

THOMAS JEFFERSON

HENRY GEORGE

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

democracy

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

9333

with the small "d"

1165 Broadway
New York City

Vol. VI - No. 93

6 Issues—25c

13 Issues—50c

26 Issues—\$1.00

May, 1948

WE ARE FREE TRADERS AND SINGLE TAXERS, WILLY-NILLY

AND THEREFORE THE ONLY ACTUAL MARSHALL PLAN PEOPLE

FREE TRADE MAY SAVE US, WILLY-NILLY

IT SHOULD. THERE SHOULD be no power on earth strong enough to keep people—neighbors—from freely meeting and exchanging whether it be only as individuals or as business organizations. One goes to the center of the principle of FREEDOM: and the other to Economic Independence.

The Marshall Plan was predicated on that and its twin of Freedom—getting possession of our own resources. But the Secretary did not follow up his first masterly announcement of June 5th. And so the elements that contained all the virtue of the Plan are left behind.

And the plan we now have is about what is described by its enemies. The trouble with our present system is that it leaves to our enemies all our precious resources and the perfect system of transporting them. If those are not the two OBVIOUS causes of war—what COULD be?

BUT everyone knows how strong is the pressure for these TWO freedoms. And they are of the vital things which automatically the pressure should leave no slack that enables the forces to resist. But in fact this resistance is enough to make "protectionism" rule.

MUCH MAY HAPPEN BEFORE WAR!

IF WE COULD KEEP OUT the war-mongering and hysteria from our own side, we would have no war. And the same influence could hush all the stew and worry about ATOMS. But I am not able to suggest any formula to provide the restraint and inspiration for peace required.

There are two essentials to war, in favor of peace—or at least against war, which is a little—not much—different. Its horrors on which there can be no discount. And poverty or lack of cash and credit. These will, I think, hold USSR a good many years.

Preparedness is the next biggest influence for war. This is the great reversal of ideas the war spirit is responsible for. It seems to me if we could use our common sense we would look at our best known criminal law, Sullivan's against gun-toting. We swear by it and by its reverse in voting for defense.

If only we could get ourselves so normal and start to mold ourselves into natural formulas of life so we could feel comfortable in what we have and demand patriotic adherence to, we might readily reform our politics and our economics to a satisfying existence.

★

BIG MEN COULD SHOW HOW

RALPH HENDERSHOT transmits Marshall Plan tips from the Westinghouse President, Guilym A. Price which could help but they seem to want subsidy where Marshall wants to get away from it. "Get possession of all your resources and control of all your trade." They are now tied up in subsidy and the trade is behind tariff walls. Mr. Price could swing the Plan in the direction it should

MARSHALL—OR MARTIAL PLAN?

SURELY THE MARSHALL Plan has sold us out: and there seems nothing for us faceless and voiceless guys to do but hold the bag for the greater plan with a name that sounds like the one we thought we had.

Just for the record let us use a few words describing our position:—Our Marshall Plan made the best and biggest use of the Secretary's words while waiting for him and others to improve our words (not change the meaning). These were not over a dozen so there was little chance of misstatement.

"Get possession of all Resources: and all Exchange Facilities". In justice this boiled to securing two freedoms, which (as we shall learn to our sorrow) there would be nothing to spare, to do the job ahead. These were Free Resources and Free Trade.

I am not naive. I know there are from 500 to 1000 billions of monopolized value and that the Secretary is not a reformer. But he must know the facts I state and, their magnified meaning in the issues to this Nation and the Globe.

THE ALTERNATIVE TO THE MARSHALL PLAN

IT IS LITERALLY 'THE MARTIAL'! It looks to average observers like a fine substitute: but this is how it figures out: Say 500 billions of resources will stay impounded by our parasites, so the cause of war III remains, perhaps doubled. And we leave disturbed our equally deadly tariff monopoly, equally active as a war-cause.

The loss is from 5 to 10 times greater in the old world where both the 'Marshall' gains would measure as much, in the same kind of coin-recovered assets and recovered freedom. The recovery in both cases involved about the same understanding.

The principle of the plan that was too good for us was that of collecting a resource-monopoly-debt that had been running 100 years or so: and possibly equal billions of tariff special privileges. And if a similar dual collection happens to other countries it would have cured them of the habit of running across to USA with their tin cups.

There's no doubt that if this war-hysteria could have had the Marshall Remedy used on it there would have ensued the peace, plenty and harmony we look for. But that did not fail the Marshall way and he cannot be blamed more than most of our other leaders.

go for unlimited success as its popularity intended.

Let Guilym A. Price read an economic story by Henry Hazlitt: "Will Dollars Save the World?" for the complete reasoning how this may be done. He does not name the plan but he shows exactly how it shapes all fit the job. The resources are of unlimited value and transportation (logistics) is the only missing element to complete the transaction—of SALVATION FOR DOLLARS!

J. Rupert Mason Quotes the Law

"I KNOW OF NO POWER NOW INVESTED IN THE States or Nation which can be used to publicly collect ground rent, except the power of taxation. If you hear any other power suggested that might be used, I will appreciate your letting me know of it."

In short, a land title deed grants the holder an exclusive right of possession, as against any other person, but gives him no right to pocket the rent value of the site, if that value is demanded by state, county, city or nation under a federal, state or local tax statute.

Instead of weakening the case for "single tax", all of the above and all that I have previously written definitely strengthen the case. I have long wished there might be more consideration paid to the constitutional principles that govern and control the sources of revenue our nation, states and local governments can lawfully tap.

We have different ideas on how to help more people understand the inequities and injustices in our present federal and state tax laws, and the importance of getting much more public revenue from those holding land title deeds. But there should be no difference of opinion about the governmental power that can and should be used to publicly collect the ground rent, when there is only ONE such power! Whether it is called a tax or an "assessment", both stem from the tax power (See 164 US 112.)

I believe special privilege and monopoly is on the defensive, everywhere and that we should bury relatively unimportant disputes and emphasize the basic principles we agree about. Let us have our differences, but not ventilate them too much in print?"

