

The Freeman, 1920–1924

Charles H. Hamilton

AMERICANS FACED THE 1920s with conflicting emotions. The war and the failure of Wilsonian idealism reduced many intellectuals to despair. Reformism had largely run its course. A mechanistic business ethic and a sterile social conformity bore heavily upon creative impulses. But there was also a sense of excitement, for a fresh and free inquiry into the meaning of America now seemed possible. As Lewis Mumford remembered: “Despite the disillusion that set in after the First World War, we believed that we might give a more humane shape to American culture before our molten desires had cooled. These latent hopes tempered even our postwar cynicism.”¹¹

The task of reviving a usable past and building a new future was taken up by three important journals of opinion: *The New Republic*, *The Nation*, and *The Dial*. These journals, in different degrees, expressed the dominant thread in American liberalism. This form of liberalism had found the war instructive and sought to apply aspects of wartime collectivism to domestic problems. It was eager to experiment with America’s newly found international power. Liberals focused especially on the political sphere, exhibiting what Randolph Bourne decried as a “cult of politics . . . inherent in the liberal intellectual’s point of view long before the war.”¹²

On March 17, 1920, these liberal journals were joined by a serious rival. *The Free-*

man proposed “to meet the new sense of responsibility and the new spirit of inquiry which recent events have liberated, especially in the fields of economics and politics.”¹³

The Freeman helped to shape intellectual opinion in America for four years. It forcefully presented another thread in liberalism, claiming a classical liberal and Jeffersonian heritage that *The Freeman* proclaimed as “radical.” Individual freedom and voluntary cooperation—what is called “social power” and “economic means”—were presented as the only consistent way to progress and freedom. This was starkly contrasted with the inherently invasive and exploitative nature of the state and “political means.”

At the end of 1919 Albert Jay Nock had written Francis Neilson that “the sane radical is up for his turn at the bat and is in the right mood to make a hit”¹⁴ The idea for *The Freeman* originated with Nock and came to fruition through conversations with Francis Neilson and Helen Swift Neilson earlier that year. Both the classical liberal Francis Neilson and the Jeffersonian liberal Nock were dismayed by liberalism’s turn toward state socialism. Through *The Freeman* they confronted the liberal journals and other brands of political messianism. But they especially excoriated liberals for *their* war recently concluded and prophesied that “far worse than a liberal’s war is a liberal’s peace.”¹⁵ *The Freeman* was to speak for the great tradi-

tion of classical liberalism, which both men were afraid was being lost, and for the economics of Henry George, which both Nock and Neilson shared. With the help of Helen Swift Neilson's meat-packing fortune, the publishing venture was made financially possible.

Francis Neilson, born in England in 1867, had been the leader of the British Liberal Party's "young radicals" and was a Member of Parliament until he resigned in 1915 in protest against the war. He moved to the United States. Neilson's knowledge of English constitutional radicalism and his personal contacts were important advantages for *The Freeman*. Though he did not often write for it, his influence is readily apparent in his self-described role as "a feeder of ideas."⁶

Albert Jay Nock is best known for his *Memoirs of a Superfluous Man*, a brilliant discourse on libertarian sensibilities. His writings in the 1930s and 1940s were to have a profound influence on many of the major conservative figures in the post-World War II period. As Henry Regnery wrote: "There can be no doubt that he contributed substantially to the development of modern conservatism."⁷

Born in 1870, Nock started his journalistic career in 1910 with the muckraking periodical *American Magazine* and later spent time at *The Nation*. It was only when, at the age of forty-nine, he helped found *The Freeman*, that he came into his own as a polished essayist, a gifted writer, and an important political essayist. Nock provided *The Freeman* with the unique framework it applied to politics, international affairs, manners, literature, and the "good life." Despite his sometimes eccentric ways, Nock's special skills as an editor made the journal, in the words of Van Wyck Brooks, "a wonderfully good school for us all."⁸ When Nock himself protested that he did nothing to make *The Freeman* such a good journal except to leave its writers alone, a friend replied, "Yes, I understand, but if someone else had been letting them alone, it would have been a very different story."⁹

