

distant future" holds the answer. Events these days are deciding things rather quickly. We may not have to wait too long for an answer to Mr. Mayer's speculations.

In the Epilogue, Mr. Mayer reiterates the principles upon which the European tradition is founded, and which has stood the test of two thousand years—principles which have often been abandoned, but which constantly recur: "Freedom of thought and doctrine; the dignity of the individual; a human responsibility to society and the State."

R. C.

### SEVEN SORRY YEARS

"After Seven Years," by Raymond Moley. Harper and Brothers, New York and London. 1939. 446 pp. \$3.00.

Mr. Moley's book—a critique of the last seven years of Roosevelt—bids fair to serve as a warning to all budding patriots, students of social science, amateur economists, so-called professional economists, reformers and new-world architects, to make sure that the kite to which they wish to tie themselves as tail segments is in the hands of a competent flyer. That the great kite of the American republic has not yet crashed upon the rocks of complete bankruptcy, is a credit to the stamina of a people still endowed with a strong love of liberty, and to whom opportunities to fulfill ambitions have not yet been completely closed.

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President, Georgeists were convinced that he could not be expected to do anything to bring about economic justice, for the simple reason that he did not know the causes of economic injustice. If, after all these years of New Deal, any further proof is needed that they were right, Mr. Moley's book has provided it.

The first chapter of "After Seven Years" tells of the birth of the New Deal, when Roosevelt was still Governor of New York and was mentioned for the Democratic nomination to the Presidency. Moley was interested in Roosevelt's ideas, and saw in an affiliation with him an opportunity to "satisfy my desire for a wider experience in politics and, at the same time, to help, in a small way, in the realization of old and time-tested concepts of political evolution." Moley also thought that Roosevelt was the one "who could do on a national scale what Tom Johnson had done in Cleveland." During the campaign, he had ample time to entertain doubts as to the ability of his champion to fill that role. For Roosevelt seems to have thought of nothing but success, and he left to his yeomen, the "brain trust," the lesser tasks of formulating policies and principles.

Chapter II is properly entitled "Gayly the Troubadour." For while the farm policy and other features of the planned economy of the New Deal were being thrown together by twenty-five super-minds, the Troubadour was merrily instilling the nation and the "forgotten man" with confidence. At that time Mr. Moley began to have qualms of misgivings.

In the chapter, "For Kings Cannot Err," the story of the London Conference is told. Moley relates how this "dream of world salvation" was bungled by Roosevelt. His rejection of the proposals for stabilizing the currency in foreign exchange, and his famous "bombshell"—although not understood by the delegates—wrecked that Conference.

Moley himself is no economic sage. For one thing he is a high-tariff advocate. But, having some inkling of economics, it is hard to understand why he sacrificed time, money and health to push forward to a high political office a man who was thoroughly unprepared in fundamental economics.

JOHN LUXTON.

## Correspondence

### COOPERATIVES AND HENRY GEORGE

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I was very pleased to see the article by Holger Lyngholm on "Cooperation and Democracy in Denmark," in your last issue. For a long time I have believed that the cooperative principle and the Georgeist philosophy are related. Toyohiko Kagawa of Japan once told me that when we have cooperatives established, the Henry George system would be followed. I believe that when we all wake up as consumers, and organize cooperatives on the Rochdale principle, we will be more keenly aware of the tax problem and more capable of tackling it.

Henry George wrote: "I am inclined to think that the result of confiscating rent in the manner I have proposed would be to cause the organization of labor, wherever large capitals were used, to assume the cooperative form, since the more equal diffusion of wealth would unite capitalist and laborer in the same person." George set the right goal in this statement, but citizens of a free democracy need full stomachs and can't wait for distant promises. Political power is based on economic power, and before we can hope to have the Georgeist reform legislated, we will have to display some economic power. I believe that consumer cooperation is the right way to gain democratic control of economic power, and through it, of political power. Through the processes of education and good business management we would have the means to accomplish the reform of shifting taxes from labor products to land values.

The Danes have set the example. Let us take up the torch.  
Flushing, N. Y.

PRESTON K. SHELDON.

### HISTORICAL VS. NATURAL ECONOMICS

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Robert C. Ludlow has rendered a most important service in the dissemination of economic truth by comparing Georgeism and Thomism in your March-April issue, in which he points out the contrasts between the historical and the natural approach to economics. Mr. Ludlow should expand his article into a book.

The natural approach is admirably expressed by Adam Smith, who wrote: "The produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labor. In that original state of things which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labor belongs to the laborer. He has neither landlord nor master to share with him." But, as Henry George points out, Smith recognized fundamentals, only to abandon them and to recommence his inquiry from the artificial state of things in which land had been appropriated and the laborer had both landlord and master to share with him.

Thus the historical view has been permeated and vitiated from its beginning by artificiality—a fraudulent artificiality at that. The confusion of economic terms today—for instance the inclusion of land as capital—is a result of the historical approach.

Delawanna, N. J.

STEPHEN BELL.

### OUR STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

I compliment you on your March-April number, which was so full of valuable and thought-provoking articles. Particularly stimulating were the editorial and the letters on Free Trade.

Cordell Hull's reciprocal trade policy has created a timely opportunity for us to educate the people, not only on the tariff but on the entire taxation question. The time is ripe for such action. We will

be dodging our responsibility if we don't make the most of it, for Democracy is on trial.

When the Hawley-Smoot tariff was being discussed, in 1930, one thousand leading economists of our country warned President Hoover that dire results would follow the enactment of that bill. Hoover ignored their admonitions, and thereby intensified the economic problem. If, at that critical time, we who believe in Free Trade had actively and unflinchingly campaigned against the bill, if we had petitioned conscientious citizens and secured a million or more signatures, if we had strongly endorsed the economists' plea, it is not unlikely that the passage of that iniquitous bill might have been prevented. We must never again let such opportunities slip by.

Fundamental Democracy stands for Freedom—and that means free land, free trade, free speech, free press, free assemblage, free religious worship, free enterprise, and free initiative. We must constantly fight encroachments upon all the forms of freedom by privileged classes and the State. We must never permit an assault on Freedom to go unchallenged. We must never waver in our struggle for a free Humanity.

New York, N. Y.

AMALIA E. DUBOIS.

#### THE FINAL LINK

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

In reply to Donald MacDonald's arguments in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, I would like to submit the following:

All labor saving inventions tend to increase the value of land. Trade is a labor-saving invention, therefore, the less it is hampered, the greater will be its tendency to save labor, and so increase rent. This is not to say that certain tariffs will not raise the value of some lands. If we must buy our timber in a certain locality, the timber lands in it will of course increase in value. If, however, we can buy timber in any number of places, the competition will reduce the cost of lumber. This will induce building, and site values will eventually absorb the benefit.

Tariffs are important, and we should work for their removal, but let us bear in mind that no matter how harmful they are, their cause is the private collection of economic rent. Let us work for freedom in all directions, always remembering the final link in the chain, the monopoly of land.

Bronx, N. Y.

ANDREW P. CHRISTIANSON.

#### A WORD FROM FRANCE

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Georgeist activity in France is necessarily very limited at the present time. *Terre et Liberté* has been suspended since the war. We feel ashamed when we read about the movement in the United States, and the progress of the Henry George School. Americans have reason to be encouraged. I don't agree with Mr. Jackson Ralston's pessimism, or his proposition of compromise.

Summer Welles' proposals to Paul Reynaud sound very promising, if he intends free trade. But does he? Or is it only the eternal bilateral?

Moulins, France.

PAVLOS GIANNELIA.

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

On April 19, Hon. Emanuel Celler, Member of Congress (Brooklyn), spoke over the radio on "Balkanizing the United States." It was an impassioned attack on the tariffs that are developing between States.

I have sent Mr. Celler a copy of Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade," and I would like to urge others to write to him suggesting that he read that book, and telling him about the free courses offered by the Henry George School.

New York, N. Y.

ANNA GEORGE DE MILLE.

#### ECONOMICS AS AN EXACT SCIENCE

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

In these last few years, thanks to Ingersoll, Beckwith and others, a new realization seems to have developed of the immediate need for a scientific approach to this subject of Economics. While the fields of Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics and Engineering have been studiously classifying and organizing their data, Economics appears to have marked time, in this respect. Isn't it the duty of this generation to correct this condition?

To date, so far as I am aware, there is no such thing as a Scientific Text-book of Economics. We have books galore, it is true, but no logical, consecutive chain of reasoning from the simple to the complex. The subject appears to be in the same stage of evolution as Mathematics in the pre-Euclidean era, a verbal foot-ball to be argued about and kicked around from pillar to post.

It seems to me that any attempt to bring order out of the present chaos requires:

1. Authoritative definitions of terms.
2. Axiomatic statements of basic truths.
3. A system of rigid, consistent, step-by-step proofs from axioms to theorems representing basic laws and principles by as nearly mathematical treatment as possible.
4. Units for measurement and comparison of quantitative relations.
5. Symbols and formulae for brevity and exactitude of expression.

Just because the field of Economics involves the sometimes uncertain element of human nature, do we have to throw up our hands and say no positive statement is possible? Personally, I am unwilling to admit it.

Economics deals with "Matter," as does Physics, only Economic Matter consists of "Goods with the power of satisfying Desire." It deals with "Force," but instead of a push or pull, Economic Force is "Desire," the greatest of all forces. And it deals with "Resistance," but instead of mechanical friction or electrical ohms, "Economic Resistance" is the man-hours of work to be overcome in the production and transportation from raw material to product in the consumer's hands. Tie these quantities together by the formula

$$W = \frac{D}{R} \quad \text{where } W = \text{Wealth expressed in Goods}$$

D = Desire  
R = Resistance

and we have the simplest possible expression of a basic truth.

The above is mentioned only as a sample. The ground work of definitions and axioms should of course come first; then the superstructure. Yet if such a method could once establish the truths of Economics on as sound and reliable a basis as has been laid for our other Sciences, one of the greatest sources of confusion and misunderstanding would be removed.

We no longer argue about the law of gravity, the combination of chemical reagents, the bending movement of a beam or the flow of current in an electric circuit. We know these things. In case a question arises, we turn directly to the text-book for verification. Why not for Economics?

LAND AND FREEDOM is our best publication. It can speak most authoritatively for the movement. It has the widest circle of contacts. Would it not be worth while to invite its readers to offer their consideration toward such a purpose, so that after summarizing and sifting out the best of the material received, publication of the final results might be made in text-book form?

Chula Vista, Calif.

RAY H. TABER.

[Mr. Taber makes a valuable suggestion, albeit the task he proposes is a difficult one. We would like to hear more about it from our readers.—Ed.]