(Signed) J. Rupert Mason

RELATION OF TAXES AND LAND

'NOT A SINGLE TAX'

EVERYONE HATES THE NAME
TAX

CHARLES T. ROOT, a cousin of Ethel, a great magazine publisher and a great friend of Henry George and his Single Tax, printed a neat little booklet of the above name. And L. D. Beckwith for years printed a paper called 'NO TAXES'.

And Root was right when he showed that paying the SINGLE tax was just like paying NONE because the other tax (our kind) came right out of the only pockets that could not afford to pay them while these went only to MONOPOLISTS. And so was LDB right.

'SINGLE TAX NARROWS OUR PHILOSOPHY'

BUT IT BROADENS BOTH our economics and our politics. Some of our economists perform as if by no chance did they ever expect their 'PHILOSOPHY' to be considered PRACTICAL for adoption.

You should debate this from the viewpoint of there being only one way of having abolition of exemption of monopoly. Considerable 'narrowing of philosophy' will not be extravagant IF we can use Single Tax to abolish subsidizing our worst enemy.

1914 (A.D.) FLIVVER PROVING DURABILITY

TWO EMMERT BROTHERS OF Salem, Neb. have just landed at Times Square, N.Y.C. in this ancient Ford, completing 22,000 miles thru 48 states in 8 months. They had the glad-hand from about every Governor and the President. Car cost \$25, averaged 35 MPH and 40 MPG (being miles per hr. and gal.)

Well, the 'application' of this story is its proof of highest value and service of lowest prices: of such as cars, watches, N.Y.C. transportation, etc. "Take good care of 'em and they'll stand by you" said Philosopher Henry. He was in '14 coming close to 10,000 a day and way below \$500 in price.

WHAT IS THE LAND QUESTION?

THE SOCIALIST ARGUMENT that the land question was ended when we converted from the AGRARIAN to INDUSTRY is typical of them. But it's not much below the mark of our average college educator or so-called Economist. The above implies that LAND is an AGRICULTURAL question.

And that's not a hard fallacy to sell. But it is because we have no idea of Political Economy. It is purely liberal and materialistic. LAND is the whole GLOBE and that includes all the water, the sea, the mineral content, the sky and the air.

In our modern times our cities and industries where most of our wealth and people dwell, depend on our Land or our Ground or Natural Resources for all the Raw Materials, from which is produced all the Wealth or what we all consume. So DEPRECIATION of our land realistically can't get very far.

THEN WHAT IS THE LAND SITUATION?

WELL, IT HAS BEEN stolen! With only these few inept lines, it should be plain how immeasurably valuable the Earth or the Globe is. Its VALUE is actually comparable to all the other wealth of the country (LAND is NOT wealth).

The best example proving this is N.Y.C. where each, the land and the improvements, are worth about \$8,000,000,000. We are always prepared for shock at our modern crime; but when we do once realize what this JOB of Stealing God's Earth really means, we will not be long in taking on the necessary shock and indignation, and will pass the simple and just law as a remedy.

Of course this stealing is not in the banditry or grand larceny or sneak-thieving class for which our own laws are responsible—nor our precious parasites as they should be. But I want to start listing all our big estates with owners and 'holdings' and begin giving them publicity which will soon make them conscious.

GIVING THE DEVIL ITS DUE

TAXATION DESERVES A much worse reputation than it 'enjoys'—that is taxation of industry—labor and capital—their products or production—the consumer. Taxation of land values has no reputation and deserves it all.

Nearly always when two examples (of anything) are laid alongside, people don't need to spend a lifetime showing their choice—and wisely. But here—in TAXES—they do just that: fall all over them and let the taxes IMPOVERISH them for a lifetime, and exercise no judgment or choice. They keep on paying double on all they buy as if they were slaves.

We have a NAME for a remedy for this DEVIL. It is the Single Tax. It has a most respectable and tested origin. It is 75 years old. AND believe it or not, quite a few and supposedly intelligent Single Taxers are finding fault with it—AND it's mostly because they don't like the NAME.

There are two kinds of Democracy: Political and Economic.

Vol. VI
No. 93**democracy**May
1948

CHAS. 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.

A VISIT TO GIs HOMES

946 VETS IN QUONSET homes or huts we were wondering about, are now enlightening us freely—or their wives are. And we haven't changed our mind about their prize-value. It may not be up to selling apples or some other compensation for patriotic service, but not far behind. Here are a few descriptive snapshots of Quonset Life. FREEZING, SOAKING, RATS, DOORS NO CLOSE, NO REPAIRS.

Well, if we had never lived in a house or never expected to it wouldn't be so bad, but from the way 'housing for Vets' looks from here, there are two alternatives it is all we can muster of sei. . . wives and kids—just for the landlord OR just QUONSETS and no prospects. If there's another alternative, let's hurry it!

TRYING TO LOCATE INFLATION

WARD BAKING CO., ABOUT the best in their line, report for '47 a new high of over \$80,000,000 sales, an increase of 10 million but a drop in net to only 3.01%. This may seem nice to the bread buyer but it is not for the financier nor stock-owner. I read lots of these ordinary reports and I don't find many of them excessive—not enough to account for the inflation.

So I'm back to the argument of Truman and Economic Advisors as coming nearest to the answer—and that is not so very near. They do not in their many ADVICES show any signs of a glimpse of the law of cause and effect as being among the economics which they have handy for Harry's use. For example: impoverishing taxation of things people make and buy and double in price.

FARMERS GETTING RICH—WATCH OUT!

AGAIN, WHAT GRADE farmers are these who, in a stick-fall, A-F dispatch are getting record incomes—17% billion 8 mos. of '47. Anyway in our last bust-after-bust it was farm inflation that led off, and 15,000 banks closed as the climax, 5000 of which have never since opened.

This was not merely inflated prices of products but prices of the farms following the product inflation. The mass bank failure came from mass farm-buying assisted by bank loans that were deflated when fancy product prices were deflated—as ours will be.