Nock wrote extensively in *The Freeman*,

most of his writings unsigned. Something from his pen appeared in all but eight of the two hundred and eight weekly issues, and he often contributed as much as twenty percent of the material in an issue. But it would be a mistake to think that *The Freeman* was solely Albert Jay Nock. Its small staff was one of the most competent and professional in the 1920s. Benjamin W. Huebsch, who was generally acknowledged to be one of the most cultivated book publishers in America, was publisher. Van Wyck Brooks became literary editor. A brilliant critic and a leader of the so-called literary radicals, Brooks had previously worked for *The Dial* and *Seven Arts*. Even with his vague socialist politics, his literary and essentially individualistic point of view complemented *The Freeman's* general sensibility.

Another addition to the staff was Suzanne La Follette. She left *The Nation* at Nock's request. He thought she was one of the best editors in the business. Geroid Tanquary Robinson, a former editor at *The Dial*, joined the staff while continuing to teach at Columbia University. Walter G. Fuller (who left in the spring of 1922), Harold Kellock (who joined in early 1923), Lucy Taussig, and Emilie McMillan completed the regulars.

There were a number of others who were at various times closely associated with *The Freeman*. They contributed unsigned editorials as well as signed articles. Lewis Mumford, William MacDonald, and Frank W. Garrison were among the better-known. More than two hundred contributors wrote articles and reviews. The journal discovered or developed writers like John Dos Passos, Constance Rourke, Newton Arvin, and Edwin Muir. Other writers who covered a wide range of cultural and political opinion included Walter Pach, Thorstein Veblen, William Henry Chamberlin, Robert H. Lowie, Mary and Padriac Colum, Bertrand Russell, Ernest Boyd, Howard Mumford Jones, and Charles Beard. The result was a journal with a special fullness that knew no ideological boundaries and yet attained a surprisingly coherent whole.

The weekly contained twenty-four pages. Each issue began with two unsigned sections written by staff members or other writers close to the journal. "Current Comment" had three pages of paragraphs concerning international affairs and the foibles of domestic politics and politicians. The next section, "Topics of the Day," consisted of five pages of editorials covering political, economic, and social issues in greater depth. The major, signed articles followed, as well as columns on art, theatre, and music, in addition to letters to the editor. One page was devoted to "Miscellany," a column of incidental paragraphs on the manners and mores of the times, signed by "Journeyman" (and most often written by Nock).

The "Books" section included a few longish reviews and a number of one-paragraph "Shorter Notices." Frank Luther Mott concluded that "some of the best book-reviewing done in any American journal in the twenties appeared in *The Freeman*."¹⁰ The last page and a half was devoted to "A Reviewer's Notebook." This was Brooks's distinguished and idiosyncratic column on the state of America's literary past, present, and future. (Nock wrote this column for the last seven months of 1922.) The back page was left for Huebsch, who contributed very good, alternately urbane, humorous, and exhorting advertising copy for the magazine.

While there was agreement that *The Freeman* was generally "brilliant," there has been little agreement about exactly what *The Freeman* was—a fact, no doubt, that must have pleased Nock, who rejected labels. It has been called liberal, conservative, Bolshevik, anarchist, revolutionary, and Georgist. Readers were constantly asking where *The Freeman* stood in the political spectrum, to which question the publisher responded that "*The Freeman* is less concerned with making its own ideas prevail in the realm of mental power than with the clarification of thought which permits people to choose their own road to freedom."¹¹ In fact, Lillian Symes and Travers Clement were probably closest when, in their *Rebel America*, they placed

The Freeman within "the main tradition of American individualism . . . individualist radicalism."¹² More than any other periodical of its time, and perhaps ever since, it was concerned with freedom—with the preservation and extension of individual freedom in all its forms.

A few years after *The Freeman* ceased publication, Nock wrote to a close friend that he was "enormously impressed almost daily with the fact that *The Freeman* never died—and never will."¹³ Indeed, the spirit and the example of *The Freeman* have often been claimed by conservatives and, rather more emphatically, by libertarians. The older *Freeman*, for example, was a model for the *New Freeman* that Suzanne La Follette began in 1930, for *Human Events* in the mid-1940s, and for a newer *Freeman* begun in 1950 and still published monthly today. Less directly, it served as a guide for the *Freeman* published by the Henry George School of Social Science in New York in 1937, for Frank Chodorov's *analysis* in 1944, for *Libertarian Analysis* in 1970, and for *Fragments*, which has been publishing sporadically since 1963.

