

democracy

Editor
Chas. H. Ingersoll
The Watchman

with the small 'd'

13244

VOL.V. No.26. Broadcast No.4132. Jan. 8, 1940 Year \$1;10 times 25¢; Bulk 2½¢ ea.

TO FRIENDS OF "democracy" Democracy (of all kinds that are real) is poor - it is hand-
to mouth: So please remember that the copy you are read-
ing of "democracy" the paper, must be paid for by someone; and that, as things work
out, payment is not uniform. So, in paying for yours---for 10 or 52 times---consider
whether you will overlap and help cover the needs of delinquents.

A THERMOMETER OF DEPRESSION AND UNEMPLOYMENT IS THE NEWSPAPER HEADLINE. HERE IT SAYS
90,000 men line up for 2000 sanitation jobs, 45 men for each job - but which will not
be available except over four years. They pay \$35.00 a week. This is more reliable
as a gauge of industrial conditions and unemployment conditions than any of labor
Secretary Madam Perkins' reports. Contrast this statement with the economic formula
that those 2000 jobs should be looking for not over 1000 men, who could possibly be
interested in them. Try and think of having to go hunting for men and making induce-
ments to men to take jobs, instead of men, 45, hunting for each job. This, of course,
can only be if the opportunity for self-employment, working on the land, can be freed
from monopolistic tie-up.

ROBERT A. TAFT MAY BE A WONDER-WORKER, BUT HE CAN'T BALANCE A BUDGET WITH TWICE AS
much expenditure as income. And unless he is ready for real business, it seems to me
the less he says about budget balancing the smoother will his political machine oper-
ate. Budget balancing can be done, but I doubt by a Republican; and there seems no
danger of a Democrat even talking about it, except to scoff. The only fellow the
President need fear to challenge -- as F.D.R. did Taft --- to balance a budget, is
one who might have been keeping company with economists, and who might have acquir-
ed that crazy idea of taxing our enemies instead of our friends -- privileges instead
of the consumers. If we dared make our most respectable racketeers pay their dues,
the budget would balance over night and never again unbalance.

HOW PERFECTLY DOES THE WAR SCARE -- OR PERHAPS I SHOULD SAY THE WAR -- FIT INTO THIRD
term and other political exigencies! Now, with every one hopped up over the prospect
of our being in some way entangled, every demand such as the President's present one
of \$2,300,000,000 for defense, will meet very little opposition. And, of course, we
cannot change horses crossing the 3,000 mile ocean that lies between us and any pos-
sibility of war.

"FAIR ENOUGH" PERHAPS IS THE STUDENT UNION VOTE OF 322 TO 49, REFUSING TO CONDEMN
Russia for joining the Nazis and attacking Finland. It is, anyway, very valuable as
a yardstick of Communism in our colleges. Determination to save the face -- the
united front -- of Communism, is the only way of accounting for such a vote, in view
of present popular sentiment. Let Mr. Dies follow this lead and he will get the
answer to where our New Deal leaders came from and Supreme Court selections.

ALL THE CURRENT HEADLINES -- MOST OF WHICH RELATE IN SOME WAY TO WAR -- REMIND ME OF
W. J. Bryan's great speech in the Madison Square Garden on the eve of our entering
the last war. It was poured fervently into the ear of the President, but apparently
had little effect. Bryan's answer to war hysteria could well be adopted now: - he
would spend this 2.3 billions for example, in gridironing this country with roads,
so 130 million people could be effectively mobilized. Then, he would promote every
man's interest in obtaining his own home, so he would not have to shoulder arms for
his "boarding house."

THOMAS PAINE, IN HIS "RIGHTS OF MAN" GIVES US A MESSAGE WE COULD NOW PROFIT BY. HE
never dwells long on the surface of things and so relates democracy to man's funda-
mental rights, as distinguished from the privileges he is able to exact from statute
law makers. Our bill of rights aims to follow Paine's logic in this respect, (though
either of our Toms -- Paine or Jefferson -- would have made it much clearer):- that
man's natural right was to himself and all he produced; and that basic monopoly was
specially prohibited from any division with him. Paine said Louis XVI was not aimed
at by the revolution, but the system behind and before him. And so do I say of
Roosevelt and the New Deal. They deserve oblivion only for their failure to uncover
and destroy the system of monopolism -- they inherited from the G.O.P. -- as the
mandate of 1932 demanded.

THAT DOLLAR MINIMUM. It is going to take a lot of dollars to carry these papers
through the crucial first few months. While there are a few
Georgists who will give unusual help, a lot who will put up the dollar minimum will
be necessary and desirable -- from their, as well as our, position.

