

trines are penetrating, if slowly, the minds of increasing numbers. And we are in a position to know.

We are prone to look back to the old Anti-Poverty days and to the wonderful campaign of 1886 when a vote of 68,000 was counted for Henry George in what is now the Borough of Manhattan. But there were few believers in those years. Men followed Henry George as an almost inspired leader. But as far as any knowledge of his philosophy was concerned it is doubtful if more than a few hundred really comprehended it.

Let us recall to Mr. Chodorov a matter of history. From the platform of the Anti-Poverty Society we heard one speaker declare that he always broke the ginger ale bottles in order to provide work for the bottle-makers! We heard another ask in the event of prohibition what all those at work in breweries and elsewhere would do when they were thrown out of employment. It never seems to have occurred to him that the liquor addicts might spend their money for candy. Now remember that these speakers appeared on a Henry George platform and were accredited spokesmen of the Anti-Poverty Society!

We say confidently that this could not happen today in any gathering of men calling themselves Georgists.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

He Was My Friend

EARLY in the World War I wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Sun regarding a tariff article it had published in which I pointed out the absurdity of choking trade in order to encourage industry, since industry and trade were not separate things, but merely separable parts of the same thing, the supplying of human needs and wants. Great was my surprise to get a letter from Theodore H. Price, the "Cotton King," who had been but a name to me, with a clipping of my letter to the editor enclosed, asking me to amplify my views for *Commerce and Finance*. I did so, got a very satisfactory check in return, and an invitation to join him at luncheon at some convenient time, which I soon did. Soon after we entered the war I was persuaded to join him.

How he so long put up with my propensity to "preach" has often puzzled me, though I know that in his heart he sympathized with it to a degree. "Bell," he said to me many years ago, "I thoroughly agree with you that the Georgian economic philosophy is ideal. It affords the only ethically sound and equitable basis for a real civilization, and eventually the world must come to it if civilization is to endure. But I see obstacles in the way of its adoption which you know not of and cannot now realize, and at my time of life I do not feel equal to undertaking a crusade for it."

On another occasion, in objecting to publishing something I had written, he suddenly asked me if my father were a preacher, and on my admitting that both my grandfather and great-grandfather had been clergymen, he exclaimed:

"I knew it! You're a born preacher—it's in your blood!"

Nevertheless, with all the many-sidedness of his genius, sometimes contradictory, he was one of Nature's princes, and my grief at his passing is tempered with a sense of exaltation and thankfulness that I was privileged to know him and can say: "He was my friend."

STEPHEN BELL in *Commerce and Finance*.

NOAH WEBSTER wrote in 1787: "The present generation have no right to say what the next generation shall deem a privilege . . . If our posterity are bound by our constitutions, and can neither alter nor amend them, they are to all intents and purposes slaves."—*An Answer to the Dissenting Members of the Pennsylvania Convention*.

Robert Schalkenbach Report

INTERESTING PUBLICITY

AMONG the interesting clippings that have been sent to us by our News Bureau, should be mentioned a series by Mr. Leslie Eichel of the Central Press Association. Several years ago Mr. Eichel visited the Foundation Office in search of information and material on the gold question, and he asked whether Henry George had written anything on this subject. The late Arthur Pleydell, who happened to be in the office at the time, looked up several references in George's writings for Mr. Eichel. Later Mr. Eichel quoted in syndicated articles from these references. He received material from this office from time to time, including the book, "Social Problems," and our prepared review which mentions Public Debt. Recently we were glad to note a series of four articles written by Mr. Eichel for the Central Press Association, widely syndicated in newspapers throughout the middle west, and east. In the first article, Mr. Eichel says:

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

Some students of economics are going back to a book written fifty-years ago to find a way out of present difficulties.

The book is "Social Problems," by the same Henry George who wrote the classic "Progress and Poverty" (which some of our readers would have us re-read).

Henry George bulks larger and larger as the years pass. He may go down into history as the major American prophet—and his words of more than half a century ago still may lead to a new social order.

Among the most striking words in Henry George's "Social Problems" are these (and they might have been written this very hour):

"Upon the assumption that ascendants may bind descendants, that one generation may legislate for another generation, rests the assumed validity of our land titles and public debts.

"If it were possible for the present to borrow of the future, for those now living to draw upon wealth to be created by those who are yet to come, there could be no more dangerous power, none more certain to be abused; and none that would involve in its exercise a more flagrant contempt for the natural and inalienable rights of man.

"But we have no such power, and there is no possible invention by which we can obtain it. When we talk about calling upon future generations to bear their part of the costs and burdens of the present, about imposing upon them a share in expenditures, we take the liberty of assuming they will consider such expenditures to have been made for their benefit as well as for ours—which is an absurdity."

Henry George strikes directly at the present situation with:

"Public debts are not a device for borrowing from the future, for compelling those yet to be, to bear a share in the expenses which a present generation may choose to incur. That is, of course, a physical impossibility. They are merely a device for obtaining control of wealth in the present by promising that a certain distribution of wealth in the future shall be made—a device by which the owners of existing wealth are induced to give it up under promise, not merely that other people shall be taxed to pay them, but that other people's children shall be taxed for the benefit of their children or the children of their assigns."

and he continues to quote at considerable length from George.

The second article reads in part as follows: