

THOMAS JEFFERSON HENRY GEORGE ABRAHAM LINCOLN

democracy

with the small "d"

VOL. IV. No. 32. CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Publisher JUNE 18, 1940 1165 Broadway, N.Y. Yearly \$1. Ten Times 25¢

'IS IT PRACTICABLE TO GET TIME ON THE RADIO CIRCUITS, to preach Single Tax?' I am asked. If my friend can discover any 'single tax' in what he reads in this 'democracy', the answer is that I have had free time on about thirty stations, for nearly 4500 broadcasts, like this one, in the past few years. But I have been clothing S.T. in new nomenclature, in order to accomplish exactly what is mentioned-- to preach it; because, as the writer says, even the name S.T. is not known to radio fans.

If one is content to 'preach' without reference to how many tune in or understand what he preaches, he could read 'Progress and Poverty' to the 'mike.' Same taxation, as proved herein, I think, may be associated with nearly all current events and notable persons, and so effectively preached. And it is one of the objectives of 'democracy' and its editor to make the doing of this a habit to which ambitious Georgian economists may become addicted.

HERE IS AN ANARCHIST-ATHEIST WHO SEEMS TO BE PUTTING his isms up on to high ground where they are not just something to talk about. I can see no more sense to atheism than to the worst dogma that atheists rail at, unless it has some further objective. For can I see sense in talking about a Utopia of lawless cooperation, so long as we have poverty that creates a criminal class, requiring law to curb it. But if atheists will shame the churches into doing something more tangible, as well as spiritual, for their loyal followers, he will indeed have something. Likewise, if he can shame the person who wants a minimum of law to do the only thing that will curb law--according to T. Jefferson--which is to discard all monopoly and privilege, again he will have something.

'THE MACHINE' IS LIKE 'TOBACCO-NICK THAT MAKES YOU well when you're sick; and when you're well, it makes you sick!' The machine has made us rich; and now it is destroying us! How wonderfully this display of cause and effect supports the Marxist theory--that the machine is always a destroyer. But 'democracy' says, without fear of sensible contradiction, that this same machine would long ago have 'set us free' if we had not hobbled it with taxes that doubled living costs and thereby halved consumption.

THE SCIENCE OF ECONOMICS IS NOT LIKE THE 'SCIENCE OF Philosophy' taught by Earl Russell, or of psychology or of literature. Economics is of the school of mathematics, mechanics and physics. Economics interprets the natural laws governing all industry and commerce, all production and distribution, both of physical things and the resultant wealth. Economics fixes the terms of all employment; and of all collective rights and privileges--social relations.

It may be O.K. for academicians to boondoggle with an assortment of dilettante 'sciences', or even some real sciences; but the universe of reality cannot afford long to permit indoor sport to delay the utility of the exact and essential sciences. Economics is about equally divided in its vitality between the dynamic tangible world of production, and the static, intangible domain of social, collective interest and values. For every time individual people produce a dollar of wealth by labor, they collectively, unconsciously, and automatically produce another social dollar--reflected mainly in the value of the earth itself.

'democracy'- small 'd' - A merger of politics and economics; the only way to realize 'life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.' Large 'D' - the small-half-portion of democracy; all we have so far achieved.

STRANGE AS IT MAY SEEM, THE GREATEST DIFFICULTY encountered in making people understand the economic problem--that is, why we have depression, unemployment, and poverty--is to get them to see the distinction between private property, and public, or social, values. Private property, or wealth, is sacredly individual, because it is produced by labor, assisted by capital. Social values, in land, natural resources, and franchises, are as sacredly public, collective, or communal, in rightful ownership, and for the same reason, that ALL the people produced those values.

Yet, after hearing this copper-riveted, sensible statement of fundamental, natural rights, people will persist in saying that a man discovering a gold mine, or inheriting one, on the main street of a big city, should own it. Because this mine-value is not taken publicly, the investment in the mine is destroyed by taxation.

THE MOST BLATANT PUBLIC EXPRESSION OF COLLECTIVIST illiteracy I have heard, was a soap-boxer at 'Bug-house Square', demanding that the Ford plant be 'confiscated and run for the people.' The one business of the world that has set the pace for both low price product and high price labor, which pace has been followed by the whole of industry--not merely automobiles. It is such vicious destructiveness, combined with unreasoning bombast, that loses all the ignorant persecution of 'Reds' and other class-war strife.

