

Another vital question, where the difference of opinion is vast and undoubtedly prejudiced—Can a nation successfully devote itself to war—as a business? If not, Germany will fail, and without a long fight, because that is what she has done for 25 years.

War is still too much like a contest between opposing exploiters to make it one-sided enough to be short. We have "the right," of course, but our per cent is not high enough.

The overwhelming question now is the economic one. When will a nation deliver the only effective answer; that of putting its own house in order so that all its resources will be available if trouble comes—financial, human, and moral; but first, so these resources will place that nation out of the zone of trouble. If England or France had been for 25 years paying wealth producers—labor and capital—all the product, instead of half; if either nation had freed its masses from impoverishing taxes by putting these taxes on the basic privileges . . . that nation could help spread this system, instead of fighting. Or, if fighting were forced on it, the millions would be fighting for their own homes instead of their boarding houses.

EX-JUDGE SAMUEL SEABURY GAVE A CLASSIC ADDRESS AT THE HENRY GEORGE CENTENARY—Famous Economist, born on S. 10th St., Philadelphia, September 2, 1839—which would be ideal as the keynote speech of a Presidential nominee for 1940. This is my way of putting the Judge in nomination. The field covered by the George philosophy is the whole field—the American landscape—the world situation of both politics and economics. And this profound address comprehensively covered that whole field. Other candidates may cover sectors of the field. Dewey is a master of crime punishment; McNutt—well, let someone more capable describe him—and not forget the smile. Hull, in my opinion, has distinction as the only statesman in the present cabinet—and so on. But Seabury boxes the compass of politics and economics; or of the only kind of politics (statesmanship) that includes economics, without which they are null and void. These are the main points Judge Seabury presented: (1) Our democracy had achieved slavery abolition; but left wage slavery to be disposed of. (2) Our fundamental monopoly stood at the base of this slavery, taking a lion's share of wages of both labor and capital. (3) Our consumer-taxes are the collectors of monopoly tribute; they must be transformed into rent-collecting taxes.

HISTORY IS REPEATING. May we safely—before we get closer to that time when thinking, talking and writing are suspended—ask what use have the Allies made of this quarter century—say in making the world safe for democracy; or even for the great democracies, which, with us, the lies are popularly classed. First, did they start out as magnanimous victors? Anything to show the influence of our great leader-in-tragedy, Woodrow Wilson, who demanded "peace without victory." Second, did they do anything to restore trade relations? Third, did they examine into basic causes of war—the economic causes of war? Did they examine the claims of "have" an "have-not" nations? Fourth, did they patch up their domestic fences to insure social justice at home? Such questioning is not only unkind but futile, except as a means of learning the lessons—mainly of economics—which are just as far in arrears in every other country, including our own, as in England.

SOME BRITISH STATESMEN—EVEN SOME NOW LIVING—HAVE SAID THINGS THAT AT THIS JUNCTURE SHOULD BE SAID OVER—as a possible defence to the waste of another generation, before England actually becomes the power for civilization, culture and freedom in the universe, that she claims to be. Lloyd George said twenty years ago, in arguing for the taxing of their most sacred privilege, that "the landlords had made the people of England trespassers on their own soil." Sir Samuel Hoare, in calling a naval parley three years ago, asserted that the unequal distribution of natural resources

was the first cause of wars; and demanded that the parley consider their redistribution. Another minister explained limitations of political rights as being wise—in fact necessary—in view of patent economic inequalities. So the riddle of war and poverty cannot be called insoluble or unsolved, any more in England than here.

The field of economic discussion, writing and teaching, is a seething mass of different viewpoints; and to me it is a healthy sign, the suppression of which would result in putting off the day—or the century—when *economic truth shall make us free*. We have papers being eagerly read for their novel viewpoints, many of which have only novelty to recommend them. We have schools and colleges teaching as "economics," fallacies without the scientific basis economics must have, but which conventional educators have not yet learned. We have economic schools that—due to their inexperience and lack of properly built textbooks—are teaching in reverse of their own stated doctrines, and so placing themselves at the same tragic disadvantage they charge against our "common schools and colleges." And finally, we have all kinds of laborers in the economic vineyard, criticising, denouncing and patching the codes, manuals, charts, pamphlets, editorials and statements. And it seems to me that if this process can be kept up by extending its facilities, we shall soon find the northwest passage to *success in economics!* Can our civil liberties be given us—and held onto—in the economic field?

BOOK REVIEWS

HENRY GEORGE

BY ALBERT J. NOCK

Cloth, 224 pages. \$2.50. Wm. Morrow & Co., N.Y.

The Georgeian movement is highly favored by Albert J. Nock's contribution of a memorial book, "Henry George," to the Centenary Celebration of the birth of the greatest philosopher and economist. Nock's fitness for this important responsibility lies in the fact that he is almost the only writer of note and of fundamental democratic acquirements who has access to the book-press. His position as biographer of Thomas Jefferson further qualifies him; and his extreme individualism gives unusual point to his review of George's life and work.

I am bound to say also that in spite of his outstanding qualifications, he is almost equally disqualified to do justice to the apostle of true individualism, democracy, conservatism, and of every phase of true collectivism, and of true optimism, by reason of a bias he (Nock) possesses against propaganda, organization, politics and government itself.

As imperfect as is his picture of the only writer who has even attempted a synthetic solution of the complexes of sociology and economics, we must accept it as embodying honesty, unusual in friendly reviewers, candid criticism—much of it truthful and exceedingly helpful—in straightening the present devious path of *promotion* of the Georgeian economic doctrine. It is a refreshing contrast to the fulsome flattery, blind adherence and lip service, of many would-be friends of George.

Nock's outstanding weakness—to follow his negative example—is in his failure to interpret both Jefferson and George *affirmatively*. Instead of concentrating all his incisive strength on developing Jefferson's outline of a simple government he left us suspended in mid-air as to what 150 years of modern industry had done to interpret Jeffersonian democracy in this respect. And this weakness of the author merges with his adverse criticism of George. Instead of making George the complement of Jefferson in supplying the missing element of economics to Jefferson's perfected formula of politics, Nock gives "Our Enemy the State" as his best result of Jefferson's democracy; and quite consistently he joins the pessimists in declaring little or no progress in basic economics; and goes further than most of them in

devising specific and rather ingenious reasons for our static position.

I wonder if Nock has not yielded somewhat to the human tendency—more prevalent among highbrow critics, of which he certainly is not one—of finding a goat for an imaginary failure; of assuming no progress in Georgeism and laying it to George; and also to take to the life-boat of current fallacy, from the sinking ship of simple fundamental truth? Is Nock a keen observer of *under-surface* trends, in economics, politics, education and industry? And is this pessimism because the full force of Georgeism has not impacted this author?

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL.

SECOND REVIEW—SAME BOOK

Just why Albert J. Nock saw fit to inflict his "essay" upon Georgeists, and at this time in particular, is more than we can guess. It may be he thinks the followers of Henry George need to be goaded into action or "broadened" into using some improved propaganda. We infer that he has some improvement in mind, as his book is bearishly critical of Henry George and of everything connected with the Georgeist movement.

Yet, in three or four paragraphs scattered through this book, he gives George unstinted praise and in the latter part of the last chapter he seems to realize that he has overdone adverse criticism and, with a flourish akin to death-bed repentance, polishes the essay to a good ending.

As a prerequisite for reading this book one should brush up on Dickens and in particular read David Copperfield. Special attention should be paid to the character known as Murdstone. Dicken's characters are always sharply drawn but here is one, drawn to utter unreality, which Nock sees fit to use as a basis of what he calls Murdstone or Murdstonian philosophy. Moreover, throughout the book he uses this idea to stigmatize persons, places and conditions and this includes Philadelphia in the year 1839 (the year of George's birth) and the George family as typical of society in Philadelphia at that time. The selection of Murdstone for his purpose must have been the result of a search to find the most reprehensible character possible to overdraw his own picture. He is not content to inflict this Murdstonian surrounding upon George at birth but fastens it on him throughout his life. Yet, in his preface, he says: "Here you have a man who is one of the first half-dozen of the world's creative geniuses in social philosophy."

From the "magnificent" heights of this civilization of 1939 Nock surveys the "Murdstonian" of a century earlier and his opprobrium falls on the George family. Why? They were "poor," a very questionable conclusion and at best only an inference, because the family income in dollars and cents was small or would be considered small now. They were regular attendants of the Episcopal Church and the diary of the youthful Henry George even up to his eighteenth year, mentions his attendance at Sunday School. Such depravity! George even went out with the boys and drank beer. That was in the diary also. Either way or any way, with or without the aid of Murdstone, the author with his great ability and facile pen, attempts a case against the George family and Henry George. One thing is certain, he made an exhaustive study of Murdstone.

As far as Henry George is concerned, he has little understanding insight. His criticism of the campaign of '86 and what "George should have known" shows this. Also, George did not go to college, an irreparable omission in 1939, not uncommon a century earlier. Think of what an economist George would have been had he sat under some of the professors! Nor did George choose the right associates, men of standing and reputation (after he had become their equal), preferring men of more modest attainments. In fact, from the author's viewpoint, from his birth George's affairs were not only mismanaged for him but in all he did he seemed to have the faculty of mismanaging for himself. Yet we again quote from John Dewey in the preface, "it would require less than the fingers of the two hands to enumerate

those who from Plato down, rank with Henry George among the world's social philosophers."

But throughout the entire essay the reader cannot fail to be impressed that George had experienced life and knew suffering and privation at first hand. Whatever came, he was true to his ideals and to himself.—C. H. K.

INDIVIDUALISM VS. SOCIALISM

BY D. C. McTAVISH, Telfordville, Alberta, Canada
(A Booklet of 42 pages. Price 50 cts.)

This is a very well written treatise divided into twenty chapters of one to three pages each. Some idea of the content may be gathered from the chapter heading of which we give the following: "Land the Physical Basis of Civilization" and the "Usehold Tenure". "Ethics of the Slogan—To Each According to his Need and From Each According to His Ability—An Examination." "The Contribution of Atheistic Socialism versus that of Christian Socialism." "True Sovereignty."

We suggest the use of this booklet for constant reference as the writer has covered a wide field in simple, concise and clear style. It is well thought out, requires careful reading and is full of historical data and historical and biblical references. Address communications to the author.

YOU AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

BY ROBERT CLANCY AND WILLIAM NEWCOMB
32 pages. New York. Published by the authors. 25 cents

In the belief that more people will read what they call a "streamlined word-and-picture introduction to Fundamental Economics" two men at the Henry George School have written a booklet called "You and America's Future" with every paragraph illustrated by a cartoon. For those people who insist that "Progress and Poverty" is too lengthy for this busy age, these men have presented its essence in the hope that those who buy the little book will become more interested by what George has to say in 600 pages, and will then read the Master's book "Progress and Poverty."

We wish we had the room to reproduce one of the pages of this little book, but lacking space we highly recommend it. The important thing about the book is that the ideas are simply and briefly expressed and illustrated. At the Henry George Centenary in New York over six hundred copies were sold. Montreal took a hundred a California area took 150, Chicago, 55, and various other cities used 25 copies.

These books were not bought to be read only by the buyers. They are to be used as gifts or lent or sold to busy people who are "from Missouri", and who like to argue, as the book clinches arguments and saves wear and tear on the throat glands. Mr Harold S. Button, Editor of *The American City*, has written the Epilogue.

"You and America's Future" sells for 25 cents; five for a dollar. Or if you want a quantity—and you do!—send the authors \$4.50 for 25 copies. Write to 30 E. 29th St., N. Y. C.

Correspondence

LET'S HAVE MORE OF THIS SORT OF THING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I have no recollection of having ordered LAND AND FREEDOM, but have been puzzled since issues of same started arriving and wondered if some friend of mine had bought a subscription for me.

The magazine is all right, however, and I enclose herewith my \$2.00 check.

Fairbanks, Alaska.

SHERMAN A. NOYES.