

# The Triple Legacy of Georgism

## -1-

In California, during the later '70s, while he was studying and writing, Henry George believed that *Progress and Poverty* would be a book for the twentieth century. His career on the West coast, it will be recalled, had given him little reason to hope that his ideas would spread at all rapidly.

George's change of mind, to expect immediate effects, which occurred on the heels of his first visit in Ireland and England, was no one-sided result, either of his natural optimism or of his inner shift of emphasis from a prophetic role to an almost messianic one. Events encouraged his hopes. A social revolution in his own day suddenly seemed altogether likely to occur. The questions in George's mind during the middle '80s were whether the United Kingdom or the United States would be the first to achieve a new economic order, and whether that change would be induced by Christian and rational measures or by doctrines of materialism and methods of violence.

But after the political setbacks of 1887, 1890, and 1894, at home, Henry George's expectations receded almost to the original estimation. His willingness to die in 1897 recalls his thought of two decades earlier. He believed once more that his ideas would have a stronger effect on men and nations in the future than on his exact contemporaries. Calculating the risks of the campaign for the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson, he turned to Johnson. 'Tom, wouldn't that be a glorious way to die?' he demanded.

The memorial services, meetings, editorials, and articles of ap-

preciation, which appeared everywhere after his death, were of course the first stage of the carrying-on of the effort of Henry George. Perhaps the tribute, the personal estimate and assignment to a place in history that George would have liked best of all, however, was a private one. George W.

Julian inscribed it in his diary. He spoke with as complete an authority, in the line of thought he chose, as anyone alive could have mustered. With a trembling hand the octogenarian abolitionist wrote: 'The death of Henry George in the midst of his grand fight against political thieving has touched the hearts of the whole world as no other death has done since that of Lincoln. George was a real saint and Martyr. He was the most religious man I have ever known, with his whole heart he loved the toiling poor, and he freely gave his life as a sacrifice. He was absolutely pure and unselfish, and his exalted place among the heroes of humanity is already perfectly assured ... I think he overvalued his scheme of Land reform, but his books, and especially those dealing with the tariff, will probably influence public opinion in the years to come.'

## -2-

When the leader died he left behind three types of belief in his ideas: the fiscal-reform Georgism of the single tax, of which Thomas Shearman was still the central figure; the political Georgism which entered into many varieties of reform activity, and which Tom Loftin Johnson represented most completely; and the moral and intellectual Georgism, of which Tolstoy and Hamlin Garland were eloquent early figures. The three categories overlap, of course, but we have noticed cases of the first without the second, and of the third without the first or second. Among Henry George's early prominent followers, perhaps Tom Johnson and Father McGlynn were the only ones who had the capacity to enter energetically into all three forms of Georgism.

In fairness to the accomplishment of the men who were Henry George's immediate successors, it should be said that the climate of American opinion after 1897 did not favor the growth of the Georgist political effort. Had the master himself lived in vigor a dozen years longer than he did, it is impossible to suppose that he could have played, during the administrations of McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and Taft, any political part equal to the one

he assumed during the Cleveland period of American history. Even the most progressive Republicans of the first decade of the present century, and there were never too many of them, were nationalistic pro-tariff men and

overseas imperialists. On the home front, the advanced Republicans who fought for conservation of the federal domain and natural resources, spoke they ever so strongly in the public interest, were more concerned to have the government manage the land than they were to have the people use it. Although Henry George's ideas may seem at first thought to have been logically perfect to give philosophical support to the conservationism of Roosevelt and Pinchot, all three forms of Georgism were in political fact quite remote from the reforms which early Progressivism introduced in Washington.

Under the circumstances of Republican domination in the country, there can have been few choices for the legatees of Henry George to make when they asked themselves the question, in the months and years after 1897, what they should do to carry on. The natural answer was to continue with what they had been doing previously, in different localities and in individual ways, as followers of their leader while he lived. Sometimes the result was ingenuous, as in the case of Charles Fillebrown of Boston, who was a businessman devotee and one who, like William Lloyd Garrison II, regretted Henry George's politics of 1896 and 1897. Mr. Fillebrown tried to become a sort of schoolmaster for twentieth-century Georgists. He wrote a primer, the *ABC of Taxation with Boston Object Lessons*; and he made a habit of entertaining at banquets professors and public men, and of presenting them with speakers for the single tax. This effort drew sharp criticism from within the single-tax movement itself.

