

THOMAS JEFFERSON HENRY GEORGE ABRAHAM LINCOLN

democracy

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL
EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

9322

with the small "d"

1165 Broadway
New York City

Vol. IV - No. 83

6 Issues—25c

13 Issues—50c

26 Issues—\$1.00

March, 1947

LET ALL TAXES ON PROPERTY AND PRODUCTS CEASE—PADELFORD

THESE ECONOMICS ARE PACKED WITH VITAL AND OBVIOUS DISTINCTIONS AND TRUTHS

Accusing Democracy of Tyranny

TYRANNY OF DEMOCRACY OR THE PROLETARIAT?

CONSTITUTIONALISTS AND others, mostly big 'R' Republicans or G.O.P.'s who are active recently in elaborating the distinction between a republic and a democracy in order to denounce the latter as 'tyranny of the majority' and even communism, need some more thinking.

The fact is that we are coming to a show-down of a gap that was left between that DECLARATION OF DEMOCRACY using the interchangeable word INDEPENDENCE and the fundamental document which was presumed to put that declaration into statute law, but which did not.

So we have not had any substantial and realistic democracy. We have had a word to play with in politics. And moralists and sentimentalists have propagandized many vague ideologies with it. But its ECONOMIC SIGNIFICANCE has hardly been mentioned.

And this show-down will bring on another show-down more interesting and personal, which will call up the parable of the sheep and the goats—Is the trouble with democracy that it is the element that is against special privilege? And that it is the ONLY real threat to Monopoly and Our Enemy the State?

WHO WANTS DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA?

AND WHO THINK THEY CAN by adherence to constitutional terms or representative republicanism sidestep the essence of democracy while toying with its name and continue to enjoy the privileges of basic monopoly and devastating taxes that impoverish every individual and all industry?

For 100 years Monopoly and its 'Collector' of product-taxes have enjoyed the protection of combined politics, education, church and press. But outstanding in the annals of our 'Revolution that Was' and 'Our Enemy the State' are the facts that the two great classes most hurt by 'the system' also defend it.

This is the 'Revolution that was NEEDED'—and that WASN'T. And first to blame for this is the Capitalist who is the owner of nearly all wealth. Numerically first should be the mistreated worker—nearly everyone. But he is OUT until this misleadership is changed.

How natural then that the second victim of an insane economic system, who has ORGANIZED LABOR IN VAST PRODUCTION, should lead its organization in correction of its system of distribution or division of its product—especially as that correction is equally vital to capital and all of its customers—EVERYONE!

★ HIGH SALES—HIGH PROFITS—HIGH INFLATION

NEWSPAPER HEADLINERS and text-writers seem to be unconscious of what all the high-jinks in the big stores and big corporations mean. Whether they fool any of the owners, stockholders or humble buyers on whom falls the full force of INFLATION, or whether they fool only themselves—

The wonderful records of 'corporation profits' or the big jumps

IN BETWEEN TWO TYRANNIES

THE TYRANNY OF MONOPOLY—no matter how many 'Revolutions There Have Been'—is still bigger and more tyrannical than ever. And the tyranny of the Proletariat which is perfectly described by bureaucracy and statism getting its power by Mob-Labor-Unionism—these are our Two Tyrannies. NOT the revolution and democracy.

The prior of these Tyrannies is Basic Monopoly: for without that we would never have had the other. And to end the other—the confusion and chaos of industrial or class war and the revolution that was and is—we only need to end that special form of underlying or fundamental monopoly—OF THE EARTH ITSELF.

In fact, if we do not end that monopoly the tyranny of the State and of the Proletariat cannot even be abated. Examination, in Russia, England and France will show you that these two tyrannies are not at all uncomfortable bedfellows.

In England the new Proletariat or Socialist government is pumping the last furling of substance from the 40 million workers' pockets to pay excessive mine-owners' prices. And in USSR all its Kholaks or Farmers or Peasants have been EXPROPRIATED of their lands to serve bureaucratic monopoly.

PROLETARIANISM AND DEMOCRACY

GARRETT'S NARRATIVE IS perfect in showing the Machiavellian perfection with which this revolution has been used to satisfy the popular and natural yearning for DEMOCRACY. And his skill only is needed to show how a drive against democracy may now be made, using as if it were democracy, the evidence of Proletarian Tyranny.

Just as in the one-to-nine-steps, popular confusion and propaganda convicts capitalism of the crimes of monopoly, so the same technic can easily utilize all the mobility of Marx class-war plus labor monopoly and confusion, to discredit democracy.

The art and business of FELLOW-TRAVELLING is the major force in such a contest. This is one place where Garrett might have been stronger. Another 'problem' is needed to compare the utter weakness of Communism using its own name or any of its Marx alibis, down to the numerous progressive and liberal ingenious substitutes.

Even 'democracy' has been largely taken over in the vast united front movement in which the Browders, Hillmans and Fosters have had such power and cooperation-in-building, from the Roosevelts, Morgenthau and Peppers. The revolution was largely put over among 27 million New Dealers and only weakly resisted by 23 million G.O.P. 'progressives'—all with no use of collectivist realities.

in retail volume are all the same—just inflation. And these profits and sales will vanish as they came and leave nothing behind them as reminders of the prosperity implied in both the loud-speaking headlines and nice-reading statements.

Conservative Council is not too plentiful. Dr. H. M. Padelford is one of America's Profoundest Economic Counselors. He is a leading Homeopathic Physician of National Repute—one of few who knows the natural laws behind his Curative Science.

And this has led him to study the laws behind the greater Science of Creation and of the wonderful Universe that has been supplied to mankind. Dr. Padelford, who has spent an average lifetime in Fall River, Mass., is a sparing author; he has written a number of admirable pamphlets and many treatises but his conservatism is shown in his care to make everything he says cover novel reasoned positions and add up to new information not left for debate.

STUDENTS OF HISTORY, having knowledge of existing conditions and tendencies, may well fear that the life of the United States, as a Constitutional Republic, is drawing to a close.

The spirit of sturdy independence which has made this country great is waning and more and more people are coming to believe that our modern politico-industrial machinery can successfully function only under the guidance or control of an efficient and wise government.

"Planned Economy," which is but incipient socialism, is now proposed as the necessary next step in our national development. A planning government, or department of government, if it is to be effective, must have power to enforce its decrees. Such an economy then implies an authoritarian and finally a totalitarian government. In a democracy neither of these have any place.

