

democracy

with the small "d"

VOL. VI. No. 38. CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher NOV. 18, 1940 1165 Broadway, N.Y. Yearly \$1. Ten Times 25¢

THE NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE IS LIKELY TO DISTINGUISH

itself again this session, by passing a taxation bill that offers hope to tax-bereft people.

The Sanford Assembly Bill No. 126, which passed the 1938 session, is to be pressed by its sponsors now with determination to make it a law in 1941.

The aim of this bill is to lighten the tax burdens of all wealth producers--laborers, farmers, and employers--which burdens now produce high prices and low wages. Taxes reduced on all improvements and personal property, and increased on valuable and speculative land, would exactly reverse our present desperate tax situation. Yet the Sanford Bill would not force its reform on any community, but would only permit its conservative ten per cent a year formula to be adopted where favored by a majority in any taxing district.

"TAXES," SAID A U.S. SUPREME COURT JUSTICE, "HAVE the power to destroy." And he might have added, "To create."

Our taxes are devoted to destruction. Apart from their great volume, their source forces this result. Taxes on industry and its products practically double the cost of all consumer-goods. This cuts consumption and production in half, and throws millions out of work and on to the WPA.

The Sanford N.J. Assembly Bill No. 126 would permit any community in New Jersey to start the current of tax destruction in reverse direction. The state has billions of dollars of valuable land, natural resources, and franchises that are under-taxed, the taxation of which would have no reactionary effect on any business interest, but would open large opportunities for investment of both capital and labor. This bill would permit a shift of taxes from the consumer, farmer, and householder, to monopolistic holdings, in 10 annual installments.

AMONG THE HEROIC NAMES IN THE NEW JERSEY HALL OF Fame is that of George L. Record. He was one of Jersey City's keenest lawyers. But he did not devote all his talents to serving rich corporations, although his economic philosophy included no rabble-rousing.

Record wrote and helped keep before the State Legislature for several decades a bill to shift taxes from the things most precious to us all: our homes and things we eat and wear, to the social values we all help create, in land, franchises, and other resources.

The Sanford Bill #126 which passed the 1938 Assembly, is now again presented and is to be pressed for final passage in 1941. It is permissive in any locality to tax valuable land 10% more each year, until improvements thereon are relieved entirely of taxes.

OF THE 48 STATES STAGGERING UNDER THEIR BURDEN OF sales-taxes, New Jersey is the only one making a definite struggle for liberation.

Lincoln said, 'A nation could not exist half slave and half free.' And he warned us that chattel slaves were not the only kind. All our people are victims of an 'industrial slavery' caused by misplacement of our heavy tax burdens.

Our industry and government activity create values in our lands and resources that would carry without any financial stress all our tax budgets.

The Assembly Bill #126, sponsored by Olive C. Sanford, of Essex, provides for the optional change during ten years to taxing these concentrated social values, instead of personality and homes.

Our universal weakness in contending with the many evils confronting us, is that no one does anything to stop them. Mrs. Sanford and a compact circle of Assemblymen propose now to start this tax reform.

CIVIL WAR HAS AGAIN BROKEN OUT AT THE FOUNTAINHEAD

of academic education--Columbia College--just as it does periodically; and as it must continue to do, as long as the two anti-democratic elements are so well balanced and belligerent.

The high priest and oracle of education which is financed so lavishly by our curious combination of big business and basic monopoly, is Nicholas Murray Butler. And with all his eighty years of experience and adroitness in using words, his faculty--so largely saturated with Marxian State-ism--breaks away from the tacit understanding of how education is to stand pat in its vast output of mis-information; and keep the science of economics as long as possible from becoming a reality.

Columbia not only stands for the private ownership of 200 billions of publicly created wealth in the U.S., but is itself one of the leading monopolists thereof--as a New York LANDlord.

NOW LOOK ON THE FACULTY SIDE OF THE COLUMBIA PIC-

ture. Its problem is to keep economics in the murk, and thus keep unemployment, poverty, and war from being traced to their obvious cause.

So, whether consciously (and therefore inexcusable) or ignorantly, they see the grand confusion of Collectivism as the best means of doing this. So then their problem becomes that of how they can teach it "extra-curricularly," and maintain the vast fiction of unconsciousness as to the realities of the various grades and kinds of Marxism, whose stock-in-trade is to blame capital, big business, and wealth, for what is obviously caused by monopoly.

To be a little more blunt, education stands at the head of the conspiracy of ignorance and cupidity that causes poverty and war. And, naturally, the greatest University has its trouble with water on both shoulders.

TO THOSE WHO MAY THINK THIS RECKLESS, BECAUSE OF

its bigness in effect and implication, let us go through the simple economic formula, involving monopoly--the cause; Marxism--the false remedy; and democracy--the victim.

The first law of economics is ownership of product by the producer. The next is administering this law by giving all wealth to labor and saved-up labor--capital, the sole producers. And, finally, the ownership of social values must ALL vest in the people who create them.

Now Columbia stands for the system that lets racketeers (it being a leading one) have the social values, which run about dollar-for-dollar equal to labor-created wealth. This misappropriation of social wealth forces the confiscation of private wealth by the state, mainly through consumer-taxation, with the obvious result of building monopoly as fast and as high as wealth, and pauperizing the consumer, and creating class war, and world war. That is the stake in these Columbia civil wars.

UNDER THE CONDITIONS THAT PREVAIL IN OUR "BILLION-

aire educational system," the only alternative for the teaching of economic truth was the establishment of independent sources of education. This has been accomplished quite largely, not only in school teaching, but in various other forms--notably periodicals, general literature, lectures, and broadcasting.

The Henry George School is the foremost of these, conducting hundreds of classes throughout the country, from the Headquarters at 30 East 29th Street, New York.

More popular economic teaching is offered (free) in classes of the School of Democracy, 1165 Broadway, New York, which is also the Headquarters of the National Single Tax Association.

"CONSERVATISM" MEANS CONSERVING--WHAT? PRIVATE

monopoly? No, the 50% interest business and its customers have, in the combined wealth and social values.

Shifting Taxation from industry to monopoly will cure poverty.

It takes politics and Economics to make -

democracy

Vol. IV
No. 38

Nov. 18,
1940

CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Broadcaster
1165 Broadway, New York City Weekly \$1.00 year
Application for 2nd Class Entry pending

IS DISTRIBUTION A PART OF PRODUCTION? AND IF NOT, if they are separate, is distribution social and a part of political economy, while production is individual, and therefore a part of economics?

None but the very creme de la creme of economists will bother with this hair-splitting. To book writers and teaching-text authors however, it probably is worth while. Essays are one thing, wherein many liberties with strict accuracy may be taken. But teaching abc and 2 and 2, is another thing. And, as Henry George tells us, in a chapter largely devoted to definition, names are of first importance. He tells us that distribution is production--i.e., a thing is being produced until it reaches the consumer.

But some Neo-Georgists choose to try to separate distribution under that name, and what harm does it do, unless it be to that ideal of simplicity, which I think is some ideal!

THE REGULAR NEO-GEORGIST SCHOOL IS SO STRONG IN ITS contention that distribution is not a part of production of wealth, that it claims the science of political economy is not at all related to production -- only to distribution!

This contention seems to be based on the fact that production has jogged along so well as to need no help; while obviously its vast achievements are nullified by halting, confused distribution of the products or profits thereon.

To this I have asked: Is it any business of any science whether or not all or part is used? Why not be content with the natural and proper stress in teaching of distribution, rather than changing sciences or dictionaries? So, comes the School of Democracy. Its text book gives us the answer that also answers another moot question:-- 'What is the difference between economics and political economy?' They are, respectively, production and distribution. Perhaps individual and social production may be permissible to make this more clear.

BUT ONLY INDIVIDUALS PRODUCE WEALTH--ONLY LABORERS using their saved labor--capital. Society in the act of producing does not increase the sum total of wealth, but only the social values or land values, which, by the way, just about equal all wealth in volume.

This may also be a dictum of dictionarians or dialecticians. Meantime it is obvious that all possible distinctions between the individual and the collection of individuals (society) must be made; that our ghastly failure, economically, and thus also politically, are because of illiteracy as to such distinctions.

We misuse collective earnings to feed racketeers, and so we have to take the food away from producers to carry the social burden. So we must wipe out these obscurities that lurk behind words, until economics, political, economic, social science, and whatever, begin to read like abc, and 2 and 2.

