

To the Editor:

Robert Ludlow, at the beginning of his article in the February News, remarks that "there is hardly anyone who does not know about Marxism." I was inclined to agree with that when I read it, but by the time I had finished the article I was not quite so sure.

George does assume the existence of natural laws in economic processes (bless his heart!), but he does at least offer his readers the possibility that general knowledge of these laws, and proper allowance for them, may enable us to improve our material and, indirectly, our general welfare, which is certainly more than anyone can claim for Marx. The latter's theory of history plots an inevitable course of events which is just about as close as one can come to out-and-out fatalism. Why Marxists work so hard to bring about what they believe is bound to come anyway, without their efforts, is something I have never been able to understand.

Mr. Ludlow's Marx seems to be quite a moralist, too. The one I am acquainted with leaves a good deal to be desired in this field of thought. He presents a certain appearance of plausibility throughout a good deal of his book (and it is an awfully long book!), but he only succeeded in confirming my opinion that anyone who attempts to establish moral laws from a hypothetical past and future history of mankind is very apt to get himself into difficulties. The inductive method makes a great show of being "realistic" and "practical," but it is a very tricky tool for the moral philosopher.

Henry George worked just the other way. His famous rhetorical question: "The law of human progress, what is it but the moral law?" gives the key to his method. Social justice was for him the only sound basis for an acceptable political or economic system. It would be hard to find, in the whole recorded history of man, a social philosopher with a finer consciousness of the dignity of the individual human soul or a greater sense of the sanctity of human liberty.

But Mr. Ludlow makes one statement with which I am heartily in agreement, to wit, that "human beings cannot be fitted into mathematical formulas."

—MARSHALL CRANE

Bedford, N. Y.