

THOMAS JEFFERSON HENRY GEORGE ABRAHAM LINCOLN

democracy

with the small "d"

VOL. VII. No. 48. CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher MAY 15, 1941 1165 Broadway, N.Y. Yearly \$1. Ten Times 25¢

WHEN THE PRESIDENT ANNOUNCED A NEW GROUP OF 'FREEDOMS,' I was disappointed at their lack of novelty; and what I wanted to suggest to him as substitutes were really new—in class and kind—they are economic freedoms and bear directly on everyone's activity and productivity.

They are: first, freedom to produce, and next, freedom to exchange or trade. This statement has application to our present tragic war situation, since the agreement is almost complete that the cause of war is economic.

Right now both these freedoms are brought up for discussion; and it is only through lack of widespread discussion that these most vital of freedoms are withheld, and that war therefore goes ruthlessly on.

FREEDOM TO PRODUCE WEALTH IS MAN'S MOST FUNDAMENTAL natural right. It follows immediately man's right to life, because he can sustain life only by production. Hence, also follows his right to access to the only source of raw materials for production—the earth.

In England this natural principle finds most positive demonstration:— 47,000,000 people must produce, because their foreign supply lines are cut. And so, in theory, they must produce or starve. So when Laborite Leach takes to task Lady Astor, of Cliveden, purely as an example of the landlords who, as Lloyd George said, 'make Britons trespassors on their own soil,' he goes to the very vitals of the first human necessity — freedom to produce— first, without this freedom, the people of Britain must literally die of starvation, which potentially millions of people are now doing.

FREEDOM TO EXCHANGE, ALTHOUGH ACTIVE IN A DISTINCT field, is economically a part of a free production. England has been the pioneer in this first great contribution to economic democracy. She built her empire through employment of freedom of trade, and if she loses that empire, her abandonment of free trade will be the obvious reason. This abandonment may be traced directly to her lack of freedom of production — the coordinate freedom.

Illustrating this prime need in present war distress, the U.S. Congress is considering 'a letting-down of tariff bars.' The Cullen bill would concede the 'cost-of-production basis' of computing duties on English imports vs their American sale price! We can donate billions of cash and materials for war; but we cannot restore a natural freedom — only in a tiny fraction — containing the vital elements of peace.

HOWEVER, HERE IN OUR CONGRESS, AND IN ENGLAND, IN their Parliament, are these two principles positively recognized. Here do we not only recognize that this change would lower prices to our impoverished consumers, but that their wool, linens, etc., would then be available as payment for war material, thus denying 'protectionism.' There the more obvious principle is need of land for production of food, where not over 5% of total consumption is now produced, on fertile soil, which, if it were not monopolized in great estates, could feed many times the population. So do we in our respective national forums debate the two principles of economic freedom — briefly and casually — not realizing that we are near the 'truth that should set us free.'

MONOPOLY IS AN OLD WORD—LIKE DEMOCRACY; IT MEANS exploitation, using man-made law; and ignoring man's natural rights. It does not mean individual or corporate ownership of 'everything.'

WE REAP THE WHIRLWIND!

We are in a World War, AND we are in a Communist Revolution. The world war comes to us directly from the last war — the war breeding Versailles Treaty — jammed through over Wilson's head by French and English diplomats.

Indirectly, this war has the same economic causes as the last one, and which all wars have:— (1) tariff walls; (2) monopoly of natural resources by the 'have nations;' and vital needs of the 'have nots;' (3) poverty in every nation, millions of unemployed, glad to be taken care of in CCC, WPA, and conscription — cheap 'cannon fodder.'

THE COMMUNISTIC REVOLUTION COMES TO US MAINLY BECAUSE, by reason of the economic illiteracy of our cheap political leadership, we do not recognize Unionism as Communism, nor do we sincerely outlaw the latter.

So, in the same grand gesture we deport, imprison, prosecute and persecute labelled (party) Communists and uphold in every branch of our government, and finally, by U.S. Supreme Court decision, the central principle of Marxian Communism, which is Unionism, and denial of property rights.

The 'Class War' is the Communistic phrase denoting the unalterable enmity of employee and employer, labor against capital; and the proletariat against the possessor of wealth. The Union is the prescribed method of conducting this war. There can be no denial of the identity of these isms; nothing but an acknowledgment of dumbness in not recognizing that identity.