Collectively we affirm that "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness," and "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men." This is but to assert that the government, in a democracy, must insure equality of opportunity and security of person and of property.

As control of property is, in effect, control of person it follows that if men are to be free their rights to own property must be respected.

THE RIGHT OF EVERY individual to possess the fruits of his own labor is natural and unalienable. To the producer belongs the things produced. To deny this is but to affirm that property is to be owned by those who are strong enough to take and hold it. If this latter concept is sound there can be in the world no lasting peace. But it is not sound. Property ownership is based on production. The creator of wealth is its rightful owner. Property rights are vital. But private property rights are of no possible worth if, upon the property of individuals, the government has a first and unlimited lien. This should be self-evident. And equally as evident should it be that a government instituted to make secure certain rights cannot itself limit or nullify these rights. No government, in a democracy, has or can have the right to seize private property by taxation.

Those who contend that the right to tax (private property) is inherent in the political state have

a faulty conception of a democratic society. In a totalitarian State the government is sovereign. The people are subjects. The edicts of the government are the law. Might is right. In a democracy the people are sovereign. The government is a servant and qualified to exercise only delegated powers.

No individual is qualified to take from any other, without adequate compensation, his property, or any part of it. Powers which the individual does not possess he certainly cannot delegate. It therefore follows that any body of delegates, or agent of this body, which, in a democracy undertakes to seize private property by taxation exercises power which is usurped is, in fact, tyrannical.

IN THE TAX DEPARTMENT of our various governments socialism has its beginning and democracy begins its decline. It is here that opposition to socialism, or to statism, if it is to be successful, must take place. Mere argument and denunciation must be futile. Unless we establish security of property we shall have, in the not-distant future, a socialistic State.

The Federal Constitution grants to the Government the power to lay and collect taxes. But a clause in the Bill of Rights denies to the Government the right to take private property for public use without just compensation.

Equality and security, which are necessary conditions to a free and prosperous social State are attainable only if this forbidding clause is literally construed and obeyed.

Taking private property by taxation is taking private property for public use, and this without just compensation. Courts have conceded this but have contended that the clause applies, not to taxation, but to eminent domain. This is an opinion, not a law. To accept as a law this opinion is to substitute for a government by law a government by men.

If the United States is to survive as a Constitutional Republic all private property must be made tax-exempt.

But we must have government. That government must be supported. If, for the support of the government, private property cannot be taken it necessarily follows that there exists, in quantity sufficient for the support of all legitimate governmental activities, what should be classified as public property.

GROUND, OR ECONOMIC, Rent is socially created. It is the fruit of the labor of no individual. No individual can claim it, or any part of it, under the plea that he has been its producer. Contemporaneously with the development of society to a point where organized government becomes necessary, and with the growth of government, land comes to have a value for use sufficient to defray legitimate expense. Those who are willing to see it must recognize in this the hand of Providence, God has ordained that government shall exist. Also God has provided revenue for its support.

If justice is to be done, if equality of opportunity is to exist, and if private property rights are to be secure, the government, which is the accredited agent of society, must appropriate for social use Ground, or Economic Rent.

Men will not build upon or other-

wise improve land unless they are assured that they can hold it at least as long as the life of the improvements. It therefore is expedient that land be privately owned. But such ownership must be for security, not for profit.

Two things are essential to human life. These are air and land. Deprived of either man cannot live. The proposal that any individual be empowered to collect from any other payment for the air that he breathes would excite ridicule—and rightly. That which is true of air is true also of land. A system of land tenure under which individuals are given the power to collect from their fellows payment for the use of land is morally wrong. It cannot be defended. Land is not a proper object of purchase or sale. In a truly Christian society it will not be dealt with as a commodity.

LAND OWNERSHIP MUST BE conditioned upon the payment to society, at stated times, of fees or taxes, which equal its rent, rent being a measure of the value of the advantage accruing by reason of location or quality of a given section of land.

The investment value or market price of land is its net rent capitalized. If rent is socialized, that is taken over by the government for social use, land will become priceless, will cease to have any buy-and-sell value. Title to any given section will be conditioned upon the payment of its rent, directly or indirectly, to the government. Land at and below the so-called "margin of cultivation," as it yields no rent, will be free in every sense of that term. The socialization of rent will bring to an end land speculation. Unused land will then become, in effect, a Public Domain.

When free land offers to any dissatisfied or unemployed worker the opportunity for self-employment there can be no involuntary idleness. One who uses land which costs him nothing and who is required to pay taxes on neither property nor income, directly or indirectly, should be able easily to support himself and his family. Such a one is industrially free.

Industrial slavery has its immediate cause in the monopolization of land. Such monopolization is directly traceable to, is the immediate result of, governmental seizure of private property by taxation.

Where private property is taxed the taxes on land will be relatively light—will be less certainly than its normal rent. Land will then have an investment value which is that part of the rent which the government fails to collect, capitalized at the current rate of interest.

WHEN ALL AVAILABLE land has come into private ownership speculation begins. Land values soar; the limit is what the traffic will bear. Those who undertake either to purchase or hire land will be compelled to pay whatever the landlord sees fit to demand. Owners of land, where such conditions exist, are a privileged class. They reap where they do not sow. For the incomes which they receive from land they make no return; they render no service; they furnish no goods. They are, as a class, parasitic. Where such a class exists there can be neither equality of opportunity nor justice in the distribution of wealth.

(Continued in No. 84 issue)

There are two kinds of Democracy: Political and Economic.

VOL. IV
No. 83

democracy

March 1947

CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher

1165 Broadway, New York City

A Tangled Country And Worse-Tangled World

H. A. Jackson Concludes 'Out of the Frying Pan into the Baruch Atomic Fire

Mr. Jackson in February 'democracy' proposed an U.N. Commission to control all our resources including conditioning them for redistribution to every country of the world and at uniform and fair non-monopolistic costs. This formula has not satisfied some all-at-once anti-monopolists.

Strictly according to Economic Science they are right. But the strict economist Jackson also admits having an eye to the getting of economics into international as well as other law: and so does not depart from the truism that Rome took more than one day to build, as some do.

If the Russians win in that contest for oil in the Near East, their government will operate those resources mainly for the benefit of the Russian bureaucrats. If the British and Americans win, are those resources to be owned, controlled and operated for the benefit of the American people? Not by a jug full. They will be turned over to an oligarchy of British and American monopolies such as the Standard Oil, the Dupont outfit, the General Electric Co., etc., and will be operated solely for the benefit of the manipulators of those corporations.

