

June 14—"Our Topheavy Government—Is Bureaucracy Inevitable?" WPA Administrator, Victor F. Ridder.

June 21—"Should Capital Punishment be Abolished?" Dr. Frank L. Meleney.

June 28—"Can a Free Press Exist?" Governor Harold G. Hoffman of New Jersey.

July 5—"Our Civil Liberties." Corliss Lamont.

July 12 "High Cost of Distribution." Commissioner Fellows Morgan, Jr., of Public Markets.

It is rare that even with these subjects that are foreign to economics, Mr. Ingersoll does not introduce an element of Georgian philosophy. Experience with "professionals" has surprised the chairman, and, in a way, favor his economic policies. In almost every instance, such as crime, inflation, war, capital punishment, the societies operated for the advancement of these subjects have failed to cooperate, leaving the chairman to go outside to have their subjects represented. The notable case was that of inflation, where a canvas was made from top to bottom of a long line of professorial directors on the "Committee" on this subject, and failing, Mr. Burger was selected with the result that the Forum had a real covering of the subject.

Following are the subjects and some of the speakers selected up to September 20, when it is expected that the time will be extended to an hour each Sunday, and facilities provided for permanent and effective management.

July 19—"The Drugless Doctor;" Dr. McCaughan. 26—"Reforms and Reformers."

Aug. 2—"Collectivism vs. Democracy;" Chairman and Socialist. 9—"Are Colleges Bringing Us Communism?" 16—"Monopoly—legal, industrial, natural;" Spencer Heath. 23—"Destiny of the Railroads." 30—"What is social security?" Benj. W. Burger.

Sept. 6—"Who Actually Pays the Taxes?" 13—"Is Class Warfare Necessary" 20—"A New Charter for New York City;" Raymond V. Ingersoll, Borough President of Brooklyn.

Here is Mr. Ingersoll's present radio schedule:

WCNW, Mon., Tues., Wed., Thur., 2:30 p.m., Sat., 7 p.m.; WWRL, Wed., 1:15 p.m., Mon. 10:15 p.m., Sat., 11 p.m.; WLTH, Tues., 1:15 p.m.; WDAS, Fri., 1:00 p.m.; WILM, Fri., 3:15 p.m.; WOV, Thurs., 9:30 a.m.; Sun., 6:30-7 p.m., Public Service Forum.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. INGERSOLL'S RADIO TALKS

I don't read political platforms with the same prayerful attention that some people do—or used to—their Bibles. But I have read the two big ones enough to appreciate the humor of young Mr. Hamilton in denouncing the Democratic platform as evasive, etc. I think the Democratic platform has a better right to evade than the Republican, since the G.O.P. ran things for fifty years, and brought us into the economic muddle of '29. Of course it is leader Hamilton's job to laugh this off; that is why the Republican candidate had to have a smiling physiognomy and an innocuous platform and a breezy campaign manager.

I don't like the President's socialistic activities, nor his glittering generalities of speech or platform, any better than Hamilton does. But I must say that I'd just as soon have the President go on distributing wealth, profits, and wages, as to have "the same old gang" make him "move over," without making any explanation of their own stewardship terminating in 1932. This country is under the heel of monopoly; and monopoly starts with tying up the natural resources of the earth, where production can't get at them, and from this start, there's a variety of lesser monopoly, in utilities, industry, commerce and finance. This bone is for Mr. Landon to pick, since the President is not interested.

If we were doing something else in high places of government, but talk in beautiful phrases—if we were thinking—the present news of a destructive drought would have the effect of sobering, if not suppressing, some of the academic or sophomoric outgivings of Secretary Wallace. While the Secretary is busy re-aligning his forces of permanent subsidies to farm landlords, at the cost of the masses of poverty-stricken consumers—re-aligning them to evade Supreme Court decisions—Nature comes along and actually does the job he has been trying to do.

But Wallace has not the grace to acknowledge Nature as his ally, and close up his office, go home to his farm paper and burn up his robber processing tax laws, he casually recognizes the drought, by way of making some allowance for its destruction of possibly half a billion bushels of wheat. The craze for helping the farmer should be mitigated by taking off his back all taxes on his buildings, equipment, improvements, and necessities of life. But the big vital help would be the removal of all such taxes from the hundred million consumers of his products, so they could double their consumption, enabling him to double production, and make money at lower unit prices. This statement of economics sheds an awful cloud on the Secretary's policy of destruction, taxation and high prices.

Our U. S. Treasurer, Morgenthau, is an optimist, otherwise he would not be pleased with our total of about 35 billions of debt and deficit for this year, of about 5 billions, which makes about 20 billions for his administration. We must remember that Mr. Morgenthau is a product of Wall Street, and that his father, the ex-Ambassador to Turkey, is one of New York's greatest land speculators. And all this is not a very good start in the conservative finance, that should guide the treasurer of the greatest nation. And this does not count the brain trust influences around him. The Secretary is like the financial man of a big industrial or mercantile business, at the peak of an inflationary period; everything is inflated, including borrowings that have gone the limit. And everything is so distorted as to have destroyed the conservative's plumb lines, yardsticks, and standards. What would the Secretary think if some economist told him that practically every dollar of his 35 billions of debt was taken from improper sources, leaving monopoly thriving upon an equal amount of exemption from taxation.

Is "Labor" going to divide itself between our two old parties? Offhand this seems ridiculous, but examination modifies this view. Socialism and communism is fairly divided between the old parties, although the Democrats are more conscious and articulate, in their advocacy of collectivists doctrine. The confusion is such on all questions that they are fairly tangled up in all parties. The fact that there are no essential, fundamental, or economic differences between any of the numerous platforms further indicates this confusion. Indications are that Green and his A. F. of L. may go to "the right," and join the so-called conservative Republicans, though they are the worst radicals, having sacrificed business, capital, wealth and the laboring masses to monopoly. This will leave Mr. Lewis and his "one big union" to the more friendly and communistic Democrats, who are frankly experimenting in socializing "everything," while ignoring monopoly.