In New York City, on the other hand, later Georgism, though conservative and fiscal-minded in emphasis, was aggressive, and it had power. The line of continuity from before 1897 descended through the Manhattan Single Tax Club; and in 1901 the Single Tax Review came to the city from the Middle West. After the death of Thomas Shearman in 1900, Lawson Purdy became a practical and thoughtful developer, in the direction of the single tax, limited. More gifted as a leader than Shearman, Purdy in time contributed to the defeat of the general property tax. During the second decade of the present century, he became the principal

spokesman for the policy the city adopted, of assessing the value of land separately from improvements on the land. More than any other Georgist, moreover, Mr. Purdy has studied the administrative implications

which inhere in the program of taxing land values. He has examined the bearing of taxation on land classification and land-use planning in the modern city; and he has asserted the need of cities sometimes to develop areas under a policy of public ownership.

During the early part of this century Georgists in other cities helped achieve tax reforms similar to those in New York. Under political circumstances which will be explained shortly, Cleveland adopted the system of separate assessments; and in Pennsylvania Georgists led in the fights, one of them recently, for the legislation which has brought about the higher taxation of land values and the lower taxation of buildings in Pittsburgh and certain other cities. Separate assessment has become a widespread practice in America, during the last half-century.

The sizable exception to the rule, that broader political Georgism faced impossible adversities during the decade after George's death, occurred, as seems entirely natural, in Tom Johnson's state of Ohio. While Henry George was living, Johnson had become a kind of field commander, west of New York at least, deploying Georgist forces at strategic centers, as his money made it possible. He had moved Warren W. Bailey, a journalist, from Chicago to Pennsylvania and made him editor of the *Johnstown Democrat*. The plan was to have a paper to compare with the *Springfield Republican*, to develop the radical side of the Democratic party. During the early '90s, he had brought Louis Post from New York to Cleveland, it will be recalled, to carry on with newspaper work when the *Standard* of New York was discontinued.

After George's death Johnson sent Post on to Chicago, to undertake a major effort. This was *The Public*, a liberal weekly which lasted fifteen years. Among many whom Mr. Post names, Jane Addams, Ben B. Lindsay, Lincoln Steffens, Professor Edward Bemis, and Jerry Simpson warmly supported the journal, and some of them contributed articles. *The Public* criticized the Roosevelt administration severely. Though Post objected to William Jennings Bryan's ideas on the trust problem, *The Public* and Bryan's

own paper, *The Commoner*, were friendly; and Bryan once contributed to *The Public* an appreciation of Henry George. Though the honor of having been the most brilliant general and literary magazine of Georgist inclination

should probably be withheld from *The Public*, in favor of Francis Neilson's short-lived Freeman of the 1920s, The Public deserves credit for having been a substantial journal of opinion. It belonged to the political and moral traditions of Georgism, more than to the fiscal one. The single tax has been served, during the twentieth century, by a dozen or so ephemeral papers.

In his home city, Johnson personally resumed the burden of practical politics, four years after Henry George laid it down. In 1901 the Democratic ex-congressman became mayor of Cleveland; and, three times re-elected, he held that office for eight years while Washington was dominated by Republicans. Johnson used the methods of a democratic reformer, one who on George's pattern would help the people to help themselves. He conducted public meetings in a huge circus tent; he encouraged all manner and kind of persons to speak and won a reputation for being a scrupulous presiding officer. As victor at the polls he had to go beyond George's old role of political educator, however, and become a people's administrator. For this he had great talent. Newton Baker's judgment, reinforced by that of Lincoln Steffens, that Tom Johnson should be ranked as 'the outstanding municipal executive so far produced in United States history,' and that he made Cleveland 'the best governed city in America,' is probably still a true judgment today, over two decades after it was written.

