

## HENRY GEORGE INSTITUTE

5 East 44th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10017

August 4, 1981

Dear Ed:

Interesting to hear what you Philadelphians are up to, and I am in sympathy with your aims. My own tactic is to ignore those who go off course, and get on with the work I think should be done - but I will admit that there is a good case for getting after the buzzards.

I enclose two items. One is my Memorandum on the Henry George School, which I did some years ago to circulate to friends who could not comprehend what was going on. It was thus done for a specific purpose, and does not cover all the information you want. But based on it, perhaps you could ask further questions that I could answer.

In retrospect, the following thoughts occur to me about this Memorandum: I was too soft on the characters involved, but that was on purpose, because I was still too close to the events reported therein and it could too easily be interpreted as "sour grapes" if I was more critical. Also, the School never did turn into an "academic showcase," not even a second-rate one. As I now believe, there never was any plan to become academic, it was all a cover-up for personal ambitions. Concerning some of the characters mentioned: Lowell Harriss has for some reason become quite friendly, contributes to the Institute and sends literature. Repentance for his part in the debacle? Even Arch Woodruff has become a bit friendly, though he was hostile at the time.

The second item is a 10-year report of the Lincoln Foundation. (It was evidently founded in 1947, not 1946 as I stated; however, the decision was made in 1946.) John C. Lincoln was still alive when this report was issued. You will read his Statement on page 8 and see what an uncompromising Georgist he was. Note on page 9 the purpose of the Foundation.

Note on page 10 the Directors' Interpretation of Purpose. It is very cleverly done. The shift of emphasis is so slight as to be practically unnoticeable. I'm certain this "interpretation" was written by the cunning Raymond Moley. It provided the opening wedge for veering off the straightforward course set by John C. Lincoln. (I am reminded of what the playwright Ionesco said of the anti-Nazi liberals of his country, Roumania. They gathered together to resist the Nazi ideology. But when some one gave in on some very minor point, another point would be yielded until finally that person became a full-fledged Nazi.)

Consider this letter for Richard Biddle too. And if either of you has any further questions, I'll try to answer them.

Sincerely,

*Bob*  
Robert Clancy