

Merry Christmas . . .

*Chas. H. Ingersoll*

THOMAS JEFFERSON HENRY GEORGE ABRAHAM LINCOLN

# democracy

with the small "d" 13241

VOL. VI. No. 41. CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher DEC. 19, 1940 1165 Broadway, N.Y. Yearly \$1. Ten Times 25¢

## MERRY CHRISTMAS 'democracy'

WE HONOR THE 'PRINCE OF PEACE'

But ministers of the gospel and other leaders have never had a more difficult task than that of formulating their 1940 Christmas greetings.

'Peace! Peace! And there is no peace!' This is an outworn lament. Either the Designer of our Universe failed to make any provision for its defense from self-destruction, or something has gone wrong with the administration of this design.

Which horn of this dilemma shall we, who believe in an omnipotent spiritual power, take? Obviously, the latter. Our earth is the only universe to which we have access, and from it we derive all our substance--necessities and luxuries. No one can conceive of any other 'design' than for this earth to minister to those dwelling on it. Is it not clearly the major purpose of 'associations among men,' called government, to carry out this Creator's design?

We customarily celebrate at this season the birth of the Prince of Peace. Can we avoid the charge of hypocrisy and dishonesty to ourselves, if we do not consider the subject of peace with absolute frankness?

Can we continue to hide behind the assumption that war is inevitable; that it is without cause; or that its causes are irremovable? Are not three 'postulates' relating to war undeniable? First, are not tariff walls the most immediate cause of wars? Second, are not disadvantages between 'have' and 'have-not' nations, shortage of vital necessities and natural resources, the underlying cause? Third, are not conditions of unemployment, of official charity, and widespread poverty, conditions--precedent to war?

Christmas is a church season. Can the church celebrate this sacred event and hold itself aloof from the realities of Peace and War? Is it not church duty to put its whole might behind a free trade movement that would displace battleships with merchant marine? Should not the church take the radical position of conserving all nature, for the use of all people? Could a Creator have had any other intent? When this is the direct and obvious first cause of world conflict, how can the church be aloof from a demand for distribution of nature's resources? And upon the cause of civil war, the impoverishment of the masses by taxation and excessive rents, royalties, and franchise exactions--can the church ignore the parasitism of basic monopoly, and maintain its standing as representing the tenets of Jesus Christ, the prince of Peace?

War is a poverty disease. War and poverty must go out together; and both are issues of common interest. This is 'reform' doctrine; but it states the absolute and pragmatic interest of all people. No one can be so degraded as not to have a vital interest in the destruction of war and poverty.

Finally, in wishing to all 'democracy' readers the joys of this festive season, and all the best things for the year 1941, permit the Editor to ask for a close reading of this paper, for the best words he can offer for such an occasion. Our battle is for our small 'd' democracy; and there are so many immensely interesting sectors in this battle, that a medium such as this seems necessary to express them.

BEST WISHES TO YOU ALL!

Charles H. Ingersoll

IT IS REPORTED THAT OUR EIGHT NEW NAVAL BASES WILL add a fifth to our naval power! Well I wonder what they will add to our naval responsibility and our foreign entanglements!

Is anyone these days wasting any time on such notions as some of our ancient statesmen had, that foreign entanglements--like these bases--were not to be boasted of? We are obviously far off our base, even if the destroyers were back numbers, in trading them for entangling liabilities.

'KNOW-NOTHING-ISM' SUCH SENTIMENTS WILL BE CALLED by 100% go-getter, red-blooded (even if red-flagged occasionally) patriotism.

Pacifism! most derided of all isms now. And this must be admitted, unless we are prepared to use beans, instead of merely eating them; if we are to line up in defense of imperialism, instead of following the only defense of imperialism, the policy of free trade--free trade that is domestic as well as international.

Economists have long known that this freedom would insure peace between nations. It is more recently discovered that domestic warfare is as costly as foreign, and requires the same free trade remedy.

'FRIENDSHIPS VERSUS BATTLESHIPS' IS THE SLOGAN OF freedom. We are now in the throes of battleship statesmanship, and we are there because friendship statesmanship has been discarded.

England made the last great gesture in this world movement, in ending her splendid record of world free trade, because (immediately) of world war conditions, a quarter century ago.

But behind this was the cause of restricted domestic trade. England, proud of her free foreign trade that had made her the greatest and most respected old-world nation, finally found it impossible to resist the pressure against freedom, because resting on all its industry and consumption was a tax burden that its landed aristocracy could have carried.

ENGLAND IS THE TRAGIC SYMBOL OF HER OWN APOSTACY TO what she is credited with being--a modern democracy. She is apostate to Freedom of Trade. Her apostacy stands forth at home and abroad.

Her abandonment of her leadership of the world as a free trade nation, after having built the most democratic possible empire by this power of freedom, is her most obvious failure.

But behind and causing this reversal of peace and prosperity tradition, was her abandonment of domestic free trade, in unloading ALL costs of government, from LANDlords who originally--and comfortably--carried it, on to the bent backs of its consumers, cutting trade in half, and making paupers of its masses, and--as Lloyd George said-- 'trespassers on their own soil!'

'DRAFT IS NOT A FULL DRESS AFFAIR.' THUS OUR GREEN-horn conscriptees and their loving mothers and sisters have had to be bluntly told to wake the boys up to the fact that 'they're in the army now,' and had better be getting tough.

The disillusionment of the early consignments of draftees was expressed in such impedimenta as big suitcases, small steamer trunks, handsomely framed photographs, scrap books, albums, diaries, and stationery sets. A few million of crossed fingers may help in keeping us out of war!

## Shifting Taxation from industry to monopoly will cure poverty.

It takes politics and economics to make

Vol. 14  
No. 41

# democracy

Dec. 19  
1940

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

### DIVIDING TIME BETWEEN THE IMPASSIONED SPEECHES OF

John L. Lewis and Mussolini to their subjects, engenders quite serious reflection. Their types of dictatorship are not at all unlike. The force they use is similar at many points. Their weakness in principle is similar. Yet Lewis presents his very best front now, while Benito is at his worst. Lewis may have been impetuous and prejudiced in the recent campaign. I classed him with Norman Thomas in his ungratefulness to the President for greater advancement to Unionism (and Collectivism) than they could ever have got under their own names, flags, and personnel.

But Lewis made good his threat and has resigned the most labor power ever vested in one man. Now if he would load up on a few simple lessons in political economy -- the science that controls all labor activity, decides wages, hours, etc., -- he could come back and really finish his work!

### MAYBE LEWIS UNDERSTANDS THAT UNIONISM IS REVOLUTION

or necessarily leads to it, just as Thomas says Marxism does. Maybe he sees that civil war cannot be operated within a world war. He seems tired of just quarreling, the principal occupation of 'labor.' There's an undercurrent of conscious frustration in his forceful speech -- signs that if he had just a little more information, he would be able to do something real for his fifty-two million 'shrunken bellies.'

It is indeed tragic that a man of his good impulses and general intelligence, and leadership-quality, must meet an impasse of futility, just as he gets a good start.

Why is it so hard for such a man to see that his success would lie in asking much more for labor than has he, the most radical of all laborites; if he used his power rightly to drive out the parasites who don't even try to produce; instead of trying to destroy the employer, who at least makes some effort.

### DOES NOT LEWIS KNOW THAT THERE'S NOTHING SO SHRINK-

ing to bellies as taxes on food, clothing, and housing? Does he not know that practically all of 15 billions of taxes in the U.S.A. go right to these vital spots? Can he not look behind the scenes enough to see that it is not the fault of the employers, big or little, that 15 million fight each other for jobs, and 52 million can buy only a fraction of their needs -- and so are the direct cause of these jobless and their own low pay. Can he not see that consumer-taxes destroy the mass buying power? Can't he see that we have consumer-taxes only because we do not have monopoly-taxes?

If Lewis doesn't know that monopoly rests wholly on the backs of his 100 million producers -- monopoly which was denounced by Jefferson, and of which we have 200 billion dollars -- if he doesn't know these things, it's time he learned them!

### 'SHIRTSLEEVES TO SHIRTSLEEVES' IS A TRUISM ALL TOO

true in these piping times. The late Herbert T. Parson was originally appraised by Frank Woolworth at \$12.00 a week, and hired at that figure. Parson died recently in a public hospital, leaving \$2500 and a house which cost \$10,000,000 but recently sold for taxes at \$100. So he must be added to the long string of exhibits of 'F.W.'s' genius as a valuer of merchandise and of human ability -- \$12.00 per week! Yet in the meantime he ran \$500 '5 and 10's', and helped make them worth, say 250 millions.

'democracy' IS NOT A WHIMSY. IT'S THE MISSING HALF OF democracy -- its economics.

### CAN UNIONISM CONDUCT A WAR? THIS QUESTION WILL BE

answered soon, and especially as the New Deal is extended for four years more. The New Deal is 100% Union, while the Old Deal was anti-Union. But if the Old Deal gets back, it will be mostly because it has -- while lambasting the New Deal by name -- accepted most of its panaceas -- like AAA and NLRB -- called principles.

The most likely thing to happen to Unions, if war, or war preparation, is active, is what has happened in all war making countries: the Unions will be conscripted and later will be socialized -- a great stride toward the collectivist goal.

### EARL BROWDER, BROADCASTING FROM THE SHADOW OF A

Federal prison, advises the American people that it is only through Socialism that they can realize democracy.

Alas, this would be true, if Karl Marx, the author of Socialism, had got its right angle when he launched it in a 2200 page book, 'Das Kapital.' He made Socialism stand for socializing private property, instead of public property. He made it attack capital, instead of monopoly. He made it stand for war instead of peace.

### THE FEUDAL SYSTEM IS CONDEMNED AS A RELIC OF THE

dark ages, but its principle was better than our system. It gave to the landlords the 'feus' or rents of the land, which is exactly what our so-called democratic system does; and now there are a thousand times more in amount.

But then the landlords performed service to earn their feus, whereas now they don't even pretend to do anything for the billions paid them.

Some 'liberal' came along and advocated 'broadening the base of taxation,' since which time the people have been slaves to taxation.

### SO WHAT WE NOW WANT IS A MODERNIZED FEUDAL SYSTEM

which will put all the taxes up to the land owners, who are collecting plenty of 'feus,' to take all tax burdens from industry and its products. This will so lower prices, that people can afford to buy perhaps twice as much of everything. This will call for twice the labor and capital, resulting in increased wages and profits.

### JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER IS THE GREATEST LANDLORD IN THE

universe. And yet he is no LANDLORD at all! The greatest aggregation of business buildings in the world is at Rockefeller Center. And by a strange perversity in the use of English, in the thousands of stores, show-rooms and offices, Rockefeller is called a 'landlord,' whereas he is an investor of capital in 'housing,' and so a capitalist.

And as a capitalist, he is -- in common with every capitalist -- paying tribute of economic or land-rent to the owner of the land under his vast buildings. His landlord is Columbia University, one of the biggest owners of New York's 12 billion dollars of unearned increment, which reduces the earnings of labor and capital more than \$500,000,000 a year.

### IS LONDON BECOMING A SHAMBLES? THE TROUBLE WITH

war is that of all battles of force -- no one wins. Especially if the war strings out for months, maybe years, and England 'wins,' as expected up to now, she will be such a wreck, and the people will be such wrecks, as to be incapable of profiting by victory.

France and Denmark may stand forth as examples of appeasement, that live to rejoice over their choice of a lesser evil.

### "WE THE CITIZENS" IS A NEW ORGANIZATION IN CHICAGO, DE-

voted to displacement of tax collection by rent collection. The taxes they mean are taxes on the consumer and the rent they mean is economic land or ground rent.

With these explanations their objective is quite obvious. But without them "Taxation of Land Values" would seem to be as certain and cheap a way of getting the idea across. I can think of no more convenient way of describing rent than with these two words "land values." Nor can I think of any way of collecting rent other than by taxation, using tax machinery and employing tax assessors and collectors.

## NO MONOPOLY - said Jefferson - will insure NO BUROCRACY.

DEMOCRACY IS THE ONLY WAY OUT FOR BUSINESS AND ALL its customers--everyone. There are two other ways, between which we are now struggling in confusion, but not getting out!

If business does not come to its own rescue, and that of all its customers-- 132 million of them--it's a good bet that we will go into chaos.

The two roads ahead are our old road of mixed business and monopoly, which we know does not work. The other way is the New Deal reform way, which leads into communism.

In other words, business is tangled with an old disease--monopoly--which is bad. And the Democratic Party is tangled with a remedy --bureaucracy-- which is worse than the disease.

DO BUSINESS MEN EVER STOP TO REFLECT ON JUST WHY they are afflicted with short business and profits, New Deals, Arnold Committees, and such monstrosities as the third term of a (to them) pestiferous President?

If so, is it not rather easy to see that these evils are all related to a tax system that is all loaded on to business, and which in turn is all loaded by business on to its 132 million buyers of merchandise and service; and that these taxes double consumer-prices, and hence halve their volume?

This is the beginning and end of an endless chain of destruction.

BUSINESS HAS FORMED THE BAD HABIT OF THINKING SOMEONE or something will 'save it.' The last decade has nurtured this notion, just at the very time when the most destruction has been meted out to business!

This Communistic New Deal thinks it can save business by regulating it and then socializing it. The whole idea is wrong, and business must hurry and bury it, and get to a basis of independent thinking, or it will go down between monopolism and communism.

### THE G.O.P. THINKS IT IS THE BUSINESS MAN'S FRIEND.

And the business man doesn't exactly know to the contrary, and goes on wearing the G.O.P. collar.

Just now this is because the New Deal, of which he was hopeful, has let him down; and he thinks G.O.P. the lesser evil, about which he is probably right.

But business must soon have something positive and constructive to build on. Following an Old Deal system of privilege, then a New Deal system of State-ism, and then back to Old Deal guesswork, is worn out.

### CAN BUSINESS AFFORD TO LONGER RISK ITS EXISTENCE

in between a system that has proved itself bad by repeated break-downs in the past half-century, and which has now lost control of itself--between that and a make-believe remedy, such as the New Deal?

Can business risk a turnover of a hundred billion dollars a year, and 200 billions of assets, on the kind of record that the G.O.P. has; or on any that the New Deal holds out?

Must not business have a deal of its own, and one free from both basic monopoly and economic fallacy?

### IT'S TRUE THE NEW DEAL HAS PROVED CONCLUSIVELY THAT

it has not the remedy for the Old Deal. It has not even diagnosed the Old Deal.

The obvious failure of the old system is in our tax system: (a) notably the protective tariff tax system, because of its monopoly-war-and-poverty-breeding character; (b) its general consumer-tax system that doubles living costs and halves business turnover; and, most important, (c) the exemption of basic monopoly from all taxation, that makes of it a 200 billion basic racket, on which all the lesser rackets are based.

### IT IS EQUALLY TRUE THAT THE OLD DEAL HAS LEARNED

nothing of its own troubles or their remedy. It is the most culpable of the two parties, because (1) it is the original offender; (2) it has had ten years of observation and opportunity to learn, and has learned nothing.

Its last platform and candidate, to the extent that they did not stand pat, merely and literally copied the New Deal fallacies.

A MONTHLY CHALLENGE TO THE BRAIN-POWER OF THE UNIVERSE is delivered in 100 pages inside the magazine covers blazoned 'THINK!'

In the current number are 35 demonstrations of the urge to ratiocinate; and many of them are fairly successful. However, the yardstick for measurement of apparatus for thinking and its output, is at present quite elastic--like Professor Irving Fisher's bouncing dollar that changes with what it measures. And so many things doubtless get by the think-meter or editor Shafer (M.M.) which might more properly appear in such thinking mediums as 'Life' or the 'New Yorker.'

However, these three dozen leading contenders in the process of thought, do their very best under sponsorship of the able editor who is setting standards that supply an urge to achievement. Popularly, there is thought to be a resistance to the process of thinking; that even our great institutions of learning are not overcoming this. Yet there are occasional signs that in the 13-year-old average adult mentality, brain cells are active.

### AMONG THE PIECES IN THE MAGAZINE 'THINK' THAT ABLY

qualify in the task, is one by Louis Wallis, 'War and Economics.' This is one of a number of admirable briefs by Wallis, each of which goes to the root of some phase of basic economics.

