

June 27, 1946

Mr. George L. Rusby  
Towaco, N. J.

Dear Mr. Rusby:

Again I agree with you, when you say in your letter of June 9th that it might be productive of better results if, instead of personally presenting this matter to the School Committee on Manual Revision, that you first convince some person, preferably a member of the School, and then have that individual present the case to the Committee.

I have given much thought to the matter of finding the best person for this undertaking, but up to this writing have not been able to select the right one. I could not undertake to do this myself, but shall continue my search for such a person.

I readily agree with you when you say that personal services make no direct contribution to the production and distribution of wealth. However, it would seem to me that personal services have a bearing on rent, and since rent is a factor in political economy, personal services should come in for some consideration. This, of course, is one of the things on which I want to get clear myself.

Although I cannot undertake the responsibility of personally taking on the job of convincing the Committee, I certainly will endeavor to find a qualified and willing friend who can do it. Let me assure you that I appreciate your interest and perseverance in this matter and I promise you my whole-hearted cooperation in working out the solution of this problem.

Sincerely,

Otto K. Dorn

OKD:mle

ECONOMICS EDUCATION INSTITUTE  
TOWACO, N. J.

Towaco, N.J.  
July 15 1946

Dear Mr. Dorn:

PERSONAL SERVICE

Replying to your inquiries in letter of June 27: You say that personal service "has a bearing" on rent, and therefore must have a place in P.E.

Everything imaginable "has a bearing" on everything else; that is, there is SOME relation, however remote, between any and every two things. But does that fact bring everything within the scope of mathematics, or chemistry, or economics, or any other given science? Every thing is related to everything else, because the universe is a unit, everything being a part of the same - but isn't that beside the question?

You teach, throughout, and unqualifiedly, that:

1. All product (wealth) is distributed, apportioned, by the operation of natural law, through the three channels - rent, wages and interest.
2. That after the rent and interest portions (for permission to use the source of the wealth and permission to use the capital employed) are deducted, the remainder, ALL of the remainder is wages, going for the labor expended in producing the product, the wealth.
3. That all, ABSOLUTELY ALL, wages are produced by the laborer, AS HE Labors; if he picks an apple from the tree, or ground, instantaneously and automatically one portion (rent) is apportioned to the landowner, another portion to the owner of the ladder on which the laborer stands (interest), and the remaining portion to the laborer himself.

Now, ask yourself this simple question:

If no wages exist except that portion of product (of wealth) that natural law apportions to the laborer (the producer), AS HE PRODUCES, ~~where~~ where can any wages come from to apportion to the man who gives music lessons (or renders other personal service) to the laborer's daughter, or to the laborer himself? Isn't it the simple fact that this is what occurs, and MUST occur - that after the wages portion of product go to the laborer, as they MUST, the laborer, in turn, shares his wealth (which came to him as "wages"), with whomsoever he may select to render him some personal service?

If the answer is "yes", it is equivalent to contending that personal service can NEVER produce wealth, and can never, therefore, receive wages.

Personal service MAY better equip its recipient for producing wealth, or may have just the opposite effect, or no effect at all; in any case, the renderer of the service merely occupies the position above described.

Look carefully at the definition of personal service. It has to do solely with supplying NON-MATERIAL THINGS. How, then, can it come within the scope of a science that, according to our definition, deals SOLELY with material things?

Have endeavored to present the above argument in a simple and convincing way. Is there a flaw in it? If so, what? If not, must we not unqualifiedly accept the conclusion that Personal Service cannot possibly ever produce wealth or receive wages?

Best wishes! Sincerely,

*George L. Rusby*  
George L. Rusby.

GEORGE L. RUSBY  
TOWACO, N. J.

Towaco, N.J.  
July 15 1946

Dear Mr. Dorn:

In reference to the subject of our recent correspondence, last referred to in yours of June 27, I will await the results of your further consideration of the difficult situation to be met.

Most sincerely,

*George L. Rusby*  
George L. Rusby.

Enclosure

---

GEORGE L. RUSEY  
TOWACO, N. J.

June 9 1946

Dear Mr. Dorn:

Following my letter of yesterday, wherein I acknowledged receipt of yours of the 6th:

Your suggestion, that the set of definitions under discussion be submitted to your Manual Revision Committee, will bear very careful consideration.

In the first place, to offer the definitions to the Committee as a body would call forth a babel of opinions, mostly superficial, and there would be little chance of that systematic procedure without which constructive progress would be impossible - each member, while a given view was being ~~xx~~ expressed, busy with his own views instead of following those of the speaker. I think that "round-table" arguments of this nature are usually quite barren of tangible results. And in this connection it must be remembered that some of your members do not accept the importance and significance of having exact definitions, non-contrary definitions, on which to build; the views of some are directly opposed to the views of some others; one of the most prominent of your teachers (Mr. Delavolpe) denies that ~~xxx~~ P.E. "is the science that treats of the nature, production and distribution of wealth"; which is basic, to the George science. Again, to present to the Committee a set of definitions suggested by me, without full endorsement by the one presenting them, would surely arouse "sales resistance", - a very important consideration. Would this be tactful?

Isn't this, instead, what is needed?: that some one member of the Committee, or some other School representative be fully convinced of the correctness of the definitions, and offer them with his full endorsement, prepared to demonstrate their correctness. If no one can be found, ~~whom~~ himself fully convinced, to do this, what hope is there? Mr. Dreyfuss and I have had considerable correspondence on this subject. But Mr. Dreyfuss is a very busy man, and, as he says, unable to give the time and consideration requisite.

How about Mr. Dorn? In April, 1944, this same question came up for discussion between us, but your health then made it necessary to discontinue the discussion. I would be willing to meet you at your convenience and thresh out all the pros and cons, ~~xxx~~ yielding wherever convinced of any error on my part, and placing you in position to offer and defend the definitions accepted, regardless of whomsoever might have suggested them to you.

If you have any objections to serving in this capacity, then some one else might be selected to concentrate upon, as a channel through which to go further. You are aware that neither of the Directors present at our conference that you attended can be considered for this service; for as you will recall they both belittled and ridiculed the whole idea that economics could be claimed to be an exact science, ~~and~~ that the search for truth could be regarded as <sup>no</sup> more than useless "hair-splitting". If you have reasons for not taking up the cudgels,

*claiming*

have you anybody else in mind? Mr. Greene has become convinced that personal service can NEVER produce wealth, and though he has authorized me to so quote him, when I urge him to actively endeavor to convince the others, on this very important point, he begs off on the plea that he "is not built that way". He is convinced, also, that the S.T. is NOT a tax on land or land value, but he lets it rest there, leaving the teachers to continue

misinstructing their students - repeating what is pure falsehood. So long as he does not consider that he has a responsibility to actively oppose ~~what~~ the teaching of what he admits to be erroneous, he cannot be considered for the work in hand. Understand me, he may have good and sufficient reasons - I am not attacking him, only stating the facts.

What do you suggest? It is farthest from my wishes to be a mere disturber. If you, taking a birds'-eye view of the situation, conclude that I should withdraw, play mum, keep still and let things take their course, I can do that, and concentrate in other directions.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

*George L. Rusby*  
George L. Rusby.

ECONOMICS EDUCATION INSTITUTE  
TOWACO, N. J.

June 8 1946

Dear Mr. Dorn:

It is with great relief and gratitude that I receive your letter of the 6th, acknowledging mine of an earlier date. It is good to know that you appreciate my motive and in your mind free me from any but a desire to be of the greatest possible to the School and its ultimate work.

Before any action such as you suggest (of the wisdom of which I am at the moment not fully convinced) I would like to have a talk with you, and if agreeable to you I will try to arrange this in the near future.

Meantime with best wishes and thanking you for your letter,

Sincerely,

*George L. Rusby*  
George L. Rusby.

J u n e 6, 1946

Mr. George L. Rusby  
Towaco, N. J.

Dear Mr. Rusby:

I was hoping to see you at the Robert Schalkenbach meeting last week and regret very much that you were not able to attend. There is so much vital material in your letter of May 15th regarding "definitions" that I felt it would be best to talk the matter over in person.

First, though, let me assure you that I am aware of, and appreciate, your sincere interest in the School. I am sure that your efforts to have these changes made are based on a true desire on your part to be helpful rather than merely critical.

I agree with you when you say we should have "a set of definitions that are not only consistent and non-contradictory, but also to be expressed in such form as to be without ambiguity and fully intelligible to the man of ordinary intelligence."

I trust it will be possible to present your definitions in a manner that will assure unanimous acceptance on the part of the Manual Revision Committee. If it is agreeable to you, I should like to present this matter to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

Otto K. Dorn

OKD:mle

GEORGE L. RUSBY  
TOWACO, N. J.

May 15 1946

Dear Mr. Dorn:

You very kindly had Miss Petersen forward to me the letter of Mr. Briggs, with its enclosures, recently received by you. To Mr. Briggs' letter I made reply, and forwarded copy of my reply to Miss Petersen, to hand to you.

I did not, as I intended, enclose in my letter, copy of the set of Definitions that was referred to in my letter, and copy of which I sent to Mr. Briggs. *Find same herewith*

As stated in my letter to him, I want a set of definitions not only 100% consistent and non-contradictory, but expressed in such form as to be without ambiguity, and fully intelligible to the man of ordinary intelligence. The set enclosed is the only one that I have ever encountered that is not self-contradictory.

I hesitate say what is in my mind- even to you, whom I know I can trust. But I think I will unburden myself, very confidentially. and please know, that I do not say these things broadcast, for I would not take any action that might do more harm to the School, than good:

If these definitions are sound, the School's Manual promotes a lot of what is not only trash, but worse, for it is pure falsehood.

With a manual of which that ~~xxx~~ is true, is it any wonder that you have various teachers in various class-rooms teaching contradictory doctrine? Or that a given teacher ~~xxx~~ at one session proclaims what flatly contradicts what the same teacher proclaimed at the previous session? *of* I have worked hard, patiently and hopefully to arouse some kind of interest in the facts as they are, but with what result? I am ridiculed (you heard it done on one occasion) as "a hair-splitter," because of my insistence on ~~on~~ the importance of teachers being fully familiar with their subject. It does not seem to me that there can be any cementing tie, making for the permanent future of the School, except love of the truth. And when the searcher after truth is thus held in contempt by even the Directors, what is the future?

I have been identified with the School and have been one of its supporters ever since Mr. Geiger founded it; he was consecrated to teaching the truth; he, like myself, had seen the movement almost on the rocks because Georgists were governed by emotion instead of knowledge; Mr. George used to call him "the economist of the movement"; he knew that in education lay the only hope. You can imagine how it makes one feel, to witness the certain deterioration that cannot but follow the lowering of standards. Education as to the science of Economics is our only hope; what must result from an attitude of ridicule of the truth-seeker? We all have much to learn; but what shall we do when effort to learn more finds no encouragement? Nobody seems to care. Getting more students and graduating them, not as lovers of scientific truth, but as mere "yes" graduates will not suffice- do you think it can? Nor will emotion suffice- it must be guided by adequate knowledge of the science. This has been demonstrated by long experience.

I am sorry to write thus. But I felt that I must unburden myself. It is between ourselves. I would not offer criticisms openly, that might work injury. The School has accomplished much good; but will its usefulness not dry up, if love of the truth is not kept the paramount object?

With best wishes, always,

Sincerely,

*George L. Rusby*  
George L. Rusby

Do you honestly expect adequate benefit from your Manual Revision Com.?