The assumption that government, notorious for manhandling everything it touches, could do anything--but sabotage--with an organism such as Ford's, goes another limit; along with that utter incapacity to see the major exploitation of basic monopoly; and thus keeping company in dumbness, with the government officials and labor leaders, who would be given the running of industry by Marxists.

IN THE SEARCH FOR NEW VIEWPOINTS RELATING TO WAR that may, by some possibility, contain reassurance that war need not take us back into chaos and another hundred, or thousand, years of darkness, we might observe that during our most progressive modern period--say the last hundred years--we have, until this decade or generation, nursed the hope and expectation that serious wars were a thing of the past.

And so it may be said that during this period, while every form of industrial, commercial and cultural progress was most rapid, we have not had the spur of war and its horrors to frighten us into activity against war. This may be a partial excuse for our not even discovering the cause; or, worse, our not making any use of such discovery in moving it out of our path. How about projecting this thought into an examination of economists' claims that (1) that war comes from poverty--(2) from monopoly of natural resources--(3) from tariff walls. Currently, leading peace societies, statesmen, notably Sir Samuel Hoare, Secretary Hull, Lloyd George, and McGraw-Hills 'Business Week', fully uphold the logical claim here set up.

SIR OSWALD MOSLEY 'IMPERSONATES NAZISM OR FASCISM and, having the courage of his convictions, he is mobbed periodically (and now he is jailed). He has just been rescued again by good natured London Bobbies. If he would--or could--tell us what either of these isms is, that is much different from our monopolism, mixed with capitalism, and sweetened with dictatorship, then he would be a big asset. Since Fascism does not disturb the special privileges that have used our sales-tax system to acquire half our substance, we can only credit it with solidifying our present misfortune through dictatorship--exactly as Communism would do.

NO MONOPOLY - said Jefferson - will insure NO BUROCRACY

Without Economics democracy is only a half-portion

Vol. 32 **democracy** June 18, 1940
No. 31

CHAS. H. INGERSOLL, Editor and Broadcaster

1165 Broadway, New York City Weekly \$1.00 year

Application for 2nd Class Entry pending

a) **'democracy'** AIMS TO STATE ITS CASE COMPLETELY IN every issue, so that he who runs may read. If the ten-year-old mind can't understand **'democracy'** the fault is the editor's. Democracy is the cause of the masses--all the people; and as such, it is necessarily the cause of every legitimate interest. Our half-democracy must be completed by building onto it the economic element which only can make democracy function. With the masses impoverished, no enterprise--business or cultural--can survive. People--by and large--consume only half their needs and desires, because taxes double costs. This depresses production and disemploys millions. Such consumer taxes exist only because basic monopolies do not pay their socially created incomes to support government. The remedy is to transfer all our 'sales taxes' to franchises, natural resources, and unearned increments. 'To the producer belongs ALL of the product.' This is the simple economic law of democracy, with the small d.'

b) IF DEMOCRACY IS EVERYONE'S CAUSE, EVERY WORD IN this paper should interest the average person. This is what the editor aims to have it do. 'Current events' are the every day happenings in society. This does not mean society of the social set, but the democratic definition of the word 'social.' It is one of the first functions of democracy to conserve the social values of ALL the people, and to stop their misappropriation by special interests.

This is the meaning of the 'New democracy with the small d.' To make clear to the average person the social and economic phase of democracy, news and persons of common interest are utilized. 'This is a haywire world,' it is often heard said, which commonly ends the talk. But **'democracy'** gives the answer. And the answer cannot fail to be of intense general interest. It is 'democracy's' business to make it so. To do this the editor has to be a critic, but not a grouse.

c) THERE ARE INEVITABLY TWO DIVISIONS TO DEMOCRACY; and one of them may interest only a small minority, because it contains a gruelling job of reconstruction and its most necessary work will be to make the other division popular--for the average mentality. These divisions may be variously named, as theoretical and practical, economic and political, or technical and popular. The objective is to make every one understand democracy, and to make it a part of every day life. And also to redeem democracy politically from the disrepute and failure that has overtaken it. It is commonplace that politics are futile.

'Our Enemy the State' is the title of a book that seemed to shock no one. This is only because the fiscal working part of democracy has not even been attempted. Statesmanship has come to be just another word, and for this reason. As fast as economics is injected into democracy, however, politics will begin to merge into statesmanship. Racial slavery abolished, is the major credit to democracy so far. Now we face the abolition of all slavery--notably that in industry, which is as fatal to industry as to humanity and society.

d) DEMOCRACY IS RATED AS A 'POOR MAN'S CAUSE.' THAT is one of the tragic miscarriages of the democracy we have tolerated. And today our most notable leaders of party Democracy (with the big 'D') are called 'rabble rousers', because they make the plea that 'the rich should be relieved of their fortunes in favor of 'the poor'; whereas, democracy's aim is to make everyone 'rich', by guaranteeing to each all he earns, whether by sweat of brow, use of brain, or earnings of what he has saved.

