

Perhaps I am naive on this subject, but I fail to see Mr. Bernstein's case.

Mr. Albert Jay Nock is disparaged in the review by Mr. Benstein, because he indorses the general thesis which he said "cannot be questioned," that wars are economic and that wars fail to solve the cause, poverty.

Mr. Nock needs no defense, and may well be distressed that I should discuss the attack on him. It seems fitting that a few words may be said about his contribution, in the *Atlantic Monthly*, of an article on "Democracy vs. Socialism," a book reprinted by the Henry George School. This article, entitled "In Defense of the Individual," induced over 500 individuals to buy this book through the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation. This was a contribution to "widening the circle" of those who study George.

Everyone who would contribute to the Henry George Movement, may do so in his own way; it won't be mine and it won't be that of someone else. On the occasion of the Henry George Centenary Mr. Nock published a biography, "Henry George," which gave the movement considerable publicity.

Those who disagree with the methods of a fellow Georgeist may well try to educate him, but the assumption of George is that man is infinitely improvable, educable, not some men, but man. "They are even as we are," said he. Therefore, while we may well criticize a product objectively, we may assume the best of motives in everyone. Concentration on a man's logic keeps the issues clear and is educational. Let us strive for the constructive, the educational in all our efforts to overcome the only emergency, Ignorance.

New York, N. Y.

LANCASTER M. GREENE

MR. BERNSTEIN SUBMITS MORE TESTIMONY

EDITORS LAND AND FREEDOM:

Albert Jay Nock is a regular contributor to *Scribner's Commentator* whose pro-Nazi character has been conclusively established after thorough investigation by competent agencies. Most of the magazine's contributors are tarred with the same brush.

In the July-August issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, I pointed out that "Unfinished Victory" was unashamedly anti-Semitic and pro-Hitler. Nock has neither denied that assertion nor my charge that he approves the book's viewpoint. In fact, he has, in the September *Commentator*, in an article praising a book by the anti-Semite Douglas Reed, reaffirmed his approval of "Unfinished Victory." He says, "My readers will remember that some months ago I reviewed Mr. Arthur Bryant's excellent, temperate and patriotic book, 'Unfinished Victory,'" and then he reiterates his belief that a conspiracy exists to keep the volume off the American market.

Despite this, Ellen Winsor "rebukes" me in her letter in the September-October issue of LAND AND FREEDOM for mistreating Nock, for ignoring his genuine Georgeism, and for being unacquainted with his "masterpiece"—"Our Enemy, the State." Well, let's look at the record.

In 1928, Nock published a book called "On Doing the Right Thing." I quote from it: "In actual life, they [the Jews] are dreadful people. I sometimes think there will be a record-breaking pogrom in New York some day, and there are occasions even now when the most peace-loving person among us wishes he could send over a couple of *cotnias* of Cossacks to floor-manage the subway rush."

In 1934, Mr. Nock, in a "Journal of These Days," wrote: "It is ironic that the offspring of those who crucified Christ are the ones who profit most by the seasonal sentiment of Christmas. But in the Jewish view *Geschaft ist immer Geschaft* and most Christians are too dull-witted to perceive the anomaly. This morning I was thinking of our newspapers here in New York as a typical *echt* Jewish enterprise for its peculiar quality of unscrupulousness and shabbiness."

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. . . .