ECONOMICS

52,000,000 TAX REDUCTIONS
BEING FELT

THIS IS A HEADLINE which I won't spoil with detail. I recently commented on President Truman's wiping out a precedent of reducing only rich men's taxes and going after the burdens of the poor man for the first time in history as his bill is doing.

Whether this popular tax cancellation was put thru by Harry and his political backers to give them a vote for each 'poor man' or not, I am for the bill and so far as I now see, I will vote for Harry, so vital is the principle involved.

It can reverse our whole economic situation and start our politics on the road to reform where for 50 years they have been going from bad to worse. This is the first disturbance to our tax system which has levied nearly all our 25 to 50 billion tax from those STRICTLY least able to pay.

Of all the things 'Our State' (government) does to earn the name of OUR ENEMY, this is the worst—loading practically all our taxes on him who can only pay them from vital necessities at double prices while resources that should pay them all devote them to building up MONOPOLY.

BIGGEST BUDGET, \$1,137,306—AND
5c FARE!

MR. O'DWYER WAS LUCKY to be in Calif. and our 'Machine' seems to be taking care of this biggest job and without sacrificing our most obvious asset to save this mark of all the attackers. The 5c fare is 8,000,000 humble workers' biggest asset.

The N. Y. City wiseacres have been teaching themselves that WE had no right to that bargain so they have been softening this great mass of taxpayers to having their fare doubled as they have had their taxes and everything else they buy doubled.

Don't you think Mr. O'Dwyer it's about time we let the taxpayers and honest workers have a break? Seems to me about the least you could do about this biggest budget which must be paid mostly by this 8,000,000 of your voters is to leave the fares where they are. That's the one thing you 'own'. And do you not own it on account of this great mass of social value?

I am pretty sure you understand this Mr. Mayor—that ALL the land values in this city are very largely a result of city transportation and of the patronage of the citizens and voters, and that taxes come nearest to belonging on our huge land and other social and to the relief of transportation and the other millions being paid directly and otherwise by INDUSTRY.

P. S. Another example of dictatorship.

THE GAME OF SALARIES

THIS IS NOW JUST A GAME between 'Our Enemy the State' and the drawer of what did represent something gainful. Notable are C. E. Wilson, G. E. Tom Watson, IBM and Betty Grable, glamorizer, running from \$200 to \$300 thousand and getting about 1/5 of the money.

The game is to hire a mathematician to make what he calls an equation. That will let you out with cash enough to pay home expenses after 'the ability to pay' tax. U.S. always wins; but couldn't and spend \$50 billion a year, without having all cards stacked against all who earn. .

CONCLUSION OF "CANBERRA-SEARCHING"

I WISH TO CLEAR MY OBJECT in pursuing this already overdone subject in H. G. News, February—it is not to bear too hard on my contemporary—journal or its editors, nor especially on the professional author, G. Vilalobos Dominguez, nor in fact on the very estimable editor of the 'American City'.

But I do wish to put in the proper focus all these cooperators in a movement that is by no means clear in its favorable objective to Economics, to Henry George and his exact-and-powerful purpose of ending the monopoly of land which he has declared as his only purpose. And to accomplish this by means of what he has also declared as the only possible method — THE SINGLE TAX on land values.

Let us see where the American City editors so-called Triple Taxation has placed him as an authority for the guidance of

Economic Editorial Boards. He says:—Henry George's fundamental solution for many problems of the world was to make land common property. This is not so: his only solution for the one greatest problem—POVERTY—was to destroy Monopoly of Land.

Buttenheim then says George explains at Page 403 that open to us were two choices of method. This is not true. At 403 he had gone thru a variety of remedies 'explaining' their FALSITY and arrived at the only remedy of HIS choice which was the Taxation of Land Values.

Must we therefore assume — pleads this influential Editor — would he not, if he could, now choose some of these many other schemes? Then he goes on and displays what planned communities 'can do for the good life'. To all of which I appeal but NOT as Georgian Economic Democracy but as a variety of Liberalism. And I do not recognize leadership in this direction as the Henry

George News editors appear to. But flies got into this same ointment before when the predecessors to this 'NEWS' then 'THE FREEMAN', edited by Frank Chodorov, or his assistant, made a bitter and mainly illustrated attack on our Sydney movement; the only excuse, as I recall, being they had failed to abolish poverty in the first few years of Single Tax!

Now indeed let us look at Canberra until we have got the true inwardness of this story and all of its wealth of detail of exterior information mainly on some kind of planned economy quite foreign to any planned end of Land Monopoly — the only AUTHENTIC George Idea.

And if that is not the purpose of all the words used in the main body of these two pages, then what is their purpose? And what is the purpose of all the other words procured by Messrs. Buttenheim, Cowan and other Editors of any or no title?

CANBERRA SOME JOB OF
LOOKING AFTER

REMEMBER WE DON'T know as an Economist who's talking, even verbally, the he makes some use of the personal pronoun. And he refers to two 'groups' as social experiments. Then increasing government control in all countries including USSR. Then Canberra, Letchworth, Welwyn (England: now multiplying) based on principle of common property in land.

'Associated toward eliminating taxes.' Two large groups competing, and finally acknowledging George influence. Credit given to G. E. Geiger for report: "no private ownership, only leases, 5% details: no H. G. idea at all."

Then H. Bronson Cowan introduced (by 'Am. City', July '40) confirms details and success leases. Gives details average, plans, architects 'enchanted land'—apparent approval Cowan or H. S. Buttenheim? Growth of land value and use of it. Now comes end of Col. 2 and start of series of 6 footnotes by (?)

Here is something for the reader to wonder about: is this series by an editor or one of several called a board or committee? And where shall we follow: Whosis to next page or Someone else in 3rd col. explaining and on thru with Buttenheim?

CONFUSION, IS MOST EVIDENT
HERE

PROCEEDS TO A FAIR statement of Geoge Economics. A method of collection of rent is required. Public auction decided as best possible. Hence land must be nationalized (tho the use will be confusively practised by Canberra — considerable detail well argued. Other error worse for prosperity no compensation for improvements.

