

of his type among men of affairs, unselfish, courageous, outspoken. He did not live to see the triumph of the cause for which he had given so much—that remains for others of the gathering hosts of adherents now being enrolled in every part of the world, slowly, irresistibly, conquering and to conquer, despite the lowering clouds that threaten all that is precious in civilization.

This belief strengthened our friend in the hours of trial and doubt. Of him it may be said in this happy close of a noble and distinguished career:

"'Tis not the grapes of Carmel that repay
But the high hopes that failed not by the way."

Tributes to Charles O'Connor Hennessy

THE death last week of Charles O'Connor Hennessy in New York is a loss to the cause of a new political economy. He was born in Ireland 75 years ago, came to America with his parents at his ninth year and made three distinct successes in life: As a newspaper writer on the old *New York Sun*, later as a banker with large trust responsibilities and still later in the cause of sane, simple tax reform—not only here in the United States, but in England.

But the class of banking that most interested him was that which would enable the common man to safely save his money and easily acquire a home.

At one time in his career he entered politics and became a leader of the Democratic party in New Jersey during the governorship of the late Woodrow Wilson.

But he found that the tax reforms for which he uncompromisingly stood, could only come with an enlightened public opinion, and in later years he has been the executive head of The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, New York, a well endowed institution, not for profit, for the publication and distribution of books on political economy, including the works of Henry George.

His loss to the cause of sane and simple economic reform would be irretrievable if it were not for his splendid precept and example to younger men and women.

DAVID GIBSON in *Lorain (Ohio) Journal*.

FROM ANDREW P. CANNING

CITIZENS of this city and state who knew of the work of Charles O'Connor Hennessy mourn with you the death of that great democrat and humanitarian.

On high authority we have been told that men are worth just so much as the things are worth about which they busy themselves.

Measured by this standard Charles O'Connor Hennessy was a great man and one whose work and memory will be an inspiration to all who share those ideals which made his life so radiantly beneficent.

A BRAVE SOUL

DESPITE his deceptive stature and his almost ethereal physique, Senator Hennessy was every inch a man—solid, sincere, earnest, powerful, and sweet.

He had many facets. For years a working newspaper man, then a banker, always a student of economics, an active political leader, a philosopher, a worker for peace and economic order, and finally an elder statesman of the international George movement. He was president of the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation which publishes the works of Henry George.

It was back in the eighties that Mr. Hennessy first met the Prophet of San Francisco. He was at that time city editor of the *New York Daily News*, a Democratic newspaper, and he reported one of George's addresses during his first campaign for Mayor. Needless to say, the young man was captivated, and the leader was so impressed with his report that he sent for him, and there began a life-long personal relationship and friendship between them.

Mr. Hennessy had but just returned from a trip abroad during which he presided at the fifth congress of the International Union for the Taxation of Land Values and Free Trade, which was attended by representatives of 25 nations. He was president of this union, in which he took the greatest pride.

He was one of the newspaper men who founded the Franklin Society for Home Building and Savings, was its president from its organization in 1888 until 1934, and thereafter continued as chairman of the board. It was while he was serving this organization so well that Mr. Hennessy was a resident of Bergen County and was sent to the Legislature as a Democrat from that county. He was a tower of strength to Woodrow Wilson while he was Governor, and as a Democrat played much the same part George L. Record did as a Republican. They were men of like vision, and cooperated in securing the direct primary law, the Australian ballot, the nomination and election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people, and many other reforms of that time. He had the distinction of being nominated for United States Senator in 1918, and President Wilson gave him personal aid, and he ran far ahead of his ticket, which was a popular tribute to the esteem in which New Jerseymen held him during his active career here.

As a friend, Mr. Hennessy was steadfast and true. As a companion he was superb. His acquaintance with the best in literature was intimate, and his native Irish wit was a boundless delight. We'll search long to find another Charles O'Connor Hennessy.

—Passaic (N. J.) *Herald News*.

Socialism A Psychosis

SOCIALISM is a figment of the imagination, born of fear psychology. We read of psychopathic cases—or personality cases—which are characterized by dream refuges. That is, the individual, for causes which are sometimes impossible to ascertain, and of which he surely is not aware, develops a fear of realities, or certain forms of reality, which he unconsciously evades by secluding his mind in dreams. In the clouded area of this dream life his mind finds a refuge from, and a defence against, the stern facts which his consciousness is afraid to cope with. The psychologists claim that if they can discover the character of the dreams they can also ascertain the cause of the fear that first induced this subconscious running away from reality; that is, if they get the patient before this dream habit deteriorates the mental fabric to such a state as to bring on a complete break-down, or insanity.

Socialism is a mass personality case. The first cause of this dream refuge is mass fear—fear of poverty. Note that the first symptoms of this disease developed with the increasing difficulty of making a living that accompanied the growth of landlordism, following the break-down of the feudal system. Fear of not having a job, fear of hunger, fear of the inability to provide for old

age, fear of seeing loved ones suffering from privation—fear of poverty so haunted the mass mind during the middle of the nineteenth century, after the lands of Europe had become completely monopolized, that a refuge of some kind was necessary. The mentality of a bewildered civilization was prepared for the dream state of socialism. When this was invented by Karl Marx, Lassalle, and other poetic imaginers, it was avidly accepted by the harassed and desperate workers as a consoling refuge from unpleasant reality. It is important to observe that socialism found acceptance in Europe first; in America it did not gain a foothold until this century, after all the free land in the country had been pre-empted, and poverty became a fixed national problem.

The growth of socialistic ideas is evidence of two facts: First, that the struggle for existence is becoming keener, and, secondly, that the mind of society is quickly approaching a complete breakdown. In Russia it has reached the state of insanity.

The burden of this dream is that organized society must take care of the individual. To enable organized society or government to do this, the individual must relinquish all claims to personal rights, including the right of possessing what he produces. It is manifestly impossible for government to provide for me if I insist on providing for myself. As such insistence breaks up the entire scheme of this dream state, my removal or incarceration becomes a matter of necessity. Thus, personal liberty, even the right to life, is abolished with the abolition of property rights. No matter what brand of socialism you examine, and there are many, you will find they all come to this: that property and personal rights are relinquished by the individual to government.

The silliness of this dream is not important. The important thing is that the world is adopting it. Why? Simply because the hopeless worker finds it easier to slip into this dream state than to ascertain the cause of constantly increasing poverty in the midst of plenty, and to make an effort to remove this cause.

When the enemy is at the city gates we turn over all personal rights to a captain, whom we follow blindly even unto death. We are afraid. And so with that more hideous enemy, poverty. We fear it so that we readily relinquish the cherished ideas of individual liberty—for which thousands of lives have been sacrificed throughout the centuries—and look to government to save us from the monster. An empty stomach obstructs reason. And so we have doles, and so-called social insurance plans, and public works projects, and regimentation, and more government and more government. And the individual becomes a slave to society. Since society consists of an aggregation of individuals, the slave mentality of the units becomes the mentality of the aggregate. Thus endeth rational civilization.

In our country the dream state of socialism has not

yet vitiated our national mind. Some of us are still able to think and act sanely, because the control of wealth has not yet been entirely concentrated in a few hands, and we are still able to make a decent living. We are rational not because of the vaunted heritage of individual liberty we are told about by Fourth-of-July orators, but because the conditions of economic liberty are not entirely wiped out. But, unless we learn how and why wealth passes from the many to the few, and unless we stop this unnatural flow by permitting the natural law of the distribution of wealth to operate freely, the American mind will, under pressure of increasing economic slavery, find refuge in the dream state of socialism, just as the European mind already has.—FRANK CHODOROV.

What's on my Mind

DR. TOWNSEND'S "Old Age Pension" proposal is on the minds of many people just now and has been for some months. It has been on my mind because it was, and is, the nearest thing to a personal problem that has recently come my way. There are several persons within my close relationship who are, like myself, on the shady side of sixty years of age. Some of them might not qualify for an "Old Age Pension," but all are very much interested in the proposition. Personally, it troubles me since the good Doctor has, in apparent good faith, hitched his quite plausible "plan" to an impossible method of taxation. Many think that such an error is regrettable.

A great many persons are in sympathy with the motive behind the Townsend movement, and also the objective desired, but the proposed method of financing old age pensions, or any other governmental activity, does not appeal to those who have their *economics* on straight.

The "transactions tax" is just another "sales tax" masquerading under a new name. It would raise the price of everything that everybody needs and wants to buy, including land, urban and rural, and, be an additional tax on labor and the poor, who now pay nearly all of the various taxes in force. They are incapable of paying any further levy and that alone would render the entire programme futile.

Most people believe Dr. Townsend and many of his associates are strictly honest and sincere, and for that reason those of us who know something about Natural Economic Laws as related to the incidence of taxation, hope that he and his political confreres may revise the "plan" and make it conform to the fundamental law of rent and taxation *which cannot be revised* nor abrogated. We believe that the "Old Age Pension" scheme is a wonderful contribution in the interest of humanity. We think it is one of the most useful and necessary conceptions that has recently been evolved by any one and, consequently, we all hope that wise counsel will not be lacking and, may prevail. Anything less will surely prove disastrous to the project. The host of proposers of farm relief measures and their nostrums have made us shy of ill-advised and superficially considered panaceas and their advocates.

Any tax that raises the price of things that any one consumes or wants to use is invariably destructive. It promotes poverty among the many and gives the social earnings of all-of-us to a few-of-us who have a superabundance of things that the rest-of-us need to raise the standard of living among the under-endowed and make it possible of attainment. It limits the quantity and quality of consumer goods and services which the great majority of consumer-workers can buy with their earnings or other regular, but often small, incomes. That limitation of effective demand reduces the necessity to produce and consequently, *the need for labor*. Then develops a condition which is so