

as we are that the remedy proposed by Henry George is the true one we can afford to wait on the development of independent thinking among the clergy to straighten out the confused thinking which after all is not important if men, including churchmen, are free to think and express their thought. For there are other Father Coughlins to come. If we believe a change has arrived it will not be long before some great voice will be heard from the Church with a message that will ring round the globe.

WE have read with gratification the admirably reasoned defense of Father Coughlin from his Bishop, Michael Gallagher, and again we can afford to ignore the implications of the philosophy for the vastly more important declaration of the intellectual independence of the priesthood. Despite the influence that must have been brought to bear to close the lips of the priest, the Bishop gives him his imprimatur, which is "leave to print," in this case the leave to speak. He says: "It does not mean that the Bishop agrees with everything to which he has given his imprimatur." And again: "His judgments are necessarily personal judgments but they are absolutely essential to estimate the ratio of our nation's debt to our nation's wealth or to see a just rate of interest on mortgaged property."

THE language is a little loose here. But again we can afford to ignore it for the fine sympathy exhibited throughout by His Excellency, and the courage with which he faces the question of the inequitable distribution of wealth. If he does not get close to the problem the important thing is that he recognizes it. In declaring for the freedom of Father Coughlin to circulate his written and spoken word "without objection throughout the land," His Excellency has ranged himself with the great leaders of the Church who, fearless and intrepid, have borne witness to the truth as they saw it. When he says: "Father Coughlin preaches the doctrine of *social justice for all*" we cannot doubt that he believes this and will stand by him when and if he does. What more can we ask? We repeat, the social ferment is rising.

WALTER LIPPMAN is most impressive in his title heads. We are held in pleasurable anticipation of what we may look for in the subject matter—only in most cases to be disappointed. Maybe the *Herald-Tribune's* heading to his recent Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard is not his, but it is so close an imitation to his habitual title heads as to serve for an example. The heading is as follows: "Lippman Tells Youth to Hold Economic Liberty as Its Ideal." Looks promising for a moment, doesn't it?

EVER since Mr. Lippman as a young man started out with his friend Croly to write on economic and social questions he has been like that. He indicates fundamentals only to evade them a few paragraphs later—perhaps in the very same paragraph. He is very attractive, he is a master of English and apparent coherency. We listen entranced if we do not stop to ask inconvenient questions. In this address he talks of "economic liberty"—he uses the phrase at least—but it is quite clear that he does not know what it is. He has approved and condemned the experimentation and regulation that have gone on under the present administration. He was never quite certain where he stood.

HE has no full conception of what constitutes "economic liberty." Otherwise he would have swept away with one impressive condemnation the preposterous experiments of the Roosevelt Administration. He would have been able to see that one man at least, in an epoch-making work, had talked understandingly of "economic liberty." He would have gone to Henry George instead of ignoring him. The challenge that this unknown printer made to the world over fifty years ago is as vital now as it was in the time it was written, and it will remain vital until it is answered. Lippman is like so many of his cotemporaries that have gained the ear of a half cultured and superficially thinking public, so enamoured of their own wordy speculations and phrases that seem to mean something but slip away from the understanding like so many slippery snakes, that if they ever hit upon some fundamental principle, it is by the merest accident and is promptly forgotten.

MR. LIPPMAN says in this address at Harvard: "We are unable to transmit from our generation to the next a credible and coherent tradition." It is not so much a tradition that is needed as an understanding. Economic liberty is impossible without a place to work, and land is a place to work. We thank Brother Foley for that contribution to clear thinking. We commend it to Mr. Lippman. If he will prayerfully consider it he will write fewer words but he will write more sense.

THE text book on physics used in Cincinnati high schools during the 1880's declared a heavier-than-air flying machine impossible because no engine powerful enough to lift the weight of a man could lift its own weight. Probably the same or similar textbooks were used in most other cities. We may laugh at this teaching now but it is no laughing matter, for it undoubtedly discouraged much research and effort that may have given us the airplane sooner and given us more time for progress in air navigation. Similarly fallacies taught today in universities as economics, which may be laughed at forty years hence, constitute no laughing matter.