Discusses other clumsy make-shifts including 99 year tenancy, also 5 year rural lands. And the co-ordination of urban and rural. Refers to architect-relative Julio A. of Argentina as pastmaster. Mixing praise with condemnation suggest confusion.

Then assuming in spite of appearances the author is as headlined and is given the last column, the conclusions and the quotations the 'departure in technique' referred to, is not helpful to Single Tax.

But in a large measure of the many attempts to improvement thereof: and show how planning of architecture, landscape, and indulgence in general public ownership perform to this end.

Democracy, generally known as 'poor man's politics' is actually the conservator of all profit, property and wealth.

A LONG WAY AROUND CANBERRA

NOW HAVING FOLLOWED an anonymous writer of unclaimed economic reputation nearly halfway around the globe, and then to another point twice that distance from ourselves and helped him firmly establish his technique adverse to Georgian Economics, let us look over the balance of the field of this extraordinary article. Especially Mr. Buttenheim.

I have known him for 25 years and as always insisting that he is NOT a Single Taxer and why, —but a TRIPLE TAXER including incomes—Yet he seems always attentive to meetings purporting to be in S.T. interest. And he evidently permits the general public to think he has actually 'seen the cat'.

So I have thought him at least a 'yes-but' follower—or probably one of those 'fiscal single taxers' as distinguished from the 'moral' kind by a few but zealous ones who have split themselves off. I have been glad to accept this fiscal part for my portion and of 100% SINGLE TAX.

BRINGING NEEDED EVIDENCE
TOGETHER

THIS CHOICE THE AMERICAN City editor has especially open to him as he is going far out of his way to thrust it on himself. He not only seeks to mark a new path for a deceased author of great standing, but undertakes to distort meaning and misrepresent the truth.

This whole contention as to George's great discovery and what anyone is authorized to teach is brought to a head at page 403 of the Memorial Edition of 'PROGRESS AND POVERTY' of which only 1000 copies were printed, of which I have the honor of possessing No. 379. Not many use it to prove their point since that point reverses the facts.

So long as people can be kept from reading page 403 by assertion of its contents as appears in this paper THE FICTION that 'common ownership of land' with variations was an interchangeable term with Single Tax or Collection of Land Values or Collection of Economic Rent, this tangle can be kept up.

The most obvious use of this distortion is to steer the George movement away from the SINGLE TAX: which would, as George designed it, by ending exemption of tax on land value, end speculation and monopoly of land AND NOTHING ELSE WILL!

It's easier to join the knocking—even by radicals—of the rich, the industrialists, the money changers, and the capitalists, than to dig under all those for the real cloven hoof of monopoly.

TO WHOM DO WE LOOK FOR
AUTHORITY?

HOW THE EDITOR OF A very good municipal journal gets the editor of a Georgist paper to let the former tell what George meant, maybe some one can tell me—I give it up. Says Buttenheim, it was 'to make land common property.' If this reporter were half as wise as he thinks he would know that was the Marx idea and that his ONLY effective opposer was Henry George.

BUT George has been afflicted by many others than Buttenheim whom I have been naming in the little 'd' 'democracy' in the past few years who have both ignorantly and viciously been furthering this mix-up of the OPPOSITE doctrines of George and Marx. And it is easy to do since they are to SOCIALIZE respectively LAND and EVERYTHING.

THE IMMUTABLE TRUTH—AND A
COPYRIGHT?

I WANTED TO GLORIFY THE truth of page 403 (and 2 pages before and after). But I'll have to see what I can do under the law of evasion: — Private property in land not to be disturbed. If we confiscate the rent by using the Single Tax on Land Values we answer all the objections that are here mentioned.

Through teaching habits that cannot be defended we have come to putting George in the position of defense which should have been assumed by the H.G.S.S.S. He was said to be so careless in use of English that he said 'we must have common property' in land when he meant we must collect land rent by taxation.

But these Cultists and Heretics said this was all straightened out in page 403. And THEY, (these teachers of what?) kept the thousands of students straight by telling this lie to them and hoping they would believe it.

I can read 403 (without a copyright) and testify that no evidence is there of any need for ANY explanation. He is all for Single Tax on Land Values as the only way to collect economic rent, as the only way to stop land monopoly, BUT without disturbing land ownership or producing wealth.

George in these 5 pages talked freely of all the schemes from Herbert Spencer's to Marx's and in their own English. But NOWHERE did he yield to the outsider's, plausible idea that common-property could ever compete with COLLECTIVE RENT VIA SINGLE TAX. Nor could there have been any excuse for drift in phraseology and going over the ground and explaining!

(To Be Continued)

NATIONAL POLICY FOR MONOPOLY TO STOP MARX PLAN

MONOPOLISTS WON'T NECESSARILY LOSE ANY CASH BY ECONOMIC REFORM

A NATIONAL POLICY FOR THE OIL INDUSTRY

BUT IS THERE A NATIONAL policy for this perhaps most vital industry? We see page ads of S.O., statement of oil operations. And here is David Lawrence commenting on what should be something authentic from Harvard. But it seems as if the policy is 'catch as catch can.'

First have wells and oil lands owners? If so, who are the owners and what the conditions? If not, why not have Lawrence find out—ask how the most valuable land existent can have any fog around that question. Is not this the point of confusion of the whole question?

Our philanthropic monopolists are also our biggest subsidizers of education. So like many other spots, they can hardly be made coherent. Harvard is shown taking the free-enterprise position but abandoning it to the Socialist claims when pressure comes.

Here might be found the starting place for the Oil Policy. And on the way to that discovery might be found a puzzling reconciliation between our social and individual battleground. If we are to acknowledge anything IS social, it might be land and oil land that could supply the basis for slowing war-causes.

OIL POLICY'S TWO ELEMENTS

THESE ARE SOCIAL AND individual. They belong invariably, and respectively to society and the individual. The individual, the oil producer, should have the oil capacity carefully appraised and its royalty paid to the Treasury which would be the only tax or lien imposed on the owner. And for his oil production or operation there would also be no taxation.

Here is the point of settlement of our whole economic question which is involved in all the problems being argued here. This might be put in terms that communists would agree to, as in the social principle they should be, one-half sound.

There has never been any excuse for division between our individualists—principally monopolists—and socialists or communists but ignorance or/and cupidity on the part of each and not far from equally.

Socialists should obviously be

WHO THIS SOLUTION WON'T HURT

THIS SOLUTION BEING shift of all taxes from wealth to monopoly: the answer is EVERY-ONE. This means every-DE-SERVING-one. It will hurt ONLY monopolists. So let us concede it will hurt the personality we have just described as a Philanthropic. And let us further describe him as interested in OIL as a business and quite fully living up to his Philanthropic Pretensions.

He will have to give the rest of the answer because he only can appraise this INTEREST in oil-land monopoly, in oil-business, in philanthropy and in all other phases of LIFE-ITSELF. But let us see how intelligently we can energize an imaginary appraisal of four elements mentioned:—

IN MILLIONS

- (1) Oil land monopoly value 1000
- (2) Oil land business value 500
- (3) Philanthropy value (C. P. A., etc.) 300
- (4) All other tangible life interests value 200

Admitting this statement is somewhat forced, I will still guess that the 'HURT' of confiscating or socializing the Rockefeller 1000 million would be at least offset by gains on the 3 last items containing an equal sum of PROPERTY or equivalent interest.

This is entirely relieved of TAXATION, which taxation of monopoly only would entirely absorb.

I volunteer the challenge to myself that if I require as the wages of a reform the surrender of alleged unjust gains to those who have been acquiring them I cannot also claim the favor of those who are presently enjoying what he is to surrender. But I think that can be explained to our C. P. A.

(To be continued)

the ones to demand an exact division because of their name—to demand all 'social property'—the oil in the ground. And we should, because we have boasted of our democracy and our justice, have cleared our social title to social property long before socialists got to it.

BUT OUR INDIVIDUALISM IS ALSO ONLY HALF-RIGHT

AND BY THIS SAME TEST—This demarkation-line—THE law of ownership. To the individual belongs irrevocably what he produces; and even more pertinent is all of society's right to all it CREATES. And in the foolish collectivism they are EXACTLY as wrong as we in letting parasites monopolize the SOCIAL-HALF of our estate.

And here I am speculating as to a phenomenal apostasy—arising from a knowledge that something is wrong in our individualism as to the very thing our quarrel is about which makes us concede the wrong point.

We have conceded in all our literature the social ownership of all social values and we know that while that concession has been a perfectly obvious one our schools and all our leadership has failed to execute this understanding.

So have we sought a way of correcting this half-right communism by falling in with an easier and more plausible philosophy which left our own and their own grosser faults uncorrected. And neither gave us political advantage we craved or gave them appeasement which some tended to.

AN ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM

INDIVIDUALISM IS WRONG only at one point, in refusing or failing to recognize social ownership of social resources of which society (everyone) has by its combined activity created all the value consisting of about as much as all the individual wealth, labor and capital have produced.

Individualism is in completely defensible position as to all WEALTH produced by capital and labor and in as completely a DEFENCELESS position as to all social wealth or values, created in failing to yield every cent of that for social use for its house-keeping instead of leaving taxation to labor products.

While collectivists are guilty of two offenses against ownership—they do not, any more than individualists, demand or concede the social ownership of social creation EXCEPT unconsciously and as the unearned part of their (SECOND offense) claiming all wealth which has been produced only by labor and capital, which it (society) has had no part in producing or creating.

Whether our two positions are in varying degrees of Economic guilt or culpability is arguable. There is in two phases: their demand for the individualistic labor and capital produced wealth; and their failure to protect their own social ownership.

We have only the phase of something they do not claim, the ceding the ownership of social values. One point has bearing: this was due society before the existence of socialism, ours is the first moral obligation.

★

Labor and capital must continue their civil war 'til they discover that they are both being robbed by the same system of taxation and monopoly, that leaves them only about half their earnings to quarrel over.

★

I asked the dean of a prominent state university what political economy his institution taught: his answer frankly stated the position of most colleges on this crucial subject: 'we don't teach any; we just give them everything and let them get what they can out of it!'

Some Things 'democracy' Could Do

WHERE DOES U.N. STAND?

UNCOUNTABLE ARE THE evidences that 'no where' is the answer. Those outstanding, of a single day as it were, are like admissions out of U.N.'s 'own mouth' of this bold statement. A 'LIFE' editorial states it positively. And Secretary Marshall all but states it in his whole assumption of leadership.

For greater proof of a U.N. vacuum of even remote influence toward peace are the numerous real and potential wars everywhere brewing without the hint that mediation is expected from U.N. Its complete yielding to USSR influence is hardly secondary proof.

U.N. will only begin to look like something when it heeds the Marshall preaching and when it uses all its power to make the Marshall Plan a REALITY. Nations, all of them, are waiting and anxious to UNITE for Free Trade and Free Natural Resources.

These Freedoms will carry with them all the many minor perplexities such as money and competition; and eventually all the major ones, such as poverty and national boundaries. These will no longer have war-significance since nations will always know on what terms everything may be had and that they are fair to all.

DEMOCRACY AT A DEAD END

THIS IS DEMONSTRATED by David Lawrence under the title of 'The South's Influence in the Coming Election' which might better have been 'The Solid South' but for the writer's devotion to the field of practical politics (and not the 'theoretical' dead ends).

I recently, being bolder but perhaps not as wise as he, uncovered another dead end of Mark Sullivan in sticking for States Rights and the Poll Tax. Whether either are arguable political questions, I admit are open questions.

Lawrence patiently and keenly takes up the 'vote monopoly' of the solid south and tries to show how it may be successful in our Republican or even Democratic politics and our other ambitions such as civil rights and the 101 perplexities generally referred to in his column.

