

I would like Miss Winsor to know that I am thoroughly familiar with "Our Enemy, the State" and consider it a third-rate work by a third-rate writer who is eminent neither in sociology, economics nor in political theory. Most of the book's ideas are borrowed from others, and what are peculiarly Mr. Nock's own are without either merit or significance.

George Raymond Geiger (Professor of Philosophy at Antioch College, author of "The Philosophy of Henry George," "Theory of the Land Question," and son of the late Oscar Geiger, founder of the Henry George School), writing on Henry George in the September issue of the *Antioch Review* (of which he is an editor) has this to say:—

"We are examining in this paper some of the reasons for George's neglect today . . . To the more legitimate reasons may be added an unfortunate tendency on the part of the most influential of George's present-day American supporters to use his work as a club with which to belabor 'collectivists' of all sorts—from Stalin to Roosevelt! [Indeed, they seem to hate Roosevelt more than Stalin, and Hitler far less than either—M. J. B.] What may be called the right-wing group of Georgeists seems to have been unduly influenced by the ideas of Albert Jay Nock, whose rather recent book, 'Henry George: An Essay,' expresses clearly the sophisticated anarchism which he has always preferred to 'our enemy, the state' . . . The extraordinarily bitter attacks upon 'statism' which evoke the blessings of many prominent Georgeists today do not have even the ring of genuine anarchism. They sound more like the 'viewings-with-alarm' of a Chamber of Commerce or the National Association of Manufacturers.

"There is no point in discussing the merits of rigorous anarchism. (Mr. Nock's brand seems somewhat unorthodox, since he has a distinct contempt for the uneducable masses, and feels that George made his fatal mistake in trying to appeal to them.)

" . . . But it seems certain, at least to the present writer, that George would scarcely approve of the unabashed Republicanism and pink-baiting that are professed by some of his followers today. Even more certain is it . . . that his permanent influence in American social thought will be in those very circles that are now being alienated by such right wing tactics."

In a footnote, Professor Geiger adds: "Since this was written several articles of Mr. Nock have appeared, and in them he has taken the first steps down a path which must unquestionably be called a fascist one."

In the August-September 1941 issue of *Protestant Digest* there is an article exposing Albert Jay Nock as an anti-Semite. It is entitled "Nock—Atlantic Anti-Semite," and is an analysis of his recent articles in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

I can't think of a more fitting sentence with which to terminate this letter, except to state the conclusion which necessarily follows from it, to wit:—that the prejudices shared by Nock and others must be exposed for what they really are. This is essential to safeguard the name and reputation of Henry George and to prevent an association in the public mind of his teachings with ideas which, were he alive, he would have utterly repudiated and tirelessly combated.

New York, N. Y.

MICHAEL J. BERNSTEIN

ADDENDUM BY THE EDITORS

[In a review of Albert Jay Nock's "A Journal of These Days" (LAND AND FREEDOM, May-June 1934), Joseph Dana Miller wrote the following: "Mr. Nock is a Henry George man but he is not eager to apply the remedy. Familiar as we are with the eccentricities of many who profess a belief in our principles and yet who are in deadly fear of them, this does not surprise us greatly. He says of the Single Tax that 'the people would not know what to do with it if they got it,' and with this shallow sophistry dismisses it. . . .