

To the Editor:

I sometimes wonder how you let them get away with it. In the February issue Leo Greenwald says Henry George was not an economist, yet he was the greatest political-economist who ever lived. In *The Science of Political Economy* George clearly shows the difference.

It is true he had no high school diploma—much less a college diploma, yet he had that rare faculty of the immortals, of getting at the heart of the problem. That places him in the ranks where stand men like Galileo, Copernicus, Newton, Luther, Henry Drummond, et al. According to the little men, Copernicus was no astronomer; Galileo no physicist; Luther no theologian.

And Mr. Greenwald states only a half-truth when he says George "was interested in just one thing—justice." That is deceptive as it stands. Many people yearn for justice, but George's right to eminence was in his *method* of securing social justice—justice in the distribution of wealth. The fact is that George wrote *Progress and Poverty* as the solution of hard times and low wages—the tendency of wages to a minimum which will give but a bare living. He saw that land *monopoly* caused low wages and that the way to destroy such land monopoly was to make land common property by the taxation of the actual and *potential* value, and simultaneously reducing in the same degree all taxes on labor and its products. He did not propose a tax-reform as is now generally believed but a reform that would secure to every worker his just wages.

—C. LEBARON GOELLER  
Endwell, N. Y.