



## From Doubt To Dedication

JOHN T. TETLEY

Mr. Tetley, a native of New Jersey, was born in 1902, and is married and has one daughter. He is the director of the Henry George School of New Jersey.

VERY vaguely, I remember, when I was in High School, there was a short course termed "Principles of Democracy." Upon reflection, I think this was supposed to be "economics," but I remember absolutely nothing that was taught. I did not attend college. My early career was in business and I enrolled for a correspondence course entitled "Business Administration." Perhaps there was some "economics" in that study, but again I remember nothing of it.

Later I was employed by a large commercial bank in New York City, and I studied at the American Institute of Banking. In the spring of 1929, as part of the standard banking course, I had my formal introduction to economics. The instructor was a Professor of Economics at Columbia University and the course the same as that given at the University. To my astonishment I deduced that most wars came about because of economic conditions and I concluded that the history I had studied in public school had never presented that phase. We studied the "business cycle" and I recall vividly a statement made by the Professor to the effect that the old classical theory of the business cycle was now a thing of the past — depressions were to be no more — from now on business would continue ever upward. (The stock market at the time was booming and industrial activity at an all time high.) What happened only a few months later is well known — the stock market crashed, ushering in the greatest depression of all time.

My work at the bank was that of Credit Investigator and required me to call upon businessmen in lower Manhattan. In the early '30s I so well recall, where a short time before everything had been hustle and bustle, the streets were quiet except for lines of unemployed and sellers of apples on street corners. I asked myself "How come — why are conditions this way?"

At the time there was a young man boarding at my home. A circular, addressed to him, was received in the mail and caught my eye. Printed on the front was this question, "Are Depressions Necessary?" It was an announcement from the Henry George School of Social Science, New York, with an invitation to enrol for a course in Economics. Another statement printed on the announcement was to the effect that no one could consider himself

educated unless he had read *Progress and Poverty*. Being interested in an answer to the question "Are Depressions Necessary?" and wishing to consider myself educated, I asked my boarder if he was going to enrol for the course. He replied "No." I then asked if he would give the card to me so I might return it and enrol. I did.

The school at that time was located in a one-family brown-stone house on 79th Street, and the classroom was on the second floor. The announcement stated that the course was free. I had some reservations — there must be a catch somewhere. When I attended the opening session and saw a stack of books on the teacher's desk, I said to myself "Ah, here's the catch, it is a book selling scheme." However, the teacher stated it was not required that students purchase the text-book from the School, it could be borrowed from the library or purchased in a book store. But if one did desire to purchase *Progress and Poverty* it was modestly priced, and "there is no sales tax — we don't believe in taxes." (New York City had a retail sales tax.) So — it is not a bookselling scheme — what then is the catch? The teacher assured me there was no catch — so I went along to see.

I carefully studied each assignment, filled in the lesson sheets and enjoyed the ensuing discussions. After the course there was a graduation ceremony attended by all the classes of that term at a hall in New York, and the speaker was Albert Jay Nock. Later I enrolled for Protection or Free Trade. The school had moved to 29th Street. I completed that course and took Science of Political Economy.

My elation was great when I received an invitation to enrol in a Teacher's Training Class, which I did. It was conducted by the Director of the School, Frank Chodorov. I remember well two statements he made at a dinner attended by the graduates of the Teacher Training Class. One was — "No matter how little you know about this subject, you know a hell of a lot more about it than the students you will get do." The other — "Don't say you are doing a noble thing by teaching at the Henry George School without financial remuneration — you'll be teaching because you love to do it." I have often thought how true these statements are.

On the evening I appeared to teach my first class I

entered with fear and trembling, but after only a few minutes I felt perfectly at ease and thoroughly enjoyed the experience. Since then I have taught many fundamental and advanced courses both in New York and New Jersey. Shortly after I became a member of the Faculty of the New Jersey School, I was requested to lead a Teacher Training Class. I tried to beg off, pleading incompetence, but was convinced I could do it — and I did.