He describes Junkerism in Germany, using Kaiser Wilhelm's 100,000 acres as his example in showing how the Junkers have complete possession of the earth of the Vaterland, from which soil its 50 million people must extract their living, if they are to live.

He explains this situation as being the basis of royalty and aristocracy, and the dominance of both so-called liberal government and dictatorships. Both kinds conspire with Junkers and landlords in letting them take the billions of land rent, and in levying other --about equal --resulting in the disenrollment of millions of workers.

Well, the war climax is reached when, thus impoverished, the business elements are forced to go abroad for world trade, build world empires, erect protective tariff walls. And in all these enterprises, compete with navies, armies, and now with bombs.

TAXES ARE OFFICIALLY, BY SECRETARY MORGENTHAU, acknowledged to be as high as the World War peak in 1918. This indicates our preparation is progressing in spending. This should soon show itself in inflation, that may again double prices from present high levels.

The outstanding question is whether basic monopoly can get by another world war or equivalent expenditure, without having its unearned profits or economic rents drafted?

### IS POVERTY CURABLE? IS WAR CURABLE? IS ANYTHING

curable? Is the theory of cure abandoned?

There is current the assurance that 'for every wrong there is a remedy.' And that 'removal of cause should result in cure.'

Why then is not humanity alert in defense against its mortal enemies, poverty and war? If people are allowed to retain only about half of what they earn or produce, is not that a sufficiently obvious cause of their poverty?

And if that missing half can be seen going via taxation--and in broad daylight--into the pockets of basic monopolists, would not spunting this 50-million-dollars-a-day stream into the public treasury, be a cure for poverty?

And is it not plain that such a system, building Chinese tariff walls, and creating vast international monopolies of vital natural resources, could cause war?

Cures are commonplace, except for our most important diseases! I wonder why!

Taxes removed from labor-products will restore mass buying power and full employment at wages over which there can be no civil war.

Labor could secure UN-taxation for itself and its co-laborers, the capitalists.

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

## The Manhattan Single Tax Club

The next club meeting will not be held until Jan. 6, 1941. On that date Miss Grace I. Colbron will speak on "How Can We Spread the MSFC Activities?"

Last week's notice brought responses from distant cities, indicating that there is need for our help in organizing latent talent. Be sure to attend and hear Miss Colbron.

There will also be a debate as to whether we will achieve the Single Tax all at once or step by step.

## THE SCHOOL OF DEMOCRACY

Some of our students insist free courses are paternalistic and that give and take is the only democratic method. Accordingly, we are going to charge \$5 for the 10 weeks course (including text) at 1165 Bway and \$2.50 for the Correspondence Course. The Schedule of classes follows. Weekdays 6 to 7:45 & 8 to 9:45. Saturdays 10 to Noon and 2 to 4 p.m. 5000 triple business return post-cards will be mailed Dec. 26th. Help and donations, please.

'NOW FRANCE IS REBORN,' SAYS PETAIN. MAYBE HE IS

right. She needed it. France has made a number of attempts at re-borning:— at the revolution, back in the 1780's; when she split up her land—'Peasant-Proprietorship' it was called; and when she a few years agowent into unionism, socialism, and fascism.

Now she has evolved some reforms that represent a composite of confusion quite in harmony with current world-wide confusions. Her old-time patriotism and new-time 'collectivist democracy' made her an easy mark for the new-time warfare. Now we shall see what Petain can make of it.

N.J. TAX ON ALL 12 RAILROADS PASSING ACROSS IT IS

over 18 millions, of which about two-thirds was paid on account recently, although half of these roads are in bankruptcy, or losing money.

So, besides being only part payment, this was paid under the protest that for years the taxes had been unjust and excessive.

Their defense should be, not primarily as to the amount, but the place of the levy. It should be solely on their land, franchise, and other social values, which are now so largely exempted, and not a dollar on their investment in improvements, income, etc., now so heavily taxed. This might favor both them and the state.

THE LIMIT OF INFORMATION REGARDING PARISIAN CONDI-

tions is in a letter in Le Temps, from the Mayor of the 11th arrondissement, telling of heavy unemployment, tragic inflation of prices, and deflation of money, and plenty of all-round suffering.

