

New York 18

August 6, 1946

Miss Helen Cartier  
252 East 61st Street  
New York 21

Dear Miss Cartier:

I appreciate very much your friendly note, with its enclosure of a carbon copy of your letter to Mr. Poore. I am happy to know that you intend to read my book, and I hope you are not disappointed in it.

Sincerely yours,

Henry Hazlitt

HELEN CARTIER  
252 EAST 61ST STREET  
NEW YORK 21, N.Y.

July 31, 1946

Dear Mr. Hazlitt:

I thought you might like to know that some people review the reviewers. I intend to read your book. I don't know whether or not I shall agree with it, but you may be sure that, unlike Mr. Poore, I shall read it with an open mind.

Sincerely yours,

*Helen Cartier*

encl.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt  
c/o The New York Times  
229 West 43rd St  
New York N Y

July 31, 1946

Dear Mr. Poore:

I have not read Mr. Hazlitt's *ECONOMICS IN ONE LESSON*, nor do I know what his position is regarding the subject. But this I do know: Your review of his book violates every principle of good reviewing.

I cannot judge the merit of Mr. Hazlitt's book from your review of it, but I can state positively that almost any book is bound to be superior to the review written by you. For, while you are fully entitled to hurl the dictionary at what, in your opinion, is an inadequate book, you are not entitled to approach its subject matter with flippancy and contempt. Which is precisely what you did, exhibiting besides, poor taste, poor humor and very little knowledge.

You quote H.L. Mencken's compliment to Hazlitt and add in parenthesis "This is ~~is~~ decidedly unfair to George Bernard Shaw..." It was, after all, Mencken who said it, not Hazlitt, so why take it out on the latter? (And referring to Shaw as an economist betrays your own ignorance--ask some real economists; they'll tell you).

Then, in one breath you state that Mr. Hazlitt "goes cruising for fallacies...in present-day economic doctrines"; and in the next breath deplore the fact that "he is unnecessarily hard on the bureaucrats, since the recent bureaucracy...contained a good many worthy businessmen who temporarily gave up the pleasures and salaries of Manhattan to go down and cope with Congressional harassment, etc."

But if Mr. Hazlitt goes cruising for fallacies in economic doctrines and he finds that under certain conditions human behavior results in thus-and-such, I assume that the point is not that he is hard on certain individuals, but hard on the conditions which make them behave so. That you shift from doctrine to individual proves your view of the subject is not only unscientific but illogical.

Finally, you make it almost impossible to follow the premise of Mr. Hazlitt's book by interjecting subjective rebuttal all the way through. CHARLES POORE sticks out all over the page rather than what he (or Mr. Hazlitt) has to say.

Sincerely yours,

*Helen Carter*