I am not in either of these cases interested in the negative showing but I do believe that a measure of SOUND ECONOMICS would throw the reliance upon them in a way to make all political problems more practical.

★

LATEST FUNCTION OF UNIONISM

STOCK BROKERS AND their helpers have acquired no great reputation for physical ability or even the mental department of wealth production. They, or their employers, would never have guessed that they could have taken over—say 1000 of these jobs—without a slip or delay.

No wonder that 'sea farmers' were envious and fought in the deadly way for such 'snaps' as they were found to be. And now we do know that the process of selling these miraculously valuable certificates-of-ownership is so simple as to awaken practically none of the skills involved in the transactions.

Wonderment is however waking of how much union-magic has uncovered as to fancy payment for mass production in common labor and where are, as a result, the whole buying (147,000,736!) paying some 100% inflated price, and where our old habit of indignation has escaped to?

ALL THINGS TO ALL MEN

THIS IS A MODEL NEWS-paper publisher's slogan. And especially if he is a politician. Prove it by the 'Christian Science Monitor'. And take this for the proof—Bill Green voted as 'no geranium' by W. Fegler, and others and touted as the pet-Unioner in a 3 col. spread and pretty halftone.

Of course everyone doesn't read all Westbrook says and everyone doesn't believe everything he hears—especially in the X Science field. But there's some classes in the unions and it's not easy to reconcile some of them, even the most democratic Christian and peaceful of them. I have been looking for Mr. Green in the role of model Union but never thought this paper was strong enough to get him.

WHY NOT TELL THE WAY OUT?

WE HAVE GOT SO IN THE habit of devoting (no, not crooked) finances and economics that when our really statesmanlike writers like Stewart Alsop and Mark Sullivan dare to point to ridiculous economic conditions, they dare mention obvious remedies only in softest terms.

EVERYONE in this country is on the verge of suffering, if not poverty, largely from inflated food costs, while a trivial number of farmers are heavily subsidized. This high crime Sullivan suggests be modified.

France and Italy are now following England's suit and going broke fast. This is presented as our problem by Mr. Alsop under the inquiring caption 'A way out?' and from a narrative of entanglement of us 4 nations it appears that the last 10% of the \$4 billion English loan is frozen and must be unfrozen—fast or else—and from that point on, a way out.

EDITOR'S BUILDING REACTION

AN AUSTRALIAN PAPER IS in mourning for the loss of the government by labor. And another prize generosity is giving large space to demonstrating that inflation is unrelated to high wages. It seems to be the view of papers that there can be no claim too extravagant, if it is made by a number of people.

For example, labor-government, in its purest form Socialism, is more discredited than anything so far evolved, but in place of going thru any form of penance, they are given every facility for boasting of their deeds.

Whether space is so cheap to progressive, liberal or fellow-travelling because of such sympathy or guessing, they will be successful; or a coincidence which they happen to favor or is this some curious form of jealousy???

★

HEARST PATRIOTISM

IT IS ONLY AN AGGRAVATED form of preparedness. There are still a lot of people who think the more prepared we are the better our chance for peace will be: whereas experience proves and common sense tells us the reverse. But Hearst pours forth in outpouring emotion the demand for our babies to go into training for WWII.

I am normally a restrained reader of the J-A, or was till it reformed its columns and got rid of most of its worthwhile writers and put JOKESTERS in their place.

And they seem to be putting their gags and serious subjects on about the same plane. Hearst was always much interested in war. In fact he has been credited with creating one or two full sized ones.

The Social vs. Individual Contest

THIS IS NOT AN ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF COMMUNISM

IT COULD BE IF IT OR ITS equivalent, Socialism, had set up a sensible and just social plan. But when Marx and Engels, 100 years ago, launched from Berlin 2000 pages named 'Das Kapital', they only had a glimpse of the social picture, or I may say, an OVERDOSE of it.

So they made exactly the same mistake we individuals did—they HOGGED IT ALL! They challenged our position by committing the same crime against individuals which we had committed against Society. It remained for Henry George to find the right equation.

And having found that, he in due course found the way to adjust economies between the individual and society. This was to see that they each got exactly what they produced or created.—To the individual all wealth: To society all values created collectively.

Now the question is clear: shall we individuals pay our dues to the 'Society of U.S.A.' we belong to when the benefits of such payment will come directly back to our ourselves in complete relief from the taxes that impoverish us: when it will end the stress of poverty, of depression, of unemployment and 2 kinds of war?

KEY DECISIONS TOO AMBITIOUS?

THIS IS A SPLENDID TIME to settle that little trillionaire question. It may be too big for some of our RUGGED individualists who haven't yet heard of the word SOCIAL or that it is not 'as in SocialISM'. This means that while we individuals have PRODUCED \$500 billion of wealth, as Society we have CREATED an equal value in 'Social Wealth'—in the U.S.A.

This is in the intangible but very real forms of all our natural resources, utility franchises and concentrated land values in cities. This may be called the value given to the earth itself by the aggregate of people who get their sustenance from that earth.

Besides a cruellest of inflation, all its own, all land prices arise from zero as population grows and as people demand social service: land value is all unearned increment. To have it piratically collected is nothing less than insane.

Yet it may not in our individual democracy be commonly or publicly owned. That is the Moscow way. Our way must be the taxation way which delivers the land income or rent to society and leaves to the individual ALL his own earnings.

LINCOLN'S ECONOMICS AND THE INCENTIVES THEY BEAR

AXIOMS HE CALLS THEM AND THEY CANNOT DIFFER FROM GEORGEAN ECONOMICS

Pres. Lincoln of Henry George School

EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC AXIOMS

I AM PLEASED TO HAVE A letter from Mr. John C. Lincoln, President of the Henry George School, Phoenix, referring to some comments about him in No. 91 'democracy'. He is apparently writing a pamphlet under the title 'AXIOMS' being printed serially in the 'E. G. News'. He remarks "that if I will read his 'Axioms' I will find out where he stands on the teachings of Henry George."

