

The Individualist

A Pint-size Periodical of Pith, Punch and Perspicacity

VOLUME SIX

NOVEMBER, 1953

NUMBER FOUR

SLOW POKE

We've been remiss. We should have told you sooner. We're back from Anna Maria Island where, with the aid—such as it was—of the everloving helpmeet, we ran the Islander during the summer and a little more—May 1 to October 1.

Running a country weekly is fun. So is running THE INDIVIDUALIST. There was, however, this oddity about running the Islander—we got paid for it. And now we're back, back home to the Steeletrap.

So-o-o you slow ones, when you get ready to send in your past-due renewal—\$2, remember?—send it to 2507 - 13th Ave. W., Bradenton, Florida. And our blessings will be upon you—but not until you send it, not until you send that two bucks. Until then you'll have to get your blessings elsewhere—you'll have none of ours.

THE CASE OF THE MISSING ANSWERS

Gallupoll came into the room.

For the sake of the new customers it should be explained that Gallupoll is our bird dog. We call him Gallupoll for short—and because he's always nosing around finding out things, some of which turn out to be true. Old readers, who know Gallupoll already, should skip this paragraph.

"Why all the excitement," he demanded, "about finding a way to make the bastards talk?"

"Elucidate," we said, "and besides you shouldn't speak that way of New Dealers."

"Who's talking about New Dealers. I mean the Reds and pinkos who clam up on the witness stand and won't talk. But, since you mention it, most of them are New Dealers, and, of course, most New Dealers are—"

"Skip it," we admonished, "and get on with what you are getting on with—if any."

"It's like this," he said. "A lot of people want a law authorizing congressional committees to grant immunity to balky witnesses, so that they can't hide behind the Fifth Amendment and refuse to answer for fear of incriminating themselves."

"What's wrong about that? It would smoke 'em out, wouldn't it?"

"It isn't necessary, that's what's wrong about it. They're getting the answers anyway, the committees."

"Do tell."

"This here Elizabeth Bentley was up before a Senate committee a few weeks ago—"

"She's the gal who admits she was a Communist and a spy-ring courier during World War II, isn't she?"

"Right. Well, this Bentley dame was on the stand—which was old stuff to her. She's been there so often you'd think some of the senators were dating her—or trying to. They've certainly been seeing a lot of each other.

Well, that's when she put the finger on a couple of guys in the audience—Silvermaster and Ullman. Silvermaster, she said, was head of a Soviet spy ring operating within the government. Ullman was a member of the same Red underground unit. And it was Ullman, she said, who helped Russia get U. S. plates to print gobs of wartime German occupational currency—at a cost of millions to the U. S. A. Just a couple of nice lads, that pair."

"Then what?"

"Then the senators began questioning the two men. Neither would talk—fear of self-incrimination. That proves my point—no law is needed. When those two jerks refused to answer, that's when they *did* answer. That's when they showed they were guilty—guilty as hell."

"How do you figure that?"

"If they were innocent they would have said so."

"They could have said so anyway."

"Not if they told the truth."

"Since when has a Communist cared a rap about whether he told the truth?"

"He doesn't care a rap about whether he tells the truth, but he cares plenty about taking a rap for perjury. In a criminal court a plea of not guilty is permissible, whether you are guilty or not. But if you say no to a congressional committee when the true answer is yes, and they catch you at it, you'll do a stretch for perjury, or contempt—or both. You can't incriminate yourself by saying no—if no is the right answer. So you can bet your sweet life that when one of those birds refuses to talk on the witness stand on the ground that he might incriminate himself, he's guilty—and that's that. Moreover—"

"Go," we said, "away. We're busy."

He left, looking a little hurt, and leaving us a little ashamed that we'd been short with him. For it looks like the doggone dog's got something at that.

QUIZZIFYING

A Florida Congressman asks his constituents to express their views on 14 vital questions confronting Congress. We are not one of the gentleman's constituents, being in a neighboring district, but we'll give our answer anyway—without regard to the Fifth Amendment. And we salute him for propounding such timely and pertinent queries. We are printing the list below on the belief that some of our readers might like to have a try at it. Here are the questions—and the answers as we think they should be:

1. As the law now stands individual income taxes will be reduced in 1954. Do you favor this reduction before balancing the budget? Do you favor this reduction even if it means curtailing our military preparedness program? Do you favor this reduction

even if it means curtailing our mutual aid program?

Ans. Yes, don't put it off. Cut out the waste, extravagance, duplication and inefficiency and the military preparedness program could be carried out with a saving of more billions than the tax cut would amount to. And that's allowing—which is by no means certain—that so extensive a program is necessary. As to the mutual aid program, what's mutual about it and what have we got to show for it save the enmity of other nations? It shouldn't be curtailed, it should be scrapped—in toto and instantar.

2. Do you favor extending old age and survivor's insurance (social security) to persons or groups not now covered and elimination of old age assistance?

Ans. Instead of being extended social security should be abolished. It's a scheme to which employers and employees are compelled to contribute, whether they want to or not. The greater part of the billions thus exacted—the part that should be set aside as reserves against future claims—are spent as fast as they come in. A government IOU is put in the cash drawer in place of the money. If a private insurance company operated that way it would be bankrupt in fifteen minutes—and its officers would wind up in jail.

Old age assistance is not a proper function of the federal government. That's a matter for the family to take care of. If the family can't, then the friends and neighbors. If the friends and neighbors can't, then the local community. Never should it go beyond the local community.

3. Do you favor a constitutional amendment requiring all treaties made by the President to be confirmed by the Senate before they become effective?

Ans. Yes, dammit, we've had enough Yaltas!

4. Would you favor a law prohibiting the Federal Government from spending more than its annual revenue?

Ans. Yes.

5. Do you favor the continuing of our foreign economic and military aid program?

Ans. No. Like all the other "give-away" and "do-good" schemes furnishing joy-rides for bureaucrats, it should be knocked in the head forthwith.

6. Do you favor a federal general sales tax?

Ans. We already have 'em, in excise and hidden taxes collected by the federal government. They all add to price. Any tax that adds to price is a sales tax. A federal sales tax would be no worse than any other tax that falls on labor products, thereby making them more costly. All taxes do that except the land-value tax—which *lowers* the selling price of land instead of increasing it, and adds nothing to commodity prices—and the inheritance tax, which is really a capital levy rather than a tax.

7. Do you approve of the federal housing program?

Ans. Hell, no! The government has no more right to take my money to build a house for somebody else than I would have to rob a bank for money to build my own house.

8. Do you favor the continuing of the reciprocal trade agreements?

Ans. Of course, though they don't go far enough. Men profit only by trading. They never trade unless they get more—as they value things at the moment—than they give. Hence, the more they trade, the greater their profit. Why should American consumers be penalized so that American firms which can't meet foreign competition may stay in business? Why shouldn't they be allowed to avail themselves of free market prices? All barriers to trade should be broken down, and the U. S. should start the leveling without waiting to see what other nations will do. We'd benefit from the very start.

9. Do you favor admission of Hawaii to statehood? Do you favor admission of Alaska to statehood?

Ans. No. No.

10. Do you favor revision of the Taft-Hartley Law?

Ans. Only if it is strengthened in its provisions against labor monopoly. Repeal would be better, with labor matters left to states and smaller communities. Organized labor should be subject to suit for breach of contract; it should be held accountable for its acts, and it should not be immune to the combination-in-restraint-of-trade provision of the Sherman Act.

11. Do you favor an agricultural price support program?

Ans. Heavens, no! Price supports are unwise and economically unsound. The only proper price is the one which finds its level in a free market. There's neither justice nor a reasonable facsimile thereof in a law which compels the Steeles to help those hardy sons of toil keep up the payments on their Cadillacs. They don't help the Steeles buy gas for their 1947 Pontiac.

12. Should the president and vice-president be nominated in state primaries rather than by the present national convention method?

Ans. Yes, if only because it would save several thousand delegates to the two major national conventions making jackassery spectacles of themselves every four years. Even so, it's doubtful that there would be any great improvement in the caliber of candidates chosen.

13. Do you favor a veteran's pension at 65 years of age?

Ans. We don't favor a government pension for *anybody* at *any* age, except for veterans with service-incurred disability. Otherwise pensions should be paid for by them as gets 'em—and not by the taxpayers. Pension plans should be handled by insurance companies, banks, labor unions or other concerns operating on a sound actuarial basis under banking and insurance laws. Government bureaucrats are the last people in the world that should be allowed to get their hands on the dough.

14. Beginning with the depression and for the years following, the Federal Government branched out into a number of various businesses. Do you favor the Federal Government now getting out of business which is in competition with private enterprise, such as hydro-electric power, printing and other industries in order that private initiative and free enterprise might again carry on the business of this country?

Ans. The federal government should get out of *all* business, even the Post Office. Handling the mails is not competitive because the government has a monopoly but private enterprise could, without a doubt, do it more efficiently and at much less cost. It's the government's business to maintain freedom and security—and that's all.

OUR TICKET!

Benson and McCarthy—and we don't mean for alderman and dog catcher, either. We mean for President and Secretary of State. True, the Secretary of State isn't elected, he's appointed. Even so, it's a good team and we'll work for it.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has shown guts over and beyond the call of duty in standing up to the farmers. Not in twenty years has any government official had nerve enough to tell those guys they ought to stand on their own feet—until Ezra came along.

We like Senator Joe McCarthy for Secretary of State because America's only real enemies are the Communists, and Joe has done more to give the bums the bum's rush than any other six men in public life today.

The influence of THE INDIVIDUALIST being what it is, the ticket ought to get two votes—if we don't change our mind and we can make the everloving helpmeet do as we tell her.

So them's our sentiments. Want to make something of it?

JOBS FOR ALL

In an article in NEWSWEEK headed, "U. S. Campus Kids of 1953: Unkiddable and Unbeatable," we came across this: "A Princeton senior, sipping his beer in a small bar, said: 'The world doesn't owe me a living—but it owes me a job.'"

That's an improvement over what we've been hearing for lo these many years from young and old alike. Franklin Delano Roosevelt started the fool notion early in his first term by publicly announcing the doctrine, brand-new in American history, that the State owes its citizens a living. That, of course, is socialistic nonsense, as the Princeton senior has come to recognize. The young man, however, is not as clear as he might be in saying the world owes him a job. He's got hold of the right idea but phrases it a bit loosely.

The world doesn't owe him a job but his government owes it to him to see that there are no obstacles put in the way of his getting a job—and to remove any obstacles that now exist. The chief barrier to jobs—the only one of any importance—is our system of land tenure which permits land that would provide millions of well-paid jobs to be held out of

use in the hope of speculative gain. That's about the only reason good land is ever held out of use more than temporarily.

Henry Ford, the elder, had the right idea when he said that idle land "should be taxed into use." What he had in mind, of course, was the proposal of Henry George. George said that the annual use value of land, being the product of no man's effort and solely a concomitant to community growth and development, should be taken by the community for community needs. The adoption of such a proposal would mean that idle land would become available to any who wanted to use it at little or no cost, since the selling price of land would disappear to the extent that its annual rental value is taken by the community. If it were taken in full, there would be no selling price and land would be available on the mere payment of rent to the community.

If land-value taxation were put into effect in full, landholders would hasten to put their idle land to use, since no one could afford to pay the full rental value, or any considerable part of it, as a land-value tax on land bringing no income. That step in itself would mean an enormous increase in jobs since you can't put land to work without putting men to work.

But that would be only the beginning. Inevitably vast areas of land would be freed for use, land which the owners could not themselves put into use. That would mean more millions of jobs. It would not mean that every job-seeker would have to become a farmer. The truth is that when a farmer goes to work he makes jobs for a dozen other men—in shops and factories and mills and transportation and offices all over the country. With the putting into effect in full of land-value taxation, not only would widespread involuntary unemployment quickly become a thing of the past, there would actually be more jobs to be filled than men to fill them. Demand would exceed supply. The Princeton senior's troubles would be over.

Land-value taxation is already in operation in varying degrees all over the country. There probably isn't a piece of worth-having land in the United States that isn't paying a tax in some amount. That fact seems to be overlooked by large numbers of people who insist that land-value taxation is a crazy idea that never has worked and never will. And also by the proposal's more rabid adherents who clamor so vociferously for its adoption you'd think it never had been tried at all, and that the millenium will be here when it is.

With insignificant exceptions, there is no locality in the United States where the land-value tax is equal to as much as one-half the rental value of land. In New York City it's approximately one-third.

Purists insist that the term "land-value taxation" is a misnomer, that no tax is involved when the community merely takes for its own use a value for which the community is solely responsible and which, therefore, belongs of a right to the community. The purists, of course, are correct. Being lazy, we'll stick to "land-value taxation." It means fewer

words, and that's our constant aim—to say things in fewer words.

The millenium won't be here when land-value taxation has been adopted in full—as it will be some day. But it will be appreciably closer. The objective of the so-called though misnamed “single taxers,” is freedom. Freedom is the end, as they see it, land-value taxation the means to the end. There can never be freedom so long as some men are in position to compel other men to pay them for the privilege of working—so long as some men can keep other men from working.

WE'RE EXPANDING

We are going into the stamp business, but not, you may be sure, out of THE INDIVIDUALIST business. We plan to continue Individualist indefinitely.

We are starting a mail-order stamp business, and we hope in time to enroll in our “club” thousands and thousands of amateurs in one of the most delightful and educational hobbies of them all—stamp collecting. Age limits for club membership: 8 to 80. If any of the members of your family—you individual reader—qualify in that respect, we'd be most grateful if you'd send us their names. And other names, too, of course. We'll send 'em a sample and try to get them interested.

It ought to be a lot of fun for everybody concerned. Some of those stamps are items of *rare beauty*—with the accent on both words. Fifty cents will bring specimens!

WHAT DO YOU MEAN FAIR?

A big supermarket in New Orleans had been selling a well-known brand of insulin at \$2.08 a bottle instead of \$2.83, the figure set by Louisiana's “fair price” law. The supermarketeters were ordered to stop it, that \$2.08 business. They said nuts, and appealed. They lost. They carried the case clear up to the U. S. Supreme Court in a petition challenging the constitutionality of the law. The Supreme Court declined to act. That means that the decision of a U. S. District Court in New Orleans upholding the law will stand, unless there is an adverse ruling later.

The law allows manufacturers, by agreement with retailers, to set prices at which products will be sold to consumers in the 45 states which have “fair trade” laws. Even if signed by only one retailer in a state, the agreement is made binding on all other dealers in that state—including those who refused to sign.

There may be a dozen makers of insulin in the United States, maybe a hundred or a thousand. We wouldn't know—we're not in the insulin business. There may be a million diabetics in the United States, maybe several million. We wouldn't know about that, either. We're not a diabetic—for which we are humbly grateful.

But this we do know: the lives of those diabetics depend on their daily shots of insulin. They are in no position to stage a buyers' strike. They must have their insulin or die.

So-o-o, we are wondering. What's “fair” about a law which keeps retailers from selling

insulin for as little as they are willing to take, and which compels diabetics to pay more for their insulin than they would have to pay but for the “fair price” business? We are wondering, but we won't wait for somebody to tell us. We won't *live* that long.

FINANCIAL REPORT

Lest misconceptions be further misconceived and readers come to think the editorial family have joined the filthy rich, it seems fitting that a final word be said anent the matter which was brought to the fore in THE INDIVIDUALIST for July, wherein 't was writ: “WANTED—Eight Americans with incomes of \$50,000 a year or more to subscribe \$500 each to a sustaining fund for THE INDIVIDUALIST.”

It developed that nary an American with an income of \$50,000—or any other amount, for that matter—cared a whoop about releasing so much as \$500 of said income in said manner—or \$400 or \$300 or \$200. A few generous friends came in with \$100 each, a few more with \$50, and others with smaller amounts. Total was about \$600, and half the contributors were “repeats”—they had helped out the year before.

Thus, with the renewals which have been received, printing and mailing costs for the year are assured. If there's any left over, it will be ours—and a surprise.