The first issue of *The Freeman* was welcomed to the fraternity of liberal journalism by both *The New Republic* and *The Nation*. There was, however, no opening statement of position. This absence distressed some readers who were used to explicit political programs. But beneath its sometimes pretentious aloofness, Lewis Mumford saw some hints that led him to write a letter to the editor: "Obviously behind these brief generalizations a whole sociology lies, and I can conceive of your performing no better service during the next few years than by slowly building up, clarifying, limiting, and relating the ideas of social development that are therein implied."¹⁴ That "sociology" was never fully articulated.

In the fourth issue Nock proudly and firmly denied any connection with modern liberal journalism: "*The Freeman* is a radical paper; its place is in the virgin field, or better, the long-neglected and fallow field, of American radicalism . . ." ¹⁵ He went on

to identify two distinguishing features of *The Freeman's* radicalism. First of all, beyond a basic commitment to *laissez faire*, radicals believed in "fundamental economics." There was an additional factor in the production of wealth besides labor and capital, Nock maintained, and that was land and natural resources. Until the monopoly on land and natural resources was broken, all other reforms, while perhaps ameliorative, would not solve the world's problems.

By no means was the magazine simply a Georgist or single-tax journal as some critics have suggested. Nock was to explain later that the view on land monopoly and some form of land tax was merely a "simple statement of a natural law . . . and the suggestion that one is a propagandist in such premises is perhaps rather flat."¹⁶ *The Freeman* was deeply steeped in the Georgist ethical, economic, and philosophical perspective; but the magazine had much broader concerns.

The other, crucially important, feature of the radical perspective was its total rejection of the great faith liberalism placed in the state. Statism quite simply meant, wrote Geroid T. Robinson, "a mechanistic civilization at home and militarism abroad . . ."¹⁷ The radical, by contrast, "believes that the state is fundamentally anti-social and is all for improving it off the face of the earth . . ."¹⁸ Often paraphrasing *The State*, by Franz Oppenheimer, *The Freeman* consistently made the point that political government and the use of political means merely enforced the expropriation and exploitation of people for the benefit of a given privileged class. Every recourse to political means—whether through political parties and platforms, political agitation, or revolutions—was doomed to failure, it claimed. Those means were inherently coercive and never changed essential and underlying economic and social conditions. Articles in every issue returned to this theme, culminating in 1923 in Nock's five-part series on "The State," which was later expanded into his biting critique of centralized government, *Our Enemy, the State*.¹⁹

This was not a call for anarchism, however. There was an admitted need for some vaguely defined form of a decentralized "administrative government" of strictly limited negative prohibitions. The state was an institution to be protected against, and not some form of magical benefactor or neutral umpire. Within that context *The Freeman* was a strong champion of civil liberties, which it saw as a matter largely of keeping the state out of affairs essentially individual.

For *The Freeman*, the truly valuable things in life were outside of the political realm. The individual had the right and responsibility to make his or her life as creative as it could be. It was important to understand, Nock pointed out, "that the instincts for freedom, for beauty, for a graceful social life, are true primary instincts and that our business is to follow them What matters is that, for life to be truly fruitful, life must be felt as a joy; and that where freedom is not, there can be no joy. . . ." ²⁰ In this the literary, political and artistic diversity of *The Freeman* all agreed.

Looking at contemporary life in America, *The Freeman* saw neither freedom nor the good life being nurtured. Nock, however, expressed his belief that a higher civilization was virtually certain:

No civilization can be permanent except that which satisfies *all* the claims of the human spirit—the claim of workmanship or expansion, the claim of knowledge, social life and manners, religion, beauty and poetry, all held in the perfection of harmony and balance. Our civilization satisfies the first claim quite well, the second tolerably, and the others not at all. Is it not inevitable, then, that a civilization which satisfies more of these claims, held in better balance, will supersede ours even though itself be not final?²¹

A major shift in paradigm was necessary to assist that change. *The Freeman* offered its own "sociology" based on the principles and application of English classical liberalism. It rested on natural rights, unlimited individualism, and equal opportunity. It was often enough, in *The Free-*

man's view, to refer to the older concept of freedom presented by such writers as Turgot, Quesnay, Smith, Cobden, George, Oppenheimer, Mill, and Bohm-Bawerk.

The basic contrast between its rejection of political methods of change and its promotion of the freedom, diversity, and creativity of everyday life devoid of political coercion was perhaps the telling difference between *The Freeman* and other journals of opinion of the times, whether liberal, socialist, or "Tory." It was at this point that readers often became confused as to where *The Freeman* stood. For to a radical libertarian conception of society and of the state Nock and Neilson added an essentially conservative conception of social change and of the importance of principles. As Neilson put it, "Radicals seek not to destroy. Their desire is to restore the old, and they are indeed . . . 'the true conservatives.'"²²

The Freeman sought solace from and a solution to state socialism through "the historical process of strengthening, consolidating, and enlightening economic organization."²³ It constantly held up the tradition of laissez faire as a means to the good life. Contrary to H. L. Mencken's cynicism about political democracy, *The Freeman* optimistically pointed out that true "democracy is an affair primarily of economics, not of politics, that democracy has not failed, for it has never been tried . . ." ²⁴ Indeed, economic freedom was the most important freedom, and if attained, no other freedom could be withheld.

The slow advance of society over the state would eventually lead to the disappearance of the state (in a formulation more internally consistent than Marx's notion of the withering away of the state). This would not happen through the force of arms. In the normal, long-term course of events people would just stop thinking in terms of the state: "The whole fundamental structure of the State will crumble and dissolve through the persuasive power of the Idea."²⁵

Invariably *The Freeman* took its radicalism seriously. Specific issues were discussed, often passionately. The Treaty of

Versailles, the League of Nations, and foreign imperialism were attacked at every opportunity. Similarly, every attempt to curtail freedom domestically was assailed. The propensity of liberals to view problems as a matter of finding the right person to put in command was subject to ridicule. Any attempt to break out of totalitarian regimes was applauded, even as *The Freeman* cautioned that a worse dictatorship might rise in its stead. (The Russian Revolution was supported precisely on these grounds.) Free trade, civil liberties, "fundamental economics," and, above all, individual freedom were set forth as answers to all social, economic and ethical issues.

The Freeman had no particular love for the status quo or for tradition. It actively advocated necessary change, not for its own sake but in accordance with those ageless principles that gave its radicalism substance. This joining together of tradition and principle with change and irreverence gave excitement and direction to most of *The Freeman's* political and literary writings. Huebsch gave voice to this attitude when he wrote: "*The Freeman* is at once an incentive to hasten the new world of ideas and a steady influence in preserving the everlasting truths that are essential to a society worth living in."²⁶

When *The Freeman* did make suggestions about how one could work for the idea of freedom, it based its views on social power, free competition, and cooperation. The basic point was to leave people alone to find their own solutions through peaceful social interaction. While praising the multitude of voluntary associations in China, Geroid T. Robinson went on to write: "The task of the practical anarchist, as we see it, is the withdrawal of all desirable functions from political control, and the arrangement for the performance of these functions by non-political agencies."²⁷

Eschewing governmental action, *The Freeman* often called for various forms of direct social action. In a letter in April 1921, Amos Pinchot acknowledged that *The Freeman*, "perhaps more than any important weekly journal in America, has be-

come the advocate of direct action”²⁸ The Gandhian movement of non-cooperation and passive resistance was often favorably mentioned. Direct action did not usually mean the industrial strike, but rather opposition to the government on the basis of the classical liberal principle that the government was the chief menace. There were often calls for tax resistance. Voting was rejected in favor of what it called the “economic ballot”: of acting within the economic and social means. While much of the cooperative movement, for instance, did not deal with the land question, *The Freeman* still regarded “it as the most significant movement of all time.”²⁹

