

BRICKBATS AND BOUQUETS

No Adjectives,
Rent Is Rent

"Dear Mr. B.—: You have been talking about economic rent. I don't know where you got the idea. It seems to me there are really six kinds of rent: economic, actual, speculative, monopoly, fictitious and land rent. I refer you to C. LeBaron Goeller and Francis I. duPont for details."—NEW YORK.

This office has said nothing about economic rent—just plain rent, because in science that is what rent is—just rent. This office is interested in simplifying economics, not in rendering confusion more confused.

If one wishes to muddy the waters, why not stick to Karl Marx? He has more kinds of rent and more kinds of capital and he is guilty of more scrambled thinking than anyone else. He has over 2,000 pages of it in his huge 3-volume work, "Capital." Marx is a more abundant source of confusion and bewilderment than Goeller or duPont.

If, however, one is interested in economics and would understand the subject, he must be content with just one kind of rent—plain rent, unadorned. Goeller's and duPont's involvement of this subject is now before the editor. He had been reading it when this letter arrived. In all this one is reminded of the kindly reproof Jesus gave Martha, when He said: "Martha, Martha, thou art troubled about too many things! He then pointed out to her the simple truth that made all her perplexities of no consequence. We have far too many Marthas in our little group!

The chemist knows that oxygen is elemental; and that the basis of the science of chemistry is the elemental character of these chemical units. The economist must profit by that example and understand that rent is an economic element, or simple; and that there can be no science of economics except it be erected like the science of chemistry upon the recognition of, and the understanding of, the seven economic elements; namely, land, labor, wealth, capital, wages, interest, and rent.

Either rent is an economic element, or it is not; if it is not, it must be discarded as useless to the student of economics. If it is not an element, this discussion of the number of kinds of rent we have is irrelevant; if rent is an element this discussion of the "kinds of rent" is absurd.

It is significant that while Goeller contends for three kinds of rent, his pupil who writes this letter has become so infected with the idea that he sees six kinds! That is the way such unscientific ideas spawn. There is only one right way, but many wrong ones.

Given time the Goeller-duPont school and their novitiates will discover and list many, many other kinds of rent. We may have Baptist rent, Townsend rent, Nazi rent, Democratic rent, Republican rent, merchant's rent, etc. Happily, chemistry has passed this visionary stage, or we would have to study farmer oxygen, professional men's oxygen, bootlegger's oxygen, boot-black's oxygen, etc.

The above appeared in a California paper in September, 1936, and is an example of the opposition which has appeared during the past forty years to the ideas put forward in our "Introduction to the New Political Economy."—C. LeBaron Goeller.

TESTIMONIALS

* * *
Guess it must be good with the name of Goeller attached. Send me a copy—enclosed the 25¢.—H. B.

I enjoyed reading your "New Political Economy" very much, and think it is written in a very lively and stimulating manner.—Prof. in School of Business

LEFT OVER From The New Political Economy

Some type matter was left over from our 24pp. "Introduction to the New Political Economy," and believing it to be of interest we are printing it below. And we would like to add that the two references attached are very fine and worth reading.

* * *
Another writer, Sir Oliver Lodge, wrote a far-seeing vision just twenty years ago in his *Science and Human Progress*:

"as Tennyson foresaw, the battles of the future, if there are to be such battles, will mainly be fought in the air;

Heard the heavens fill with shouting,
and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nations' airy navies
grappling in the central blue.

"The atomic bomb is spectacular. It is violent. It can be comprehended even by the little boy, and by the man on the street who perhaps has never so much as heard of the Science of Political Economy. But the solution of the riddle of atomic structure is in no essential way different from the solution of social problems—in another field truly, but all within the unity of Nature. The same close reasoning, the same "eyeless observation," the same "psychic illumination" (imagination) mentioned by Prof. Cassius J. Keyser in his *Mathematics*. And he continues, "(Mathematics) cannot enrich where Nature has impoverished. It makes no pretense of creating faculty where none exists, of opening springs in desert minds. ('In the end, you are what you are.') The great mathematician, like the great poet or great naturalist or great administrator, is born." And thus we say that Henry George was born the great Political Economist.

In the study of Political Economy there are three stumbling blocks. The first is in the misuse of words. We have gone quite fully into that but reiterated caution is not out of place. The second stumbling block is that Politico-Economic theory often runs counter to pecuniary interest, and as someone has said, the pocket-book nerve is the most sensitive nerve in man. The poise of the mathematician must be attained. Self-interest must not sway the philosopher. The third stumbling block is prejudice, which is simply pre-judgment, or judgment before all of the evidence is in. Every honest thinker should make a supreme effort for accuracy, selfless, impartial investigation, and unprejudiced judgment.

* * * * *
Mathematics, by Cassius Jackson Keyser, Adrian Prof. Math., Columbia University. A lecture at the University in the series of Science, Philosophy and Art, October 16, 1907. Pub. Col. U. Press 1916.

Reality of Natural Law, see *Reminiscences of an Astronomer*, by Simon Newcomb, pp. 381-4. (Houghton Mifflin & Co. 1903.)

The most significant contribution to the science of Political Economy since the publication of Henry George's book of that title fifty years ago.—C.B.

I particularly like your treatment of the place of capital as a factor in production—one too often fuddled and confused.—G. M.

PRESS OPINIONS

LeB. GOELLER'S BOOKLET "THE NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY"

IN ONLY A SUGGESTION OF review, this 24 pages, also titled "How Civilized Man Makes A Living," a rather hasty reading indicates that the names are lacking in the descriptive element, since the work is devoted mainly to explaining, defending and possibly correcting, our Oldest Political Economy, that of Henry George.

And as to its bringing this science most forcefully and practically to the getting-a-living problem, that is where I have found all the old and new "PEs" most lacking.

The author's objective, as I have divined it, is worthy and needed. How much needed and in what specific ways and how much covered by Goeller, "democracy" will go into in due course.

The author might be called a die-hard George-Man who has taken as his portion in a life-work the circulation in great mass of 100 or more "tracts" carved out of the voluminous writings of "The World's Greatest Economist," as fundamentalists in this relatively new science insist on naming him. The Henry George Tract Society of Endwell, N. Y. will help a further understanding of this "brief."

We have Goeller the plodder in this George Vineyard, for 50 years. Set to one side by some of the schisms that inflict all organizations, he patiently pursues his work. For years publishing a paper the "Single Tax News" and then the tracts.—"democracy," 1165 Broadway, New York City.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW POLITICAL ECONOMY is the title of a 24 pp. booklet by C. LeBARON GOELLER, published by the author at Endwell, New York, (25¢). The booklet does not go much beyond definitions, which, however, are made extremely clear by illustrations and diagrams. These definitions include Monopoly Rent and Speculative Rent. The implications of these definitions are carried out far enough to give a student a clearer insight into economic principles than he could gain from most text-books on a much more pretentious scale.—"The Square Deal," 991 Bay St., Toronto 5, Ont. Canada.

TESTIMONIALS

★ ★
Guess it must be good with the name of Goeller attached. Send me a copy—enclosed the 25¢—H. B.

I enjoyed reading your "New Political Economy" very much, and think it is written in a very lively and stimulating manner.—Prof. in School of Business

The most significant contribution to the science of Political Economy since the publication of Henry George's book of that title fifty years ago.—C. B.

I particularly like your treatment of the place of capital as a factor in production—one too often fuddled and confused.—G. M.

Seems generally sound to me. Only minor adverse criticism is possible, the few difficulties being of a semantic nature more than otherwise.—C.P.A.

The outstanding recommendation of your "Introduction to the New Political Economy" is that it is conspicuously Different from the stereotype Single Tax output. From it I get several thoughts that have not occurred to me before, and all worth something. Your economics presents proportions that challenge dispute—that stimulate interest and attention. It is a worthwhile endeavor.—Octogenarian.

South Africa As She Might Be, by F. A. W. Lucas, (King's Counsel), prints our diagrams Nos. IV and V, on page 15 of this 72 pp. Booklet (3/-). Printed by L. S. Gray & Co., 13 Melkile St., Johannesburg, So. Africa.

This "Introduction" contains the core of Political Economy (as distinguished from "economics"). Moreover it demonstrates certain vital points of the science which have not been made clear by previous authors, even by the last of the great ones, Henry George. Mr. George did indeed teach these points by strong inference or implication, but Goeller has nailed them fast.—M.D.