On the side of policy, much of Johnson's effort as mayor was concentrated on establishing in Cleveland a municipally owned transportation system which would render free services to the working community. Fighting Mark Hanna on this issue, Mayor Johnson did not win the battle, nor did he lose altogether. He believed in an idea George had advanced in his own mayoralty campaign of 1886, that a city's growth, like a building made higher, is justified only when size increases efficiency and service. As a tall building includes elevators in its free services, George had argued, so a large city should supply, through a charge to be made against land values, free transportation to laborers. At the end of his campaign, Johnson did win a reduction to a three-cent fare. Though

the public utility remained privately owned, the city had heard a remarkable discussion of the reasons for the public ownership of monopolies created by technology, and it had gained cheap transportation.

As for land-value taxation, Johnson made little progress earlier than his last term in office. At that time he succeeded in having a young and

dedicated colleague, Frederic C. Howe, elected to the city's tax commission. That body, first conferring with Lawson Purdy, installed the system of separate assessment; and, a little later, a new change in procedure, which placed high assessments on lands and low assessments on buildings, brought about a practical advance toward Georgist tax policy. 'It confirmed my belief,' confesses Howe, the reformer, 'in the results that would follow the taxation of land values and the exemption of improvements from taxation.'

When Tom Johnson retired from office in 1909, not long before his death, his combined record as congressman and mayor made him the American who had gone farther than anyone else to advance into practical politics all three of George's main economic proposals. His advocacy of free trade, in Congress and in Democratic conventions, and before the people; his campaign for municipally owned, free utilities; and the achievement of land-value taxation, however limited, in Cleveland, brought Georgism nearer to being established in the statute books than Henry George himself had managed in New York or California.

### -3-

By 1909 signs were increasing that Georgist efforts of the twentieth century would not be as isolated, and not as unsympathetic with main currents of politics, as they had been a few years earlier. As in George's own day, encouragement came from across the ocean. Notably in 1906 and after, the single tax and land nationalization were taken up once more in serious English journals; and the newly victorious Liberal party, whose leaders, Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith, and Lloyd George derived many of their ideas from the Radicalism of Gladstone's day, was more than favorable to Georgism. The famous Lloyd George budget, the taxation and social-reform features of which led to Britain's constitutional crisis of 1909-10, contained substantial influence from the ideas

of the American George. Tom Johnson and Louis Post went to England, quite in Henry George style, to do what they could to help in the fight and to share in the celebrations of victory.

One of the achievements of Johnson's years as mayor had been the building of a team of younger associates. Councilman Frederic C. Howe and Newton D. Baker, who would become mayor of Cleveland in 1912,

both of them lawyers, were the two most important members. But Brand Whitlock, whom we encountered during the '90s in Chicago, served, after 1905, first as right-hand man, then as successor, of Mayor 'Golden Rule' Jones of Toledo; and he too belonged to the group. Recollections weave around political discussions which were held in Tom Johnson's mansion, and which Clarence Darrow and Lincoln Steffens and other liberals sometimes attended. Howe tells us of the mayor's capacity to transmit to his younger associates the ideas that impelled his own reformism. Johnson, he says, 'had talked every phase of his philosophy through' with Henry George himself, and he had its 'deeper social significances at his fingertips ... He was not a sectarian ... His mind was a garden rather than a safe-deposit box.'

The Ohio group included several writing members. Brand Whitlock had produced a novel of political realism before he entered city politics. But Frederic Howe's books of 1905 and 1910, *The City the Hope of Democracy and Privilege and Democracy in America*, which are the best of all books that have developed the Georgist critique since George, were almost certainly indebted to the reform group in which he shared. A brief quotation from *Privilege and Democracy in America* will be the best indication of the continuity. 'Private land ownership is now complete,' wrote Howe. 'Those who come after us must come as trespassers ... The railway question is at bottom a land question ... Two hundred thousand men from the workers of the metropolis must work for ten long years, ten hours a day, and three hundred days every year to pay the annual incomes of the few thousand men who own the land underlying the city ... It is the unskilled laborer who suffers most ... He does not organize ... The agricultural worker falls in the same class ... The same is true of the salaried and professional classes.'