If we enter war with other nations, it is understood that those resources will be used to win for our side: meaning that our monopolists will be permitted to operate them for their own benefit. While the war is being fought, the American people will be taxed and bonded for billions to pay for that war, and mortgaged into the dim future in the process. After that war, the burden of principle and interest, together with the regular peacetime exactions will continue 'til time is no more. This is what privately owned and governmental-sponsored natural resources mean.

By the time the people have read miles upon miles of diplomatic double-talk, camouflaged by a sprinkling of chauvinistic home-grown patriotism, they have entirely lost sight of the fact that those fakery are really not fighting for the people's interest, but for an exclusive seat at the hash-table of privilege from now on.

Thus, if the people of the whole world, and especially America, can shake the cobwebs off their brains, they may force the U.N. to see that the natural resources of the world are operated for their benefit, and so release Nature's yield to all alike and at the same price to all, at cost of production for private fabrication and refinement. Then, no excuse for war will any longer exist.

At nearly every turn our State Department has pulled Britain's chestnuts out of the fire, and we have built up such a deep-rooted suspicion for us on the part of the Russians, that it is difficult to eliminate it now.

TO REPEAT, IT ISN'T BECAUSE the diplomats fail to understand each other, that friction and delay results, because they understand each other too well.

Nationally sponsored frontmen for private privilege recognize across the diplomatic table, other wolves of the same calibre and know that no holds must be barred if they are to win; especially when it is the common people who must pay for them. The common people of no land, cut the slightest figure in such a struggle excepting to furnish the cannon fodder, in case it is necessary to fight with bombs, for the prize.

Asserting the right of the people of the world, to nature's gift to all the people of the world, would not mean communism, but simply an assertion of the right of all men to nature's gifts to all men.

After these resources are liberated to the people on those terms, every other activity should be made as free as the air and without governmental interference or penalty, as long as every other man's rights are respected.

Then and then only, will enterprise be really free and then only will there be a general understanding between men of all races.

We have no right to sell the birthright of future generations for "a mess of pottage." The future of civilization is at stake: let us face the facts.

Reduced to its lowest terms, it is common ownership and administration of nature's gifts in natural resources, and freedom from governmental interference in every other particular, or else it is economic and eventual practical slavery for a world ignorant enough to permit the present system to continue, or Baruch's system to come into being.

H. A. Jackson, 8510 Larga Avenue, Los Angeles 26, Calif.

HUMAN RIGHTS

RIGHTS OF MAN—AND THE RIGHTS OF MEN

IT HAS TAKEN A LOT OF looking to see the obvious inseparability of these two quite simple rights. And believe it or not, to this day thru the middle ages of great philosophers, statesmen, writers and economists down to now, no one but Henry George has made a properly rounded statement of what our SOCIAL and INDIVIDUAL RELATIONSHIP actually is.

Meantime the subject has been footed with on a tremendous scale. Examples: by our Declaration and Constitution, by Marx's 2000 pages, for the Proletarian; and against the individual F.D.R.'s Revolution 'That Was', costing us tax-paying-suckers say (conservatively) \$500 billion and 5 million precious lives.

And today keen writers are calling George a socialist and democracy an obvious failure (or original sin) which shows us the most horrible example: which A. J. Neck is forcing on our attention in his 'Our Enemy the State', in his reluctant conviction that we cannot in calculable time muster the necessary indignation and intelligence to escape this enemy.

And it is not that the means of escape are not known and instantly available: considering that the 'WES' who suffer are between 95 and 100% of everyone: VS. the 'precious parasites' 0 to 5%—BUT that our State has our sources of education, information, and even ethical and spiritual influence so CORRUPTED that we cannot escape from its evil influence.

INDIVIDUALISM ONLY CAN SAVE US

AND IT CAN ONLY DO IT BY saving capitalism and democracy. In other words our CIVILIZATION, now by threatening to go by the board, as have all previous ones, can only be saved by consolidating these three systems and perfecting their relationship. Neither can be even pictured without both the others.

Let us check this over: Individualism's most intimate partner is industry which is labor and capital. Labor without democracy would be like the union-labor-monopoly of today reduced from probably 125 million to 15. Capital relies on maximum production, volume, employment, profit.

And these three, alone or together cannot survive without a REVERSAL of our economic system resulting in doubling production and employment by UNTAXING products. And by freeing all natural products from present monopoly by shift of the taxes to that monopoly.

So while it might be said that saving either of our other indispensable would save our society, since they are integers of economic existence, the problem does not change. This is our way of life corrected and made to work. The other ways are first the old way of boom and bust: or that of Modern Monopoly, Bureaucracy and Storkdon.

on which rest poverty, domestic and world-war.

Our individualism and democracy, say of Jefferson, and even his precedent Declaration and subsequent Constitution, failed to note that our total estate was about half each individual and social. And that no ideology or Statute of Justice, Peace or Prosperity could exist so long as this indisputable fact was unrecognized in our Basic and Statute laws.

ACCESS BEING ON EQUAL terms to all, no inequalities would then generate wars. This agency should withhold such resources from aggressor nations, should they seek to use their share for aggression.

A policy of conservation should protect the interests of the present and of future generations, in the production and use of those agencies, which as I have indicated, are a natural heritage of all people, of all lands and of all ages. Not only would such a policy prevent the major cause of war, but all the great privileged corporations now dealing in natural resources and legislatively created privileges, then would be forced to do business on the same terms as any other business organization, and we would for the first time in human history, enjoy real "free enterprises."

Leave those monopolistic leverages in private hands under a fascist administered super-military governing power such as Baruch's plan would create, and atomic processes will serve only to fasten on the unprivileged of the whole world, a master class which would never be shaken off.

With individual national sovereign power, relating to national defense surrendered, and the sole military power vested in a super state, such as that power would make the U.N., the whole world would be at the mercy of the directors of that mighty organization.

BEFORE I CLOSE, I WANT to call attention to another misapprehension in current thought. This is the question of understanding or lack of it, between Russia and America. It becomes very irksome to have to listen to well-meaning alleged liberals chime in with dyed-in-the-wool reactionaries in chanting the same dirge. They repeat, "Why can't the Russians understand us and the purity of our motive?" The Russians come back with the same arguments about us not being able to understand them.

The answer to it all is that both peoples could understand if they were given the true facts to work on. As the case stands, the Russian people are given a censored and garbled account of the facts with extraneous chauvinistic matter thrown in.

The American people are treated to what amounts to a censorship of the real facts, thru the garbled account given this country by its diplomats and leaders. The real bones of contention are never permitted to be brought to light for the common people of either side to see.

There is no misunderstanding among the diplomats of both sides, either of their respective peoples, or of the real issues at stake. The real reason for the contention is that they understand each other and the issues only too well. They realize and understand that it would be fatal for them to doze for an instant, or the other sharks would have their shirts. What I mean by this is that the present and in fact all friction, whether diplomatic or military, results because of the struggle for possession of the Earth's strategic natural resources. No tactics, no matter how foul, are barred in such a contest, and it would be a grave mistake from their point of view, to trust their diplomatic opponents, or take their respective peoples into their confidence, where privileged interests are at stake.

IT IS ALWAYS WAR TO THE hilt, with the common people doing all the fighting, and the prize going to privileged. In the last several hundred years, there hasn't been a major war that hasn't been fought for those prizes.

The Russian manipulators are trying to corral all the oil and other natural resources and bring them under their domination, for their own use and to prevent their use by their military opponents. From all accounts of their methods, the Russian people do not get anything in particular from such acquisition because of the bureaucrats' habit of turning the cream to their own benefit, rather than to the Russian people. While the Russian People are a million times better off than they were under the czars, still they are a long way from benefiting in proportion to Russia's capabilities.

When the Russian people were trying to free themselves from czarism, all the great nations, including this country, ganged up on them and made it just as tough for them as possible. The Russians haven't forgotten this, nor the fact that the Russian offers to disarm and encourage open trade relations were turned down because control by Britain was not included in the arrangement.

At nearly every turn our State Department has pulled Britain's chestnuts out of the fire, and we have built up such a deep-rooted suspicion for us on the part of the Russians, that it is difficult to eliminate it now.

This is why the Russians with their crude diplomatic methods find it difficult to hide the feeling which the crafty but polished diplomatic methods of the other powers make it so easy to observe.

RUSSIA IS A DICTATORSHIP just as truly as was Nazi Germany and its half-baked communistic economy will undoubtedly cause the fall of that country, because of the economic fallacies contained in communism. Communism must eventually and gradually shift vast power into the hands of few men, and that power will always be abused, no matter in whose hands it rests.

However, the present Russian dictatorship is operated by able and intelligent men who can see that tremendous power is now wielded by crafty and self-seeking men in other countries like ours, where democracy is supposed to rule. They can see that the rank and file of the people are densely ignorant of what is really going on in their names. This is the reason they mean to see that if anybody is to be taken for a ride, it won't be them.

If we had been frank and cooperative with the Russian at the outset, I believe that we would have had a thousand times less trouble with them at this time than we are experiencing. They don't trust our diplomats, and who can blame them?

The British and the Americans are trying to achieve the same goal for our side, as are the Russians: and what do we mean by "Our side?"

A REPRESENTATIVE OF our State Department said recently, "We have sacrificed so much of our natural resources in the war, that we are entitled to share part of the oil of the Near East." Then further explanation revealed the fact that what he meant by "We" was that the Standard Oil Co., was to get that oil.



CHARLES H. INGERSOLL

50 years an industrialist and student of Scientific Economics. Co-ordinator, in 1892, of the 'watch that made the dollar famous'. 500 million sold. Record broadcaster and lecturer, Economics and Taxation, nearly every State. President National Tax Relief Association. Ed. 'democracy', 1165 Broadway, New York City.

Ruggedness

WHAT IS RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM?

THIS QUESTION SHOULD BE answered accurately by its friends so that attacks from its enemies may be more effectively met. For now the Marxists are applying the accusing name to our industrialism which is all our labor and capital: and destroying them in fratricidal 'class-conscious warfare.'

Here for a moment we should compare the positions of George whose name is the only rallying point for the democratic system, and Marx whose name stands for destruction of that system. For more clear-cut oppositeness nothing could be.

RUGGED means all-out individual. It means that there is nothing BUT individual. There is no attempt, in this definition, to discover whether in the heaven and earth of the whole universe there is any possible conflict with this all-out ruggedness. Did the earth itself and the heaven above all belong to the individual?

The principle of the individual — free and supreme — is not brought into question. In fact it is only to make secure that principle and all individual property and rights, that economists such as George, recognized and insisted on individualism recognizing—that there is something besides the individual: and without which he could not exist in peace and prosperity.

HOW TO SAVE INDIVIDUALISM FROM ITSELF?

NOT WITH PHYSICAL FORCE against its ignorant collectivist class-war. Certainly not by defending it in any false position. And certainly not by denying the rights of SOCIETY when even the Socialist doesn't understand those rights. For he is in this exact position of EXCESS RUGGEDNESS.

Individual's rights are inalienable. As such we should defend them—even to death—against every encroachment even of society or government. But Society is composed of all individuals and as such also enjoys equal inalienability of rights. And hence the individual can only protect his rights by ceding society's rights.

It is upon this simple and obvious point that practically all our world confusion of this day and age hinges. This point comprises the prime economic issue on which rests all the other major issues. The economic issue is that of PROPERTY and OWNERSHIP

MAKING A MAGAZINE OF UNIVERSAL FREEDOM GROW

THIS MEANS FREEDOM OF ALL PEOPLE, OF INDUSTRY AND OF WORLD TRADE

DEAR MR. INGERSOLL.—SO YOU PRINTED MY LETTER, and I'm tickled pink. It is the first time in years that an editor has printed anything of mine that I wanted to write and enjoyed writing about Henry George and the Single Tax.

Now I'll get right to work and tell you why I wrote and what I'm driving at. Nowadays we are told to be PRACTICAL, to be REALISTIC, and FACE UP TO THINGS AS IS.

All right. That's fine. That's the way to do. I have a bit of a creed on that line that I've worked on for years and found it pays off, as the saying is. This is it: **BE IN WHERE YOU ARE, WITH WHAT YOU'VE GOT, AND THEN GO ON FROM THERE.**

And now, Mr. Ingersoll, why did I write that long letter which you were good enough to print? It was because it struck me that you were putting out a little paper with three or four headline propositions that ought to be read by enough American people to elect the next president and Congress to make those propositions into the laws of the land.

Now that's biting off a pretty big chunk to chew on, but I'm in a position to know that that's just what some mighty big and influential people are out to do right now, and I'm saying that the time has come for we American people to get into the game early and do some of the policy-making and candidate-picking on our own hook.

Now let's have a look at that proposition and pace it off on all four sides and get the dimensions of it. To begin with, let's face up to the fact that we are in a mess. I'm no pessimist. I don't believe in glooms and dooms and morbid melancholies. We American people do too much worrying about things—and most of all we worry and wait, whimper and whine, and do nothing, while all sorts of special groups, (business, religious, political and what have you) are as busy as beavers "cooking up schemes" to puzzle our wits and rake in our dollars.

And that's why it occurred to me to write under the mask of We American People in Person. The great Emerson once wrote, "Speak your latent thought, and it shall be the universal sense," and I believe that most all the American people feel, and think and believe and want just about the way I feel and think and believe and want.

Mr. Wallace has made much of his saying that this is the century of the common man. So far, Mr. Wallace is dead right. That's what's turning the whole world upside down. All of a sudden, within these few years that I have lived, some two and a quarter billion human beings on this planet have commenced to feel the stir of something as brand new and revolutionary as ever moved the human mind in any age of the past. And the new something is as old as man himself: people want to live better and have more to live for. And that's the most wonderful thing so far produced by the progress of mankind.

My old friend, Russell Conwell, the Great American Preacher who preached and lectured to more people than any other man of recent times and left behind him a Great Church in Philadelphia, a Great College, a Great Hospital, and a vision that's running like new wine through all this earth—

In my last chat with him before he died, he said two things, one of which dazed me as with a sock of the fist, the other dazed me like the rising and shining of the sun. The first went like this:

"As I look back over the fifty years during which I suppose I have talked and preached and lectured to more people than any other American man or woman, I am saddened by one appalling fact. People will not face up to their opportunities, take hold of their governments and their institutions, and make them work to accomplish what they were invented to do."

And then he added sadly and a bit cynically, it is impossible

to overestimate the ignorance of people—everywhere it is the same story,—rich and poor alike—there isn't a bit of difference between them—they will not listen—they will not learn—so awful and inevitable and saddening and true is the saying of the old Prophet Isaiah: "Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider."

But further along he said something that will remain with me warmly, hopefully and happily to the end of my days. He said:

If we American people would only learn how to work together we'd all rise together and everything would go on all right.

And there's where I drop anchor, Mr. Ingersoll, and go to fishing for what I hope will be a whole of a catch. In the name and behalf of We American People I want to see a million new subscribers mail one consecutive dollar bill for "democracy" with the small 'd' and get help to your three headline propositions:

1. That State and Government are great social inventions by which all of us can work together for the health, prosperity and happiness of each one of us.

2. That the ills and woes and wars that sink us in a wallow and welter of bloodshed and butchery are largely thrust upon us by state and governments that are run, not by the people themselves,—but by privileged classes,—that run them upon the old, outmoded, and outdated principle that the purpose and object of governments and laws are to control the people and make them behave.

Now, when it comes right down to brass tacks and facts, We American People dished and abolished that whole idea of the State and Government and laws, and our forefathers and mothers had to fight a revolutionary war to do it. Our Declaration and Constitution set up an ideal of the state, and a Government to make the ideal work, that are about as perfect as can be conceived by the mind of man, and every man and woman of sense and experience knows that's so.

3. And your third headline proposition is that taxation is the one sovereign power of state by which the Government lives, and that a right system of taxation makes for the healthy, prosperity and happiness of the people, and that a wrong system of taxation can and does balk and block and handicap and kill what it is invented to promote and protect.

Now Mr. Ingersoll, I'm facing up to facts and things as they be, when I say my dollars are headed your way to make the U.S.A. work on the lines laid down in Declaration and Constitution. If the New York Times, or Mr. Marshall Field with his hundred million of grandpoo's dollars, or anybody else were in the field with a paper honestly and capably devoted to the principles and objectives as you state them,—I'd be just as dead set to join in and help them.

But there's a special reason why I'm out to do my part to get that million subscribers for "democracy" with the small 'd' so that they'll get another million, and the two will get ten million, and the ten will get the other fifteen

million necessary to elect a president and Congress who will know how to make our forty billion dollars of tax money buy more government service than we are now getting.

And now a word about myself. Mind you, I am not a Single-Taxer. I'm getting warm, and I stand ready to do a lot of something for a lot of nothing to help you get the audience your name and reputation and many years of big business success entitle you to have.

That 500,000,000 watches is no fairy tale, and what you have done in a business way entitles you to be taken seriously in what you are now out to do. My line has been words, and what I am most peeved about is that in my forty years of writing and publishing I have never found it possible to get in a word about George and Single Tax, although I know that a great many of the best writers of our time have been, and are, as sympathetic toward George's great book and his taxation ideas as you are, and as I am.

In a recent magazine article I find Stuart Chase saying he has always liked the single-tax idea and would like to see it tried. I knew the once famous, now forgotten, Tom Johnson; and also I knew Joseph Fels, the wealthy Soap Man who made a Cranside of Single Tax—and I have books of very able men, such as the late Rev. Rauschenbush, whose Social Gospel changed the whole atmosphere and tempo of Religion from his time on—

And I once heard the famous Catholic Priest, Dr. McGlynn, in an address to a crowded audience in New York's famous Academy on 14th Street, and never have I heard a more Christian and Powerful Exposition of the Single Tax Morality, Philosophy and Religion. "And as far back as I can remember, when I had reached college and was working my way through, I scragged up enough money to go to New York on purpose to see Mr. George, who was then running the Standard in a little ramshackle office on Ann Street. Mr. George presented me with autographed copies of all his books which were among my most sacred heir looms until a storage-house fire destroyed them along with a whole life-accumulation of books, papers, files and household belongings that meant more to me than ten times their value in money.

And once, believe it or not, I got up a meeting for Mr. George in a Western city and introduced him to a large audience gathered to hear his lecture on Messes.

Thus I have known many prominent and influential men and women, and have read of a great many more who have said openly that they were urged and "inspired to vaster issues" by George's Progress and Poverty—Bernard Shaw, that brilliant but sassy old British cynic, among them—

And there was Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Interior, the name slips me at the moment, who told in a book of a "poll" he operated to find who were the three greatest men America had produced, and he said Henry George was one of the three finally agreed upon.

Now Mr. Ingersoll, I'm for putting that Great American where you have put him in your masthead, between Jefferson and Lincoln, because I have read most all the economists and have found Henry George to be the Greatest of them all—Great because he showed how America has grown Great on democracy and free enterprise, and can go on and be still Greater if Declaration and Constitution are more clearly understood and vigorously applied by an awakened, and organized public opinion to quit fooling and go to work on safe, sane, sound and sensible lines.

Therefore, because you come in from the business side—from the side of one of the biggest busi-

Conflicts in Economic Teaching

THE ENTANGLEMENT OF HENRY GEORGE WITH KARL MARX

THIS CONFUSION IS PARALLEL to that of democracy with communism and with similar reasons. They are mainly two:—(1) Reactionary aim to discredit George and democracy. (2) Similar defects in the equally important portions of our economy, the Social and the Individual which only George and democracy would correct.

This entanglement is tragic in its consequence, especially to that of efficient teaching of political economy. Yet its features are simple and their correction should not be difficult. Our whole American aspiration has been to human freedom which is democracy, to wealth production thru industrialism which is capitalism.

And these have involved us, with no other possibility, in the philosophy of individual initiative or individualism. To this end we have proudly attached "RUGGED" which Marxists or Statists have seized on, to stigmatize our enterprise.

And these Statists were smart at several points that have made them the very effective scoldings of our Democratic Individualist Capitalism. And these points are still open to our enlightenment and have not been grasped and dealt with by our best and biggest forces.

IS OUR CIVILIZATION DOOMED?

IT WAS ALWAYS 'THE fashion' to call serious discussion or warning DEFEATISM or pessimism. And in the ups and downs of something like a century it has been impossible to get much attention from 'average persons' because of this fashion. But quite a few (millions of) people are so scared into listening at present that I feel some urge for counter-warning.

HOPELESSNESS is about as easy to find in these revolutionary, murdering, frothy times as formerly professional optimism was. So another form of hysteria,

ness successes achieved in America—and because from where I stand it is business that most needs and can do most to put over a tax system to do what George said it would do:

Increase wages for Labor, Increase Profits for Capital, stop the Capital-Labor fight and make them mutually cooperative friends, and carry our whole free-enterprise system to Heights of Health, Prosperity and Happiness beyond anything so far known among nations and peoples.—

Well, if I had the million dollars I had before '29, and which by '33 had "gone where the wood-bine twined," as you once famous Boss Tweed used to say, I'd subscribe for the million readers right now, and make them a present of a six months' reading of "democracy with the small d."

But there's a better way. One dollar per each from a million readers is about a million times better than a million dollars from any one person. And if you'll print this letter, Mr. Ingersoll, I'll fire another at you that'll tell why that dollar per each ought to flow in thick and fast if We American People are going to save our industrial civilization, both for our own Health, Prosperity and Happiness, and to throw the whole weight of our great adventure of democracy toward better things for better living for all mankind—through the state as the friend of the people, and governments their servants.

And with all good wishes, will you let me go on signing myself, **We American People—In Person**

CONFUSIONS THAT ARE COSTLY

THAT THE GEORGE DOCTRINE is communistic, is held by some intelligent and well-meaning persons. The reasons for the mistake are two:—

(1) George exploited individualism's failure to recognize the community's right to ANY share in the community-created estate, to which extent communism is right.

(2) Careless teachers, text-writers and critics have failed to keep the line clear between communism and Georgian economics. Examples: they teach common land ownership and ending private ownership. George doctrine relates only to land values or rent.

These "confusions" of OPPOSITES in the first principle of the Master Science of Political Economy by an ignorant or careless public and by careless or fellow-traveling teachers, take the edge from teaching that can afford no confusions. World-monopoly and its hand-maiden of deadly taxation accounting for 200 or 300% of price inflation are involved.

This confusion calls attention to natural solution under right leadership.—BOTH individualists and collectivists are HALF-RIGHT and HALF-WRONG. The combined estate of property and land value is half each private and social. We claim ALL as private and they claim ALL for Community or Society. Meeting half-way and burying our RUGGEDness would be the solution.

more or less impedes rational thought. Still it is 'democracy's' conviction and purpose to EXCLUDE the defeatism of either our Society or our Democracy; or to have a permanent ENEMY STATE.

In a few words, such purpose is worthy of recording:—I accept the George-Noek theory that the State, driven from the defense of basic monopoly and product-taxation automatically becomes our friend. I agree with George (against Noek) that the masses can be educated in SIMPLE ECONOMICS.

In fact our educational problem I don't think can be laid at the door of the masses by the simple process of changing a space to 'them assee.' I think our job is to break thru the ivory towers of 1500 colleges, 12,000 high schools, 25,000 papers and say 1 million all-round High-brows.

★

DARE WE NOT KNOW WE ARE BROKE?

TWO EMINENT COLUMNISTS raise this little question—almost in one day: Prof. Haney of N.Y.U. and Mark Sullivan. Writers don't give much enlightenment because "ostich-playing" has been our only official policy on this subject so no FACTS are RELEASED. In private life the INFERENCE is sufficient.

Of course if NOBILITY is to displace economics, if our world is to displace our country and militarism to become our guide, this is but one of many more rules we have thought inviolate that we shall have to forget—the rule that loans can't be made from liabilities.

Mr. Sullivan observes some truisms along these conservative lines: but then in a day or two he seems to get much kick from the Truman idea of ending world-communism with DEPTIC lending.

Prof. Haney soberly discusses the outlying circumstances of the New Deal—Great Britain unlimited debt theory, the war we had, the cost. And now the two practical phases we face—the immensity of another and greater war, and unlimited repudiation of debt and unlimited more debt.

PESSIMISM, OPTIMISM AND REALISM OF GREAT WRITERS

REVIEWS OF NOCK, GEORGE AND GARRETT SHOWING WHERE WE STAND

SHALL WE ACCEPT NOCKISM? I HAVE JUST FINISHED RE-reading (after 10 years) his 'Our Enemy the State' and will put in a few words a reaction that seems like a 'parting-of-ways' decision of life or death. With Hamlet: 'To be or not to be!' This book says there's no use. (By Carxon Printers, Caldwell, Ida. Price \$2.50).

Nock sets up this claim and stays by it in 290 pages of historical and logical proof. This means, to him, that our continued physical existence depends on our destruction of the state—our government. And not by revolution but by reversal of the State's process of destruction of Society by absorption of its power.

I shall have to do a little defining for the author; as to me, his lines between society, government and the state are not as clear as I'd like them. And before I comment too much I shall study this tremendous volume again to avoid any misstep.

His State, I should say, is the present bureaucracy and collectivism so far as developed: but hardly less our 'enemy' are any of its predecessors such as Feudalism and its outcome of the 'Merchant-State,' and especially our own Rugged Individualism, called Democracy.

