

question as evidenced in their editorials and their comments on the article by Mr. Sanford Benjamin.

I have no way of knowing whether the editors accept the validity of an objective criterion or subscribe to the basic principle that the end does not justify the means, without which any attempt at moral evaluation is worthless. But from the standpoint of one who does accept this I would like to state that the question of whether or not participation or non-participation in the present war will or will not favor the Georgeist cause must take secondary place behind the more pertinent question as to whether one can in conscience use modern methods of war to further any cause.

Georgeist teaching is permeated with moral judgments, so much so that one may consider Georgeism primarily as an ethical system. With this in view, to reject the moral issues involved in modern warfare on the assumption that they are not specifically Georgeist and are unrelated to economic teaching appears to be a very illogical viewpoint indeed.

If a question to be faced by Georgeists is this—should violence be the means to a realization of the revolution?—then also it is feasible that the larger question—shall modern warfare be a means to freedom?—be examined. So far the editors seem to content themselves with the usual arguments for defense—how we are to react at what is happening to us. But there is the positive consideration—what are we being asked to do to others? If we must become intolerant to kill intolerance, if we must spread hate propaganda to destroy hate, if we must use poison gas, or bomb open cities or have recourse to all the horrors of modern warfare (and how can we wage a war otherwise today?) then it is time to ask—are these things fitting in with an objective system of valuation or is such a system a luxury of peace to be discarded under the fury of a war psychosis?

I am not suggesting that a Georgeist *must* be a pacifist, but I am inclined to believe that a reexamination of the causes of war and a realization that we are being asked to preserve a system whose false idea of freedom has and will again lead to economic slavery and fascism should cause us to pause and reconsider not only these things but what is after all the basic question—can we in conscience make use of an immoral means even if the outcome were the full realization of the Georgeist cause?

Clarks Summit, Pa.

ROBERT C. LUDLOW

TAKES ISSUE WITH PRAISE FOR PIUS XII

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

To those of us who have been hoping that the conclusions of Henry George might some day develop into something more tangible than a minor protest, Comment and Reflection in the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM is a far from reassuring sign. Are the findings of Henry George so lacking in fundamentals that a publication devoted to land reform actually rejoices in the broadcast of generalities by the head of an institution whose major events are behind rather than ahead? While the writings of Henry George are not altogether free of generalities, he did offer a democratic plan of action—a plan that is in no need of inspiration from civilization's most conspicuous beneficiary of land monopoly. The celebrated vows of poverty and chastity have enhanced rather than impeded a world-wide accumulation of landed estates and other forms of material wealth. The wealth of this institution can only be estimated, for it is answerable to no authority but itself. Where men have not been conditioned to respect the organization headed by the Pope, they fear its political and economic power.

Are the editors of LAND AND FREEDOM so innocent of what has been happening not only through the ages but at the present time that they should consider it ungracious to complain because "His

Holiness" did not offer specific remedies for our "civilized" ills? Apparently, the editors of LAND AND FREEDOM need to be reminded that somebody must come to grips with the society dominated and controlled by the Roman Church before the simple proposal advanced by Henry George can become a democratic reality. Be fully persuaded, that the world's wealthiest organization will resort to every artifice that 2,000 years of experience have generated before it will give up a single acre of ground or pay a dime of tax, single or otherwise.

Let us not deceive ourselves concerning the challenge to be faced. We should neither over-estimate nor cringe before any adversary irrespective of honeyed phrases or extravagant claims to supernatural authority. So long as a piece of soil can be priced, taxed and monopolized by every whim of attitude, place and circumstance, there can be nothing but economic instability, rampant corruption and war among the nations.

These days so oppressive to many and difficult for most of mankind, are not the offspring of some mysterious fiend at work in the earth, the sea or the heavens. These anxious moments are, on the contrary, but the inevitable result of many a yesterday of under-world techniques employed by men in politics, industry, religion. At a time when religion should be of genuine service as an elevating influence in a war-shattered and dictator-infested world, there are nothing but hollow gestures with which to speculate upon the more devastating consequences of "civilized" blundering and neglect. Out of these blunders of men, the dread spectres of dictatorship, militarism and universal squalor are now stalking the earth. When the observance of organized religion is largely confined to special days, ecclesiastical psychosis and political manipulation, the voice of a leader of organized religion is not an element to be conjured with in this hour of man-made uncertainty, dread and actual horror for untold millions.

Chicago, Ill.

N. B. KROHN

THE AFFAIR NOCK-BRYANT-BERNSTEIN

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

A recent review of "Unfinished Victory" in your paper, by Mr. M. J. Bernstein, might well have shown the Georgeist points made by Mr. Arthur Bryant, the author.

A statement by T. E. Lawrence (from "Lawrence in Arabia") precedes the first chapter pointing out the struggles of the young men who sought ideals in the World War. When they won, the old men then came out and reconstructed the world as they knew it. Lawrence says that he and the other young men stammered that they had fought to make a better world on earth. The old men thanked them and had no further use for their ideals.

The thesis of Mr. Bryant is that wars have economic causes, and that those who seek to improve the world by other than economic means or solutions will be as disappointed as Lawrence.

This is Henry George's thesis: You cannot solve the cause of war—poverty—except through what George called the one panacea, Freedom, and you can't get that without the public collection of ground rent.

Bryant does a creditable job of showing that the longer a war, the less likely are ideas of justice and freedom to flourish afterward. This is complementary to George's analysis of Malthus, whose solution for the problem of poverty was the four horsemen, war, disease, pestilence and famine.

Some questions given by Mr. Bernstein in his review were given to prove Mr. Bryant anti-Semitic, but on rereading "Unfinished Victory," it appeared to me that Mr. Bernstein had extracted quotations out of context which indicated they were not anti-Semitic.