The year 1909 would have been a natural time for the dis

integration, or at least the withering, of the Ohio group. But just when Tom Johnson quit as mayor, a gift of money from Joseph Fels, of Cincinnati, created new work for him and his associates. In a way a latter-day Francis Shaw, Mr. Fels set up a commission and assigned to the members all responsibility for distributing the money. Johnson himself became the Fels Fund's first treasurer; Daniel C. Kiefer of Cincinnati was president; and Frederic Howe and Lincoln Steffens were members of the

board. The assignment was exciting, according to Steffens, who noted that the immediate problem was to spend \$50,000 a year 'so that radical economic reforms of the system would result.' Though this same commissioner felt obliged to explain to his colleagues, who seemed not to understand the motives of the creative artist very well, that offering a large prize would not be a good way to secure the writing of a social- protest novel, he lacked no sympathy for the spirit of the undertaking. 'When they are thoughtful as they are today,' Steffens wrote to Warren W. Bailey, 'the real artists are likely to be propagandists or muckrakers.'

Thus, at the point of the Fels Fund, more distinctly than earlier the Georgist impulse entered the stream of Progressivism. By now, that movement had become a broad intellectual and moral current, which included members of both parties, and which extended itself beyond the limits of any political party. To be sure the fund supported the *Single Tax Review*, which represented the narrower Georgism. But it also underwrote translations of *Progress and Poverty* into Swedish and Bulgarian, Yiddish and Chinese, and assisted the distribution of Henry George works at home; and it helped *The Public of Chicago*.

The fund contributed to political protest in addition. Money was sent to Rhode Island, where George's old admirer, Dr. Garvin, was governor. The largest contributions were sent to Oregon, because a vote of 1908 had indicated a sizable single-tax minority. W. S. U'Ren, the reform leader in that state, believed in working for political reforms, direct legislation especially, as a necessary first step to deeper, Georgist, legislation. On that basis three subsidized campaigns were fought, in 1910, 1912, and 1914; and the results were pretty crushing. Yet, although Mr. U'Ren suffered remorse that he and his associates had been too cautious and wished

they had worked for 'the full Single Tax philosophy,' he did derive satisfaction from thinking that the campaigns had saved Oregon from a complete political reaction.

Before the presidential election of 1912, at least a few Republican conservationists awoke to Georgist theories. The star case, here, is Congressman William Kent of California, who gave Muir Woods to the United States as a national park. Never a single-taxer but a reader of George and a sympathizer, he wrote the following to Louis Post, as early as 1909, when he sent his check for *The Public*. 'Inasmuch as my fear and hatred of

Wall Street and its affiliated highways in other cities has driven me to seek investment in land and products of the soil, I have been brought to do a lot of thinking about this land-owning privilege which seems to me as absurd and as unjust as a privilege can be. For the sins in which I am compelled to indulge I am endeavoring to make reparation in terms of land, and hope that others will see the point and do likewise until such time as the privilege is abolished.' A year later, when he was about to be candidate for the house, as independent Republican, Mr. Kent crossed party lines to tell Louis Post that Gifford Pinchot — Roosevelt's appointee as chief forester, who had just been ousted by President Taft — had sought advice about building a program 'that would stand for human welfare.' Bowing himself out, the Westerner offered the opinion that 'the time is not ripe for a radical assault on the land owning privilege, which I have come to believe takes up more of the result of human invention and human cooperation than any other privilege.' But in case Mr. Post might judge action to be possible, Kent proposed that he frame a platform and send it to Pinchot, as the person 'in a position to do more good in this country than any other man.'

During the next few years, Congressman Kent's own 'lot of thinking' led him to prefer an inheritance tax to land-value taxation, and ultimately to prefer a partial nationalization of land. Especially during the session of 1915, he worked for a system of leasing the grazing lands of the domain; and he drew his ideas together in an article for the *American Economic Review*. 'In my philosophy,' he told a friend, 'I hold that the land of the nation ought not to be in the hands of those who will not use it productively— ought not to be held by those who selfishly preclude

others from the enjoyment of a privilege which ought to be national ... It may have been unfortunate for the cause that I, a radical in the matter of land tenure, should have been attacked at once as a beef baron, as a tool of the beef trust, and as a public land thief.'