While Hitler will deserve the brunt of this condition, including the censorship preventing the leading newspaper from talking freely about it, the world will also remember that French industry has for years been dislocated by the class war of unionism and socialism. And also that, as terrible as blitzkriegs are, poverty, hunger, cold, and unemployed millions are not unknown in peace times in all our 'Christian democratic civiliza-

tions.' 'INTEREST' IS THE INCREASE IN PRODUCT, DUE TO THE use of capital. This is the plausible definition. How is this: 'Interest is the return for possession of capital, at the rate fixed by supply and demand.' Interest has no concern with the use made of the wealth for possession of which it is paid.

'RABBLE-ROUSING' WAS FREELY CHARGED IN THE RECENT campaign, especially by Willkieites. And there's much to justify it.

The attack of the New Deal on wealth and capital, as such, and the use of WPA politically, can hardly escape the suspicion of trying to build political power, by preying on the distress of the poor and unfortunate.

It is plausible—the Communist doctrine—to point to wealth and say let's take it away. And when to this is added the Marxian doctrine that this wealth was created by 'the rabble,' it becomes truly revolutionary, as shown in Michigan and elsewhere in 1938. But political campaigning against rabble rousing or rousers, is not the answer for true conservators of the business, capital, and wealth of the country.

Safety can be accomplished only by wiping out the rabble; and that, by wiping out its cause.

The cause advocated by rousers of all grades is 'capitalism.' The rousers will win, unless this ISM rises and defends itself, by uncovering the actual cause—basic monopoly.

WE HAVE JUST FINISHED A CAMPAIGN INVOLVING 50 MIL-

lion vitally interested voters; and the two candidates managed to steer their ways through 25,000 miles and 10 million words (more or less) without either one mentioning the biggest and most obvious issue—MONOPOLY.

One of them being a conceded monopolist, is excused for his neglect. But how can we excuse the other? He is a Democrat, employed to see that no monopoly is tolerated. What excuse has he? He calls himself a follower of Jefferson, who said we must have no monopoly, in order that we might have no bureaucracy.

But we seem to be fostering it so we can go faster through bureaucracy and into Communism.

I HEAR RUMBLINGS OF A THIRD PARTY. BUT I FEAR IT

is only rumbling. That it should be put off when the handwriting on the wall is so obvious, is indeed a tragedy. Didn't the C.O.P. give all it had this time? Was not the New Deal weaker, and Willkie stronger, than the 1936 candidate?

'Well what shall its name be?' I am asked. 'The Jeffersonian.' 'That's fine; we will all like that; what are the principles?'

This is the parting of the ways between sheep and goats. The slogan is 'NO MONOPOLY and NO BUREAUCRACY.' And the second line: 'Shift all taxes from consumption to basic monopoly.' "It will come some day!"

POTTERING AROUND ON 2500 TO 12,000 PLANES A YEAR

does not sound like big work, especially after our Uncle Henry—our patron saint of mass production—says he can make 1,000,000 a year.

These 'regular' plane builders who get as much as \$325,000 (for just one), seem to be in something like the position the Selden patent owners were in, when automobile production was trying to start. Henry was the answer then, and he may be now.

IS THE LABOR WAR, WHICH THE PRESIDENT WILL TRY TO

settle, getting afoul of the main war we are partly in? At Fort Dix, where carpenters get \$8.00 a day (each) the plumbers and laborers are striking, as if there were no war and as if they were working for a capitalistic boss.

Comparing the wages of soldiers to those struck for should raise some nice questions that all the international, national, and governmental labor officials would have to labor hard to answer.

ONE OF THE MOST VITAL PRINCIPLES NOT YET LEARNED

by the human race is the relation of cause and effect. And the U.S.A., with its billions sunk in educational structure, has not gone further toward learning such obvious simplicities, than have the most backward nations.

We proceed with cares for affections of both the human body and the body politic, without the slightest reference to the cause of disease. I call our medical and economic professors to answer why we have so much disease, poverty, and war, if this is not true.



BRONX, N. Y.  
555 E 223 St.  
MAX BEKOWITZ

NEW YORK CITY  
1165 BROADWAY  
RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED