

---

Joshua K. Ingalls, *American Individualist: Land Reformer, Opponent of Henry George and Advocate of Land Leasing, Now an Established Mode*

Author(s): Bowman N. Hall

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Oct., 1980, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Oct., 1980), pp. 383-396

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3486273>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

JSTOR

# Joshua K. Ingalls, American Individualist:

## *Land Reformer, Opponent of Henry George and Advocate of Land Leasing, Now an Established Mode*

By BOWMAN N. HALL \*

**ABSTRACT.** *Joshua K. Ingalls* was a member of a particularly cohesive group of 19th century intellectual iconoclasts in America, the *individualists*. Two controversies made him widely known at the time: the *land reform vs. abolition* argument before the Civil War, and his attacks on *Henry George* in the 1880s over the issue of land reform through *tax reform* or land reform through *land leasing* under an *occupancy and use system of tenure*. Ingalls held George failed to understand the "true" nature of capitalism; rent goes to the *landlord* as *capitalist* as reward for his investment; the landowning capitalist appropriates this by his dominion over the land. Though Ingalls' argument did not prevail, land leasing, which he advocated, is the form in which some resources are now disposed of, as in grazing rights and mineral exploration on public land, and in oil exploration rights on the continental shelves; and in the disposition of urban sites such as the site of *Rockefeller Center* and the *Chrysler Building* in New York (the former to the benefit of Columbia University, the latter Cooper Union, both by legislative action).

### I

THE LAST THIRTY YEARS have seen a rekindling of interest in the political philosophy of libertarianism, the economic arm of which is most simply described as *laissez-faire*. This interest has lead some historians to investigate the precedents of the movement. Particularly through the careful research on one modern scholar (1), it has become obvious that the individualist movement in 19th century America (which began with the writings of Josiah Warren, a product of Robert Owen's experiment at New Harmony) was more cohesive than previously recognized. What Warren (2) and his followers had to say about the nature of man's social life in the changing scene of that century has been of increasing interest to general historians and historians of economic thought. One such individualist was Joshua K. Ingalls.

\* [Bowman N. Hall, Ph.D., is associate professor of economics, St. John Fisher College, Rochester, New York 14618.] An essay presented in commemoration of the centenary of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 39, No. 4 (October, 1980).

0002-9246/80/040383-14\$00.75/0

© 1980 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Born in Massachusetts in 1816, Ingalls moved quickly from such ideas as Quakerism, temperance, and dietary reform to economic radicalism, specifically land reform. His ideas on the evils of the present order were reinforced by his experiences as a legitimate member of the "laboring class," something which is conspicuous in its absence from the careers of so many radicals. Not until his early thirties did he turn to propagandizing full time for his cause.

The purpose of this paper is to introduce Ingalls as an individualist, and to examine the relevance of his career to a study of 19th century America in general and of the land reform movement and Henry George in particular. In the conclusion it will be suggested that the neglect of Ingalls by current and past scholars (3) leaves incomplete the knowledge both of George and the forces which lead to the immense interest in George's classic, *Progress and Poverty*, published just 100 years ago.

## II

TWO INTELLECTUAL CONFLICTS stand out in importance in Ingalls' career: the first was the land reform vs. abolition argument, which came to a head with his debate with Frederick Douglass in Providence in November of 1848. The second occurred in the early 1880s when Ingalls attacked George over the question of land nationalization vs. land limitation.

Although attracted to Andrew Jackson's "attitude in regard to the public lands, and his proposition to hold them simply as a trust for the actual settlers, and to abandon the idea of deriving a revenue from them . . ." as early as the mid-30s (4), it was not until 1845 that Ingalls became an admitted land reformer, upon reading copies of George Henry Evans' periodical, *Young America*.

The paper was "devoted almost wholly to Land Reform" and it "drew my attention to the question of Private Land-Ownership, with great force, and at once convinced me, of what I had inferred . . . that usury of land, (rent) was the basic usury, on which that of money, and of other property chiefly rested" (5). Ingalls, through *Young America*, learned of such figures as John Windt, Lewis Masquerier, Allen E. Bovay, and Gerrit Smith who were at the time, and were to remain in the future, the stalwarts of the radical movement.

In 1847, Ingalls attended, as a land reformer, the Industrial Congress held in New York. In the following year, he was a delegate at the Industrial Congress in Philadelphia where a split first became obvious between the land reformers and the abolitionists.

By this time, Ingalls was publishing a small paper, *The Landmark*, devoted to land reform, which even if it was a failure commercially, served to place his name among the leaders of the movement (5). As such, he was invited to address an anti-slavery meeting being held in Providence on the subject of the relationship between the land reform theme and the slavery question.

His summary of his position went along the following lines:

The right to life, involves the right to land to live and labor upon. Commercial ownership of land which enables one to exclude another from it, and thus enforces involuntary idleness, is as destructive of human freedom as ownership of the person, enforcing involuntary service. I remarked in passing that our reform did not antagonize the anti-slavery movement, but complemented it—that Gerrit Smith, George H. Evans, John Windt, Mr. VanAmringe and many other prominent men, were abolitionists in the strictest sense of the term. . . . Liberation of the slaves would bring their labor in more direct competition with our over-crowded and poorly paid wage-workers. I did not offer this as a reason against the abolition of chattel slavery, but as a reason why the friends of emancipation from chattel slavery, should unite with the friends for the emancipation of the wage-worker, by restoring to him the right to land, for the production of the means of life . . . few instances of the starvation of slaves could be found, while wage-workers and tenants were starving by the hundreds. . . . The real issue was between the rights of man and the rights of property; between the rights of labor and the rights of ownership. . . . And it was not color or race-hatred which lay at the bottom of the vulgar prejudice, and enmity of the White laborer against the African slaves, so much as the fear that if liberty was given to them, they would crowd him from his opportunity to serve for wages (7).

At the conclusion of Ingalls' address, Frederick Douglass, "then at the height of his popularity" arose to provide a reply. Douglass said that the anti-slavery question was totally different from the question of property, for it was a question of liberty. He deprecated the notion of even comparing the worker, with his freedom of person and surrounded by wife and children, with the chattel slave, who was not the owner of himself, and whose wife and children could be sold from him at any moment.

At the conclusion of Douglass's speech, the audience "did not want to hear anything more from Mr. Ingalls" (8). Ingalls carried a mild dislike for Douglass through the rest of his life, noting that although Douglass was to become famous as an early advocate of women's suffrage, "in 1868, at the Equal Rights Convention in Steinway Hall, he claimed that it was then the 'Negroe's hour'—as the question of

giving him the franchise was then before the country—and that women should wait. In this he was opposed by Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Stone, Miss Anthony and most of the advocates of equal rights . . .” (9). Moreover, Ingalls noted with some pleasure that some 20 years after the debate, “I read a report of an address made by Frederick Douglass at a colored people’s convention at Lexington, Ky., in which occurred words in substance like these: ‘When the Republican party emancipated and enfranchised you, it failed in justice, in that it did not also award you land’ ” (10).

The times were obviously not right for an appeal to land reform as a prerequisite to abolition. Nevertheless, Ingalls continued his campaign. To him the wages system was the natural outgrowth of the historical process which commenced with slavery (as an alternative to the slaughter of a vanquished enemy in war) and lead to feudalism. In each case, the result was for one man, whether he be called master, lord, or capitalist to secure the results of another man’s labor without payment in an equivalent of his own labor (11). The present effect of slavery on business is to bring

the slave in competition with all who labor. This must tend to make labor disreputable, and reduce its award; for why should I pay you a just compensation for your labor, when I can buy a man with my property, who will be compelled to work without remuneration! But then it must be perceived, that in consequence of this power of property, there would be a great demand for its use. . . . Now this must react on what is called free labor, in the same way as the competition is subjected to by the slave labor. Capital needed to carry on the mechanical, manufacturing, or agricultural business, will command higher rates. . . . Thus this wrong affects more than the poor victim of oppression; it forces him into competition with other laborers, and while it reduces the products of their labor in value, it also increases the tax they have to pay for the privilege of toiling . . .

But the feature of our social system, which allows property in man, is only one of the wrongs, by which the existing claims of capital are sustained. The power of property over natural possessions is a still more general cause of its exactions . . . (12).

Indeed, Ingalls is suspicious of the motivation of some apparently liberal proponents of abolition: “slavery should be abolished because *free* labor is *cheaper*, and would increase the wealth of the employer more rapidly. Go where you may this selfism meets you” (13).

### III

PERHAPS ONE OF THE MOST DISTURBING EVENTS in the life of Ingalls was the success of Henry George’s *Progress and Poverty*. What Ingalls

had failed to accomplish in four decades was seemingly done by George overnight: raising the land reform question to a level of national discussion and debate. Ingalls accused George of confusing the issue by concentrating on tax reform rather than land reform, and further hinted strongly that George was guilty of plagiarism from Patrick Edward Dove's *Theory of Human Progression* (14). More specifically, he attacked George's theory of rent and spent the rest of his life trying to capitalize on the attention aroused by *Progress and Poverty*.

In Ingalls' mind, George saw private property in land as the fundamental evil. Because of private property, landlords arise and establish a monopoly of the land which is "the foundation of class dominion and of poverty and industrial subjection" (15). Rent arises, as explained by Ricardo, out of the different degrees of productiveness of different soils. It is a gratuity of nature and belongs properly to the whole people. It arises not from labor but in addition to or independently of labor. The holder of land who cultivates it himself receives rent over and above the compensation of his labor just as truly as does the idle landlord.

Interest on money and profits from the exchange and distribution of commodities are different in their nature from rent and are realized only "after labor has been duly rewarded" (16). There is an inverse tendency between the operation of landlordism and capitalism, and between the rates of rent and of interest.

Thus the capitalist is just as wronged as the laborer by the private monopoly of land. The solution is to tax away the unearned increment accruing to land and to use the proceeds for the benefit of the whole society, to whom the use of and fruits of the land belong in the first place.

The basic problem with this line of argument is that it fails to reveal the true relationship between man, economy, and land, according to Ingalls. George, like Ricardo, fails to understand the concept of rent, which is really an arbitrary tribute levied upon industry by usurped rights (17). It is, according to Ricardo,

Merely the excess of product, of the best land over the poorest, as the latter shall come into cultivation or other use under the exigencies of increasing population. As two prices cannot prevail in the same market at the same time, so he thinks the cost of producing grain on the poorest land will determine the price of grain raised upon the best land, and thus the excess will determine the rent which will be paid for its use . . . (Ricardo) assumes that rent does not arise until increase

of population forces the use of less productive soils. In fact, the operation is directly the reverse of this. It is rent which forces the use of less productive soils . . . If the land I till will yield 40, and I have to pay 10 rent, it is evident that this will force the use of a quality which will yield only 30 (18).

The fallacy is further illustrated, says Ingalls, by assuming that an island of uniform surface and fertility is divided equally among a certain number of people, all of whom support themselves by raising grain. Clearly no rent would be paid. Rent would permanently and inequitably be established, however, as soon as there arose a group of laborers who were refused access to the soil:

“As soon as there arose an increase in the population requiring land, which it was in the power of the holders to deny, land would have a price, rent would be offered and taken, or the laborers would offer their services at a price below ‘the whole produce of their labor’; and the use of rents and decrease of wages would inevitably follow every increase of such laborers, just the same as if extremes existed in the productive capability of the land” (19).

As population increased, the number of landholders would decrease under a system of land ownership such as our own, and “a divergency of conditions would proceed till a landed aristocracy arose at one extreme, and a dependent, wretched proletariat at the other” (20). This result would occur, not because of any unequal fertility among the soils, but rather because the increase in population outstripped the increase in land ownership.

Moreover, the Ricardian rent theory would lead one to believe that land below the margin of cultivation can be had rent-free. Only exceptional cases can be found to verify this, and indeed, sometimes the best lands can be had without rent.

For example, under monopoly, the poorest land is rented, while the best lies idle in deer-parks, or sheep-farms (as in Ireland) (21). Additionally, the rent theory assumes that the best land will continue to produce bountifully forever.

The best writers on agriculture suggest the opposite: that it is the culture, not the soil, which determines the great disparities in agricultural output: “Land, however fertile, when first taken up, will, unless continually manured, soon work down to a point where it will yield no more than the same quantity of manure will produce upon land of ordinary quality. . . . Generally, then, productiveness of the land depends upon the labor applied, and upon the return to it of the



elements of fertility" (22). Any original disparity in soil quality would soon disappear under "natural apportionment and intelligent use" (23).