The colorful and reform-minded Californian who wrote these words, and who, very much a free-trader, was later appointed by President Wilson to the United States Tariff Commission, of course represented neither the center of Georgism nor the center of his old political party. But Kent did represent with eloquence the cross-connecting of ideas, the conscience and

will to act, which were the best of the Progressive movement and a true part of the Georgist one.

-4-

Among the three great Progressive leaders, La Follette, Roosevelt, and Wilson, who gave the election of 1912 its character as a turning point in national history, there seems to have been lacking any consciousness of obligation to the ideas of Henry George. In *La Follette's Autobiography* the one acknowledgment of *Progress and Poverty* is the terse sentence: 'I read the book.' More than this we learn only that he had friends who remember his saying that he really avoided *Progress and Poverty* for fear of falling under a spell.

Though, of the three leaders, the Bull Mooser would have been the last to borrow doctrines from his rival of 1886, we do have a story of his own platform building, which resembles the correspondence between William Kent and Louis Post. At midsummer, 1912, the Reverend Heber Newton, whom Henry George had judged to be a soft reformer, approached Theodore Roosevelt from a Georgist angle of thought. 'I am sure you recognize, with all reformers who have the gift of vision,' wrote the clergyman to the ex-President, 'the fundamental nature of the land question in a reconstructed commonwealth ... The thin edge of the wedge in this case seems to be a measure providing that all mineral resources to be discovered on and after a given date in the future should be held by the State for the people at large ... the profits to create an educational fund for the State ... It would inevitably lead to further applications of the general principle.' The

fact that such a policy would be for the states to execute, rather than the nation, would not prevent using it for the Progressive platform, Mr. Newton urged.

Roosevelt agreed completely. 'I am absolutely in sympathy with you on your proposition about the mineral lands,' he replied at once, 'and I shall forward your letter to Dean Kirchwey and ask if he cannot put in the plank substantially as you recommend it.' Heber Newton's proposal seems possibly to represent the origin of the Progressive party plank of 1912, which called for retaining in public ownership all domain lands that had water, forest, oil, coal, or other mineral resources.

The bearing of Georgist ideas on the Democratic campaign and victory of 1912, and on the administration that followed, is a somewhat complex problem, and one to be posed rather than solved in this book. The plainest fact is a negative one. No more than La Follette and Roosevelt did Woodrow Wilson owe conscious debts for ideas to *Progress and Poverty*, or to any of Henry George's writings. Historian and political scientist, the academician president did have a set of economic ideas which combined *laissez faire* and control; but he had derived them from English sources principally, and apparently not at all from the American ideologue who had tried so hard to influence the Democratic party.

Yet Wilson's political history, if not his reading and thinking one, contains essential elements of Georgism. Up to 1910, when he resigned as president of Princeton, he had been a social and religious conservative, politically inactive. But his crucial two years in New Jersey politics, the one-term governorship which comprised his amazing short cut from academic life to the White House, took Wilson through Georgist terrain. The important man who more than any other guided this transition was George L. Record, a lawyer, politician, and reformer, a Republican at this stage of his life, and the leading Georgist in the state. Though at first disliking Woodrow Wilson, Mr. Record was challenged by his campaign to be governor. Before the campaign was far advanced, the two became friends, and Mr. Record rendered services of advice and counsel which compared with the famous services to be rendered Wilson by Louis Brandeis during the 1912 campaign. Among many acts which helped make a political progressive of Wilson, Mr. Record drafted the utilities control bill which be

came one of Wilson's triumphs in Trenton. Meanwhile, from across the continent, William U'Ren tutored the candidate, as Mr. Record did also, in the new ideas and practices of direct democracy. A primary law was the principal political reform of the Wilson administration in New Jersey; and in this direction the governor was particularly guided by Georgists.

