

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