'THE FREEMAN' IS A GOOD NAME FOR A GOOD PAPER AT A bargain price--50¢ a year, monthly. It is the organ of the HSSS, Henry George School, of 30 E. 29th Street, New York! It is the third rebirth of the name, serving the cause of scientific economics. The first was financed by Francis Neilson, published by Ben Huebsch, and edited by Albert J. Nock. The second was a revival, edited by Suzanne LaFollette. The latest Freeman should, at its democratic price, succeed financially, as it has already done in quality of its content.

REFORMERS, LIBERALS, AND PROGRESSIVES ARE AMONG OUR most dangerous public enemies, because they are sincere, humane, and spiritual; and economically illiterate.

COLUMNISTS ARE CONSIDERING MEETING THIS WAR-LABOR-

inflation problem with such devices as by understanding, or by another law, deferring the excess or overtime expenditures of labor, during the emergency; also considering the labor-diplomacy dangers, whether C.I.O. Lewis is out, with F.D.R. in. But there is only one way to avoid inflation, and that is to avoid subsidy and restriction of natural process. Instead of subsidizing industry, untax it. Instead of forcing high wages, by untaxing industry double production, double returns to capital, and double wages.

With this balanced condition in the two exclusive factors of industry, mass production would not only take care of heavily increased consumer-demand, but all probable needs of war preparation; and without that inflation which has always been the crowning curse of war preparation and defense.

There are ample social sources of taxation to replace all our present impoverishing taxes on industry.

THE QUESTION OF WAR INFLATION IS GETTING INTO PUBLIC discussions, and via the labor market. The situation of short production of war materials, compared to the unlimited demand, is becoming too apparent to longer stall off; and casual examination shows it to be no fault of industry or capital, nor any unwillingness or other interest of labor, such as health, but the ridiculous 40-hour-week Wagner law. This law or its sponsors make no pretense that it represents any need of labor for less work or more leisure, but only a means of exacting more money--wages--from the employer, who, of course, must pass them on to the consumer, in higher prices. Hence, inflation.

The point is that 40 hours being only 2/3 of the normal week of a few years ago, is not enough to produce normal consumer needs. And thus a demand for overtime is created, for which the law prescribes time and a half wages.

LOOKS LIKE SMALL POTATOES--SENDING ONE LITTLE Communist woman back to Moscow. Yet that seems to be about the size of the Fifth Column purge.

The idea that Communism is to be thrust on us by the propaganda of honest, labelled communists like Earl Browder and his wife, is very childlike. When will politicians learn the simple fact that communism means every attempt to weaken private ownership and build bureaucracy to absorb and regulate it. Deportees for these offenses would come from both our parties and all our colleges.

WHEN WE GET WISE AND DESTROY OUR INVERTED ECONOMIC system, honesty will begin to thrive and statesmen will begin to grow into politics.

THERE'S SOMETHING PECULIAR IN THE OPERATION OF THE new Hatch law to keep people from backing the political horse they want to win. The statements 'filed' after being duly sworn to, show that this form of crime is well in hand. But all the other evidences are that the spending is from ten to twenty times as much as reported. Of course the GOPs say most of the Democratic expenses are covered by WPA and other official 'vote-getters.'

SO IN THIS COMMUNIST-UNION LABOR SITUATION, THE brain trust administration is again convicted of producing an impasse of illiteracy, in its attempts to circumvent nature and common sense with ingenious statutory devices.

Wage increases exacted in this way have the same effect in higher costs to the government, paid by consumer-tax-inflation, or high cost directly to the consumer on all he consumes; so that the increased wage is illusory--only in money--which buys so much less, that the increased wages do no good.

This system of wage boosting by NLRB laws, sit-down strikes, and picketing, and not reacting directly on the labor-consumer, does not disturb the college economists who steer the government; but slowing up war preparations will bring the system into the open and may show it up.

COLLEGES HAVE DUBBED ECONOMICS "THE DISMAL SCIENCE,"--their handling of it has rendered it true to that name.

NO MONOPOLY - said Jefferson - will insure NO BUROCRACY.

HAS THE BRITISH EMPIRE SPREAD ITSELF OUT TOO FAR, and in the process encountered too many powerful enemies to make survival possible? And will civilization necessarily go to pot if the British Empire does not survive? 'Empire' is one thing; peoples and nations are another. Is it natural or necessary that these empires exist? There are many trailing Britain along--Holland, France, Denmark, and many others--trying, competing, and fighting for Empire.

