

The Remedy for Democracy is more Democracy; deTocqueville

THOMAS JEFFERSON

HENRY GEORGE

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

democracy

with the small "d"

VOL. IV. No. 51. CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher SEPT. 15, 1941 1165 Broadway, N.Y. Yearly \$1. Ten Times 25¢

NEW JERSEY IS ACQUIRING A REPUTATION FOR POLITICAL

complexes, in an atmosphere of anarchy, where nearly everything must be done backwards, since regular processes are sacrificed to politics. This condition includes Governor Edison really signing a bill abolishing the injunction in normal protection of property rights, although he is one of the state's largest property owners. Next, he fosters what Frank Hague calls a 'steal' of \$121,000,000 by railroads. Now he is rebuking the Attorney General for not upholding the constitutionality of this 'steal.'

The Governor is a New Deal Democrat in a stand-pat Republican frame -- a bad complex indeed. Injunction against deprivations of unionism are futile in our Communistic regime. Taxation of railroads should be abolished, as in any industry, if their monopoly privileges are made to yield all their income in exchange for exemption of their investment and operation. But the Governor is not moving to clear up these moot questions.

STATE CONTROL OF LABOR AND WAGES IS NOW PROPOSED BY

British Labor Minister Bevin. This involves the age-old question of what share of war and its spoils belong to labor. Mr. Bevin is rated so high as a wise man of labor, that our social minded Ambassador, Winant, his monitor, Ben Cohen, Harry Hopkins, and others of our New Deal (big D) Democracy, have been drawn to him for instruction on how to handle that mysteriously dangerous commodity, labor. He has been through one world war with labor, and can testify as to the pay-off. He is the center of the world-wide promise of a new and better order, after this war.

I would not be surprised to learn that Bevin was at sea with Churchill, F.D.R., and his two decorated sons. Labor, Union Labor, and Labor Leaders are three stages of the labor problem. 'Labor' is 100% of it; Union Labor is maybe 25% (even when government and war boost it) and as to what the leaders do for and to labor is a guess.

GENERAL LEAR SEEMS STUMPED BY THE 'LIFE' AND 'TIME'

showdown of army morale. The general is a disciplinarian with a philosophic trend. He won't give the boys any Hoo-Hoo concession; but he is liberal enough to blame their folks at home for some of the bad breaks the efficient Luce papers prove.

The situation here is mixed. From F.D.R.'s claim of 100% behind him, to Ham Fish's 85% against, is quite a gap. And considering that we are not at war but only making believe, ten-year sentences and shooting draft-ees from behind, mix the situation more. Roman Catholic Chaplain Zenigraf frankly reports that the draft extension bill upset soldier morale. This is a slant from quite a different sector than Lear's.

SAY NEW YORK HAS 1000 MILES OF STREETS (AND I'LL bet it has!) $\times 2 = 2000$ miles of parking space $\times 5280 = 10,560,000$ feet; divided by 10 = room for parking 1,056,000 automobiles. And New York has the cars to comfortably fill this vacancy.

Where the cash comes from to pay the installments, gas, oil, and tires -- who knows? But here is the riddle: By a stroke of the pen, our little dictator can make the 800,000 cars outlaws in their own streets. And by orders to his 25,000 policemen, he can shake out of these cars as many millions a year as he desires. Can you solve that riddle?

'YOU CAN'T DO BUSINESS WITH HITLER' IS CLEVER AS

propaganda goes; but that's all. The whole trade portion of our Foreign Relations side-show is a farce, including our waste of a half billion dollars on South America. The pretense of concern over foreign trade, and now Britain's similar pretense, is unmasked by our persistent adherence for half a century to the most top-heavy Chinese tariff wall that the world knows. And England's disgrace in this respect is even greater than ours, because 'Free Trade England' had come to be a great exemplar of freedom; and even her world imperialism and militarism (her Hitlerism) had been made tolerable by this crucial freedom on which its empire was founded. And all was upset--cancelled--in a characteristic reprisal by its House of Lords. So that our two great democracies now agree that 'We can't do business with each other!' Or with any of the lesser democracies we are so solicitous of!

THERE ARE, IN 132 MILLION PEOPLE, A GREAT MANY WHO

'arise and shine' in such an emergency as war. And it may be said that so brilliant are their emanations, that long before we arrive at actual hostilities, their rays are visible. It might be said further that so far ahead are these shadows cast, as to powerfully influence the start of war itself. The editorials, the columns, and the vox pop letters all show how long-conserved have been these stores of wisdom, and how fortuitous is the opportunity to give them circulation!

THERE IS TO BE A 'SCIENCE OF DEMOCRACY,' SAY SIR

Richard Gregory and H.G. Wells, in a Times cable. They with others are organizing an Association of Scientists, pledging themselves to the study of the scientific principles of democracy.