THE RELATION OF THE UNEMPLOYED MILLIONS TO THE LAND -- ESPECIALLY AGRARIAN AGRICULTURAL land -- is by no means obvious, particularly to the average city student who rarely sees land and knows little of his own economic connection to it; i.e. that all his sustenance has always and will ever come from the land. If these unemployed were farmers, the land question would be more apparent to the average intelligence. But it is the covered up city lands, the deep down mines, the water powers, and the utility privileges that make the economics of land -- the values which equal all other wealth and which, not being normally used to support government -- leaves that support to be taken from the masses whose unemployment is caused by the fact that mass buying power is, by these taxes, cut in two.

CAN WE REDUCE GOVERNMENT, BEFORE GIVING IT AN HONEST FISCAL SYSTEM? AS LONG AS WE flout natural law in revenue collection, can we avoid the penalty of thousands of patchwork state laws, and the horde of administrators that give us bureaucracy, extravagance and corruption? This question involves the essence of the novel contention that had we economics, all moral questions would settle themselves. But the moralist contest with vice and crime can never end and so cut down government, while normal life and ways of earning are made impossible by systems that prey on earning and buying power.

WE NEVER EXPECTED TO SEE THE U.S.A. CONDUCTING A WAR FOR FREE TRADE AGAINST HER 48 states. The U.S.A. is itself, committed to the very opposite principle -- or fallacy -- that of protection. Yet when Uncle Sam sees his children setting up trade barriers between the different units of his happy family, his sense of justice, as well as his traditional common sense, revolts. The federal government has launched a campaign in the name of sound economics against states that have erected "artificially created trade barriers", imposed to "enrich individual state coffers." This is the exact language of the free trade school of economists, whose wise counsels have for fifty years been disregarded while the international tariff wall has built up our monopoly system.

I SEE THAT "60 U.S. EXPERTS" INCLUDING PROFESSORS SHOTWELL AND NEILSON, ARE TO STUDY bases for peace. I look carefully through the program for evidence of their respect for the economic causes of war as a condition-precursor to achieving peace, but I am disappointed not to find it. Perhaps before the 400 page report which is to occupy 3 months of study, is finished, the 3 most obvious economic causes of war will be amply covered: these are: 1. Tariff walls; 2. Misplaced natural resources as between "have" and "have not" nations; and finally (3) poverty-breeding consumer-taxes, at home in each nation. There have been many reports but few measure up to the requirement of discovering the cause of wars before prescribing a cure--the "bases for peace".

DOUBTLESS UNCLE SAM WILL MAKE IT A PART OF HIS CAMPAIGN-- OR HIS COLLEGE-BRED ADMINISTRATORS will -- to set up the claim that the economic principle which applies with full force between states, is reversed as between nations. In other words, whereas this nation can be enriched by shutting out imports of desirable goods from foreign nations, states cannot avail themselves of this easy way of getting rich. If modernist so-called economists did not take this position, they would have the free-traders test question to answer:- "Why then not apply this principle to counties, townships and even to families?" The fact is that trade interference is always equally destructive to both the buyer and seller.

THESE TIMES ARE NOT GOOD FOR FREEDOM: NOT ONLY ARE THE PRESIDENT'S DEMANDS FOR MORE foreign pacts denounced, but free-trade at home, is being opposed by courts. Mr. Randall of New York City is now fined \$139 for the innocent act of buying cigarettes in N. J. where he could save money, and "smuggling" them across the Hudson River. This attitude of the law is now likely to become a part of what we call our jurisprudence -- too optimistic a name?

IF BY SOME FREAK OF LUCK THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY ARE TO HAVE THE BENEFIT OF A complete discussion of the tariff question, as a result of this family quarrel, the whole question of the Republican policy of protection,-- which has been the prime factor in building monopoly to equal all other forms of wealth--will have to be threshed out. And this should lead to a solution of the whole economic problem. The tariff question will tend to endless detail, but this should be short-cut by an appeal to broad principles. A use of common sense supplies the strongest argument for free trade and against protection:- trade is barter -- the exchange of goods for goods; therefore, every shipload of goods coming in will call for a shipload to go out. This disposes of the argument that imports cause unemployment or low wages, which is the keynote of the monstrous fallacy of protection.

"FREQUENCY": This is a radio expression and very expressive. I have tried for years to get the late Joseph Dana Miller to make "Land and Freedom" a monthly. I think frequency in itself is a very important element in a publication for economics. But especially is it important for the phase of economics, I am trying to develop, which is to take advantage of every current event available, and every important personality, to hitch basic economics to: to drive home some point of economic importance, and to do it in language familiar to the average person. In view of all this I am asking that this little paper be given a standing in the economic movement, partly because of its "Frequency."

MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB, CHAS. E. INGERSOLL, PRES., 1165 BROADWAY, N.Y. TEL. MU 4-2129