

which begins with the use of force and coercion locally for local projects?

Universal Principles

Principles are discovered as they relate to *individuals*, not to masses of people. Is something that is wrong for an individual to do, right when the wrong is multiplied? Or is an action which is right for an individual, some way in error when more than one is involved? A principle is universally applicable, or it is not a principle.

The federal government is not following a policy which is at odds with the convictions of the rank and file of citizens. Despite some clamor to the contrary, the evidence reveals that the people of this nation want what they are getting at the hands of the spend-it boys in Washington. And the cities, counties, and villages are emulating the program, albeit with less flair, less rakishness, less of an attitude of snap-the-fingers, to-hell-with-the-people.

Consider the income tax. Is this the exclusive scheme of the Washington crew? It is not. There are at the moment 31 states with income taxes. Also, there are 256 cities (including boroughs) which are prying into the local purses and lifting out vast sums of money in this same fashion. And if we are

really concerned about local incursions via the income tax route, it might be noted that in Pennsylvania (effective August 1, 1958) 25 first-class townships and 505 school districts began collecting income tax money.

Consider farm subsidies. Is this exclusively a federal program? Again, it is not. Almost all the states have their own agricultural aid programs, which in numerous instances are augmented with county funds.

What about unemployment relief? States, counties, and even cities are in on this one.

So it is with pensions, education, labor-management relations, tariffs (remember the border guards at California and Arizona state lines, not to overlook the so-called "ports of entry" in many states), employment, welfare, government-owned utilities and the ownership of various businesses including golf clubs, zoos, peanut stands, recreational equipment, airports, roads, cemeteries, hobby shops, tourist attractions, and what have you.

The Local Burden Grows

We might even point out—though we do not mean to impress you with size—the National Tax Foundation reports that since 1950, whereas the per family share of the national debt has dropped

by \$188, the per family share of state debt has increased by \$179. It is not this growth that indicates socialism, however; it is the fact of state and local confiscation in any amount that indicates it.

In short, while it may be true that the federal government is moving us toward national socialism on a giant scale, most of our local governments are pursuing this same objective with as much vigor and intensity as they can muster.

Socialism Taxes Individuals

What is socialism? There are many definitions. And without in the least attempting to contrast socialism with its more rabid twin, communism, let us take the definition given by Marx. The core of the socialistic process, as he put it, was this: "From each according to ability, to each according to need." The point is that socialism is initiated at the "from each" part of the process, not at the "to each" part of it. Yet we have so long accustomed ourselves to analyzing socialism according to the things governments do with the money they take from us, that we have almost forgotten the purpose of socialism is primarily served in the taking. As Marx put it in the *Manifesto*: "You accuse us of wishing to do away with your private property. Precisely. That

is exactly what we intend to do."

Nothing is said in the definition which requires that our property and our means of production and distribution, when taken from us, must be transported great distances or taken in quantity above a fixed amount.

"All Business Is Local"

In the newspaper business we have a slogan, "All business is local." Newspapers are big business. But they are all big *local* business. It is true that almost all newspapers make an effort to acquire national advertising. But, the fact remains that the advertising rates of the newspapers are determined by the number of their local subscribers, and it is in the hope that the local subscribers will purchase the nationally advertised product that the advertiser buys space. In other words, even the national distributor knows that all business is local.

But, we are told, newspapers are not local. Do they not subscribe to wire services, and is it not the fact that they are filled with national and international events which makes them readable? But what is national or international news, except something that is local somewhere? And isn't the reader of a paper always a person who exists locally at some place in space? Isn't that