The reader may already have collected in his mind several loyal believers in Henry George's ideas, whom Woodrow Wilson called to high place in Washington. From recent connections, the new President appointed his idealistic and personable secretary, Joseph Tumulty, who was a younger member of the New Jersey Georgist group. The President's alter ego,

Colonel Edward House of Texas, exhibited in his novel, *Philip Dru, Administrator*, a diluted Georgist social philosophy. At cabinet level, the new secretary of the interior, Franklin K. Lane of California, was the only Georgist before 1916; but in that year Newton Baker came on from Ohio to take office as secretary of war, as the nation's ordeal drew near. From the Middle West, Herbert Quick, Georgist mayor of Sioux City, was appointed to the Farm Loan Bureau. In a backward-looking mood, at the end of his conservationist-minded administration of the Department of Interior, Lane told a friend that he believed that Emerson, Henry George, and William James were a 'singular trio' in history, who in the future would be 'regarded not as literary men but as American social, spiritual, and economic philosophers'; and he thought also that William James, Theodore Roosevelt, and Henry George were 'the three greatest forces of the last thirty years.'

As for the old associates of Tom Johnson, besides Baker, Brand Whitlock was sent at once to Brussels, and Frederic Howe was made commissioner of immigration. He would be sent in due time to Paris on a semi-official assignment concerning the peace negotiations with the central powers. Louis Post became the assistant secretary of labor. Yet before Post accepted, Warren W. Bailey solicited Lane and Whitlock and others to urge him for the full secretaryship of that department. The effort failed, but Mr. Bailey was comforted to learn that the President expressly wanted Post because he was a Henry George man. 'Mr. Wilson thoroughly understands what Mr. Post represents,' Bailey informed Daniel Kiefer, still the Fels Fund head, 'and both he and Mr. Bryan

frankly recognize the importance of bringing the single-tax people into closer touch with the administration.'

In 1913, as twenty years earlier, two or three Georgists entered the House of Representatives. Warren W. Bailey of Pennsylvania was one; and Henry George, Jr., still of New York, was another. Since 1897 he had edited his father's writings and written the biography so often drawn on for this book; and, more or less as his father's successor, he had traveled for the movement and had even visited Tolstoy. He had pursued his career as journalist and had written a book of social criticism, *The Menace of Privilege*, and a third-rate novel which may have been inspired by his father's life. These new members, and Congressman William Kent also,

voted with the majority, of course, on the Underwood low tariff of 1913, the first great reduction of rates since before the Civil War.

Apparently the one time President Wilson was presented with Georgist reform proposals in a large way was in 1919, long after his own program of domestic reform had been enacted and put into practice. The President sent a message to the Democrats of New Jersey, which George L. Record read as an opportunity to render a reformer's suggestions. He proposed that the President recommend to Congress a policy of government ownership of all monopolies of federal size and interest. He specified railroads, pipelines, and resources owned by trusts. He urged federal legislation against land speculation and monopoly, a statutory limitation on the inheritance of great fortunes, and even income taxes.

Record spoke with a bluntness, and with an assumption of mutual understanding such as Henry George could never have used in addressing President Cleveland. 'In my judgment nothing that you are proposing in the League of Nations idea, will give you a place in history as a great man, because at the end of your term you will have rendered no great and lasting service that will lift you above the average of our Presidents, and you have ignored the great issue which is slowly coming to the front, the question of economic democracy, abolition of privilege, and securing to men the full fruits of their labor or service.'

Like George, but not much like Woodrow Wilson, Record saw in economics the source of political conditions, domestic and international alike, and he drew his morals in those terms. 'Wars are caused by privilege ... I do not criticize your going abroad ... But my point is that you ought not neglect the bigger domestic questions ... You should become the real leader of the radical forces in America, and present to the country a constructive program of radical reform which shall be an alternative to the program presented by the socialists and the Bolsheviki, and then fight for it ... You could so educate the public that you could force this radical program into the platform of the Democratic party.'

Before this letter was written, President Wilson had told Tumulty that the advanced opinions he held about land and government ownership might be right after all; and it is not unlikely that the secretary had hinted to Record that the time was ripe to urge economic reform. At any rate Tumulty himself wrote an endorsement, and speaking 'as a Democrat,' he pleaded,

in phrases reminiscent of Henry George's speeches half a century earlier, for a 'realignment of parties' and 'a fight between the Federalist and anti-Federalist, between the Whig and Tory' once more.

Wilson was in the midst of peacemaking when the recommendations reached him, and already the pressures were gathering which would break him within half a year. He acknowledged Record's letter in a friendly way, but he said nothing to indicate what even his flash judgment was on the merits of the plea his Georgist colleagues had made. He seems never to have had another occasion to speak. As 1919 advanced, his preoccupation with the Treaty of Versailles, and then his illness, turned him from domestic reform for the last year of his administration and for the short remainder of his life.

The men and influences considered in this section make clear that, in larger part than has often been noticed, the idealism of the administration of Woodrow Wilson was Henry George idealism renewed.

## -5-

Returning to the terms with which the present discussion opened, the Georgism that came to Washington in 1913 was moral and intellectual, rather than political; and of course it was not fiscal Georgism.

Political Georgism, in the sense of leaders, organizations, and campaigns dedicated to Georgist ends, we may count as having passed from the scene when Tom Johnson's career as mayor closed.

Perhaps Newton Baker's administration of Cleveland should be thought of as a residue; and certainly the election to Congress of Henry George, Jr., and Warren W. Bailey should be considered that way. We do not need to disregard the little enclaves of Georgist communities, such as Fairhope, Alabama, which have been established in this century; nor to forget such events of the early '20s as the introduction of several Georgist bills in Congress and the serious effort, aided by John R. Commons, to introduce a 'farmers' single tax' in Wisconsin. Such programs, however, were not inclusive enough, or such successes and failures of the vote significant enough, to fit the pattern of Henry George's campaigns in New York City, or Tom Johnson's campaigns in Cleveland. The presidential election of 1912 had assimilated political Georgism in the larger

progressive movement. The epitaph was composed on ambassadorial stationery and addressed to Newton Baker when Brand Whitlock learned, in June 1920, that he was wanted to run for President on a single-tax ticket, with Carrie Chapman Catt as running mate. 'I may be a single-taxer, but I am not a damn fool.'

After the war, when America's political climate shifted violently, nearly every change was adverse to Georgist growth of any kind. Georgists in the government at the end of the Wilson administration were embittered by the anti-liberal reaction, as Louis Post and Frederic Howe most eloquently testified. Their group was close to the retirement age. They had no role in the Republican victories of the '20s. And if any later Georgists had the opportunity to introduce ideas into the New Deal or Fair Deal, in a way that at all compared with the work of the introducers of the ideas of Veblen, Keynes, and even Henry C. Carey, they are indeed the forgotten men and ideas of those epochs of our history. Perhaps the one specific instance of Georgism, cropping out in the new policy of great nations in recent days, is the dilute variety that the British Labour government wrote into its Town and Country Planning Act of 1947.

The quiet influence of Henry George, then, during the agony and revolution of the last four decades, is to be discovered on two levels. On the visible surface of affairs is the persevering work of the fiscal Georgists, who win occasional reforms in city tax policy. Very close to that effort, yet different, is the continuing task of the propagation of ideas, in the line which Henry George and Francis

Shaw began in 1882. The work done in America centers in New York, where the Schalkenbach Foundation supplies subsidies, and where George's books and speeches are distributed and journals issued year after year. To the old habit of giving and selling Henry George's writings, the Henry George schools, in several cities, have added free instruction in *Progress and Poverty* and a number of other writings. The overseas work carries on in London, in the organization and journal of the International League for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade. If the present-day life of intellectual Georgism seems anemic by the standards of the last century, it is nonetheless wonderfully persistent; and we may suppose that no book except the Bible has been so widely and devotedly distributed as *Progress and Poverty* has been.

The deeper level of Henry George's influence on the modern world is the one described in the earlier part of this book but so often forgotten to be his. The participation of free governments in the processes of social justice is now accepted everywhere as policy to be maintained. A desire for world-wide free trade recurs in our day; and many believe that a greater equality among the peoples of the earth, of access to its resources, would increase mankind's hope for mankind. For the United States and the United Kingdom, for Australia and New Zealand, for many in Norway and Denmark, for early liberals in Russia, and for others around the world, Henry George has been the incomparable prophet of these three goals.