

A Word With You

By ROBERT CLANCY

Communism is the top talk of the day. The spread of its influence has reached such proportions that even our "liberals" no longer speak sarcastically of a reactionary "viewing with alarm."

In its early days, communism was something with which the advance guard did not consider it disgraceful to be sympathetic. After all, was it not the revolt of the people, the common man, against oppression? Was it not a throwing off of ancient chains? Surely the people would find the way, no matter what mistakes were made.

Well, perhaps they still will! But meanwhile it is evident that they have taken—or rather, have been forced onto—the wrong road.

Still and all, being merely "against" something—even if it's communism—is not very satisfying. Besides, when one is "against," one is likely to find himself with strange bedfellows. Wasn't it to combat the Comintern that the Hitler-Mussolini-Tojo axis was formed?

What has given communism its strength is that it proposes to do something—even if only to turn things upside down. What has given it strength is its most outspoken enemies. The greatest clamor came from those at the top—and whose bandying of the word "freedom" gave that glorious principle a distorted meaning—"We propose to stay at the top."

Thoughtful people today are coming to understand that the only way—not the most effective way, but the only way—to quell communism is to offer both abundance and security, with freedom—to "make democracy work," as the saying goes.

Such an offer had better come soon. Our present winking of "abundance" has not eradicated a gnawing insecurity—and there comes a point when insecure people are more susceptible to wild promises than to reason.

The failure and misery of communism to the east of us may cause the insecure to pause awhile—and give us time to reason them into free land, free trade, free men.

"There are many who . . . are animated only by a blind hatred of the rich and a fierce desire to destroy existing social adjustments. This class is indeed only less dangerous than those who proclaim that no social improvement is needed or is possible."—HENRY GEORGE

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

By SYDNEY MAYERS

Holding that no man can patent "a handiwork of nature," the United States Supreme Court declared invalid a patent granted on a novel bacteriological mixture used by farmers. We patiently await a judicial ruling annulling private patent "rights" in nature's chief handiwork: the earth we live on.

When 100,000 packing plant workers went on strike in support of their demand for a "third round" wage increase, government officials calmly expressed doubt that meat shortages or price increases would ensue. Want to bet, gentlemen?

The South African government proposes increased tariffs to protect local manufacturers against "unfair competition from exporters who sell end-of-season goods at prices far below cost." Obviously, below-cost imports mean more goods at lower prices for the consuming public—but why worry about them when a favored few need "protection"?

Add one vote in support of the Divine Right of rulers—from a somewhat unexpected source. The Patriarch of Moscow nominates Prime Minister Stalin as "the wise leader whom the providence of God chose and set to lead our fatherland."

Lever Brothers Company (chief products: Lifebuoy, Pepsodent, Charles Luckman and Bob Hope) has both reduced its prices and raised its employees' pay, attributing the ability to do so to "the establishment during 1947 of new records in productivity per man-hour." Now, students of Fundamentals, again: Where do wages come from?

The Census Bureau reports that the United States, which has been "over-populated" (according to immigration "experts") for many decades, has reached a new high of 145,340,000 residents. The whirling noise you hear is Dr. Malthus, spinning excitedly in his resting place.

Abandoning their bedside manner (says The New York Times) in an effort to "maintain the integrity of medicine," Britain's physicians are vigorously fighting the National Health Service Act as "dictatorial" and not in the best interests of the public or themselves. Good old Doc—still the stalwart individualist!

In the midst of the political maneuvers now going on, it is to be hoped that action to renew the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act (a small enough step toward free exchange) will not be neglected. As Gerard Swope states: "This program is vital to United States world trade and European recovery, because it provides the means for continuing economic cooperation among the nations."

Hastily, albeit with some face-saving, Britain has repealed its drastic 75 per cent tax on imported (meaning American) motion pictures. This was brought about, let us note, not by American pressure (Hollywood merely boycotted the avid English market), but by the British movie industry, which was nearly wrecked thanks to the curtailment of trade in films.

Quickly following the work stoppage by 400,000 coal miners, an embargo was placed on all coal exports, and all coal-burning railroad service was cut 25 per cent. Thus we see again demonstrated the economic axiom that we live on present, not past, production.

Observing how increased supplies of goods are bringing the consumer back into his own, Earl Shreve, president of General Electric, comments: "Increasing competition brings lower prices, more purchasing power for buyers, better quality of goods. In the long run, more competition will mean more business."

This Statement Was Used by Land and Freedom

We declare:

That the earth is the birthright of all Mankind and that all have an equal and unalienable right to its use.

That man's need for the land is expressed by the Rent of Land; that if this Rent results from the presence and activities of the people; that it arises as the result of Natural Law, and that it therefore should be taken to defray public expenses.

That as a result of permitting land owners to take for private purposes the Rent of Land it becomes necessary to impose the burdens of taxation on the products of labor and industry, which are the rightful property of individuals, and to which the government has no moral right.

That the diversion of the Rent of Land into private pockets and away from public use is a violation of Natural Law, and that the evils arising out of our unjust economic system are the penalties that follow such violation, as effect follows cause.

We therefore demand:

That the full Rent of Land be collected by the government in place of all direct and indirect taxes, and that buildings, machinery, implements and improvements on land, all industry, commerce, thrift and enterprise, all wages, salaries and incomes, and every product of labor and intellect be entirely free from taxation.

That there be no restrictions of any kind imposed upon the exchange of goods within or among nations.

ARGUMENT

Taking the full Rent of Land for public purposes would insure the fullest and best use of all land. Putting land to its fullest and best use would create an unlimited demand for labor. Thus the job would seek the man, not the man the job, and labor would receive its full share of the product.

The freeing from taxation of every product of labor, including commerce and exchange, would encourage men to build and to produce. It would put an end to legalized robbery by the government.

NEXT MONTH:

LAND VALUE TAXATION IN CANADA

by HERBERT T. OWENS

The Henry George News (Continuing The Freeman) is published monthly by the Henry George School of Social Science, 50 E. 69th Street, New York 21, N. Y. Publication Committee: Lancaster M. Greene, Chairman; Otto R. Dorn, William S. O'Connor, Alice Elizabeth Davis, Editor. Entered as Second Class Matter, November 16, 1943, at the post office of New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscriptions \$1 a year, single copies 10c.