Whether these gentlemen know it or not, they represent the greatest need of all humanity today--the development of the scientific elements of democracy. Democracy has been known only a few hundred years, and so far, only in its humane, moral and political phases. It is hardly more than a word -- and as such, it gets little more than lip-service. The economic phases of democracy are now being forced to the front, and these are essentially scientific, as this new contribution indicates. Indeed, industry and business are forced to espouse democracy scientifically, or be destroyed by the two opposing anti-democratic elements. The primary enemy of capitalism is basic monopoly. Failing to disengage itself from this enemy, 'free industry' is in immediate danger of communization.

MODERN WONDERS NEVER CEASE. RECENTLY 28 MILES OF

cement pavement, 12 feet wide, have been moved over, to make the great No. 1 national highway from New Brunswick to Trenton twelve feet wider, and leave a parked safety center. Now to escape from the path of a new million-dollar-a-mile drive along the East River front, a 300-ton pest house--the Willard Parker contagious disease branch of Bellevue Hospital--is to be pushed over 60 feet, at a cost of \$50,000.

TROUBLES IN THE NEW DEAL CAMP ARE UNDOUBTEDLY MUL-

tiplying, so that dangers of a fourth term are limited to starting another three-term 12-year series, with a hand-picked candidate, probably Wallace.

While war hysteria has given us the third term, translation of this into the action of preparation, and spending 10 to 25 billions, is quite another matter, which will make many a cleavage quite new to New Dealism.

democracy

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

SEPT. 15,
1941

THE EDITOR'S LECTURE TRIP TO CHICAGO AND BACK.

Charles H. Ingersoll, editor of 'democracy,' and President of both the National Single Tax Assn., and the National Tax Reform Assn., is booking speaking dates from September 15 to October 15, including four days at the Henry George Foundation Congress ending October 1.

Ex-Mayor William H. McNair, of Pittsburgh, wires on the 25th, 'Hold the 18th evening for Pitcairn Kiwanis.' Then on the 27th, 'Hold 18th noon for Sharpsburg Rotary.' This indicates that history of 1939 will be repeated and give 8 or 10 meetings around the Smoky City.

Old Friend Jim Bell, of Elkhart, invites the speaker to his home during his stay, which he threatens to extend by securing a number of dates. This recalls a similar invitation to Friend Murray's, of Spokane, some years ago, which covered nearly a week and yielded 20 good meetings.

If such habits could be revived, trips like this and the one hoped for in 1942 (1000 meetings); in every state, would be more practicable and frequent.

Peter Witt writes from Cleveland with assurance of a meeting. The Hammond Indiana Kiwanis gives its luncheon meeting of September to Mr. Ingersoll. The old Saratoga Club, of Schuylerville, N. Y., gives him October 21.

ITINERARY (ARRANGE DATES TENTATIVELY, GIVING ALL POSSIBLE LATITUDE).

Sept. 15 Phila.	Sept. 25 Indianapls.	Oct. 6
" 16 Harrisbg.	" 26	" 7 Toledo
" 17	" 27 Chicago	" 8
" 18 Pittsbg.	" 28	" 9 Cvlnd.
" 19	" 29	" 10
" 20	" 30	" 11 Buffalo
" 21 Cincin.	Oct. 1	" 12 Rochester
" 22	" 2 Grd. Rapids	" 13 Syracuse
" 23 Louisvl.	" 3 Lansing	" 14 Albany
" 24	" 4	" 15 Binghamtn
	" 5 Detroit	

THE LABOR UNION WAR REFLECTS THE COMMUNISTIC WAR;

and both are lost in the confusion of world war. In other words, war is inherent in the totalitarian dictatorships of world imperialism, of national collectivism, and in political unionism. Labor war is not only carried to the whole industry of the greatest producing nation, and to its destruction; but it is fiercest between its own right and left wings.

Two phases of the internal labor war are now at their height in the UAW--the automobile industry, where radicals have triumphed, but where Conservatives are trying to steal the show, so war progress will not be stalled. This reflects the national labor war between CIO and AFL, which is to be appeased by a species of 'nationalization,' as it has been under the same stress of war in all other countries like Germany, Italy, France, and England. A labor-politician is as likely to displace the two belligerent heads as 'mediator.' This process reminds us of (1) the consolidations of industrial monopoly, and (2) of the substantial merger of our national political parties, substituting for the frictions of a democratic 'cure,' the low-grade qualities of 'planned economy.'

ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY MEANS THE NATURAL LAW THAT DE-

crees that everyone must have all he earns. Political democracy means the tangle of statute laws that creates the labor warfare for what labor and capital can force from each other.

'LIPPMANN CALLS TIME!' HE SAYS THERE MUST BE A

showdown; that the debating must stop. He puts up one of his (almost) irresistible arguments for a closure of debate. And that is just the question --who calls time in this young democracy of ours?

I heard Ham Fish a week ago talk for 90 minutes to an audience of nearly 5000 in Philadelphia; and I will refer to only one of a hundred sensible things he said: that by all the polls it was evident that about 85 per cent of the people oppose war. That is enough for me, as it should be for anyone who more than lip-serves the word 'democracy.' That leaves to settle the question of defence which has been tortured into that of war by war-mongers--meaning non-fighters, who want war for its own sake--or their sake.

And I will mention something that may determine the thing that agitates Lippmann--the papers, largely controlled by war-mongers--report only for the 15% pro-war minority. Will this help the grand crystallization for war, behind the 'Commander in Chief' Lippmann looks for?

WHAT IS TO BE DONE WITH THE RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL

issues that are allowed-- only by convention and around the edges, by law--to be discussed, and sotto voce, under cover?

Suppose Jews were smart enough -- and we all acknowledge their smartness -- to (a) to out-do Americans in business, (b) capture their politics, although not comprising over 10% of voters; and finally (c) drag us into a feudal war against their ancient enemy, which would deliver our democracy to an economic system invented by a mid-European Jewish agitator?

Should 100 million Americans refrain from dealing factually with this situation because it is taboo or even illegal?

SUPPOSE JEWS, AS A PART OF THEIR WARFARE ON A RUG-

ged individualistic American business system, (a) succeeded in attaching to it the stigma of exploiting labor and the people, customer-consumers; (b) in organizing unions to help win their war, (c) in having all this culminate in delivering democracy, capitalism, and our 'American way of life' into a new order, of which Communistic labor-ism is the backbone -- well if all this were immediately threatened, you may say pending, as a result of Jewish smartness -- should the 100 million Americans let Jewish war-mongers 'call the time' because it was deemed impolite, or something, to tell the truth about race or religion?

AND AGAIN SUPPOSING THAT THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

--although violently opposing Communism by name-- were (just as our greatest democracy does) in every practical way giving aid and comfort to it. Would it be necessary for this same 100 million non-Catholics in America, because of certain taboos and inhibitions, to refrain from showing the exact position of Rome on this crucial subject? And especially would it be incumbent on the great but non-militant Protestant reform churches to so abstain?

What is freedom of religion, thought and expression, if it must all crystallize into such conventional cowardice as to amount to dark-age slavery of these primary elements of modern light?

JAMES A. FARLEY, ADDRESSING 12000 MACY EMPLOYEES--

in the great charity fund drive, of which their share alone is \$5,000,000-- says that 'our democratic way of life is to help our less fortunate brothers!' He means what Eleanor Roosevelt feelingly calls the 'under-privileged.'

I'd rather hear these democrats quote Jefferson on democracy, than to give it a WPA, New Deal, Communistic definition.

Jefferson's notion of 'our way' was to make it as simple and frugal as possible, instead of tangled and extravagant. His way would be to give to everyone his full earnings, so that none would have to be begged, borrowed, or stolen. Under-privilege comes from over-privilege.

This is the way to phrase the great unsolved riddle of humanity. And strangely, the absolute principle of right settlement involves about a 50/50 compromise of these two (at present unyielding) extremes. Individualism and Communism are balancing philosophies. But both are deadly except when balanced; each is deadly when the other is excluded.

This is a very original statement, and since it is prepared to stand every test of truthfulness and reality it had better be taken seriously. Its originality consists in its oppositeness to the popular idea, held not exclusively by the extremists--the two ISTS in question--that the independent individual and the social-minded collective represent two distinct and separate cults, which must by no manner of means aim at assimilation, cooperation, and especially merger. We are speaking of a principle and not a scheme.

HOW TO EXTRACT THE RIGIDITY, OR RUGGEDITY, FROM

the ISMS of the individual and the massed individuals; that is literally our problem! It is their extremism which characterizes ISMS generally, that makes them deadly. How can they be made to compromise? The collectivists--Marxists--started this argument; and if it can be finished, to them will belong the credit of solving society's 'riddle of the Sphinx.' They cast the stigma of rugged, like a blight, upon individualism; and individualism had not the wits to show how it was exactly as applicable to them.

The reason why the individual's wits were impaired was his contamination, and more his confusion, with monopoly; and I mean real, basic monopoly. So when the keen and shallow red propagandists began to depreciate laissez faire and make of it an evasion of duty and morals, instead of a protest of the individual against New Dealism, then called bureaucracy, individualists accepted the cheap 'Socialist' gibes, and have never discovered their truth or falsity!

THE FACT IS THAT WHAT THE MARXISTS WANTED TO COMPLAIN OF WAS NOT THE ruggedness of individualism, but its wrongness in standing for monopoly. But Marx thought this wrongness was in standing for CAPITAL; so he made of Capitalism a double team of misguided zeal, with rugged individualism, and of course let monopoly alone, as does every one else.

So what have we? A system of basic monopoly which having acquired our consumer-tax system, sucks half the substance of the people automatically and perpetually. This substance is the collective, communal, or social half of their earnings and wealth. Now Individualism refuses to recognize as social the half of wealth that individuals create collectively. This is so far inists that this must be piled up in the possession of basic monopolists, whereas it should displace the whole present burden of taxation (just stated by F.D.R. as 23 billions a year.) With this heroic exhibition of naivete, can it be considered strange that a cult has arisen to take the exactly opposite position and demand ALL for society?

THE GRAND COMPROMISE OF THE INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIAL

is the world's job -- whether to do now or 1000 years hence. This cannot be the sort of compromise of which we now have much, which is but confusion. It is most obviously up to the individualist to recognize that for every dollar he produces alone, he 'creates' another dollar automatically, cooperating with all other individuals; that the first dollar is his inviolably, even by a tax levy; and that by the same token the other dollar is society's, to displace all monopoly and all taxation.

If the individualist will not see this as an alternative to being destroyed by the collectivist, does he not deserve destruction? This is what is going on now. If it is not to proceed to its logical conclusion, one of three things may stay it:-- (1) the individual, capital, wealth, and democracy, may cede monopoly to society. (2) A neutral reform movement may intervene. (3) The collectivists may see the light which the individualist cannot see, and decide to take only the half belonging to society, instead of all, as now claimed.

Now comes John H. Delaney, head of the Transit Board, -- a hand-me-down from Tammany, who has survived because of his ability and integrity -- asking for \$47,000,000 for a new connecting link subway. And he lets a big billion-dollar cat out of the bag in showing this demand as only an entering wedge for a dozen other 'connections' totalling nearly \$1,000,000,000,000, to provide a carrying capacity of 12,000,000 commuters. This produces a literal gridiron of municipal public-owned transportation, and gives vast scope for discussion of this, as another 'entering wedge' to Collectivism (Communism). But here let us only refer to the crucial relationship of a requisition of a billion dollars of the people's tax money to the doubling of the landlord graft already equalling the total of the New York annual budget of six hundred million dollars. The doubling of monopoly and special privilege is not very encouraging for correction of the evils of democracy.

WHEN THE BMT SUBWAY WAS BUILT 40 YEARS AGO, JUDGE

Seabury caused a survey of this subject to be made; and it was discovered that even in advance of the building there had been enough increases in land value to pay the entire cost of the lines and their rolling stock. Yet we have gone on and built all these and other public improvements enough to make New York land worth twelve billion dollars, and have presented 2/3 of that value to the title holders, going in debt for their cost, just as we now will do for this new billion.

A city automatically creates the income -- economic rent -- which would take care of all its social needs, government. The great sabotage occurs in collection of the rent privately, building half our wealth into monopoly, and requiring a tax system which doubles living costs and creates poverty.

THERE ARE MANY CLIMAXES--AND ANTI-CLIMAXES--TO THE

Big City idea; but this is the most important. Mr. Delaney says he must spend this billion to be able to service with transportation 12,000,000 people-- 50% increase coming now in a few years. This makes sense. In fact, he is applying the yardstick he has already bought for two billion dollars to transport 8,000,000 people. Here is the climax--the strange thing--that Delaney, Mayor La Guardia, or any of our smart leaders, and some of them very socialistic, like Norman Thomas, Harry Laidler, or even Judge Seabury, who has the Henry George social viewpoint -- not one of them is going to demand that this new billion be paid from new land values which the new subways will create, instead of borrowing the money in Wall Street at 5 or 6% (and having to raise the 5¢ fare as a result!)

A FRIEND, AN AUTHOR, SHOWED ME A SUGGESTION OF A

book he might write, and its title, relating to what shall result from this war. Offhand, rather a trite suggestion, in view of various progressive programs-- notably Dorothy Thompson's, Herr Hitler's own 'Union-Germania,' the machinations of the English Labor-Communists that have so attracted our new Ambassador, and his side-kick, Ben Cohen. And finally the Roosevelt-Churchill offering, with all its freedoms, climaxed with that of the Fuehrer and the Duce!

In all this Babel, there's not a hint of (1) Individualism, (2) Jeffersonian democracy with a small 'd' (3) a capitalism with its ISM defined and eliminated; (4) a definition and end of monopoly; (5) property rights as upholding human rights; (6) the placement of all wealth with its producers; (7) inauguration of economics as a science; (8) abolition of consumer taxation; (9) taxing only social sources: economic rents and natural resources.

Yes, this is the book of our vital need, and the name something like this: 'Can We Defend Ourselves?' Sub-title: 'Or Must We Take It Hands Down?'

MONOPOLY THRIVES ON OUR SALES-TAX SYSTEM. WE DO not collect monopoly rents and royalties that would pay for our fifteen-billion-dollar government, and so we tax 130 million consumers into poverty.

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

'THE STORY OF FREELAND' IS REPEATED IN HAASE'S

book, 'The Economic Democracy,' Part 5, Chapter II. The astonishing introduction to this discovery of 'a new land of the really free' tells us that the greatest trouble is to get colonists to understand and conserve their own freedom, because they had become so distorted by false and weak education, and living under closely rationed freedom, they had no concept of its realities.

How truly this depicts our world situation now, and shows how -- merely to make plain simple and obvious truths--we must devise such novelties as 'Freeland,' of 'Caesar's Column,' or of Bellamy's 'Looking Backward.' And then how we risk getting only part of the truth. Another important item from this story clarifies fundamentals: 'justice' is supposed to be basic in expressing the ultimate law; but it is only incidental to Nature's law and the Natural Rights of Man! Then, such rights are so obvious: rights to ALL man produces, by applying his labor to Nature -- the last word of joining Labor's Rights to Property Rights.

WHAT RECOGNITION OF 'LABOR' AS THE FIRST HUMAN

'problem' can class with the economic demand that labor shall have ALL it produces? How puny, compared to this total and basic formula, is the appeasement by unionism and its bold progenitor, Communism! What is it they appease? A system that takes from labor by indirection --but literally and methodically--fully half of what it produces.

In 'Freeland,' says the story, their first statute is to 'deny to any one anything he does not produce.' Whose common sense could rebel at this simple copy-book rule? Contemplating the enforcement of this inoffensive provision, however, shows you two vast realities:-- (1) that this robbery of labor of 'fully half' its wages, including, as it does, stored-up labor--capital--is quite enough to account for all of humanity's major problems: of unemployment, depression, poverty, civil and world war. (2) The stoppage of this robbery would upset the biggest vested privilege-- the private ownership of all social values, such as land, natural resource royalties, economic rent, and basic monopoly -- fully half of all our wealth.

IS 'FREELAND' A POSSIBILITY FOR CONSIDERATION NOW;

or is it too Utopian and visionary? It surely is not difficult to consider--to understand. If there is such a thing as logic, reason, or common sense, the statement just made cannot be denied or questioned at any point. That social values are the equal of all tangible private wealth and property; that social values are not socially owned; that this is a sheer robbery of society composed mostly of labor -- I say this cannot be denied or disproved; nor the reversal of the condition, as the cure for humanity's major ills.

But I freely admit the impossibility of a guaranty of focussing people's attention on the truth and facts and Nature behind them; and the possibility that people cannot see the obvious; that false remedies may persist; that false education may continue; that substantial interests may not protect themselves; that so called intelligence may continue to scoff at obvious truth. Selah!

'THE LAST WORD' OF THE CONVENTIONALIST TO THE REAL

ist (who really can see freedom and therefore advocates it) is that it just can't be; it is wild, visionary, Utopian; in fact, that it proposes so vast an expropriation or confiscation (half of all wealth) as to alone condemn it practically, if not ethically. And this is conventionally (not actually) good logic.

But reality defeats popular ignorance, which usually hides behind conventionality. The fact is that although involving half the wealth, monopoly of social values does not involve half the people. This is where the familiar rabble-rousing attack on big business monopoly gets its force, in the concentration of monopoly in a few hands. While everyone practically has some slight interest in private monopoly, not over 2 to 5 per cent of our 132 million people have more of such interest than in free, unprivileged wealth or property. So the conclusive answer to this 'last word' is that there is no viewpoint,

IF BUSINESS, CAPITAL, WEALTH, AND PROPERTY CAN ONLY

escape destruction by unhooking from basic monopoly, will they do that; or will they sink along with their arch enemy, whom, however, they are too economically illiterate to recognize as such?

If these total substantial elements of society have no antenna with which to catch a message--a SOS--of this kind, possibly some of the minor executives can get the force of it and start something.

This simile might be impressive; suppose that above Niagara Falls a boat's lifeline got tangled with driftwood and the boat was being rapidly dragged to destruction. Would the boatman cut the line and use the oars, or go along over the Falls?

THE UNIONS HAVING GOT ON THE INSIDE OF GOVERNMENT,

having turned our U.S. democracy into an effective Communism, wherein industry is taken out of the control of its owners--why, these unions are now giving lip-service to democracy, by joining government in the prosecution and persecution of all honest Communists.

New Deal politicians, Unionist, CIO and AFL statesmen and Moscow Reds play their game the same way-- according to their current stress, with no notice of principle. The double cross is their most familiar instrument of progress.

MARK SULLIVAN QUOTES FRANK KNOX, G.O.P. VICE PRES-

idential candidate of seven years ago, as making very clear the object of the New Deal in displacing our free industry with the European totalitarian system. Then he quotes Wendell Willkie's campaign oratory of only a year ago making this New Deal object more effectively clear. Then Sullivan mildly suggests that our ALL-OUT for England and Russia--or against Adolf--be still with a weather eye on that convenient secondary object of a New Order of Society.

Here are three cases of appeasement by leaders who should make it their FIRST business to fight for our own home-grown democracy, and refuse to be diverted by any shadows of democracy 3000 or 10,000 miles away.

I SUFFER MUCH FROM LACK OF INFORMATION. I FEAR I

am not what is known as an 'omnivorous' reader. As for books, I have been biased by old Ed. Howe's pronouncement that few are fit to read, or worth reading. Newspapers, and especially tabloids, are made up mostly of effete material. And magazines have long since lost the muckraking element that gave them virility, and have come to be high-class and low-grade hodge podge -- just literature.

Well, all that to justify my not knowing what happened to Rudolph Hess, and to the war as a result of his descent into Merrie England. And there are so many world events and conditions I need to know more about. I read that Hess's trip was made just as Adolph had decided to shake off the Russian bear; but that he was not enough salesman to get peace across the Channel

no matter how camouflaged by such vagaries as convention and precedent, that can defend a robbery of even 95 people by 5!

ONE OF THE POINTS NOT YET CLEAR IN THE MINDS OF

some teachers of economics is that under no circumstances should labor get any advantage from the taxation or public collection of rent or land values. All that labor is entitled to by this change is the stoppage of robbery by the present system. Labor needs no help from any system. All that labor needs, or has right to is what it produces -- no more, no less. 'The Story of Freeland' makes this clear, as it does the whole economic story; whereas some of the numerous charts, diagrams, tests, and formulas of teaching show specifically--and oftener imply--that labor is injured if any limitation of its share of production is imposed. This is usually a part of the incontinent claim that 'rent' reduces wages, stops progress, and creates poverty, without making clear the two kinds of rent--economic and speculative; and without remembering the factor of consumer-taxation, without which rent could not be privately collected.

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

'THE STORY OF FREELAND' IS REPEATED IN HAASE'S book, 'The Economic Democracy,' Part 5, Chapter II. The astonishing introduction to this discovery of 'a new land of the really free' tells us that the greatest trouble is to get colonists to understand and conserve their own freedom, because they have become so distorted by false and weak education, and living under closely rationed freedom, they had no concept of its realities.

How truly this depicts our world situation now, and shows how -- merely to make plain simple and obvious truths--we must devise such novelties as 'Freeland,' or 'Caesar's Column,' or of Bellamy's 'Looking Backward.' And then how we risk getting only part of the truth. Another important item from this story clarifies fundamentals: 'justice' is supposed to be basic in expressing the ultimate law; but it is only incidental to Nature's law and the Natural Rights of Man! Then, such rights are so obvious: rights to ALL man produces, by applying his labor to Nature -- the last word of joining Labor's Rights to Property Rights.

WHAT RECOGNITION OF 'LABOR' AS THE FIRST HUMAN 'problem' can class with the economic demand that labor shall have ALL it produces? How puny, compared to this total and basic formula, is the appeasement by unionism and its bold progenitor, Communism! What is it they appease? A system that takes from labor by indirection --but literally and methodically--fully half of what it produces.

In 'Freeland,' says the story, their first statute is to 'deny to anyone anything he does not produce.' Whose common sense could rebel at this simple copy-book rule? Contemplating the enforcement of this inoffensive provision, however, shows you two vast realities:-- (1) that this robbery of labor of 'fully half' its wages, including, as it does, stored-up labor--capital--is quite enough to account for all of humanity's major problems: of unemployment, depression, poverty, civil and world war. (2) The stoppage of this robbery would upset the biggest vested privilege--the private ownership of all social values, such as land, natural resource royalties, economic rent, and basic monopoly -- fully half of all our wealth.

IS 'FREELAND' A POSSIBILITY FOR CONSIDERATION NOW; or is it too Utopian and visionary? It surely is not difficult to consider--to understand. If there is such a thing as logic, reason, or common sense, the statement just made cannot be denied or questioned at any point. That social values are the equal of all tangible private wealth and property; that social values are not socially owned; that this is a sheer robbery of society composed mostly of labor -- I say this cannot be denied or disproved; nor the reversal of the condition, as the cure for humanity's major ills.

But I freely admit the impossibility of a guaranty of focussing people's attention on the truth and facts and Nature behind them; and the possibility that people cannot see the obvious; that false remedies may persist; that false education may continue; that substantial interests may not protect themselves; that so called intelligence may continue to scoff at obvious truth. Selah!

'THE LAST WORD' OF THE CONVENTIONALIST TO THE REALIST (where really can see freedom and therefore advocates it) is that it just can't be; it is wild, visionary, Utopian; in fact, that it proposes so vast an expropriation or confiscation (half of all wealth) as to alone condemn it practically, if not ethically. And this is conventionally (not actually) good logic.

But reality defeats popular ignorance, which usually hides behind conventionality. The fact is that although involving half the wealth, monopoly of social values does not involve half the people. This is where the familiar rabble-rousing attack on big business monopoly gets its force, in the concentration of monopoly in a few hands. While everyone practically has some slight interest in private monopoly, not over 2 to 5 per cent of our 132 million people have more of such interest than in free, unprivileged wealth or property. So the conclusive answer to this 'last word' is that there is no viewpoint,

IF BUSINESS, CAPITAL, WEALTH, AND PROPERTY CAN ONLY

escape destruction by unhooking from basic monopoly, will they do that; or will they sink along with their arch enemy, whom, however, they are too economically illiterate to recognize as such?

If these total substantial elements of society have no antenna with which to catch a message--a SOS--of this kind, possibly some of the minor executives can get the force of it and start something.

This simile might be impressive: suppose that above Niagara Falls a boat's lifeline got tangled with driftwood and the boat was being rapidly dragged to destruction. Would the boatman cut the line and use the oars, or go along over the Falls?

THE UNIONS HAVING GOT ON THE INSIDE OF GOVERNMENT, having turned our U.S. democracy into an effective Communism, wherein industry is taken out of the control of its owners--why, these unions are now giving lip-service to democracy, by joining government in the prosecution and persecution of all honest Communists.

New Deal politicians, Unionist, CIO and AFL statesmen and Moscow Reds play their game the same way-- according to their current stress, with no notice of principle. The double cross is their most familiar instrument of progress.

MARK SULLIVAN QUOTES FRANK KNOX, C.O.P. VICE PRES-

idential candidate of seven years ago, as making very clear the object of the New Deal in displacing our free industry with the European totalitarian system. Then he quotes Wendell Willkie's campaign oratory of only a year ago making this New Deal object more effectively clear. Then Sullivan mildly suggests that our ALL-OUT for England and Russia--or against Adolf--be still with a weather eye on that convenient secondary object of a New Order of Society.

Here are three cases of appeasement by leaders who should make it their FIRST business to fight for our own home-grown democracy, and refuse to be diverted by any shadows of democracy 3000 or 10,000 miles away.

I SUFFER MUCH FROM LACK OF INFORMATION. I FEAR I

am not what is known as an 'omnivorous' reader. As for books, I have been biased by old Ed. Howe's pronouncement that few are fit to read, or worth reading. Newspapers, and especially tabloids, are made up mostly of effete material. And magazines have long since lost the muckraking element that gave them virility, and have come to be high-class and low-grade hodge podge -- just literature.

Well, all that to justify my not knowing what happened to Rudolph Hess, and to the war as a result of his descent into Merrie England. And there are so many world events and conditions I need to know more about. I read that Hess's trip was made just as Adolf had decided to shake off the Russian bear; but that he was not enough salesman to get peace across the Channel

no matter how camouflaged by such vagaries as convention and precedent, that can defend a robbery of even 35 people by 5!

ONE OF THE POINTS NOT YET CLEAR IN THE MINDS OF

some teachers of economics is that under no circumstances should labor get any advantage from the taxation or public collection of rent or land values. All that labor is entitled to by this change is the stoppage of robbery by the present system. Labor needs no help from any system. All that labor needs, or has right to is what it produces -- no more, no less. 'The Story of Freeland' makes this clear, as it does the whole economic story; whereas some of the numerous charts, diagrams, tests, and formulas of teaching show specifically--and oftener imply--that labor is injured if any limitation of its share of production is imposed. This is usually a part of the incontinent claim that 'rent' reduces wages, stops progress, and creates poverty, without making clear the two kinds of rent--economic and speculative; and without remembering the factor of consumer-taxation, without which rent could not be privately collected.

NO MONOPOLY - said Jefferson - will insure NO BUROCRACY.

a) 'ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY' BY HORACE J. HAASE.

Review of this work by L. D. Beckwith seems to question mainly both words of its title. Beckwith insists that economics relates not at all to 'production of wealth;' only to its distribution among its producers. And as to 'democracy' he recently said its scope was too limited to make it very useful as a name. And, of course, this implies that the juxtaposition of the two words in a book title is deplorable. The most common charge against this reviewer is 'dogmatism,' to which his answer is that a teacher who knows, and knows he knows must appear dogmatic. Here seems a good place to apply the test.

b) HE SAYS (1) COUPLING CONCEPTS OF ECONOMIC LAW AND democracy is unscientific; (2) there can be no democracy in economics. The seasoned definition of economics or political economy is the 'science of wealth production;' and that production includes distribution; that this did not mean physical distribution of the gross product but rather the division of the net product or profit. And this distinction has also been used to assign economics to production, and political economy to division.

But Beckwith seems to deny both to production, saying it is fully taken care of by authentic physical sciences--physics, chemistry, botany, etc. So he monopolizes both phases of economics in the division of wealth. And I have always wondered, as I have followed him in differentiation, whether he was not guided by the need of help only in distribution--rather than the nature of economics.

c) BECKWITH NOW ASSOCIATES THIS CONFUSION, AS HE CALLS

it, with the failure of our constitution to differentiate property, and our consequent nearly two centuries of confusion between social values and property, (and wealth?) which has delivered the social half of wealth (?) to monopolists. But while he covers much familiar ground in this charge, he does not make it clear. His whole argument is, as in the past, devoted to showing our crucial need for help in division and the fact that we have help to spare in production.

d) PRODUCTION OF WEALTH MAY STILL INCLUDE ITS DIVISION.

Economics may still include its social and political phases. And L.D.B. certainly does not show any relation of this discussion to the illiteracy of the 'founding fathers' in defining property; and the two assertions as to democracy in economics remain just that--and dogmatic.

Is L.D.B. in too much hurry to get to the cardinal crime of Author Haase in relating rent to land? And must this review be rated by this idiosyncrasy? And is L.D.B. devoting himself more to names than to realities? I'll ask him: if it be conceded that public service or government causes rent, will there ever be a way found, --except through the good old medium of land--to deliver this rent to the landlord or the treasury?

e) MY TENDENCY, RATHER THAN TO MAKE DUCKS AND DRAKES

of such words and things as 'democracy' and 'economics' --and especially as to their relationship to each other-- is to give them vitality, usefulness, and, if possible, double drawing capacity. This tendency may produce bias; a bad state for a reviewer, and especially a critic. The statement is a habit with me that (1) democracy must be made whole with plenty more democracy (deToqueville) (2) Ours is perfect but for its economics. (3) I have tried to make this good by a rediscovery of economics; and to me it all dovetails and makes sense.

Harry Haase actually writes and gets published a 400 page book on that theme. And now comes 'a teacher of economics as sound as arithmetic' and tells us the two cannot be related! Usually L.D.B. takes too much room for what he has to say; but in this case he is away short, apparently.

WE HAVE A POWERFUL ANTI-MONOPOLY COMMITTEE, FRONTED by a myriad of Department of Justice lawyers and the Sherman law, trying to find business guilty of monopoly.

WAGES ARE PRODUCT MINUS RENT, MINUS INTEREST, SAYS Dr. Padelford's great work on 'Economic Democracy.'

Say a year's product is \$10,000; Rent is \$1,000; Interest is \$1,000; how much is wages? Answer, \$8,000. Suppose we try to save some of this outlay. Let us pay interest as inevitable-- the position of saved-up labor actually working side by side with labor. We can see it, check and verify it.

Rent is not so well understood or so easy to see, to check and verify. So let's let it ride for a few months. This owner of 100 acres, for which he wants \$10 an acre, won't mind waiting. Meantime crops are planted and Mr. Farmer can foresee the improvement in this new farm over the one he had last year, where he paid no rent. So when the landlord suggested that if he didn't have the thousand dollars, he would gamble on a share of the crop he signed a note due at the year-end; and when it fell due he found his year's product was \$11,200; so that between the two helps of extra-productive soil and the machinery to help him work, neither had cost him a cent. So that while both had to be paid, both were in the nature of advances, or credit bookkeeping. In fact, the function of capital was found to be the equalization of the factors of time, power, and labor; and being essentially a contribution of labor, must divide the product with labor.

But rent was different. Although monopolized by a landlord who had no right to it, that fact alone made no difference to the tenant as such. What he paid as rent was in no sense a charge on wages or the employer or laborer. Nor was it charged into higher costs or prices.

There is, however, a rent paid for the privilege of possession of land, which should be called monopoly rent, said Henry George, etc., etc.

Page 16 only partially corrects this. It now says 'Wages should equal product, minus rent, minus interest, minus taxes, minus speculative rent.' This should be revised to eliminate 'rent' in all statements of wealth division, and call the above formula the existing destructive one whose destruction is itself demanded.

EDWARD P. E. TROY --CONTRIBUTING TO THE SAN DIEGO

'Broom' on 'Churchill-Stalin Democracy'-- is a name that I have known for at least a quarter-century. What happens to names like this? Mr. Troy has been prominent in the several 'adventures' of Georgian economics in California, but in between -- well, where?

This is a fine story about this new kind of democracy, and I am much interested in all varieties thereof.

Troy can beat this writer stating this case: Why can't we have these wonderful statements every week in the 'Broom' and larger papers? He gives most attention to the English kind of 'great democracy' as so unctiously referred to by such spell-binders as Dorothy Thompson, Benjamin Cohen, and Ambassador Winant. Stalin democracy is still accepted only by regular Communists. Budding ones --New Dealers and Progressives--don't quite understand the identity of the Marx dictatorship with what we used to call Jefferson individualism.

TROY PACKS SO MUCH INTO HIS NARRATIVE OF JOHN BULL'S

democratic achievements, that he cannot be chided for missing one or two, such as (1) recent abolishment of free trade, the only thing that made their imperialism tolerable. This alone should be sufficient cause for these two world wars. (2) He could have more closely connected the 90% Lord's monopoly with the connected the 90% Lord's land monopoly with the potential extinction (starvation) of 47,000,000 people with their lifelines practically cut by U boats. Indeed, Eden is just now saying England's food supply is in vital danger. (3) He could have quoted Lloyd George's historic statement that 'these Lords make the English people trespassors on their own soil.' What is the English definition of treason? (4) He could have made as effective a quotation from Winston Churchill's great speech against land monopoly, of July 1909.

However, without these additions, this Tory document should be put on Senator Wheeler's free postage (but not free printing) million-shot mailing assembly line.