outside a U.N.?

Nearly all the delegates of the various nations to the U.N., at present do not actually represent their own people, but simply the holders of monopoly in their own countries. As a matter of fact, our own people have had practically nothing to say about who should represent them either.

AS A RESULT OF THAT POLICY privilege overwhelmingly dominates even our delegation. Give that aggregation sole military power and they will surely make certain that they and their kind keep those monopolistic privileges.

Another thing to be considered is, what if Russia or Argentina or Spain, etc. won't come into the project and surrender their sovereignty; is it planned to attack them and compel them to do so? This would insure the Bloody struggle which the UN is supposed to avert.

I don't believe for an instant that Russia or Argentina or Spain

would keep a promise not to make atomic bombs; and I am not too certain that our own militarists could be trusted either.

Suppose Russia actually has atomic bombs right now, attempts of the U.N. to coerce that country, under such circumstances would bring on a struggle too horrible to contemplate.

Then too, it is altogether probable that atomic energy may be secured from matter other than uranium, plutonium, etc., such as is known now, and by simpler methods.

While we are dealing with the matter of arbitrary power usurpation, I want to call attention to some brazen statements by Emory Reeves in his recent book, "The Anatomy of Peace." This man and his book have been acclaimed from the house-tops by a horde of self-styled scholars and alleged 200% Americans.

THIS ATTITUDE DEMONSTRATES the worst phase of the present mental state of those who aspire to be leaders: it is the blind leading the blind.

What the worst brand of Nazis and Fascists have been condemned for, these American counterparts are unthinkingly praised for.

Reeves after repeating in various ways, what any thinking person recognizes as Fascism, finally abandons caution and says outright, what Fritz Kuhn would have been sent to a Federal prison, if not hanged for: especially if uttered during the war. All thru the book, he by innuendo urges scraping our constitutional safeguards, to set up Fascist machinery here in the United States. However, before he finishes, he throws caution to the winds and says right out loud, what really is on his mind.

Listen: (Page 269)—"If we cannot attain universalism and create union by common consent, and by democratic methods, as a result of rational thinking,—Rather than retard the process, let us precipitate unification BY CONQUEST."

Did Hitler ever state his case for Nazism with any greater brutal frankness than that? Even this revoltingly frank statement hardly creates a ripple with those who have spent their whole lives and careers sloppily affecting to worship the American constitution. This whole aggregation has gone overboard 100% for Baruch's atomic supervision plan.

OF COURSE, WHATEVER WE may think of that band of loose thinkers who fall for Reeves' philosophy, Baruch cannot be placed in their category. Barny and his band of American Tories know just exactly what they are doing. They are making a bid to make the world safe for privilege and monopoly. It is important that we examine the process by which they hope to accomplish their object.

The holders of monopolistic privilege already well entrenched, will find itself in a position absolutely impregnable if protected by the only military force capable of making itself felt. This is the power we would be putting into their hands thru the machinery of the U.N.

Many men are fired with a desire to save the world; some are sincere and others are not. Hitler told the world that he wanted to save it, but it later developed that he wanted to save it for himself. Even the sincerest saviors of the world should be investigated, and not taken at their face value. The world needs saving because of the rotten economic administration of every nation on Earth, that I know anything about; especially the big ones. The question is, what is the rational way to save it?

To be brief, all wars are caused by the struggle for control of the earth's strategic natural resources. If we can solve that problem, we shall have found the only rational means of stopping armed conflict.

The abolition of the monopoly of those strategic natural resources

which control production of any kind of wealth whatever, is essential to peace. Not only that, but it would bring to the world for the first time in human history, sanity, free enterprise, and democracy.

WHAT ARE THESE STRATEGIC monopolistic privileges of which I speak?

I shall specify just what they embrace and then go on to offer a rational solution for the horrible mess into which the whole world has sunk, despite the guidance of what professes to be the last word in economic knowledge.

Monopoly and special privilege may be divided into two great classes: (1) Natural monopoly, and (2) Legislatively created monopoly.

In the first class are all the natural metallic and crude chemical deposits in the earth, and land value itself. Embraced in this classification are all the natural agencies which cannot be duplicated artificially, and without which no creation of wealth of any kind may be effected. It also includes the kinetic energy of falling water and that immensely important item of petroleum, etc.

Legislative monopolies are those which are created by fiat of legislation. They embrace complete or partial monopoly of furnishing service exclusively, to the people, and in which public property must be used. They cover railroads, shipping terminals, tariffs, subsidies, bonuses, patent monopolies, communication facilities, etc.

It is when the great powers clash in maneuvering for position in the weaker NATIONS, over natural resources, that wars are brewed. Whatever issues are dragged in to justify their actions in goading the people to armed conflict, never for a moment forget, that they are fighting for natural resources. The present mess in Iran is actuated by what? Petroleum.

In the East Indies and other places it is oil, metals and other natural agencies which cannot be duplicated artificially.

GIVE ME UNQUESTIONED title to the only well in the community, and I'll make the people of that community my slaves. Permit the earth's natural resources to remain in private hands as at present, (or in Fascist hands) and not only will those monopolists make the rest of the world slaves, but they will control atomic military power as well. It makes no difference whether the benefits of a monopoly are divided between just two men, or two thousand; those on the outside are just as much on the outside.

Sovereignty is always claimed in the name of the people. In coveting the gifts of nature to the people, for their use, without tribute to private interests, according to a rational process, there is no surrender of sovereignty, but an affirmation of that sovereignty in their interest. If there must be surrender of national sovereignty, let it be surrender of the use of sovereignty of individual nations, to protect the private monopolists in their respective countries who hog the gifts of nature to all the race. In other words, "Those who saw them first."

You ask how could this be done?

The U. N. should create a "Natural Resources Commission," which should make a complete survey over the whole world, to discover and develop such natural agencies where they occur. This international commission should then proceed to produce the yield of those gifts of nature to all men, in their crude form and release such crude yield to all corners of all nations, at strict cost of production and at the same price to all, for PRIVATE FABRICATION OR REFINEMENT. This process would not mean Communism, but Democracy.

(To be continued in No. 83
'democracy')