There's an analogy in business:- Of all the monopolistic attempts, many are 'successful.' But how many are permanent? The only thing in business empire that has seemed to guarantee permanency, has been absolute ownership of land and natural resources. In other words, empires of every kind are based on the private ownership of land, increments, and income; and that ownership as surely inhibits security of private wealth, property and capital, as it does peace among nations.

HERE IS A SURPRISE! THE MUCH ABUSED OLD FEUDAL system compelled land values to pay for government, as they should. Some 'new dealers' came along and got the landlord's burden of taxes shifted to the consumer, where it has since comfortably rested. The consideration was the franchise--it caught the 'popular' vote--a trade of sound economic values for a very doubtful political 'honor.' Some bargain!

BRUCE BARTON, TALKING TO WORLD WAR VETERANS, STRESSES the 'American System,' as the patriotic objective for which we contemplate such a sacrifice as theirs. From a prospective U. S. Senator, these men who have risked their existence, now have a right to directness in such a statement.

'The system' is considerably mixed. The G.O.P. had a system they claimed protected all of us-- full dinner pails, chickens and motor cars. Can Mr. Barton tell us why it broke down? Or does he think we have forgotten it in the fanfare over the New Deal?

AMOS PINCHOT, BROTHER OF GIFFORD, IS PAYING HIS RESPECTS to Mayor LaGuardia and the President in a single letter quoting F.D.R.'s foreign policy relating to Japan and the Mayor's high praise of it. Amos disappoints me in not using his rapier-pen in explaining the common interest of these twins of public service, in building bureaucracy. Pinchot was at one time--some 30 years ago--on the Committee of 48, interested, with the editor, in forming a Third Party, having agreed as long ago as 1910 the old parties might as well be merged--and seemingly there has been no change for the better.

BUSINESS, GOVERNMENT, AND RELIGION ALL AGREE THAT 'Thou shalt not steal' is a primary rule of human conduct. But none of them does a thing to protect their social, composite and communal earnings from respectable violators of this rule.

IN A COMMUNIQUE FROM THE LABOR-WAR FRONT, THE COLONEL (Fleming) in charge of the labor forces, announces with pride the 40-hour law's victory, in compelling industry to pay 30¢ an hour minimum, or time and a half, to nearly 3,000,000 workers -- OR ELSE!

The war expert does not follow through in his report and tell how many millions were 'let out' because industry couldn't or wouldn't conform. Politicians can strong-arm NLRB laws through, but they haven't yet found how to make employers employ more people than they can work profitably.

'COMMUNISM', 'COLLECTIVISM', 'SOCIALISM', ARE ALL fine names for 50/50 ownership of all individual wealth and social values. But utterly worthless as describing ownership of private property and wealth--the Marxian demand.

SOME INDUSTRIOUS REPORTER HAS COLLECTED ALL THE questions--150 of them--to be decided in all the states in the November election; of course, in addition to the major one, who is to be our next President, and what 'reforms' he will carry along.

I often wonder what has put on us the affliction of a faith that a man-made law can remedy our ignorant disregard of a nature-made law.

IT IS FATEFUL THAT CAMPAIGNS GET SUCH LA

Here is Willkie saying that the President is taken into State Socialism; Ickes, that utilities want to control the country, and the President, who has refused to turn aside from military duties to debate with Willkie, will now deign to make five speeches 'to curb falsification of fact.'

Procrastination, after all, curses politics, as it does everything else. After booming into the middle of the campaign; after standing off the opening so it would snappy and conclusive, everyone seems to be devoted to stalling off real issues!

Ickes has spent his life stirring around in utilities and has much to say in this campaign. But this is the first I have seen on this vital subject. As to a debate, what a smoking out of dark recesses on both sides, if a debate could be launched and held to the line by a competent chairman!

HOW TRUE AND HOW FEARFULLY IMPORTANT IS THE GOP'S charge that the New Deal leads to Stateism! What a campaign Willkie could have made on this issue alone, had he concentrated instead of diffused. How unanswerable would the charge be, as a whole, and in detail? And what is there of all the New Deal principles that do not extend bureaucracy and control by the state; and in the same measure, subjection and impoverishment of the individual!

Check them over--Banks and Brokers, Farmers, agriculture, industry, commerce. Then labor, and all its ramifications, almost the ultimate of State domination. The reason for neglecting this great opportunity by the GOP is two-fold:- (1) Not many of the Communistic brain trust devices that did not have their taproots ten to fifty years back in Republican politics. (2) Attack on them would require removal of the cause of such monstrosities--the growing special privileges.

WHAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP OF UTILITIES WANTING FAVOR and the Stateism of the Willkie charges? There is a strong parallelism between the Stateism of monopoly and that of the proletariat. By the opposite sides they are called Fascism and Communism. But they are both State Socialism, Totalitarianism, Collectivism, etc., all Marxisms that maximize the state and minimize the person. That is why this issue has not come to the top in this campaign --or any other -- because there is little difference between them. Because, starting with the basic cause--the monopoly of the earth--and ending with the pseudo-remedy of Stateism, there is only an endless confusion of fallacy and foolishness. Briefly, utilities combine about 50/50 of basic monopoly, (of franchises) and of industry. The former should support the state, thereby freeing the latter from all burden of taxation.

WHAT MIGHT HAVE HAPPENED IF F.D.R. HAD ACCEPTED THE first challenge of Willkie? Assuming it was sincere, what paramount questions would have been settled by a comeback by F.D.R.?

Imagine:- F.D.R.:- You represent monopoly; you must exchange your monopoly for tax and control relief.

W.W.:- Then you must draw the line between our monopoly and our capital investment--our business.

F.D.R.:- The same as in all business and industry, what you create and what the people create.

W.W.:- Then you must remove all taxes from investment, capital and wealth.

F.D.R.:- This can be done, if special privileges like yours will assume them.

W.W.:- We will if other forms of monopoly will do the same.

F.D.R.:- All the vast social values in the natural resources, and the billions of unearned increments in the cities, probably make up three times as much as utilities.

W.W.:- Then we can agree that while monopoly will be a hit, business will make it up many times over.

THE TECHNIC OF ECONOMICS IS SUPPOSED TO BE VERY COMPLICATED. So true is this, that an educational plant, on which billions have been lavished, has not acquired that technic. And it has therefore compelled those interested in promoting the subject, to establish their own teaching organization. I refer to the AGSSS.

Half our wealth is MONOPOLISTIC which Jefferson said could not be.

LEWIS'S ABANDONMENT OF THE PRESIDENT AND

is the outstanding case of disloyalty in Everyone knows Lewis as aspiring to labor's on of industry, if not dictatorship, the ultim of unions, in which they had been thwarted un- the happy combination of the New Deal and CIO.

From the 'drop of the hat' in 1932, the President and his college-bred administrators and advisers have been 100 per cent unionists. The class war of Unionism (and Communism) has been diligently promoted in every field and by every branch of New Dealism --legislative, administrative, and judicial. It has been accepted as the solution of the labor problem--Lewis's own solution --instead of Nature's simple solution of giving labor 100% of its earnings, by stopping the taking of them by monopoly.

SOME SPECTACLE THIS:- THE STAR RABBLE-ROUSER OF ALL

time abandoning the man charged with being his effective and official ally; and swearing fealty to the rival having the unanimous support of industry: industry that detests Roosevelt, solely for his support of labor monopoly and his various attacks on business!

The evidences are that someone is being fooled. Wilkie says he is against the New Deal, but that he is for NLRB, AAA, SEC, etc., etc. Which of these Wilkies is telling the truth?

Lewis is for dominance of industry, by labor; and he chose Wilkie to further his end. Was he a good or bad guesser?

The fact is that basic monopoly is the enemy of both labor and capital, which are taxed into poverty, while monopoly is exempted. Neither of the candidates nor Lewis knows anything of this. So labor and capital are sure to lose. And if monopoly were consciously promoting this confusion, it would be a logical answer.

IS CIO LEWIS--LIKE NORMAN THOMAS-- A VICTIM OF HIS

own 'class-consciousness?' Is he sacrificing his cause to his personal ambition and frustration?

The President perhaps became frightened at the signs of revolution exhibited in this union domination so ably sponsored by him. The Communistic form shown in Detroit, Wierton, And Scranton, gave pause even to the brain trusters. So the AFL antidote was used; and the forgotten Mr. Green was found servicable. But it left New Deal still Unionist and deserving of every loyal laborite; just as New Deal has done more for Marxism, Collectivism, and Communism in eight years than they had done for themselves in a hundred. Yet Thomas abandons the President and runs as a rival. And Lewis followed suit.