THE WHIRLWIND WE ARE REAPING IS A REFORM WHIRLWIND — of liberals and progressives, culminating in the New Deal. This picture of a communistic revolution, going on merrily within a 'world war economy,' is a most ugly one, which not many seem to recognize or trouble themselves about. And as we examine its detail, we can trace its development. A clear cut example is a paper coming to the top from my extensive files: a form letter from the American Association for Labor Legislation of 30 years ago, reporting an attack on it for its I.W.W. activities, by a local 'guild' in Brooklyn. Among its officers were President Wilson, and literally dozens of prominent people in all walks of life, especially the intelligentsia.

UNIONISM IS NOT THE AMERICAN WAY OF GETTING A SQUARE deal for labor, which America does insist on. Strike, sit-down, thuggery, and racketeering are not our style. But there's a large disposition to tolerate the wrong way, as there is not enough intelligence in our leaders to find and pursue the right way. And when this wrong way is backed by our educators and politicians, it gets into the form of a cult, and takes on what looks like popularity. Our democracy is only a half portion because it is based on an unsound system of taxation that breeds basic monopoly. Instead of correcting this system, and thereby making democracy economically as well as politically sound, we tolerate red revolution and mix up in world wars, all of which harmonizes with a 100 billion dollar bureaucracy, which may soon be a 100 per cent Communism.

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

NO MONOPOLY - said Jefferson - will insure NO BUROCRACY.

It takes politics and economics to make --

Vol. 14
No. 41

democracy

Dec. 19
1940

CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Broadcaster

1665 Broadway, New York City Weekly \$1.00 year

Application for 2nd Class Entry pending

WHAT IS AN 'ASSOCIATION FOR LABOR LEGISLATION' THAT

attracts such supporters as a President, de Forrest, Lewisohn, Warburg, Addams, Fisher, Lamont, et al? It is based on the assumption that our laws are against labor per se; that they favor property vs humanity; all of which is good IWW doctrine. IWW has, since 1910, passed through the stages of Socialism, Anarchism, and into that of Red Communism, but which, as the department of action of all these, remains Unionism, or Syndicalism. This is tracing tragic effect back to innocent cause.

Instead of cold-bloodedly examining the assumption referred to, this potpourri of over 100 of all grades and kinds of sentimentalists saw Unionism and Marxism as the only active challenge to the many obvious wrongs tolerated by our democracy; and so they got behind these isms. And if a growth in numbers of the sponsors of these red fallacies was their objective, they may be proud to count 'liberalism' as numbering 26,000,000 now; and also add that 23,000,000 WilkieISTS are potential New Dealers.

NOW WHAT ABOUT THE NEED OF LABOR AND HUMANITY FOR more statute law, and of property's need for less? Do we need more liberalism, or more adherence to both science and sense? A real demonstration of our own laws of property would take 100% care of ALL people, which would include ALL labor, not only the Union minority.

The law of property or wealth is that the producer or creator of it must have it ALL. No one can ask more than 100%. The trouble is that monopoly is now taking half, using our consumer-tax system to do the taking, and leaving the two exclusive producers--labor and capital--goaded by the Communist class-war-cry, to fight over the half which monopoly 'allows' them.

You can readily see that the crux of this tragic difference is the Marx finger pointed at capital, instead of at the basic exploiter -- monopoly and special privilege -- well understood by Jefferson democrats.

THESE LIBERAL LEGISLATION-MONKERS ARE A GOOD REFLEX

of the great aggregation of 26 million present New Dealers; and, if their leader is a reliable indicator, also of 23 million GOP rank and file. They represent a 30-year crucial period of indoctrination in and out of school. These 100 names are eloquent of how thorough and far-flung has this process been. Its five main points are: (1) Legislation is the remedy; (2) Labor is the victim; (3) Capital is the oppressor; (4) No reference to scientific interpretation of natural law; (5) or to taxation and monopoly.

This chain of spurious thinking has its taproots in our colleges, of course, and mostly for that reason has found ready acceptance everywhere. And now we all face two forms of destruction, which are racing to see which shall reach our vitals first. I refer to International Blitzkrieg War and Internal Marxian Labor Revolution. I am not predicting either for the U.S.A., but while they proceed from the same general cause and may both get us, one may get us if the other fails. The question is do we need them closer to get us busy in a real defense of economic democracy?

THE WAR IS NOW CONSIDERABLY FOCUSED ON PSYCHOLOGY.

Even our commentators, like Major Elliott, are using their space to warn us not to be depressed by the news. And in England they are having a very frank debate about the behavior of their censors or news disseminators. The impressive thing, as 'democracy' has remarked, is that news-rationing seems to follow the simple lines of good or bad news -- much or little, respectively.

Some Sanford Bill Publicity

THE NEW JERSEY CAMPAIGN IS PROGRESSING WELL. A

test vote has proved our strength sufficient to carry the Assembly, and we are now working with the Senators.

Mrs. Sanford and Harry Haase are working in close cooperation with Mr. Alfred Chandler, and are covering the 81 legislators individually. Mr. Ingersoll is devoting most of his time to seeing editors, and has got some very fine stories.

The Legislature has taken a recess until May 19th, which gives us the very opportunity needed to complete the work.

We have made no general appeal for funds, although we have been much handicapped. We have spent only about \$150 in cash so far -- contributed by a few New Jersey friends, but largely by Mr. Allen and Mr. Ingersoll, the latter having contributed also his car, time, and three issues of 'democracy'.

This bill, if passed--as we expect it to be-- will be one of the most important national events in the history of the Georgian economic movement. We, therefore, urge all our friends to AT ONCE give us as generous help as possible, so that in the final weeks we can concentrate and waste no valuable time begging cash!

THE MOST FREQUENT QUESTION ABOUT THE REMOVAL OF

taxes from improvements to land is; what is the difference what I pay on, so long as the amount is the same?

The answer is that the amount will not be the same: a) this being a more economical system, all taxes will go down; b) if your improvements are worth more than your land, which they are, on the average of two to one, you may not pay a quarter of your present tax; (c) if, however, you are one of those whose land has jumped, and your improvements are only 'taxpayers,' you should pay more. And there are other answers.

Another frequent question: 'How will you induce a city to try this plan of exempting improvements, when income is in such demand?' Answer: 'Should you not ask: how will it prevent all cities from adopting the plan when it opens up new and natural sources of income?' It is the only possible way of increasing income without destruction. It is taxing our enemy--speculation--instead of our friend--industry.

'WILL NOT THIS SYSTEM TEND TO DRIVE PEOPLE AWAY BY

this increase of tax?' 'No, of course not; it will tend to draw people in by its tax reductions. If it drives any away, it will be speculators, whom we are well rid of. But this system will make homes cheaper to buy and maintain; and the city adopting it will draw from the cities not adopting it. Cheaper homes, and everything the consumer buys are the equivalent of higher wages. Ending taxes that bear on consumption will end high prices. So wages and incomes will buy perhaps double the output of farms and factories, ending depression and the unemployment of millions.

This phase of shifting taxes from improvements can not be overdrawn in its widespread benefits. Its benefits apply literally to ALL the people, while 'damage' will reach practically none.

ESPECIALLY LEGISLATORS, ARE OVER-IMPRESSED WITH THE

dangers of municipalities being left with more non-tax-paying property on hand, because of the increased land-tax.

If such objectors will reflect for a moment on the extent to which the present system has loaded them with actual or potential tax-sale property, they will see what an offset is possible. Foreclosures of speculative land will be offset by the many thousand homes saved from tax foreclosure. Then, if account be taken of the difference in sacrifice of a home with five human beings (and a couple of voters), and the possible money loss to a land speculator, this fear is completely answered.

WE HAVE CONSUMER, OR SALES-TAXES, BECAUSE WE DON'T COLLECT rent and royalties due us from basic monopoly.

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

Property-Rights or Human-Rights?

The idea that our statute law, behind which is the constitution, is designed primarily to protect the substantial interests -- property, wealth, and capital -- is dangerous to express in these times of emotional blitzkriegs in the name of humanity, labor, right, and even justice.

This 'idea' will not gain its rightful place at the center of our 'American way of thinking' until it is placed there via the process of showing that the interests of all the people can only be set up and made permanent, by way of having ownership and property clarified, identified, and made inviolate.

OWNERSHIP DERIVES ONLY FROM CREATION OR PRODUCTION.

This gives all public or social wealth, or value, to all people collectively, and all private wealth to its individual producers and assistants, Capital.

At present the social value is privately appropriated, which results in society taking in taxation half of labor's wages and capital's earnings. So is it not obvious that the first and only thing to do about human rights is (1) to get government off humanity's backs; and (2) to give all social income to humanity?

ARE OUR COURTS SNAPPING OUT OF THEIR UNCONSCIOUS-

ness of the basic meanings of law and justice? Are they coming to see that it is only by absolute protection to ALL property rights that 'human rights' have any significance.

Supremt Court Judge Valente delivers two straight blows at Unionist tyranny and terrorism: (1) Unions may not force workers into Unions, or collect their dues, by picketing their homes; (2) that employment depends upon fitness -- not Union membership.

What other Supreme Court members, such as Frankfurter and Black, will do with such common sense as this we shall see. Eventually they will have to say wages are kept down by taxes which should be paid by basic monopoly -- but when?

NEXT IN ORDER FOR A JUDGE OF THE VALENTE MENTALITY

and independence is a case not related to municipal transportation or public employment, but it is equally obvious in its elements:-

A milkman serves milk to a cafeteria in a department store employing 12000 people, and having over 100 thousand customers daily. Is it 'right' to picket this institution, when the only object is to frighten, prejudice, or destroy, as customers or employees, this concern's only asset?

VIEING WITH LABOR-LEADER ECONOMIC IGNORANCE, POL-

iticians in Congress are giving inflation, and wage-slavery another big boost, by planning a \$1,500,000,000 sales-and wage-tax.

This is conscription of savings and wages, which the British authority from Barclay's London Bank said was the only way war could be financed; that these taxes were futile in supplying actual payment for materials of war, until they had been paid out of the workers' stockings or wages!

A 20-SHARE CO-OPERATIVE FARM AT TUNERIDGE, VERMONT

is a model of Socialism that should reform the Marx kind that should be called Stateism, not Socialism.

Here are twenty men who all worked for \$1.00 a day until they had enough to pay for their 230 acres. They have been hampered, as well as helped, by some academic and socialistic ideas, as they are mostly college boys. But voluntary cooperation is their method, which is not the method of Socialism -- that of getting the police, army, and navy behind your cooperation, and building a bureaucracy of it.

This cooperation is like that of Dr. J. P. Warbasse and his great institution which, in spite of the handicaps of a topsy turvy tax system, has in England come to do a big portion of all merchandising, and has here come to be a big factor in all our trading-CO-OP. it is called

THE SUMPTER, BULL RUN, OR GETTYSBURG OF INDIVIDUALISM is being dramatized -- or tragedized -- at Detroit. 'Ford' may be just another strike to CIO, AFL, and NLRB. But to those who are far enough away not to be tangled up in its detail, and who have some understanding of the difference between Individualism, which is democracy (small 'd'), and Collectivism, which is Marxian Stateism, the reverse of democracy -- to them this may be taken as epochal in this war that has been put into its crucial stage by New Deal labor policies.

Ford represents nearly all that is good in individualistic democracy, while Unionism represents all that is bad in Marxian State Socialism. So the issue is clearly drawn at Detroit. Not much chance for mealy-mouthed palaver.

STAGED AT DETROIT IS A DRAMA OR TRAGEDY -- WHAT

might be considered the parting of the ways of our American way of life. This we have been proud to consider as individualistic Jeffersonian democracy, while the new order being ushered in with much acclaim, following the novel patterns issuing from brain trust leaders of thought, under the slogan of a New Deal -- This is found to correspond very closely to the well authenticated Marxian State Socialism.

Presently influential in bringing in the new order, is the enactment by the N. J. Legislature of a specific affirmative law, as distinguished from a general court decision, which, if it spreads to other states, and is finally adopted by Congress, would deprive property of protection by injunction. This, up to now, has been a statutory barrier to mob force, such as in the past few years has ruled the labor-war.

LAW, IN THEORY, IS AN INVARIABLE PROCESS, EVOLVING

from our conception of justice, and sustained by the constitution. Law is, of course, changeable with our concepts; and so is the constitution. But both are surrounded with safeguards against change by ukase or emotion.

One of the most important phases of law is, in a sense, 'extra legal' -- the injunction. It is an attempt to minimize inherent abuse of law, and is itself subject to abuse. Its theory is that of emergency -- to use, when, to await the regular course of law, would 'defeat the ends of justice' -- always law's objective.

Applied to labor, it frankly was used to keep labor from becoming a mob and revolting from the law of property rights. Labor being involved in an age-old struggle, wherein privilege -- employing an evil tax system -- has stolen perhaps half its wages, in desperation has adopted Unionism, an obviously false remedy for labor's manifest wrongs.

GENERAL STATEMENTS OFTEN GO UNCHALLENGED, ALTHOUGH

oft-repeated, without being proved with facts, especially when the statements are reasonable.

One of these relates to the widespread monopoly of land: -- that it is a direct cause of the millions of unemployed. Since land supplies all the raw materials required for wealth production, which process employs all labor, this statement might be called a truism -- obvious and indisputable. Now Germany gives us a large-scale demonstration for those not affected by truisms. It is copied from 'Land and Liberty' of London: -- Half of German land is owned by Junkers in large estates, and employs 2,500,000 people, while the other half is in smaller holdings, and employs 7,500,000.

This was in 1930 when, if there were 5,000,000 unemployed, they could be charged to the private ownership of land, its increment and income or rent. A comparison with England would be of first interest -- and then the U.S.A.

THE LATEST PROFESSORIAL -- OR AT LEAST PROFESSIONAL --

attack on us 'lay' boobs is to take away our precious wisdom teeth. When all the wisdom most of us have is in our teeth, the American Dental Association experts will extract all of them, leaving us to think as best we can -- probably with our feet.

Dollar Watch Man Here In Interest Of Single Tax Bill

Devoting All His Time To Gospel Of Henry George

Charles H. Ingersoll, "father" of the dollar watch and also a former leader in the fountain-pen industry, paid a brief visit to the office and plant of the Burlington Home-News last Friday afternoon.

Mr. Ingersoll was not primarily interested in inspecting the "works" of the Home-News, although he did express surprise at the expanse of the building and the extent of its equipment.

Today the great industrialist is devoting his entire time to spreading the "gospel" of Henry George, commonly known as the "Single Tax." He is president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club of New York, and delights in addressing service clubs anywhere. He also frequently broadcasts the George theories on the air.

His specific purpose in visiting this and other newspaper offices throughout the State at this time is to urge support for the Sanford Land Value Tax Bill, No. 233, which is now before the New Jersey Legislature.

As No. 126 this same bill passed the 1938-39 Assembly. Its purpose is to remove, in five equal annual stages of 20 per cent, the tax from improvements upon land and from personal property, and to place it upon the land. The proposed act is not mandatory; it may be adopted by popular vote or by official action in any taxing district, and may be repealed at the end of two years, in the same manner as that in which it was adopted.

Sponsors of the bill claim that under the proposed new taxing system the public revenue would not be reduced, but would be taken from a social source, the value of land, created by all the people and their activities. They express confidence that if the change were once voted, the people would never wish to return to the present system.

James R. Brown, Mr. Ingersoll's predecessor as president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, addressed the Burlington Kiwanis Club a number of years ago, and created at least some temporary interest. Alfred N. Chandler, of Newark, another crusader in the cause that never seems to accept defeat, also spoke here.

In addition to campaigning for passage of the Sanford Bill, Mr. Ingersoll is planning to establish a



MRS. OLIVE C. SANFORD
Assemblywoman who reintroduced
the Single Tax Measure

Single-Tax colony at Monmouth Beach, where he owns 85 acres of suitable land. In this proposed enterprise he has the cooperation of John Ryan, a newspaper publisher and real estate operator in the short town.

Mr. Ingersoll edits the Single-Tax publication called "democracy."

LAKWOOD CITIZEN.

MAY 2, 1941

Here in the Interest of Henry George Taxing System

Horace Joseph Haase, director of the School of Democracy, 1165 Broadway, New York City, was in Lakewood last week in the interest of Assembly Bill No. 233 introduced by Mrs. Sanford. The bill is out of Committee and will soon come up for third reading and final passage.

He gave out the following information pertaining to the system.

Every home owner, manufacturer and business man, in fact everyone except those who are holding land idle or not putting it to its full use, will benefit from shifting taxes off improvements and onto land. Such a shift in taxation will benefit everyone whose investment in capital and improvements exceeds their investment in land thus giving them more to spend for food, clothing, medical care, entertainment and home improvement. Manufacturers and businessmen will

Trenton Evening Times.

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1941

FOR TAX ON LAND VALUES

In support of the Sanford bill for taxing land values, the Tax Relief Council broadcasts the following thought.

"It is injurious to industry, agriculture and the State that one man should be taxed more for putting land to use than another man is taxed for holding similar land out of use."

That is the Henry George theory of taxation. And the fact that it has been successfully put into practice in Pittsburgh, to mention the outstanding American case, should be enough to induce thoughtful consideration on the part of the Legislature.

Certainly the need for encouraging the building trades and other basic divisions of industry by a scientific program of tax reductions is so obvious as to make extended comment unnecessary.

Advocates of the Sanford bill sincerely believe that they have something worth while in this connection. The least the Legislature can do is subject the proposal to careful analysis. There's just a chance that the single taxers may be right.

have more to spend on plant expansion and improvement. All these demands for labor products are necessarily demands for labor and therefore will further stimulate all industry, business and commerce. It will improve the real estate business, for, as every economist knows, each increase in production increases the demand for land and the lessening of taxes on improvements would encourage the use and improvement of land.

Though some land would be thrown upon the districts for non-payment of the increased land tax such land would be available for productive use as needed and at its true value rather than at a speculative price. With land in demand and available at its true value, and with lessened taxation on buildings and improvements the impetus to investment in production would be tremendous.

The plan which you are asked to permit through approval of Bill No. 233 will give forward looking taxing districts a chance to do something about unemployment besides raising taxes to make it endure. It will give them a chance to stimulate production and employment which are the sources of all the wealth we tax. Furthermore it will give them the opportunity to do away with the need for that part of taxation now required to support those who will shortly find

Dollar Watch Man Here In Interest Of Single Tax Bill

Devoting All His Time To Gospel Of Henry George

Charles H. Ingersoll, "father" of the dollar watch and also a former leader in the fountain-pen industry, paid a brief visit to the office and plant of the Burlington Home-News last Friday afternoon.

Mr. Ingersoll was not primarily interested in inspecting the "works" of the Home-News, although he did express surprise at the expanse of the building and the extent of its equipment.

Today the great industrialist is devoting his entire time to spreading the "gospel" of Henry George, commonly known as the "Single Tax." He is president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club of New York, and delights in addressing service clubs anywhere. He also frequently broadcasts the George theories on the air.

His specific purpose in visiting this and other newspaper offices throughout the State at this time is to urge support for the Sanford Land Value Tax Bill, No. 233, which is now before the New Jersey Legislature.

As No. 126 this same bill passed the 1938-39 Assembly. Its purpose is to remove, in five equal annual stages of 20 per cent, the tax from improvements upon land and from personal property, and to place it upon the land. The proposed act is not mandatory; it may be adopted by popular vote or by official action in any taxing district, and may be repealed at the end of two years, in the same manner as that in which it was adopted.

Sponsors of the bill claim that under the proposed new taxing system the public revenue would not be reduced, but would be taken from a social source, the value of land, created by all the people and their activities. They express confidence that if the change were once voted, the people would never wish to return to the present system.

James R. Brown, Mr. Ingersoll's predecessor as president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, addressed the Burlington Kiwanis Club a number of years ago, and created at least some temporary interest. Alfred N. Chandler, of Newark, another crusader in the cause that never seems to accept defeat, also spoke here.

In addition to campaigning for passage of the Sanford Bill, Mr. Ingersoll is planning to establish a



MRS. OLIVE C. SANFORD
Assemblywoman who reintroduced
the Single Tax Measure

Single-Tax colony at Monmouth Beach, where he owns 85 acres of suitable land. In this proposed enterprise he has the cooperation of John Ryan, a newspaper publisher and real estate operator in the shore town.

Mr. Ingersoll edits the Single-Tax publication called "democracy."

LAKEWOOD CITIZEN

MAY 2, 1941

Here in the Interest of Henry George Taxing System

Horace Joseph Haase, director of the School of Democracy, 1165 Broadway, New York City, was in Lakewood last week in the interest of Assembly Bill No. 233 introduced by Mrs. Sanford. The bill is out of Committee and will soon come up for third reading and final passage.

He gave out the following information pertaining to the system.

Every home owner, manufacturer and business man, in fact everyone except those who are holding land idle or not putting it to its full use, will benefit from shifting taxes off improvements and onto land. Such a shift in taxation will benefit everyone whose investment in capital and improvements exceeds their investment in land thus giving them more to spend for food, clothing, medical care, entertainment and home improvement. Manufacturers and businessmen will

TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1941

FOR TAX ON LAND VALUES

In support of the Sanford bill for taxing land values, the Tax Relief Council broadcasts the following thought.

"It is injurious to industry, agriculture and the State that one man should be taxed more for putting land to use than another man is taxed for holding similar land out of use."

That is the Henry George theory of taxation. And the fact that it has been successfully put into practice in Pittsburgh, to mention the outstanding American case, should be enough to induce thoughtful consideration on the part of the Legislature.

Certainly the need for encouraging the building trades and other basic divisions of industry by a scientific program of tax reductions is so obvious as to make extended comment unnecessary.

Advocates of the Sanford bill sincerely believe that they have something worth while in this connection. The least the Legislature can do is subject the proposal to careful analysis. There's just a chance that the single taxers may be right.

have more to spend on plant expansion and improvement. All these demands for labor products are necessarily demands for labor and therefore will further stimulate all industry, business and commerce. It will improve the real estate business, for, as every economist knows, each increase in production increases the demand for land and the lessening of taxes on improvements would encourage the use and improvement of land.

Though some land would be thrown upon the districts for non-payment of the increased land tax such land would be available for productive use as needed and at its true value rather than at a speculative price. With land in demand and available at its true value, and with lessened taxation on buildings and improvements the impetus to investment in production would be tremendous.

The plan which you are asked to permit through approval of Bill No. 233 will give forward looking taxing districts a chance to do something about unemployment besides raising taxes to make it endurable. It will give them a chance to stimulate production and employment which are the sources of all the wealth we tax. Furthermore it will give them the opportunity to do away with the need for that part of taxation now required to support those who will shortly find

Shifting Taxation from industry to monopoly will cure poverty.

'SAVINGS CONSCRIPTION SPELLS THE END OF CAPITALISM'

is the startling caption of John T. Flynn. He draws this conclusion partly from England, where the 'Barclay Bank' theory I have quoted is reduced to practice. They are, in the main, avoiding (1) loans, (2) taxes, and (3) 'borrowing through banks.' And largely displacing all this by 'enforced loans, conscription savings --everybody's savings!'--and quoted as the Hitler system.

Mr. Flynn interprets this as a confession by the English capitalists, who have managed their country into this war -- that their system, capitalism, is through.

I TAKE THIS STATEMENT BY MR. FLYNN VERY SERIOUSLY, and partly because I have an impression, from what I have read of his views, that the conclusion coincides with his own beliefs and desires -- but not that it is less truthful for that reason. He does not say so, but the obvious successor of capitalism will be Bevin-Communism, perhaps under the name of laborism. And, assuming the accuracy of this, I guess it dovetails with the go and come of the Hopkinses, Winants, Cohens, and even Willkies --all such zealous New Deal Communists, as to make them parties in the rejoicing.

ONE OF 'democracy's' BEST FRIENDS IN THE GEORGIST colony of Arden, Del., sends a very interesting 'letter to Hitler,' which, while refusing to longer accept prop-aganda from one of his 'bunds,' gives him a splendid line of friendly counsel, embodying the whole economic philosophy.

Will the editor gamble an opinion on whether an hour or two invested in such an adventure is invested? Yes, the chances are fair that such an epistle (or mis-sile) will land -- if not at the center--on an outpost, where it might take root. All prop-aganda is in the air, but the aim is, in two senses, of the essence.

MY FRIEND, KOSTI DE ARYAN, OF THE SAN DIEGO BROOM, argues the labor question under the heading: 'Is striking a right or a privilege?' But I cannot follow him in the latter conclusion. Like collective bargaining, I can't see any lack of 'right' in it. It is derived from the individual's right to do either. The 'col-lectivity' in either, of course, is implied conspiracy. But I doubt if that can be avoided safely. I don't see how either can do any harm, if such things as sit-down, picketing, and other violence, and violation of property rights are denied.

Of course, the final answer is to end all disputes by ending the robbery of labor and capital by basic mon-opoly, using our tax system, which leaves them to fight over half their wages and profits.

HOW TO GET THE MOST TONNAGE SUNK MOST QUICKLY: IS not that the convoy way? Certainly at this moment this seems to be the most likely way of our display of urgen-cy to 'do something' for England. No one seems to ad-vocate it on other grounds, as the sinkings--abstractly and relatively-- are being played up in startling forms most effectively.

THE PRESIDENT STATES, AT ONE OF THOSE REMARKABLE weekly press conferences, that it would be 'a good thing' to lower the draft age to 18, and that 'every young man should give a year of his life to his government.' The liberty taken with their President by a hundred or two smartest reporters, is certainly shocking; and he is sometimes as free with them.

I wonder what Calvin Coolidge would say to the let-down in national dignity. It may be a good thing to skim the cream off our humankind for the game of mass-murder. It's not so easy as F.D.R. seems to make it. Maybe we should raise the age to 60. Then as to a boy's duty to his state, concerning a year of his time, can a President guarantee to return the boy in as good shape as he got him, and at the end of the year? Some day this war question may be dealt with less imaginatively and emotionally. Then the answers to such questions may not be so offhand -- and therefore more reliable.

WAR

The Cause and the Cure

THE CAUSE OF WAR

WARS are waged for LAND (wheat, oil, coal, iron-ore land, etc.) -- After the wars the victors claim title to the land and back up the title with the sword. Then the victors rent the LAND (the gift of God) to the vanquished and live on the ill-gotten rent of the LAND, thereby producing a world of mas-ters and slaves.

At present the masters of Europe are forcing their slaves to war for LAND to determine who shall collect the rent of the LAND; English LANDLORDS or German LANDLORDS. THAT is LANDLORDISM, the curse of humanity, therefore *as long as the rent of LAND goes into LANDLORDS' pockets there will be WAR for LAND.*

THE CURE FOR WAR

Some day the people of the United States who are now pay-ing thousands of millions of dollars as LAND rent to LAND-LORDS every year, (for land provided by God) will demand that the government shall collect all of the people's LAND rent for all of the people's public needs and abolish all taxes then WAR FOR LAND AND THE SLAUGHTER OF MILLIONS OF MEN WILL CEASE *for no one will WAR FOR LAND when no one can pocket the people's LAND rent and fathers and mothers will not die broken hearted over the loss of their sons.*

P. S. -- The members of all organizations opposed to war for LAND should pass the following resolution and send copies to the newspapers:

RESOLVED: WE... Hereby demand that all of the people's LAND rent amounting to thousands of millions of dollars shall be collected by the government for all of the people's public needs and thereby abolish the cause of WAR FOR LAND AND THE SLAUGHTER OF MILLIONS OF MEN.

"PLEASE TYPE THREE COPIES FOR YOUR FRIENDS"

George Lloyd, care of democracy, 1165 Broadway, N.Y.

THE TIGER'S CLAW

I wonder what this crazy world of ours Will look like in a hundred years from now, -- Unless we curb the predatory powers Tax-Tigers hold, and foolish laws allow! The rage for spending other people's cash Must wreck the world; for if a single straw Can break the camel's back, he must be brash Who thinks it could survive the tiger's claw.

The jungle tiger knows what is enough -- Tax-eaters never will. They chop and chop, As if they thought your pockets made of stuff That stretches faster than the taxes flop. How long, Oh Lord, how long must we endure An agony our Tax Reform would cure!

-- Horatio.

WHY DO SOME FASHIONS CHANGE SWIFTLY -- AND OTHERS

not at all? It seems to be no trouble to get changes in styles of hats, shoes, vests, and even automobiles. It would seem that change in these commercial things coincides with what Marxists call the 'profit motive,' (which is such an evil thing!) To emphasize this, I might cite the (late) Prince of Wales being rated as England's greatest (tangible) asset, because of the fre-quent change in cut and pattern of his vests or 'west-cuts.'

Well, what I am asking is, 'Why then do we not have new styles of tax laws? Why does not good health become 'catching'-- and good manners? How about a new pattern of statesmanship? Why must politics be forever inept? And why economics -- even in colleges -- remain the same old dismal dope?

NOTHING CAN SEPARATE THE VITAL INTEREST BETWEEN business and its 125 million customers and employees. Both must prosper abundantly, if either does.