NOCK'S 'ENEMY THE STATE' REVIEWED

AT PAGE 40 HE CITES JEFFERSON, Parkman, Schölkraft, and Spencer, as describing American Indian and other old-world tribes, as having Social Codes protecting them against such trespasses as fraud, theft, assault, adultery, murder, etc.—but no government.

Nock challenges this last statement and its implication that their code was imperative because of lack of enforcement. Their statements all indicated that there was even better enforcement than we, on the average, have by our elaborate State.

Then he proceeds to argue—that is, wanting in positiveness—that such government, which he insists this 'social code' is, would displace the present 'enemical' modern tyranny we call government of the state—which he describes as having pumped all its substance from the social order, transforming social power into state power.

At page 44 he cites a line of philosophers, Economists, etc. accounting for the Social-State complex he describes. And for their divergence as to cause, as due to lack of observation of some common fault (as for example the failure to find the cause of malaria till recent 'discovery' of the mosquito). I question both his reasoning on this point and his 'skeet' citation.



P. O. Lincoln 50 E. 69th St. New York, N.Y.

Return postage GUARANTEED SECTION 352—L. N. K. 146

IS NOT ECONOMIC SCIENCE OPTIMISTIC?

MY PRESENT IMPRESSION is that if he would include Jefferson, Paine and himself in his generalization and attribute their failure to agree and to DISCOVER, to their failure to observe the incidence of TAXATION and MONOPOLY, he would have come close to his mark.

This means that our political failure and all its many and tragic entailments, such as poverty and wars, is due wholly and obviously to ignorance of simple economic principles which would end the exploitation of 98% of all the people by the 2% monopolizers of the earth.

This failure of observation makes the state an oppressive, tyrannical and parasitical government batten down upon and displacing a natural Social Code or Formula which would be perfect in the Central function if the obvious economic readjustment were made.

Nock has made the observation basic to this comprehensive statement and quotes others who also have. But they all seem at fault in conclusion, concentration and action upon their own knowledge. And so continue to write books.

To the 'average reader' there is a constant need for knowing more exactly the Nock meaning of State, Government and Society and perhaps also such as merchant-State and other groupings.

THE STATE, SOCIETY AND GOVERNMENT

NOCK 'SOCIETY' SEEMS TO be people individually and collectively in all their ordinary and natural relationships of getting a living. Government is perhaps best described by our Declaration of Independence and in contrast to the Constitution as stolen by special interests.

Government I take to be the Nock ideal of what a state is supposed to be and could be if we the people were enlightened enough to demand that it GOVERN FOR OUR INTEREST and stop-off the racketeers who are now using the state to rob us of our birthright.

When Nock indicts and names the State, as stealing the Social in all the affairs of us, the honest, wise and capable people, the politicians, masking as government (as described) build bureaucracy and impoverish the people and all their institutions.

And the conceded hopelessness of our situation is NOT that it could not be easily and quickly reversed, but that there is no great urge anywhere visible for its reversal. This very 'we the people,' the kicking like steers at its acts, still worship at the shrine of this indescribably corrupt and incompetent, discredited institution and refuse to change or reject it.

BRING NOCK TO A CONCLUSION IN HIS FOOTNOTES AND quotations he is more himself and makes one feel like appealing to him to RE-WRITE, not only NOCK, but his 'JEFFERSON' and 'HENRY GEORGE'. This may be 'democracy's' little 'd' job! (Read pp. 182 to 209) What ARE Society, State and Government—the first need of a Nock Review?

This query may explain my previous mild criticisms of Nock, I.E. (a) that he had not recognized the modern NECESSITY for a state (b) that he had not made his Jefferson supply a simple workable formula; therefore (c) or (and) made his Henry George clothe this formula with the only finality of economics.

This obviously is unfair criticism. Yet my second reading after 1 or 2 decades of further study compels me to complain that this remarkable book is too much like a (philosophic) anarchist cry for abolition of government which we know cannot be done and which we (including Nock!) know need not be even suggested if the Geogeuon Doctrine of Economics were adopted.

'COMMUNISM SPREADING FAST IN AMERICA'

THERE'S A HEADLINE I LIKE—considering where it is perched on page one in N. Y. Times. I didn't say I liked the fact—the horrible truth. What I like is the acknowledgment of it, boldly, by the leading 'news authority.'

Times' Editor didn't quite mean it as I 'got it.' In fact, I guess I missed letter 'd' on America, which sidesteps the vital issue of this SPREAD, making it appear as if it were only true of our South American brethren and sis-tem when it is more true of the U.S.A. of North America.

Playing ostrich is the main divertissement of the biggest editors. The little ones can afford to see and say things as they are. Our beautiful collection of STATUS QUOS are in the keeping of our biggest individual and chain newspapers which probably comprise at least three-fourths of total circulation.

Their managers' smartness is subject to little discount in holding a measure of reader-confidence in their sincerity: so that from year-to-year the game of 'Our Enemy the State' goes along underground with little suggestion of revolution.

'THE REVOLUTION WAS': GARRETT

I HAVE JUST READ THIS remarkable 'Booklet' by Garett Garrett and sold by the Carxon Printers of Caldwell, Ida. for 50c. It is what I call an analysis and synthesis of the New Deal: respectful, factual—and a conclusion consistent with this title.

The Garrett is doubtless a Republican, this book is by no means a typical partisan blast; but holds to the historian's dignity and fidelity in proving that there was a revolution, consciously aimed at our capitalist system by a 'governmental capitalism' which could only end in a complete statism or communism.

What's the typical GOP enemy has been instinctively—perhaps recklessly—charging, this pamphlet (of 25 big pages) proves, step-by-step. As a little brother to Nock's 'Our Enemy the State' these publishers are throwing this searchlight on the mechanism by which our speed into 'Statism' has taken on a truly modern tempo.

There is but one major difference between those two powerful writers and it relates to CAUSATION—Nock accounts for 'this tragic trend toward SERFDOM as Basic Monopoly while Garrett, giving a more detailed and accurate story of the process, does not search the reasons, for such a destructive and illogical course.

SO WHAT, MR. NOCK, OR ELSE?

MR. NOCK IN THE LAST pages and in agonized phrase, but calmly—almost coldly—declares it to be his unalterable conviction that our 142,000,000 people are lost! That they are too deeply 'hipped' by the myriad of FETTERINGS our state is sunk in, to be for ages at least, rescued from this enemy.

Mind you, Nock is not trifling with such things as a change of administration. He shows where ALL administrations have gone the same course. It is the system of state-intervention—that is INCORRIGIBLE. And so only because it coincides with our low mass I.Q.

Our state devotes itself to the special interests that pay most! This system impoverishes the masses and thrives on unemployment, poverty, class-labor-war and world-war. It is what 'democracy' calls the 'Monopoly System,' supported, and supported by, the 'Product-Tax-System.'

Now my tentative conclusion which I wish Mr. Nock were alive to discuss with me—The book comes with evidence of a unitary cause of the state-debacle; that we mutually describe it, in varying terms. That cause must be removed: IT IS MONOPOLY.

WHEN AND WHERE DID THE REVOLUTION START?

GARRETT STARTS IT IN 1929-32 with the New Deal. He does not hurry or play ostrich with his picture of the economic emergency which made it possible for smart men, led by the new President, to actually plan and put over a real but bloodless revolution. His implication is clear enough that there was deep rooted cause; but this story starts there.

Here is where these two books are indispensable to each other and where these western printers are functioning, as a FREE PRESS which the rest of their vast field only prints about. Nock shows us where revolutions, like this even as planned in nine sadistic stages as here wrought out, don't grow in fifteen or twenty years.

So putting these two books together we find we have plenty to do if we still have faith in ETERNAL VERITIES. Meaning, let us say, faith that the UNIVERSE was created by Jehovah or NATRRE with LAW for its operation. And that it's not too much for such beings as we are, to do that job.

Nock proves that the State has come to be ANTI-SOCIAL. And believes its deterioration of us humans is so profound that we may not be expected to throw off the yoke of Monopoly of Our Earth and consequent impoverishing 'Taxation. Garrett supports in detail the aggression of State against Society; and rather also Nock's view of our inability to find and enforce a remedy, THEO IT IS IN PLAIN SIGHT!

A PARALLEL OF DESTRUCTION

NOCK'S STATEISM IS NATURALLY destructive, thru its inherent favor for special interests and disfavor for the common individual good. Garrett builds much the same sort of institution but in dynamic terms and of such devilish ingenuity as to give wonderful point to the Nock generalization.

This revolutionary form is a marvel of intimate knowledge or vivid imagination or both. It portrays in nine divisions or successive steps: (1) Seizing Political Power (2) Ditto Economic Power (3) Propaganda of Hatred (4) Merging in 2 greatest classes (5) Liquidate or Shackle Business (6) Softening the Individual (7) Reduce all Rivals (8) Perpetual Unlimited Debt (9) Government Capitalism.

It would appear that while, as in Nock's view, the State had been relentlessly aiding and abetting our destruction by basic-monopoly and product-taxation, it had not really got down to this destroying-business till FDR came along with his New Deal Revolution, since when leaps and bounds had been the order.

And that is OUR big question to mull over in dead earnest right now—has this 'revolution' been anything different or brought us anything different in kind, or only in degree or tempo; than what we have been getting right along—for a few hundred or thousand years?

CAN WE GET A NEW START FOR FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY?

WE HAVE HERE TWO GREAT author-leaders whom we must marshal into our service. Nock's work is done; we may take it or leave it. Garrett may help us use his. They agree that our State is destroying our Society; or that our Government is destroying US the People. One leaves us the reason for this destructiveness; and his doubt of our ability to cure it.

The other has nothing to say as to a basic economic cause or whether reversing his 9-point-order of destruction would spell 'CURE' to him. The Nock 'reason' is our permitting the MONOPOLY OF THE EARTH ITSELF. And his doubt is that the required intelligence can be mustered to vote

WHAT IS GOVERNMENTAL CAPITALISM?

THIS IS THE CLIMACTIC ninth problem of the revolution and hence presumed to be 'our way of life' at this confused ending of the New Deal in a landslide G.O.P. election. Was this revolution completed? Or was it a still-born, viewed from the totalitarian distance?

If it WAS a revolution as per the Garrett title, that's that—and some problem, but if it is a figure of speech, a 'wake-up America's' headline there are two contingencies of different kind—(1) we can go on and set up democracy and capitalism—both of the real kind and for the first time in history.

(2) We can slip back into the old status quo of G.O.P. monopolism when N.D. and FDR took over; or G.O.P. could throw over monopoly and become our STATIST FRIEND. It would make capitalism what it's supposed to be. So the question is whether these two books will scare us, the people, or our politicians in either of two ways?

Shall we accept the Nock challenge that we are not compositely smart enough to see that our one world should not be monopolized by PRECIOUS PARASITES,—to turn our state from Enemy to Friend. Or shall we make another try at Counter-Revolution starting at 9 and retracing thru all the problems to where the revolution started?

OF EVILS WE SHOULD CHOOSE NEITHER

THE EVILS ARE 'GOVERNMENT capitalism' (see Communism); and basic Monopolism and Product-Taxation. These we identify positively from this 'Revolution Was' book. And by this we have all seen with our own eyes for say the last 20 years; I.E. the merger of the two rottenest political and economic systems; and two world and one continuous, civil labor war.

We are now poising between the two evil extremes we are trying to describe: the old deal Nock has pictured in a thousand year expanse and the Garrett New Deal Government Capitalism which seems to be little, but the modern K. Marx State Socialism.

And it remains to be seen if we shall jump from this frying pan, do a few spirals and nose-dive into this fire—OR WHETHER we can reject both evils, and even if it does take 100 years, go straight, midway between Monopolism and Communism and comfortably into FREEDOM!

It's as simple as that. And to bring us to a mile-post, comma or semi-colon in this discussion, we only need a few words of definition of what we mean by Freedom. But we can fail even at that simplicity if we don't hold it to a scheme which in itself will demonstrate what we are describing. Freedom's number one plank is freedom from Entanglement. And some of many fatal Entanglements are discussed in other columns of this issue of 'democracy'.

so ridiculous a social crime into reversal.

Whether Garrett, after going the whole distance of proving the Nock case against the New Deal State can or wishes to take the reverse of Nock's opinion, and that there is, or has been, or can be a friendly or constructive State, such as the G.O.P. might constitute, we may know from another volume.

Political circumstances of the past dozen years do not favor such reversal. The G.O.P. has not shown any form in any opposition to the revolution. And in fact it has shown many signs of collaboration with the enemy; and today has no program containing any definite principles for foreign or domestic operation to effectively oppose the 9 steps of the revolution.