THE MOTOR SHOW IS ALWAYS CHEERING -- THE RALLYING

point of optimism. Our poverty has not yet come to the low that has made us stop buying and wearing out cars. This time the headlines gave credit to the suburban buyer for the plus of the show. In spite of the shine and luxury of the 1941 models, the transportation they deliver is truly economical. And, naturally, since the automobile has made distance a minor factor, people live where they like, and they don't need to be sold a car--they buy it.

THE SAME NEWS AUTHORITY THAT TOLD US THERE HAD BEEN

1075 fatalities in August, resulting from the thousands of weekly visits of fighters and bombers, and scores of thousands of bombs dropped on England; and which told us of 3000 German soldiers killed in one air attack by R.A.F., now tells us that 40,000 to 50,000 Germans have been lost "recently" in the one coast town of Cherbourg!

THE ITCH FOR BUILDING OVER THE DICTIONARY SEEMS TO

be spreading. Now 'Cause and Effect,' a splendid organ of 'Economics,' is telling its readers that there is NO speculation in land! and that there never has been; that what we have been for a thousand years kidding our selves about as 'land speculation' was really 'speculation in government organization': 'Land title holders purchase service at the tax-rate and sell at the market price.'

This is the Neo-Georgist way of saying that 'government organization,' so costly to us, goes to enrich the land speculator by increasing land values. Obviously, this 'increment' should be by a single tax, to displace all present impoverishing taxes

ly, this 'unearned increment' should, by a single tax, to displace all present impoverishing taxes, be taken for government organization, thus destroying land speculation, instead of prosperity! 'You pays your money and takes your choice!'

IN HIS ALERTNESS TO CAPTURE NEW DEAL POPULARITY,

the G.O.P. candidate finally took over about the last major garment from the President's clothesline--HOUSING. This is among the many brain trust schemes of which he disapproved only the method of handling, approving them in principle. Yet this is perhaps the most extravagant misuse of public funds -- to give charity to white collar folk who don't need it; and to enrich land speculators, who are its first and biggest beneficiaries.

JUDGE SEABURY IS, MORE THAN ANY OTHER ONE MAN, RE-

sponsible for Fusion success, and F.H. LaGuardia as a national figure. One of the events in this movement was the Judge's forcing of Mayor Jimmy Walker out of office. For LaGuardia to give Jimmy a political-labor sinecure at \$20,000 a year, was an insult which Seabury has publicly resented.

At the Henry George Congress of 1939, the late Fred Leubuscher secured the participation of Judge Seabury, who, in turn, secured Mayor LaGuardia; and both made splendid addresses.

BUSINESS IS SMART ENOUGH TO PRODUCE ONE HUNDRED

billion dollars of wealth a year; but not smart enough to see that it is distributed to those who produced it --including business and its 132 million employees and customers.

THE SOCIAL IDEA IS SOME ISM. IT HAS REACHED THE

racket status because of the Marxian extreme of having everything social, whereas Nature, of which Marx knew little, decreed that our created wealth and collective social values were to divide about 50/50. But this false concept of the sacred word 'social' has spread until it has become a disease.

People everywhere have become obsessed with this notion that they are being robbed, because wealth that is privately produced is not socialized. But they pay no attention to the tragic fact social wealth is not socialized.

So the urge for more attention to the social means --or should mean--that all attention should be given to the obvious principle that ALL social values should be devoted only to social uses, whereas now they are devoted to racketeers,-- to building a basic monopoly that equals all our created wealth.

THE INDIVIDUAL IDEA IS IN THE TALL TIMBERS OF IDEOLOGY. It needs dusting off and setting alongside its twin brother of sociology. Our whole destiny depends upon their being driven together. There is no natural opposition between them. We are 50/50 social and individual; and it is only by being administered strictly in accordance with this parity, that we can progress or exist in a balanced economy.

Expanding on the freedom of the individual is exactly as true and effective as the co-operation of all individuals socially. To stress the importance of one over the other is futile. Our misfortune is that our individualism has been so rugged as to claim and absorb social values--and go broke at that. Naturally, it has not only come into disrepute of normal reformers, but individualism has become the mark of radical revolutionists who advocate destroying it--and they are progressing rapidly.



3912

BRONX, N. Y.
655 E 223 St.
MAX BEIKOWITZ

NEW YORK CITY
1165 BROADWAY

RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED