

classes? In a recent letter, referring to the Newark proposal, Representative Ralph W. Gwinn points out that the demands of the masses are all too likely to be irresponsible or immoral. The typical individual tenant would not think of occupying by force another man's house or apartment and then deciding how much, if anything, he would pay to the owner for the use of the property. Yet, when we enact by a majority vote a law forcing the taxpayer to build houses and lease them to tenants at absurdly low rates, we do exactly that. We commit robbery and see nothing immoral in our action.

If such legislation produced more houses, more food, and better health and education, it might be partially excusable; but since it always results in lessening the supplies of these things, it is evident that people suffer rather than gain when they put their faith in false gods. The nation always loses when it robs one group to pay for the votes of another group.

Communists everywhere work persistently to gain power for themselves by promising power and privileges for the proletariat. Does or does not the Newark scheme fit into this general pattern? Has Whittaker Chambers exposed all the communists, or do some of them still occupy high places?

THE RISE OF THE UNITED STATES to a scale of living unequalled in history resulted largely from the independence and protection against a collectivist crowd, which our constitutional republic assured each citizen starting new enterprise.

By protecting stockholders and managers from unjustified crowd demands and from government itself, our Constitution released the energies and initiative of individual men, making it possible for them to accumulate capital, make inventions, and provide better tools—the result being higher production per man than the world had ever known.

As the result of the individual enterprise, profit and loss system, Americans have better housing, more food, greater freedom than any other people have ever enjoyed.

All in position to guide public opinion in their communities and circles—clergymen, industrial workers, farmers, educators, lawyers, doctors, heads of service clubs, women's organizations, and farm organizations—all should be familiar with the viewpoints expressed by students of our great public questions.

First, inform yourself; ask for free copies of "Public Housing, Disastrous Here and Abroad," "Our Most Dangerous Lobby," "The Implications of Federal Aid to and Control of Education," "4,000 Years of Failure of OPA," "Benson's Federal Aid to Education," "Sargent's Socialized Medicine."

Then, write a letter on each issue to your Congressman and two Senators. Make the topic a matter of discussion in your community and service groups. Distribute this folder as widely as possible. Up to 5 copies free, postpaid anywhere. In bulk: 40 for \$1; 2c each in quantities of 200 to 700; 1,000 or more, 1½c each, postpaid anywhere. To all to whom you distribute we will stand the cost of supplying 5 free copies, upon their request. Ask for: "Do You Want to Pay Higher Taxes?"

Copyrighted 1949 by the

**Committee For Constitutional Government, Inc.**

205 East 42nd Street

• New York 17, New York

**TO FRIENDS AND EDITORS:** This piece is released for publication as a feature article or letter-to-the-editor, or background material for editorial comment. It carries an important lesson for this country and is worthy of wide distribution. If used, thanks for tear sheet.

## DO YOU WANT TO PAY HIGHER TAXES?

**DO YOU WANT MORE INFLATION**—that malignant unseen virus which causes the value of your saved dollars to shrivel away and makes your cost of living climb higher and higher?

*You know that you are practically sure to suffer one or both of these evils if Uncle Sam goes on a spending spree—pouring new billions into:*

1. Federal aid for education.
2. Federal housing.
3. Socialized medicine.
4. Expanded social security.
5. Veterans' bonuses or pensions.
6. Maintenance of farm prices at wartime levels.
7. Subsidies to shipping.
8. Larger donations or loans to foreign socialist governments.

9. Support for tottering European currencies.
10. Expansion of Federal bureaucracy.
11. Enlarging Federal power projects.

Moreover, as European experience is so effectively demonstrating every day, BIG GOVERNMENT means:

1. Destruction of individual liberty.
2. Inefficiency and waste.
3. Elimination of incentives.
4. Skimpy production, and poverty for all.

If you desire to escape paying more taxes, to avoid further inflation, and to retain economic freedom, tell your Representative in Congress and your Senators to vote *against* spending projects which will unbalance the budget and enlarge the sphere of government, and to vote for economy all along the line. You have a vote. You have influence. They will give heed to your advice. IT'S UP TO YOU!

Tell your representatives that you have enrolled in the grass-roots movement, "Fighters For Freedom," ("grass-roots" F.F.F.), that you will forever oppose those who, regardless of party, squander taxpayers' money to buy minority group votes by socialistic legislation.



Comm. for Constitutional Gov't

# WHERE ARE THOSE COMMUNISTS?

by WILLFORD I. KING

DO YOU BELIEVE that Whittaker Chambers has exposed all the communists operating in the United States? Before definitely coming to this conclusion, you should consider how Michael Pecora, Newark area rent director, and Louis Danzig, his subordinate, are handling the renting of Federal public housing apartments in that New Jersey city.

According to the *Newark Evening News* of December 2, 1948, these men propose to raise or lower the rents of most of their three thousand tenant families on the basis of the respective incomes of those families. Tenants will be required to pay 24 per cent of their incomes for rent if they have no minor dependents, and 17.14 per cent if they have three or four dependents. The avowed purpose of the new rent schedules is to force families having relatively high incomes to move out of these Federally-owned apartments.

Clearly this program aims at putting into practice the basic communist precept which

Karl Marx stated thus: "From each according to his abilities; to each according to his needs." (See *Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Parteiprogramms von Gotha*, p. 17.) The man who works hard and gets ahead is to be penalized; the man who loafs is to be rewarded! Is this the system that made America great?

Doubtless the Federal Housing administrators will assert that their procedure is appropriate because the 3,009 apartments just mentioned were built solely for the purpose of aiding the indigent. But New Dealers are striving to get Congress to appropriate many billions to expand the public housing program. Is all this to be done to aid paupers? Is it not intended to extend the Newark variable rent scale to other public housing projects?

If public housing is to be leased primarily to the poverty stricken, a rental scale which virtually offers premiums for large families is especially anti-social. Anyone having the least familiarity with eugenic science ought to know that one of the nation's toughest social problems is the high birth rate prevailing among the least competent members of our population. And now the Federal Housing authorities move to encourage more births among the indigent! What public servants these are!

And how does this Federal housing program fit in with the ideal of a square deal for all