There'll be no more begging in these columns. Rather than that there'll be no more columns—though we earnestly hope things won't come to such a pass. If any of our readers feel like sending in subscriptions for friends—well, that'd be swell. And maybe the friends won't mind, either.

UNDEBTEDLY

A while back the Administration asked Congress to increase the federal debt limit. Congress said go chase yourself—or congressional words to that effect. So what happens? A few weeks ago the national debt stood at \$272,500,000,000—less than one per cent away from the limit of \$275 billion. Even for the Treasury boys that's too close for comfort. So they canceled sales of short-term government tax-saving notes, which had been bringing in about \$60 million a day, in order to avoid going through the ceiling before they knew it.

What the government lads had been doing with that sixty million a day we wouldn't know. They weren't putting it in a piggy bank, that's a cinch. Whatever it was they won't be doing it any more. It's easy to be economical when you've reached the limit of your credit and don't have a nickel in your jeans—no fun, certainly, but easy.

Congress does some foolish things at times—like prohibition and price controls. But Congress wasn't being foolish when it refused to increase the debt limit. Eisenhower has done some smart things at times. Asking that the debt limit be hiked wasn't one of them.

Which brings on a story. The town's leading merchant was a member of the Board of Aldermen. The proposal was made that the town float a bond issue of a million dollars

for some improvement which, it was claimed, was justified by the town's expected growth. The merchant objected. Said one of the proponents of the measure, “But Mr. Jones, you are spending a million dollars expanding the facilities of your own business on the prospects of the town's growth, aren't you?”

“Yes,” admitted Mr. Jones, “I am.”

“Well then,” demanded the other, “what's the difference? If it's good business for you, why isn't it good business for the city?”

“The difference,” replied Mr. Jones, “is this. I've got the million.”

President Eisenhower please note.

WORDS, WORDS, WORDS

Speaking of words—no one was, but we will—the fewer you use to say your say, the better you'll say it. And the converse is true. The most horrible example of a diarrhea of words combined with a constipation of ideas we have run across recently is Section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code. It is not an obscure portion of the law; it's the tax basis for pension plans, one of the most important sections of our tax law. We won't inflict you with all of it. But then it won't take all of it to be enough—and then some. Here we go:

“(1) General Rule.—If contributions are paid by an employer to or under a stock bonus, pension, profit-sharing or annuity plan, or if compensation is paid or accrued on account of any employee under a plan deferring the receipt of such compensation, such contributions or compensation shall not be deductible under subsection (a) but shall be deductible, if deductible under subsection (a) without regard to this subsection, under this subsection but only to the following extent:

“(a) In the taxable year when paid if the contributions are paid into a pension trust (let's omit three or four lines) . . . is exempt under section 165 (a), in an amount determined as follows:

“(i) an amount not in excess of 5 per centum of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued (we'll skip another half-dozen lines) . . . to be more than the amount reasonably necessary to provide the remaining unfunded cost of past and current service credits of all employees under the plan, plus

“(ii) any excess over the amount allowable under clause (i) necessary to provide with respect (we've lost all respect by now, so let's get on to the last line of (ii)) . . . shall be distributable over a period of at least 5 taxable years, or

“(iii) in lieu of the amounts allowable under (i) and (ii) above, an amount equal to the normal cost of the plan, as determined under the regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, plus, if past service or other supplementary pension or annuity credits are provided by the plan, an amount (if the Commissioner prescribed anything like that he ought to be shot, and if the Secretary approved it, he ought to be drawn and quartered) . . . except that in no case shall deduction be allowed for any amount (other than the normal cost) paid in after such pension or annuity credits are completely funded or purchased.”

And that's that, thank heaven. You have been given the benefit of omits; we had to read it all. It's one sentence of 440 words. Normally 440 words can be read understandingly in less than two minutes. If any living person can read those 440 words from the Internal Revenue Code, Section 23, and tell in *two hours* what they mean, we'll give him a year's subscription to THE INDIVIDUALIST. And if we ever catch ourselves writing like that, we'll take a feather duster and beat our own brains out!

"IS CAPITALISM BAD?"

