

Perhaps I am naive on this subject, but I fail to see Mr. Bernstein's case.

Mr. Albert Jay Nock is disparaged in the review by Mr. Benstein, because he indorses the general thesis which he said "cannot be questioned," that wars are economic and that wars fail to solve the cause, poverty.

Mr. Nock needs no defense, and may well be distressed that I should discuss the attack on him. It seems fitting that a few words may be said about his contribution, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, of an article on "Democracy vs. Socialism," a book reprinted by the Henry George School. This article, entitled "In Defense of the Individual," induced over 500 individuals to buy this book through the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. This was a contribution to "widening the circle" of those who study George.

Everyone who would contribute to the Henry George Movement, may do so in his own way; it won't be mine and it won't be that of someone else. On the occasion of the Henry George Centenary Mr. Nock published a biography, "Henry George," which gave the movement considerable publicity.

Those who disagree with the methods of a fellow Georgeist may well try to educate him, but the assumption of George is that man is infinitely improvable, educable, not some men, but man. "They are even as we are," said he. Therefore, while we may well criticize a product objectively, we may assume the best of motives in everyone. Concentration on a man's logic keeps the issues clear and is educational. Let us strive for the constructive, the educational in all our efforts to overcome the only emergency, Ignorance.

New York, N. Y.

LANCASTER M. GREENE

MR. BERNSTEIN SUBMITS MORE TESTIMONY

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Albert Jay Nock is a regular contributor to *Scribner's Commentator* whose pro-Nazi character has been conclusively established after thorough investigation by competent agencies. Most of the magazine's contributors are tarred with the same brush.

In the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, I pointed out that "Unfinished Victory" was unashamedly anti-Semitic and pro-Hitler. Nock has neither denied that assertion nor my charge that he approves the book's viewpoint. In fact, he has, in the September *Commentator*, in an article praising a book by the anti-Semite Douglas Reed, reaffirmed his approval of "Unfinished Victory." He says, "My readers will remember that some months ago I reviewed Mr. Arthur Bryant's excellent, temperate and patriotic book, 'Unfinished Victory,'" and then he reiterates his belief that a conspiracy exists to keep the volume off the American market.

Despite this, Ellen Winsor "rebukes" me in her letter in the September-October issue of LAND AND FREEDOM for mistreating Nock, for ignoring his genuine Georgeism, and for being unacquainted with his "masterpiece"—"Our Enemy, the State." Well, let's look at the record.

In 1928, Nock published a book called "On Doing the Right Thing." I quote from it: "In actual life, they [the Jews] are dreadful people. I sometimes think there will be a record-breaking pogrom in New York some day, and there are occasions even now when the most peace-loving person among us wishes he could send over a couple of *cotnias* of Cossacks to floor-manage the subway rush."

In 1934, Mr. Nock, in a "Journal of These Days," wrote: "It is ironic that the offspring of those who crucified Christ are the ones who profit most by the seasonal sentiment of Christmas. But in the Jewish view *Geschaeft ist immer Geschaeft* and most Christians are too dull-witted to perceive the anomaly. This morning I was thinking of our newspapers here in New York as a typical *echt* Jewish enterprise for its peculiar quality of unscrupulousness and shabbiness."

I would like Miss Winsor to know that I am thoroughly familiar with "Our Enemy, the State" and consider it a third-rate work by a third-rate writer who is eminent neither in sociology, economics nor in political theory. Most of the book's ideas are borrowed from others, and what are peculiarly Mr. Nock's own are without either merit or significance.

George Raymond Geiger (Professor of Philosophy at Antioch College, author of "The Philosophy of Henry George," "Theory of the Land Question," and son of the late Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry George School), writing on Henry George in the September issue of the *Antioch Review* (of which he is an editor) has this to say:—

"We are examining in this paper some of the reasons for George's neglect today . . . To the more legitimate reasons may be added an unfortunate tendency on the part of the most influential of George's present-day American supporters to use his work as a club with which to belabor 'collectivists' of all sorts—from Stalin to Roosevelt! [Indeed, they seem to hate Roosevelt more than Stalin, and Hitler far less than either—M. J. B.] What may be called the right-wing group of Georgeists seems to have been unduly influenced by the ideas of Albert Jay Nock, whose rather recent book, 'Henry George: An Essay,' expresses clearly the sophisticated anarchism which he has always preferred to 'our enemy, the state' . . . The extraordinarily bitter attacks upon 'statism' which evoke the blessings of many prominent Georgeists today do not have even the ring of genuine anarchism. They sound more like the 'viewings-with-alarm' of a Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers.

"There is no point in discussing the merits of rigorous anarchism. (Mr. Nock's brand seems somewhat unorthodox, since he has a distinct contempt for the uneducable masses, and feels that George made his fatal mistake in trying to appeal to them.)

". . . But it seems certain, at least to the present writer, that George would scarcely approve of the unabashed Republicanism and pink-baiting that are professed by some of his followers today. Even more certain is it . . . that his permanent influence in American social thought will be in those very circles that are now being alienated by such right wing tactics."

In a footnote, Professor Geiger adds: "Since this was written several articles of Mr. Nock have appeared, and in them he has taken the first steps down a path which must unquestionably be called a fascist one."

In the August-September 1941 issue of *Protestant Digest* there is an article exposing Albert Jay Nock as an anti-Semite. It is entitled "Nock—*Atlantic* Anti-Semite," and is an analysis of his recent articles in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

I can't think of a more fitting sentence with which to terminate this letter, except to state the conclusion which necessarily follows from it, to wit:—that the prejudices shared by Nock and others must be exposed for what they really are. This is essential to safeguard the name and reputation of Henry George and to prevent an association in the public mind of his teachings with ideas which, were he alive, he would have utterly repudiated and tirelessly combated.

New York, N. Y.

MICHAEL J. BERNSTEIN

ADDENDUM BY THE EDITORS

[In a review of Albert Jay Nock's "A Journal of These Days" (LAND AND FREEDOM, May-June 1934), Joseph Dana Miller wrote the following: "Mr. Nock is a Henry George man but he is not eager to apply the remedy. Familiar as we are with the eccentricities of many who profess a belief in our principles and yet who are in deadly fear of them, this does not surprise us greatly. He says of the Single Tax that 'the people would not know what to do with it if they got it,' and with this shallow sophistry dismisses it. . . .

"'George's biography,' he says, 'makes it clear that he knew singularly little about human beings and the workings of their minds.' Nevertheless, Mr. Nock hastens to reassure us that something might be done with the fundamentals of his doctrine 'if the right people took it in hand.' We find that phrase, 'the right people,' subtly intriguing.

"We hasten to record our conviction that Albert Jay Nock is of no use to us. . . . The philosophy he preaches is the very negation of any real conviction on the question or of any influence he may be capable of wielding. He can be of no help to us in advancing the cause. He would do us a great service if he refrained from mentioning it. We say this because it is rumored that he has in contemplation the writing of a life of Henry George."]

LIKES OUR DEMOCRATIC POLICY

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Enclosed find my subscription to LAND AND FREEDOM. Mr. Alexander Greene of Chicago sent me a single copy, and I think it is excellent. One of my roommates, who is a Republican, was impressed when I showed him the William Allen White endorsement; the other, who is an active liberal, and who has no use for those Georgeist groups who wish to remain in an ivory-tower, was enthusiastic when he read the anecdotes by Mr. J. W. Graham Peace.

I myself do not favor war, but I am in full sympathy with your editorial policy of allowing free expression to both sides.

Harvard College, Mass.

F. MASON GAFFNEY

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

SOME publications recently added to our exchange list are: *The Antioch Review*, a quarterly journal published by professors of Antioch College; *Freedom and Unity*, a California quarterly of cultural and social content, edited by Prynns Hopkins; *The Country Book*, a new magazine devoted to rural living, published in New York; *Dynamic America*, an outstanding liberal magazine, also of New York; and *The Biosophical Review*, published by the Biosophical Institute, New York.

CAUSE AND EFFECT, Georgeist paper published in Chicago, which had been temporarily suspended, has recently resumed publication. In short, interesting articles, Georgeist principles are related to the news of the day. Mr. C. R. Walker is the editor. The subscription rate is \$1.00 per year, and the address is 127 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A POSTCARD has come from our Spanish colleague, Prof. Antonio F. Matheu Alonso, at Tarragona. Unfortunately, his situation has not improved since our report of him in the November-December, 1940, LAND AND FREEDOM. "I have lost my University chair," says Prof. Alonso, "and am not allowed to practice law. They have seized all my possessions, even my books." However, he maintains his faith: "In the midst of international distasters, the march of our movement constitutes a hope and it is a consolation to receive news of our co-workers and of the progress of the School."

THE 1941 issue of "We, the People," a yearbook of American public opinion, contains a contribution from our good friend W. L. Crosman of Revere, Mass.—"a well-known single tax advocate," as the *Revere Budget* says. Mr. Crosman's contribution is a succinct statement on the single tax.

THE August 8 issue of the *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts* (London) contains a paper by our Georgeist friend, F. C. R. Douglas, on "Economic Aspects of Soil Fertility and Nutrition." Mr. Douglas

is a Member of Parliament and a Member of the London County Council, and he occupies the important position of Chairman of the Finance Committee of the latter. In his paper Mr. Douglas points out how the enclosure of the common lands by the great landowners and the migration of the landless proletariat to the cities was an important factor in depleting the richness of the soil.

JACOB SCHWARTZMAN's series of articles, "The Critics Criticized," which have attracted favorable attention, will be resumed in our next issue. The previous articles have dealt with individual economists' objections to Georgeist doctrines. In the forthcoming articles, Mr. Schwartzman proposes to deal with the objections of various schools of thought.

STATEMENT of Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc., required by the Acts of Congress of August 24, 1912, and March 3, 1933, of LAND AND FREEDOM, published bi-monthly at New York, N. Y., for October 1, 1941.

State of New York, County of New York, ss.

Before me, a notary public in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally appeared Charles Jos. Smith, who, having been duly sworn, according to law, deposes and says that he is the owner of LAND AND FREEDOM and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in Section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher: LAND AND FREEDOM, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Editors: Charles Jos. Smith, Jos. Hiram Newman and Robert Clancy, all of 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Managing Editor: None.

Business Manager: Charles Jos. Smith, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

2. That the owner is Charles Jos. Smith, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: None.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company, but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stocks, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

CHARLES JOS. SMITH

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 15th day of October, 1941.

(Seal)

AUDREY I. SHAY, Commissioner of Deeds,
City of New York.

(My commission expires Sept. 16, 1943)