This is to be done by the obvious process of stopping the big leak, through taxes, to the underlying monopoly. The unfortunate coincidence of exploited (robbed) people being 'poor', and the exploiters being 'rich', gives color to this rabble rousing. But the democratic economic law is that even poor people must not rob rich people; that property rights equal human rights because the masses are the first wealth producers and the largest property owners. And, finally, this present depression has shown the biggest business people that they can prosper only through the mass buying power of all the people. So democracy is literally for all (except 2 or 3%, whose main interest is in monopoly).

THE YOUTH CONGRESS IS AGAINST ARMS--'DON'T WANT guns--want jobs--say the youths. So they are just now picketing Congressmen--as the Unionists and the Communists do. Their methods and associations may be bad, but they certainly are in order in protesting war, if anyone is. If it were not for youth, war could not start. They are the traditional cannon fodder. Again, with their slogan: 'Jobs vs. Guns', they come close to the central truth of economics. War feeds on unemployment. Jobs are the solution of poverty, which is the feeder of war.

a) DISPUTATION OVER WHAT, EXACTLY, CAUSES LAND RENT, and over terminology, is mostly a filler of time and space that might be used more profitably. One school (of thought) insists that rent is not affected by fertility or productivity of the land for use of which the rent is paid, but arises wholly from 'service', public and private. This claim is minus several legs. It is exceedingly dogmatic, as not only is productivity the prime element in land value and rent, but there are at least two other such elements--people or population and monopoly.

But the greatest weakness of this intense strain for analysis of rent, is its fallacy in mixing public and private service in compounding this formula. While it is true that individual activity complements social or public service or utilities, as a rent cause, it is mere dogmatism to try and separate this element from--and substitute it for-- 'pressure of population', and thereby leave an important constituent 'a root out of ground.'

b) SOME OF THESE ATTEMPTS AT RENT ANALYSIS LURE THEIR authors into the tall timbers of the Marxism they abhor. They picture every private act and enterprise as involving 'service' and an obligation to them of a share in the rent. 'Stand-by service', such as carrying in stock merchandise not in active demand, is a part of this strain for analysis of rent. This plunges 'the state' into private enterprise, and produces a tangle where economic demand clarity.

Rent can mean only social production; service that cannot be individualized and paid for directly. A movie enterprise, as a part of community life, is entitled to freedom from taxation. But its land is not entitled to freedom from obligation for rent--land that supplies the audiences. If land values and rent are recognized as public 'property', by their payment to the public treasury, it is not necessary to know the details of how the people, in using land and servicing it, builds its value--more than one needs to know the details of his digestive process.

FIVE HUNDRED SCIENTISTS PLEAD TO THE PRESIDENT FOR peace. We thank them. But we plead to them to get back to their science and dig out the scientific answer to peace and war. Do they think that the Controller of all science, Nature, has left a vacuum where there should be defensive apparatus against the destruction now going on? Have they no faith in science? Science that has, by its exactness, produced our vast wealth, culture, and civilization? Is it possible that there is not also a science exact enough to conserve what science has created. The President cannot grant peace. Science can.

'democracy' is standing in the breach between old and new deal monopolism and the quick remedy of communism. Won't you help circulate "democracy"? Do it by sending in your own subscription at 25¢ or \$1.00. AND a few trial 10-week subs for your friends at 25¢. BUT please have them sign individually, so we can get OUR P.O. rate.

MARXIST EVOLUTION: New Dealer, Socialist, Bolshevik, Communist, Twin brother to Fascist, and Naziist.

NO MONOPOLY - said Jefferson - will insure NO BUROCRACY

DYNAMIC VERSUS STATIC MONOPOLY IS A WORTH-WHILE distinction. One is intermingled with business, hard to find, and harder to uproot or punish, without hurting business and all its employees and customers -- everyone. The other monopoly is 100% special privilege, which no one can fairly deny; and effective action against it would inconvenience very few people. Dynamic monopoly involves business quite generally and action necessarily slows down industry, prevents recovery, and continues unemployment. Disentangling business from monopoly is an almost impossible task, as proved by many attempts like the present one of stopping monopoly with the Sherman and Federal Trade laws. Static or basic monopoly has no such disadvantage, though all other monopoly rests largely upon it. Natural resources, franchises, and land values in cities are distributed among a few wealthy investors who would not feel their loss in any such way as do the millions of owners of business securities.

DOES ANY ONE DOUBT THAT THE BEST, IF NOT THE ONLY, preparedness is JUSTICE? The answer being 'no' the aim must then be to define justice, and use it to keep us out of war, and defend us if war is brought to us. If there were no poverty or unemployment in this country, that condition would probably banish forever the threat or fear of war, and it would certainly make it impossible to rush the country into war. However, the question is whether with justice, we would be better prepared than with billions invested in war machinery. A true saying is 'Men do not shoulder arms for their boarding houses,' meaning that patriotism can only be expected in a country of homes. The first element of justice is the insurance to every man of all he earns; whereas the question is now present of whether he is retaining half of it. The possibility of a working man owning and supporting his own home grows less year by year, because of a tax system that rests largely on homes and their maintenance.

OLD WAR HORSE, ALFRED N. CHANDLER, OF N. J., WHOSE land value tax bill has been for twenty years before the Trenton Legislature, and which bill has now passed the Assembly, asks me to substitute 'land speculation' for 'basic monopoly' in my broadcasts, as 'more enlightening to the common run of people and business men in high places.'

While I accept his suggestion to use oftener this description of our fundamental evil, I doubt the wisdom of substitution, because I think the meanings are so different. 'Monopoly' covers subdivisions of land speculation or monopoly, such as franchisees, natural resources, unearned increment, etc., which, although a part of the land problem, are far more familiar to the public. My aim being to make economics simple enough for radio fans to understand, has behind it the suspicion that this process may help a lot to get it to college professors and the intelligentsia. I think we need all possible variations both in plan and terminology.

THE INDICTMENT OF UTILITY MAGNATE, HOPSON, FOR building a billion from nothing, using the Sam Insull technic, should be a warning to all utility monopolists to do some thinking for themselves, and ahead of the pressure from the Department of Justice. Mr. Willkie is the logical one to do this, since he is breaking convention in offering himself for public office. And it might give him the presidency - (Yes, of the U.S.A.) The \$20,000,000 or \$63,000,000 bagatelles named in the indictment, that come so easy in utilities, are land values, or social values, or monopoly values. These our laws allow persons to own and speculate in; and for which 'crime' we run a Department of Justice to indict the individuals who are selected for the slaughter, as for example, Insull and Hopson.

As long as such gentlemen play with unearned increment or economic-rent fires, they will be subject to both prosecution and persecution by a government, the statecraft of which cannot distinguish between the monopoly and business phases of utilities. Utility leaders will apparently have to supply this statecraft, if they want to save their billions and their hides.

democrat - small 'd' :- One who would make inviolable and sacred the right of each -- (a) the individual, and (b) all individuals -- the people, society -- to the half of property they respectively create.

a) ON A SINGLE PAGE OF A LEADING PAPER APPEAR TWO 'columns' which together allege that the U.S.A. faces a vital decision as to war; and that the President had on this subject made at least four statements in the last three years that might fairly be called prophetic. These writers have no superiors in reputation. Mr. Lippman states that this blitzkrieg may actually bring to Hitler the royal British navy; that concurrently Italy and Japan might join him and obviously control the oceans. The presidential prophecies cited by Mark Sullivan are incidents, but so great as not to be overshadowed by the major subject.

The statement of the possibility of a world dictatorship need not be considered in detail; if that possibility be admitted, the question of how far it could go, in first absorbing the balance of the civilized world, and finally America, might also be waived. This puts war in a new light--as a grand success, instead of a futility; and, from an opposite standpoint, it gives the ultimate reason for seeking justice to displace war.

b) IN HIS GREATEST BOOK, 'WAR AND PEACE,' TOLSTOY proved the futility of war, arraying its inability to carry out any coherent program. But the great Russian never dreamed of airplanes and the revolution they might bring. Now it seems that the machine age has actually brought its own destruction. It has developed a machine which can turn and destroy all existing machines in a few days or hours. This is proved by a single photograph of how a bomb, only a few days ago, destroyed a library in Louvain, costing millions.

Why did we need to wait for a columnist to tell us of this tragic juncture at which we have arrived? Do you say that we, in the U.S.A., being the masters of invention and machinery,--that we will be the ones to do the bombing? England and France thought they would be; and so they would have been, if Hitler had given them time. But he has not in their case, nor will he in ours! And, anyway, is not justice better and cheaper than war? Are we not now close enough to this abyss to get the lesson it is forcing on us? We have waited long for this lesson; now can we function on simple justice?

c) 'ECONOMIC JUSTICE' HAS BEEN TOYED WITH A LOT. WE have heard the words and something of their meaning. Father Coughlin has taken them for his paper's mast-head. Like democracy, freedom, Christianity, they are words full of meaning. In fact, they are the only words that express our approximate need. 'Justice', without 'economics', is vague. But justice that IS economic, goes the distance--gives us all we need. And to take justice out of the utopian class, let us say it means only what men are able to do for themselves.

Justice asks no favors--no charity. 'Justice, not charity' is an old slogan. All man needs is access to his mother earth; and then to be left alone in his industry. Our leaders have got the idea that man needs a lot of caring for by government and other agencies. But they have not noticed that it is only because he is being robbed that we need so much social-mindedness about being our brother's keeper. We need only to keep off our brother's back.

d) THAT'S THE WORD: BEING ROBBED! AND IT'S NOT PETTY larceny that is committed on man, and it is not simply grand larceny. It is compounded and organized larceny. 'Systematic fobbing of all producers, of something like half their product', is the charge in the indictment. You may think stopping this will make the most fearful conceivable war. But it will not make any. This robbery being by a system, having our consumer-tax as its pickpocket, has no friends or defenders in the usual sense. Its beneficiaries--who draw from monopoly in excess of other interests--are few; from two to five per cent of the people.

The only war needed to break down this great robbery, that causes poverty and war, is to educate some of our educators to the simple, obvious facts; and then decide, popularly, to change the system. We tolerate these impoverishing taxes only because we have not yet noticed that these few parasites are taking the natural revenue that would be ample for all government--the economic rent, or unearned increments, as they are called.

COLLECTIVIST:- One who denies all right of private property; can see only 'social.'

INDIVIDUALIST (rugged):- One who denies all right of public property, or social values; sees only 'individual.'

Shifting Taxation from industry to monopoly will cure poverty

a) 'YOUR HOOKING OF MONEY TO TAXING LAND VALUES IS ingenious and apparently sound,' writes a friend. 'But you start out to show how money should get into circulation, when the present system of subsidizing banks is killed, as you say it must be. Will you please finish this job?' I am only an amateur Money-IST, but let's see:--Government, the only creator of money, which is (1) a measure of value, and (2) a medium of exchange, (and as such should be made only of paper) can only issue it for value received. Hence it must -- dollar for dollar -- be redeemable. The question is how to induct it into and take it out of circulation in the three main branches of the money stream. These are: (a) production and commerce. The bank will deposit approved securities against its issue. The loan of money to business will be the bank's principal function. (b) permanent construction. Again, banks and financial institutions will loan cash needed during construction only, replacing - redeeming - it as permanent loans, in stocks and bonds, are sold. (c) for tax budgets; issued to taxing authorities against tax bills; redeemed from tax, or rent, collections.

b) THE CIRCULATION AND REDEMPTION OF MONEY WILL BE THE function of (1) banks and (2) taxing authorities. The movement of money -- out and in -- to the U.S. Treasury, through issue and redemption, will possibly be government's most important function and responsibility. Yet it should be without substantial stress, risk, or loss. (1) Banks will make money their main stock in trade. It will cost them the interest or dividends on their high-grade, long term, low-income securities, hypothecated at the treasury as security. It will cost their customers, the business, and other borrowers, its value in a free market, under the law of supply and demand. The novel feature here presented is that if as and when this money system is adopted, concurrently will be required a method of collecting land values or economic rents by the government, to redeem the money issued to it to cover budget deficits. This will equal the non-liquidating or expense outlays of government. Thus, the money and tax problems will merge and be solved by a single tax, that will be taken from the only correct source of taxation, and displace the impoverishing consumer taxes.

CURING WITHOUT KNOWING ANYTHING ABOUT CAUSES IS the modern way. And it is surprising how many medical doctors and professional economists try to cure disease of the body and of the body politic, following that method.

FUNDAMENTALIST: One who tries to find a higher law than the City Hall, State House, or Capitol.

LIBERAL: One with an open mind (resembling a sieve).

CONSERVATIVE: One who conserves social values as the only way to conserve private property.

RADICAL: One who tries to find and cut the tap-root of evil.

SCIENCE: The formulation of natural law. Unfortunately, tardy discovery by man limits its benefits.

ECONOMICS: Of the making and selling of everything; the employment of everybody, & their compensation.

CAPITAL: Saved up labor; laborers are the largest owners of capital (even if not in dollars).

WAR IS OVER THE INSECURITY OF PROPERTY, AND SO IS poverty. Now please stand still a few moments and think - and listen; because this statement is the reverse of current opinion, but none-the-less true. It is generally thought that people are poor because 'property rights are set above human rights,' and that war is in behalf of the vast property interests. Believe it or not, people are poor because their earnings (which are the most sacred of all property!) are - at least half of them - taken from them. And this is not done in behalf of any other property rights, as the communists say, but purely for the building up of monopoly, which is always anti-property.

And war; - Always the representatives of property and wealth, use all their power to prevent and stop it. But because they are tangled with monopoly, they are both confused and disarmed. So their property is sacrificed, with millions of lives of their customers and employees; and to bolster the anti-property system of holding out of use natural resources, and of building Chinese tariff walls to prevent international trade. Property is owned by 95% of the people; and its ownership is made insecure by the 5% of parasites who manipulate our tax system in holding half of 'property' at ransom, in monopolistic form.

a) CAN A CAT LOOK AT A KING? WE SHALL SEE; AND ALSO at a Prime Minister and a Major Domo. Chairman Sloan, President Knudson, and Expert Kettering, of the great General Motors, assert that our closed frontiers of natural resources (closed, not by distribution or exhaustion, but by monopolization) may be more than offset and 'reopened' by progress of invention, physical science and industry. And this message is received without challenge by the leaders of education in our colleges and universities, gathered at the opening of the G.M. \$8,000,000 Fair exhibit.

This statement reflects that of ex-President Hoover, which should have become historic. It was made shortly before the specter of depression, unemployment, poverty and war appeared around the corner. It was:-- 'that our vast production of wealth could, and would drive out poverty.' This optimism was recently reproduced by Mayor La Guardia. The statements should all be true; but they will require a new economic set-up.

b) INDUSTRIALIST SLOAN HAS BEEN VERY PROGRESSIVE IN his public statements. He has also outlaid \$10,000,000 on an institution for economic research--thus recognizing that there is one science that has not been covered either by academic or industrial efficiency. In fact, as president of the greatest industry of the universe, he frankly acknowledged that, while about all the mechanical and commercial problems had been solved, they were still short of the necessary stability and continuity to consolidate their scientific achievements.

The implication of this statement was that all their science was rendered null and void by the simple lack of economic science. Yet this 'jury', including also Columnist Johnson, the M.I.T. President, and Dartmouth President, while broadly supporting the viewpoint of unlimited prosperity under 'free industry', gave no word or sign of how to achieve free industry. Industrialists should include in their efficiency a way to tell when they are being robbed, and by what; but, alas, they do not!

c) HOW MAY INDUSTRY BE FREED FROM EMBARGOES THAT KEEP it from employing every idle man and dollar, and thus abolish business depression, unemployment, and poverty? This question was asked, or implied, in about all of about 500 questions asked the leading industrialists at the G.M. World's Fair symposium. And they must know the answer or acknowledge, as in fact Kettering did, that no command of the future exists. He supports this pessimism by a string of unanswerable questions.

The most prevalent attitude of great leaders of today is the negative, defeatist position of cleverly devised alibis, of which this is a fine example. This strong language of a humble layman (or mere economist) toward economic royalists, seems justified by the facts that their corporations, their million employees, and, say, 50 million customers, are being robbed of half their substance--wages, profits, incomes--by taxes that exist only because social revenues are not collected; which, being true, renders their optimistic outlook impossible.

d) THERE'S A SCHOOL OF ECONOMISTS, CALLED GEORGISTS-- who would bluntly tell Mr. Sloan that the future of the educated youth--and every other kind--of the country, becomes harder as these wonderful developments of science and industry increase; that such progress only increases the value of land, which, like a millstone, drags the wage earner, the salaried man, and industry itself, to a constantly lower level.

This may not be as clear to these conventional minds, as if monopoly land values were referred to, and the private collection of all land values, resulting in the most obvious and voluminous destroyer of industry, our consumer-tax system. That business men and scientists do not, without reform propaganda, see that they are thwarted by about half of sheer robbery of wages and profits, by a tax system, surpasses all belief. How many meetings like this one--meetings where the best minds of industry and education meet and rub together--how many must there be before this obvious truth is stumbled upon?