Young Norman Wiegel is a senior in a Chicago high school. His Civics Class is studying Magruder's "American Government." Recently, in the lesson for the day, this sentence appeared in the Magruder text: "Capitalists naturally restrict the output of a commodity to increase the unit price."

Norman arose in his class and said that capitalists did nothing of the kind. Asked by his teacher how come and why, the lad said he was a regular reader of "The Fact Finder," a pocket-size Chicago publication which told the truth about capitalism, communism, private enterprise, and the like, and that was where he got his information. He advised his teacher to get a copy, which the teacher did, to his credit, with the result that there was one high school class studying Magruder's textbook which didn't fall for the Magruder socialist-slanted lies.

"The Fact Finder" is written with a human interest touch which makes ordinarily dull subjects anything but ordinary and dull. We suggest that you write to our friend, Harry T. Everingham, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago 1, for a copy of the number entitled "Is Capitalism Bad?" You'll like the little periodical—that we'll guarantee. Just as Norman Wiegel does—and for the same reason.

MORE WRECKONOMICS

The Democrats threw a Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner at Oklahoma City last Jefferson-Jackson Day. The chief speaker was Senator Symington of Missouri. The Senator told his hearers that Secretary of Agriculture Benson "wants to circumvent the will of Congress by cutting to pieces the prices of cattle through the withholding of feed . . . But he has no right to blame the terrible results of his decision on the Democratic Party."

The Senator should of stood in bed—or talked about the flag, home and Mother. Instead, he stuck his neck out. He said, "The American cattleman and dairyman are not asking to be given anything." (At that very moment 350 rebel-yelling cattlemen were in Washington demanding that Secretary Benson support cattle prices at not less than 90 per cent of parity—the level now maintained by law on "basic" farm crops.)

The drought-stricken farmers, said the Senator, getting himself further out on the limb, want only to be allowed to buy feed from the enormous government surpluses "at prices which make it possible for them to hold their cattle through the Winter."

The simple truth is that the high price of feed is the direct result of price-support measures voted by a Democratic Congress in the

Truman Administration. It is equally true, of course, that the Republicans are carrying on the same economy-wrecking program, but that doesn't let the Democrats out as Senator Symington would have you believe.

Without a doubt many farmers have been hurt, and badly, by drought, but no drought in all history ever did one-tenth the damage that twenty years of crop-control and price-support madness have caused.

BREVITIES AND LEVITIES

IN THE NEWS story of the death of William (Big Bill) Hutcheson, former president of the AFL Carpenters Union and one of labor's most powerful figures, we read: "The big, hulking 79-year-old Hutcheson ruled 800,000 carpenters with an iron hand until he relinquished control of the union to his son two years ago. He had held control 36 years."

And after the son has held control 36 years—or longer if he likes—he can turn over the 800,000 to his son. That's what President Eisenhower calls "free trade unionism."

ANOTHER EXAMPLE of how "free trade unionism" works is seen in the strike of the AFL United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers Union against Hat Corporation of America. The company wants to move one of its three South Norwalk plants "somewhere west of the Mississippi." Nothing doing, says the union, and 1400 workers strike.

You might think the owners of the plant would have a right to move it where they please—this is a free country, isn't it? OK, go ahead and think. This is a free country. It's not like England, where you'd have to have government permission to move your plant. Here, you don't have to have government permission to move. All you have to have is permission of your "free trade union"—if you can get it!

WHY, we asked ourselves, couldn't the President have named as Chief Justice some one like Judge Medina, of New York, a brilliant lawyer and a distinguished judge. Then we realized we had answered our own question. Brilliant lawyers and distinguished judges aren't appointed to the Supreme Court—not any more. If you doubt that, go over the present membership and see what you come up with.

NEWS HEADLINE: "1,000,000 Pounds Of Free U. S. Butter Goes To Berlin."

Free? Well, in a manner of speaking. It's free to the Berliners who get it and don't pay for it. It's not free to the American taxpayers who pay for it and don't get it. They are stuck twice, the Americans. First in higher taxes to pay for the butter that's given away; second in higher prices they pay for the butter they buy for themselves.

For American buttermakers it means—more profit. For Berliners it means—more butter. For American bureaucrats it means—more jobs. For American taxpayers it means—morons!

WALTER REUTHER, the socialist stalwart who got his Marxist training in that glorious democracy known as Soviet Russia, says that the Eisenhower Administration is following a "trickle down" policy which piles up food on the banquet tables of the wealthy so that crumbs may trickle down to the poor. His statement was so moving we almost cried in our coffee when we read it at the breakfast table. We would have but for one thing. We couldn't decide whether his CIO members, who are drawing the highest wages ever paid to industrial workers in all the history of the world, were sitting at the piled up banquet tables of the wealthy or among the poor, waiting for the crumbs to trickle down. He should have been more specific about who was getting the crumbs—the crumb.

A CUSTOMER writes: "I have voted for only two New Dealers in my life—Eisenhower and Dewey."

We read in NEWSWEEK'S Periscope: "This could have something to do with the stiffened reluctance of Norway and Denmark to let the NATO build and use air bases of their territory. Both countries have recently been doing tremendously increased trade with Russia. Norwegian-Soviet trade has increased 60 per cent since April." People don't quarrel with each other when they trade with each other—regardless of boundary lines or nationalities.

It's when they don't trade that they quarrel. Complete free trade the world over would be one of the biggest steps toward world-wide peace and prosperity the world has ever known.

HEAD LINES AND TAIL LIGHTS

"Mrs. Roosevelt Says DAR Harms United Nations." First kind word we've heard about the DAR in a coon's age.

"Indians See Explaining Talks Ended." So did everybody else who was there.

"Quads Born to Woman Divorced Nine Years." Tchh, tchh, tchh!

"Ingrid Bergman Is Suing Writer For One Cent." And if she gets it the guy'll be broke—if he's like most writers.

"Frank Hague's Nephew Backs Republicans in New Jersey." Those poor Republicans!

"Secretary Weeks Says U. S. Solvency Demands Sacrifices by Business." It's the U. S. government that's been demanding 'em for twenty years. Now it's U. S. solvency. Same thing, so far as business is concerned—and the same sacrifices.

"Senator George Says Let Europe Help Herself." He doesn't want to let George do it.

"Nepal King Is Stricken On His European Tour." Reminds us of the man who was shot between the roundhouse and the watering tank.

"Two Brothers Ready For New Round In Church Fight." Sounds like competition for Madison Square Garden.

From a news story: "Police Lt. Louis Shoulders, who arrested Hall and later resigned in the furor caused by an investigation of his handling of the case, were here to testify." He were?

"Bishop Says Entirely Too Much Teen-Age Crime." How much would he consider the proper amount?

"Psychologist Says Americans Not As Happy As They Would Like To Be." Who is?

"Queen Elizabeth Is An Unusual Wife." Of course she is. How many women have husbands whose wives are queens!

"Molotov Missing From Red Scene." Which improved the scene a lot, we'll bet.

"Bishop Smashes Commandment." A lot of people do—but not with a sledge-hammer.

"Soviet Envoy Called Boss Of Red Spies." What did he call him?

"Greek King and Queen Eat Hot Dogs And Praise U. S." Let's feed some of those hot dogs to Vishinsky, and see what happens.

"Protesting POW's Hear Explainers." Which was nothing to what the explainer heard.

"General Marshall Gets 1953 Nobel Peace Prize." And who gets the peace?

"Fire Plug Knocked Over." Tough on the neighborhood dogs!

"Tarpon Springs Rotarians Hear Member From Brazil." We can get New Zealand on our set.

"Ban Nut Gathering." The Navajos did it on their reservation. There's no such ban in Washington.

"Multimillionaire Suffers From Poor Circulation." So does The Individualist.

"Wife Shoots Husband Who Pours Liquor Over Her Head." Liquor prices being what they are, no wonder she shot him.

THE INDIVIDUALIST

Published monthly by C. O. Steele,
2507 - 13th Ave. W., Bradenton, Florida.
Subscription \$2 a year.

THIRD CLASS
PERMIT No. 2
SEC. 34.66 P.L. & R.
BRADENTON, FLA.

Mrs. Mabel L. Rees
39 Winthrop Street
Brooklyn, N.Y.