In 1944 there were three vacancies on the Board of Trustees of the School in New Jersey, and three Faculty members, of which I was one, were invited to serve. In 1948 I was very much dissatisfied with my job at the bank, resigned, and went to Louisiana where I became manager of a motel. However, that which I missed most of all was my association with the Henry George School. One night I lay awake in bed and my thoughts wandered to the New Jersey Headquarters of the H.G.S. I knew they wanted a full time Director, and I felt that I was not only qualified, but it was something I really could do which I liked and believed worth-while. I dispatched a letter and received a reply to the effect that I had the job.

Early in 1949 I assumed my duties at Newark headquarters. I have been there since — to sum up — an announcement of a class at the School, sent not to me, but to someone else, resulted in a life devoted to Henry George, full time. If I had never heard of the Henry George School—and it is possible that I might not have — I very much doubt if my life would have been so rewarding to me.

As Director of the School, my job is primarily administrative, but I do get the opportunity to do what I enjoy most — teaching fundamental economic principles. One point of methodology, I believe, is well worth mentioning. In an early class which I conducted, a gentleman who was an economic major in college, after we had covered the "definitions," remarked to me, "You define your terms and then logically draw your conclusions from these definitions. If we accept your definitions then we must accept your conclusions." I pondered over that statement a long time, and later the Faculty of the New Jersey School developed the idea of presenting the terms as concepts and giving the concept a label, thus avoiding defining words. This has proven most valuable over and over again when conclusions are reached.

Just a few comments on direct results of my association with Henry George and the School. Not only did I get an answer to depressions which is so basic — of course there are many contributing causes — but it is so clear that the speculative increase in land values underlies all else. Whatever is done, other than collect the full rental value of land, in the final analysis increases land values and aggravates the problem. Important as is George's proposal to solve the land problem by a change in the land tenure system, the fact is that its implications go far beyond a mere fiscal reform. My enthusiasm in devoting myself to this educational effort is in the summation of Henry George's philosophy — justice and equality of opportunity for all.

## Will They Ever Grow Up ?

The Secret behind the clamour for Growth

By PETER TRACEY

AMERICA'S growth rate must be increased. And there are two very good reasons why. In a full-page article in the *Christian Science Monitor*, the whole position is made clear.

One reason is because the twenty nations of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development have decided to increase productivity by 50 per cent by 1970, and the dismal American performance is threatening to wreck the plan.

The second reason is that buoyant growth shows itself in national élan. "France is able to throw its weight around partly because of rapid growth."

Now we know, and the consequences are far reaching. The prospect in the field of international relations is immense. Think of the terror to be inflicted into the heart of some lesser nation by the appendage to a Diplomatic Note or Aide Mémoire — "N.B. Our growth rate last year was 4.6 per cent." Why, the mission is half accomplished.

Shall we see growth rates quoted at international conferences, at the U.N. for instance? The placard in front of each delegation will read "Italy (5.9 per cent)"; "U.S.S.R. (6.5)"; "United States (2.3)". Maybe voting power will be adjusted so as to reflect national growth rates. New countries not coming up to a minimum standard will not be admitted at all.

Manufacturers will be quick to cotton on. Why, if a housewife is confronted with two articles, one bearing the legend "Made in France, contributing to our growth rate of 4.2 per cent a year;" while the other, British, article can only boast participation in 2.7 per cent expansion, which one will she buy? After all, growth rates are *impressive*.

As for planning growth rates, what a chance to score off countries you don't much care for. Think of the derision in the eyes of the other five when one of the Six fails to make the grade for that year, or the contempt poured on little Iceland when told by the other members of the Nordic Council that its poor performance is endangering the whole planned growth rate for Scandinavia. If Nigeria or New Zealand doesn't come up to scratch there'll be nothing for it but to boot them out of the Commonwealth. The crowning humiliation will probably come when Pomrania has to withdraw from the Olympic Games because its contestants simply cannot face their competitors with only 1.1 per cent upon their singlets.

It's time our economists grew up, their record of growth is depressingly static — stunted no doubt by economic gimmicks.