Despite *The Freeman*’s forays into practical suggestions and a tendency to rely on its wit and criticism, these things were basically secondary to its self-appointed task. The most practical suggestion *The Freeman* wanted to give, and one that served as a credo for its work, was, “*Get wisdom, get understanding* And this is precisely the point . . . of much that we publish. . . . to discuss fundamental principles and not to peddle nostrums.”³⁰

Robinson crystallized a common opinion of *The Freeman* when he complained in a pseudonymous letter that “the radicals tend to confine their attention to the gay business of destructive criticism.” What radicals needed to do, instead, was to present “a detailed plan for reconstruction which meets every test of reason . . . [a] technique of organization necessary for the establishment and maintenance of this fundamental liberty.”³¹

Neilson pointed out the terrible assumption implicit in that call: that “there is in every generation a select few endowed with special powers of directing and supervising millions of their less fortunate brethren in the work of producing food, fuel, clothing, and shelter.” He continued, “We have been nearly organized out of existence by the ‘technique of organization’ devised by these gentlemen” who hold to “the whole of the precious theory that men can not get a living unless some Tory or some Socialist or some Liberal is there to

supply a ‘technique of organization’ for the producer.”³² *The Freeman*, for all its admitted aloofness, avoided and countered both the elitism of intellectuals and political soothsayers and the cynicism often expressed, for instance, by Mencken.

An editorial in the February 6, 1924 issue announced that the issue of March 5 would be the last (completing four full years of *The Freeman*). It would retire “at the highest point of its circulation”—probably around 10,000, which was near to the respective circulations of *The Nation*, *The New Republic*, and *The Dial*.³³ The Neilsons had lost their enthusiasm, at least in part, because the magazine was losing between \$70,000 and \$80,000 every year.³⁴ Nock, Huebsch, and Brooks all exhibited and expressed great weariness. They were ready to move on to new things.

A few supporters of *The Freeman* inquired about the possibility of continuing the magazine. Nobody on the staff was interested, least of all a tired Nock, who stepped aboard the *Volendam* on his way to Brussels the day after the staff bade one another farewell. And so what Huebsch had described in the farewell editorial as “a fellowship of fine minds” faded away exhausted and depressed.³⁵

There was a strange irony in the life of *The Freeman* in that it left an essentially non-political ideology undeveloped, opting instead for the easy and heady world of political criticism. In its perceptive editorial on the passing of *The Freeman*, *The New Republic* pointed out that “‘Radicalism’ of the *Freeman* brand is not a political staple It is properly a relish to go with plenty of non-political meat.”³⁶ By placing so much emphasis on the political and devoting so much space to politics, *The Freeman* had allowed itself to be distracted.

As true as this criticism obviously was, *The New Republic* was at least partially disingenuous. The whole world of serious social thought at that time was political. It was more concerned with personalities and expediencies than with principles or “disinterested thought.” To take part meant dealing with the political assump-

tions of the world. *The Freeman's* view of the world focused on individuals and voluntary social cooperation instead of on the coercive monopoly of the state. It turned out to be a view much more foreign to readers than even Nock and Neilson had feared. Most commentators failed to appreciate the positive and non-political underpinnings of the magazine and tried vainly to put it in some political camp.

Nock had assumed that *The Freeman* was written for an audience of independent thinkers. One purpose in publishing it, he wrote in his *Memiors*, had been to "give us some sort of rough measure of the general level at which the best culture of the country stood Any one who remembers the state of the public mind in the early 'nineteen-twenties does not need to be told that we launched our experiment under as unfavorable circumstances as could well be imagined" ³⁷ This tone was often taken as severely elitist.

The Freeman was, in part, an attack on the elitism inherent in all political ideologies. Its failure proved to Nock that intellectuals had little interest in freedom or in disinterested thought. His early optimism was turning to disillusionment. The authoritarian mentality that *The Freeman* had sought to forestall seemed to have the upper hand in 1924. As a result of his later reading of Ralph Adams Cram's 1932 essay, "Why We Do Not Behave Like Human Beings," Nock's idea of social and economic freedom and a free life would become lodged with what he called "the remnant." ³⁸

As a literary and cultural journal, *The Freeman* captured much of the vitality and disillusionment of the period in a way that the more programmatic and political journals could not. For all of its critical presentations, it represented a special combination of careful thought and creative authors. These authors infused the pages of *The Freeman* with a love of culture, the arts, and the spirit of the "good life." As Van Wyck Brooks wrote to Lewis Mumford in 1936:

I have been reading the 8 bound volumes of *The Freeman* with astonishment at all the good things I find there. The history of those four years, 1920-1924, seems to me assembled there as one could find it nowhere else . . . and more than once they say the last word [I]n preparation for any book, concerned with any phase of modern thought, one could not do better than run through *The Freeman*. ³⁹

An assessment of *The Freeman's* place in the history of American conservative journalism is muddled by continually changing ideas on exactly what the American right has to offer. Certainly *The Freeman* has been evoked by numerous post-World War II conservatives and libertarians, but they have only caught various aspects without touching the full spirit.

For the entire *Freeman* staff the main currents of progress did not flow through political channels, where they would be constantly obstructed. Rather, progress was the function of channels of individual initiative, social power, and the free market—as revealed by classical liberal and American radical principles. The editors valued the past for those principles and for the actual legacy of freedom given to the present. But they were not afraid to advocate risks in the name of freedom. They eagerly advocated necessary change while always placing it within the context of the old truths. In one sense, then, *The Freeman* can suggest to contemporary readers ways to work out the complicated relationship between tradition and change.

The Freeman is unique in at least one other way. As John Chamberlain has observed, *The Freeman* stands in American political journalism as "a great liberator . . . the great conservator of the idea of voluntarism." ⁴⁰ It fits well into the history of American conservative and libertarian political journalism because it never lost sight of the importance of freedom. And it still has much to say to contemporary conservatism for precisely that reason. As Nock wrote on one occasion: "Of all things that human beings fear . . . the one that strikes them with abject and utterly de-

moralizing terror is freedom . . . which some day they will have the happy surprise

of discovering to be the only thing that really works.⁴¹

¹Lewis Mumford, *Sketches From Life* (New York, 1982), p. 248. ²Paul F. Bourke, "The Status of Politics 1909-1913: *The New Republic*, Randolph Bourne and Van Wyck Brooks," *American Studies* 8 (August 1974), 199. ³"A New Weekly, *The Freeman*," *Publishers Weekly* 96 (December 20, 1919), 1620. Susan J. Turner's book—*A History of The Freeman* (New York, 1963)—concentrates on the literary contributions of *The Freeman*. ⁴*Selected Letters of Albert Jay Nock* (Caldwell, ID, 1962), p. 96. ⁵"Current Comment," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 5 (June 7, 1922), 289. All editorials and many shorter pieces in *The Freeman* were unsigned. However, G. Thomas Tanselle has attributed authorship using several marked staff copies. Names listed in brackets after the article title refer to that listing. G. Thomas Tanselle, "Unsigned and Initialed Contributions to *The Freeman*," *Studies in Bibliography* 17 (1964), 153-75. ⁶Francis Neilson, "The Story of *The Freeman*," *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 6 (October 1946, Supplement), 31. For information on Neilson, see his *My Life in Two Worlds*, two vols. (Appleton, WI, 1953). Neilson came to dislike Nock very much, so his remarks on *The Freeman* must be read very carefully. ⁷Henry Regnery, "AJN: An Appreciation," *Modern Age* 15 (Winter 1971), 25. See Nock's *Memoirs of a Superfluous Man* (New York, 1943). Two biographies of Nock are: Robert M. Crunden, *The Mind and Art of Albert Jay Nock* (Chicago, 1964), and Michael Wreszin, *The Superfluous Anarchist: Albert Jay Nock* (Providence, 1971). ⁸*The Van Wyck Brooks-Lewis Mumford Letters*, ed. Robert E. Spiller (New York, 1970), p. 18. ⁹Albert Jay Nock, *Snoring as a Fine Art* (West Rindge, NH, 1958), p. viii (Introduction by Suzanne La Follette). ¹⁰Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines*, vol. 5 (Cambridge, MA, 1968), 96. ¹¹Back Page [B. W. Huebsch], *The Freeman* 7 (May 2, 1923), 192. ¹²Lillian Symes and Travers Clement, *Rebel America* (New York, 1934), p. 128. ¹³*Letters From Albert Jay Nock* (Caldwell, ID, 1949), p. 20. ¹⁴Lewis Mumford, "Constructive Criticism," *The Freeman* 1 (March 24, 1920), 34. ¹⁵"In the Vein of Intimacy," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 1 (March 31, 1920), 52. ¹⁶"The Formula of the Single Tax," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 4 (November 23, 1921), 247. ¹⁷"The Blessings of Government," [Geroid T. Robinson], *The Freeman* 4 (February 22, 1922), 558. ¹⁸"In the Vein of Intimacy," p. 52. ¹⁹See Albert Jay Nock, "The State," *The Freeman* 7 (June 13, 1923), 320-21; (June 20, 1923), 344-47; (June 27,

1923), 368-69; (July 4, 1923), 393-94; and (July 11, 1923), 416-17. Also see Albert Jay Nock, *Our Enemy, the State* (New York, 1973), and Franz Oppenheimer, *The State* (New York, 1975). ²⁰"Our Pastors and Masters," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 2 (January 26, 1921), 461. ²¹"Current Comment," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 8 (November 21, 1923), 243. ²²Oeconomicus, "Too Much Technique of Organization," [Francis Neilson], *The Freeman* 1 (July 7, 1920), 398. ²³"In the Vein of Intimacy," p. 52. ²⁴"The Liberal's Rabbinitism," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 5 (September 6, 1922), 604. ²⁵Albert Jay Nock, "The State," *The Freeman* 7 (July 4, 1923), 394. ²⁶Back Page, [B. W. Huebsch], *The Freeman* 7 (May 9, 1923), 216. ²⁷"The Wisdom of the East," [Geroid T. Robinson], *The Freeman* 7 (March 28, 1923), 55. ²⁸Amos Pinchot, "Direct Action," *The Freeman* 3 (April 20, 1921), 136. ²⁹"Current Comment," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 4 (October 19, 1921), 122. ³⁰"A Programme of Action," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 3 (April 13, 1921), 100, 101. ³¹"Gallerius," "A Challenge to Radicalism," [Geroid T. Robinson], *The Freeman* 1 (June 16, 1920), 328. ³²Oeconomicus, "Too Much Technique of Organization," p. 397. ³³"A Last Word to Our Readers," [W. B. Huebsch], *The Freeman* 8 (February 6, 1924), 508. Different sources estimate *The Freeman's* subscription size from 7,000 to 10,000. B. W. Huebsch said in the mid-1950s that "The circulation never got up over 10,000. It was somewhere around there, maybe a little more." *The Reminiscences of Benjamin W. Huebsch* (New York, 1965), p. 71. The figures in Frank Luther Mott's *A History of American Magazines* for the other three magazines are not entirely comparative but they are suggestive. For *The Nation* see Mott, vol. 3, 350; for *The Dial* see vol. 3, 542; and for *The New Republic*, see vol. 5, 213. ³⁴Susan J. Turner, *A History of The Freeman* (New York, 1963), p. 30. ³⁵"A Last Word to Our Readers," p. 508. ³⁶"The Passing of *The Freeman*," *The New Republic* 38 (March 5, 1924), 34. ³⁷Nock, *Memoirs of a Superfluous Man*, p. 167. ³⁸See Ralph Adams Cram, "Why We Do Not Behave Like Human Beings," *Convictions and Controversies* (Boston, 1935), pp. 137-54; and Albert Jay Nock, "Isaiah's Job," *Free Speech and Plain Language* (New York, 1937), pp. 248-65. ³⁹*The Van Wyck Brooks-Lewis Mumford Letters*, pp. 131-32. ⁴⁰John Chamberlain, "A.J.N.: Man of Letters," *The Freeman* 12 (November 1962), 59. ⁴¹Journeyman, "Miscellany," [Albert Jay Nock], *The Freeman* 8 (October 3, 1923), 79.