I certainly shall do so at once and keep good track of them, as I have known Mr. Lincoln for many years as well able to comprehend Scientific Economics and as possessing unusual ability to express these. Whether he will displace any science with anything axiomatic is doubtful.

(1) I shall take the liberty of sketchily dividing, numbering and possibly commenting on some of these Axioms. He starts fundamentally:—telling what land is and how and whom it serves as humanity.—(2) With production of human need (wealth): (3) private possession and ownership of

land began, as apparently a human necessity for fullest use.

(4) That land grew in value as population grew in numbers and activity, was readily accepted and with that quite naturally was understood that these values were communal or social property.

(5) Thus one of the Lincoln Axioms is that of Land Rent.

(6) And it is axiomatic that such rent is collectible naturally, economically, and morally and only by all the people or society or the community. (7) A parallel axiom is that the extent to which Rent is not so collected supplies two axioms or natural laws of greatest moment:—

(8) Producers—both capital and labor—all of them—and consumers—all of them, 147 million—are loaded with taxes upon property and wealth which have no right on them.

(9) And these taxes which by nature and Henry George were exclusively designed to perform the function of collecting this rent, go into parasite's pockets who do nothing to earn them and who build them into Natural Resource Monopoly which is the Primary source of Poverty, Crime and Wars.

(To be continued)

HOW TO HANDLE DISAGREABLE WORK?

RALPH HENDERSHOT OF Scripps seems to put up to the G. E. which is investing \$50,000,000 in reconditioning prices with pay-rolls and their own profits, also the ENNUI of the worker. There are of course hundreds of jobs that are distasteful; millions can't stop them.

And this columnist is no trifler; his is unusual insight. And GE, or their experts, don't need any of my help. Maybe to suggest calling on Jas. F. Lincoln of Lincoln Electric Co. is most direct. To me it seems this is involved in the price or wage.

We must assume the Ennuui button or nut is there: it won't fly or jump; so the question is to whom does it fall to do: and I'll bet there's a Lincoln way (and of course many others) and that the job will be comfortably done within this average of some \$10. a day.

And I don't think it will require an undue application of mere price or of solution of problems along too materialistic or realistic lines. I think it weaves in with industry's practices naturally; and you'll find the boredom is paid for and at more generous than all the other generous prices.

BILL GREEN'S DILEMMA

BY G. SOKOLSKY COVERS A similar field I have recently done but not of course in his style; nor do I refer to his use of Burton K. Wheeler, misnamed ISOLATIONIST who is no protectionist but a fair pacifist. Bill must have had in contemplation the rightist-union a long time.

The numerous 'fall guys' such as the 'XScience Monitor' interested me as much as Bill and your narrative because they seem to deserve all the fellow-traveller blame, which can hardly be exaggerated.

The naïveté of especially the publishers who are loud in denouncing communism and labor REVOLUTIONARIES and do their best boosting for the same thing, is exactly what has brought us our few million of subversives of all kinds who could have never got near us on their own (absent) reputation.

Good sense such as these several men have, showed them at a glance the truth of Bill's purpose in giving as much union-works as any leftist could muster; and reaping greater rewards from his hypocrisy.

A BUGABOO OF RENT

MR. BECKWITH APPARENTLY does not know (any more than the thousands of HGSSS 'teachers' know) which horn of this rent dilemma he is taking. He must know of the two kinds. That information is not unique with me.

In fact the George Movement, which L.D.B. calls inferior to his own big-headline WESTERN SCHOOL, is literally BUILT—not on any economic or normal rent—but on the devastation of the monopoly kind.

All the force of both these branches of the Economic movement of the U.S.A., which includes Our World, is expended on the one assumption that there is but one kind of rent where there is no discussion, especially of the ABUSES of RENT which does not go into great detail of excessive and costly rent.

This course is a bugaboo of L.D.B. because he specifically declares, and has for a generation taught, that there is but one rent. Also he is trying to make his students accept his ridiculous claim that land has no value leaving rent in a very sorry position.

H.G.S.S.S. teachers are in little better position in their misinterpretation of stress of George's 'rent chapter' as being only the price of monopoly.

How Control Economic Teaching

THE CULTISTS ARE COMING AGAIN!

MR. C. R. SMITH (40 WALL) is today's debater. This makes about a dozen examples of sneers to which I have been treated, of about the same calibre which makes one wonder as a separate phenomenon at the process of selection of the numerous controversialists. They all make nearly the same blunders. So maybe they are NOT blunders at all!

But now they are Economic Heretics by vote of some of our best Economists. I have room for only 2 paragraphs of such junk verbatim, from which I acknowledge no one can tell how to satisfy them.

No. 1 stumbles onto the truth. No one having any knowledge of my views could accuse me of calling natural resources "common property"—yet cultism makes this a charge against me—characteristically.

No. 2 foolish break is that THE SINGLE TAX which effects the end of land monopoly by socializing ALL its income, at the same time ending inflation, labor-war, unemployment and poverty.—Mr. Smith denies that this Single Tax would affect the land-holder's property rights and "leave him only the shell" of ownership or would make land common property!

He then refers to "these simple concepts" which doubtless is according to some "simplicities" so named in the N. J. H.G.S.S.S. text. These 'ECONOMICS SIMPLIFIED' are, Smith says, "the only work ever written on the subject free of self-contradiction."

Here he follows about the same line of all cultist ignorance and heretic disloyalty to the NAME of HENRY GEORGE which his institution of N. J. and its headquarters (50 N. 69, N.Y.C.) and a score or two 'extensions' seems to revel in—always adding insult to their disgrace of a great name and movement.

WHEN SINGLE TAXERS ORGANIZE AGAINST SINGLE TAX!

IT IS AT LEAST SOME PHENOMENON. This is the situation:—With an immense Industrial System, a 'Civilization', and an Educational Plant of some 1500 colleges and 12,000 Highschools we are unable to have SIMPLE ECONOMICS taught. So we have to DISCOVER our own economics and build our own institution for teaching them.

NOW we find our 'LEADERS' discarding our perfect original system wrought out for us by our only philosopher and scientist, Henry George. We find our schools without competent leadership and showing us the ways of Strange Gods. They act like what Brand Whitlock called Tired Reformers.

Can the following be the answer to our phenomenon? As 'democracy' has often proclaimed, Communism is Half Right. This means by our own Single Tax Economic Standards. We claim for society all socially created 'property'; we would socialize only all land value by taxing monopoly to death.

They, Marxists, misnamed Socialists, see no demarkation for the word SOCIAL and therefore would socialize (or communize) EVERYTHING. They tempt us to join them to get their ignorant masses to supply the votes for their HALF-RIGHT ECONOMICS.

PROHIBITION OR WHAT?

WHILE RUMBLING OF genuine prohibition is heard, Bedford, Pa. is evolving an original brand that sounds plausible. The town has 3670 pops, 11 bars, 80 acknowledged addicts, of whom 5 are

LETTERS ARE MOST HIGHLY CULTIVATED HERE

HE FOLLOWS THE EXACT pattern of several others received, in accusing me of 'trickery' in taking from the land-owner all his wealth while accusing him who did the same thing honestly! This he tries to back up by forcing me to read the accused cultist-heretic textbook. To which I answer I have read it enough to have written two reviews-critique.

But it is quite enough to find in the Teaching Manual at least a dozen repetitions in the three or more forms, that you are teaching common ownership of land. Your own testimony is all I need. And wiggling out of it will require a much better job than is so far shown—here or elsewhere.

After so far hopping back and forth in favor of landlord several times, Smith essays some of the simplicities of common property private land-ownership, but one would know from a few of his words that he or any cultist or heretic could never understand that.

Henry George explained how without disturbing the private ownership, the EQUIVALENT of common ownership could be secured. That is by use of the SINGLE TAX in the killing Land Monopoly which is the thing the Cultist-Heretic either can't understand or doesn't want to. Maybe the trick is to tell which—and let them—OR—

CULTISTS ARE FINE FELLOW-TRAVELLERS

THEN SMITH DOES THE smart thing:—He takes refuge in a subject—USSR—Communism—where anyone can talk any kind of nonsense he can think up. And wind up with what would be a few more insults, were he capable.

Is it that Natural Resources is Common Property, or is it Pure Communism that worries him? The answer Smith won't understand is that they are not property at all because not produced by industry. But their VALUE is CREATED by all and must be possessed and used only by all, which can only be accomplished by the SINGLE TAX. Communism is supposed to want this solution IF IT KNEW THAT MUCH ECONOMICS.

As to how to SIMPLIFY ECONOMICS, that still needs doing more than ever since Rusby-Bowen tangled them up. And that no one has in the Henry George Movement authority to drive out such intruders as these presents the most fearful tragedy in this Economic Science and Philosophy.

If the George Economics could have been left alone: could the splendid concept have been left alone by the partners and even by such ignoramus sent out to represent them in a writing chore, this False Simplification might have blown over. But since the fallacies have become AUTHENTICATED and one after another position taken and held, the main situation will soon have little left.

female, and a law 75 years old against selling hard drinks to all having the habit. It is very simple—in fact pragmatic: names of the accused are posted in saloons and they just aren't sold.

The Police Chief keeps the dog-house and if he sees signs of improvement he can remove the black mark. Nothing said of psychiatric help nor has this law of 1872 any other influence savoring of toadying or forming a special or favored class of hard drinkers. The law makers said they saw these fellows being nuisances—and they got fed up on it.

IS STRIKE-BREAKING DISHONORABLE?

PEGLER DARES TO DEFEND a man held as 'notorious' by union-eers and those many, even employers, who think the only way to be 'fair' to labor is the present union-way. He is Pearl Bergdorf whom he persists in calling a splendid strike-breaker.

Incidental to his review of an attack by the Bartenders Journal Editor of Phoenix, Pegler displays his ablest vocabulary on the achievements of unions in this branch of industry. Of course Bergdorf was of the day before our "Fauntleroy President" discovered 'labor' as a political asset in terms of millions of votes and billions of dollars: and when union acts were judged in some relation to property and individual rights, and protection by injunction.

★

It should not be hard to see that our trouble lies in our tax system: when it works night and day, taking the earnings of business and wages of labor, and giving them to racketeers, speculators, and monopolists.

LABOR—ANTI-MASS-PRODUCTION

FOLLOWING THE UNION failacy supplied by K. Marx, these (mis) leaders apply it everywhere in destruction of their own as well as everyone's best interests. Now the 'Eastern Railroads' are trying to show by page-ads the paying public, which finally pays all the desperate losses, how strikes tend to cut their 'production in two'.

Railroads have pressed the limit of big locomotives to draw long and heavy trains at high speed so as to serve all the 100 million producers and 145 million consumers to get them most wages and cheapest products. Now (dis) organized labor (racketeers) cut their trains in two to double employment but which will inevitably HALVE employment—and maybe halve the present high-wage scale.

TRUTH AND FACT-FINDING HARDEST

DR. H. M. SHELTON OF SAN Antonio should be building a monument for he is building The Science of Health or Natural Hygiene. And in his most effective instrument in that herculean task, the 'Hygienic Review' (\$1.50 a year, Bx 1277), he expounds the reason for our headline above.

Either way of expressing this greatest Truth of Life should be obvious as just stated and so treated by all teachers and students, I.E., as an inviolable Science and demonstration of Natural Law. But to have this paramount subject so dealt with exhausts most of his valuable time.

For example, having proven himself and by testimony of other scientists that instead of thousands of DISEASES to befall doctors and patients, there is but one, TOXEMIA, or self-generated poison, and wishing to tell us about SINUS:—

The Doctor starts by showing how the mere differentiation of these thousands of affections by the adding the word ITIS for inflammations only, consumes columns of his article. And he makes it clear that this is only an inkling of this gigantic waste to millions of doctors and patients.

"Democracy" Room 506 Return postage GUARANTEED 1165 Broadway New York 1, N. Y. SECTION 582—P. L. & K.