Presently labor is forced to deal with privilege by statute, to which no economic principle applies, where demand and supply have no operation, and where one party to a transaction has the power to determine the compensation of both parties. Between the whole produce of labor and subsistence wages, there is a wide range from which the landlord may choose, in a manner both extra-economic and extra-ethical, the compensation to be allowed the laborer. The result is "stupendous larcenies" (24).

The science of political economy, says Ingalls, is little more than a century old. The term was first employed "by Quesnay, a French philosopher, who published a volume in 1758, no copies of which, however, are now extant" (25). One value of Quesnay is that he was the first to systematically attack the "balance of trade" doctrine which "had obtained among the savants of Europe, and exerted a wide and powerful influence over the government and fortunes of nations for nearly two hundred years" (26).

Quesnay's maxim was simply that nations are interested in the prosperity rather than the destruction of their neighbors. A school of economists and philosophers was immediately formed, who adopted in the main the teachings of Quesnay. This school held that wealth was derived wholly from the land, and consisted of the excess over the cost of production, or "that which was consumed by the labor producing (the wealth). . . . They recognized the land as the basic element in economics, but failed to see that only when joined to labor it was a factor in the production of wealth" (27).

Soon a second school arose, advocating freedom of commerce, like the first, but saying instead that labor was the basis of all wealth. The leader was, of course, Adam Smith. Each school, according to Ingalls, was established on a half truth. Neither clearly understood that it is the union of the two factors, land and labor, that produces all material goods. This confusion has lead economists to simply rationalize the status quo, and to treat man-made phenomena as natural, or inevitable.

In nature, land and labor are always capital and never commodities, while their products are always commodities and never capital: "If the land be reduced to condition of a commodity, and made a thing to be trafficked in, the money or goods for which it will exchange will have



imparted to it the same power of increase which attaches to the land, and will have conferred upon it the same royalty or power to tax the production of labor" (28).

By a subversion of normal relations then, rent, and interest and profits, as well, not only come into being, but are thought to be a part of the natural order. The three are identical in character. Interest is the profit obtained by the money lender or capitalist for the use of his "capital". Profit is the interest realized by the merchant from the money invested in his business. Rent is the interest the landholder receives from the money he has invested in the land, or for the money for which that land would sell. Alternatively, profit is the rent of the land sold to obtain the capital employed and the interest is the rent of so much land as was sold to raise the principal.

All of these three forms of unearned increase rest upon one, sole logical base: the ability of the land to produce spontaneously. Yet spontaneous productions can have no price, "except in the degree that *dominion over the land gives dominion over man*; for without the *two* there is, and can be, no increase of social wealth" (29). Only man and soil together can produce wealth. Nothing else can produce any increase of wealth, and neither man nor soil separately can produce anything. "To introduce another claimant in the division is fraudulent" (30).

Rent, in other words, goes not to the land, but rather to the landlord, *as a capitalist*. It is the reward on the money he has invested in the land. This truth, Ingalls argued, has totally escaped George. He treats the monopoly of land and capital as not only distinct from each other but actually antagonistic to each other. He sees the capitalist as the friend of labor while the landlord is the enemy of labor, overlooking the fact that land is reduced to a commodity and brought under the reign of capitalism.

Ignoring the fact that private property in land is simply one of the means of subjecting labor (and the principal one, since slavery was abolished), George concludes that there is an inverse tendency between the operation of landlordism and capitalism, and between the rates of rent and interest. Nothing, says Ingalls, could be further from the truth (30). The failure to understand the true nature of capital and capitalism "is Mr. George's weakest point—indeed, a fatal blunder to his whole plan to remedy the evil" (32). To Ingalls, there are but two factors of production: labor and raw material. Human labor is what he calls the dominating or active factor. Man is the active and

moving force in all social industry. Human wants must be satisfied and they must be satisfied by human activity. Labor is a normal condition of human existence and becomes irksome only when the few, by shirking their share, can force burdensome proportions on the remainder.

Likewise, it is only when excluded from "nature's laboratory" and forced to beg the privilege of toil from his fellows, that a man comes to regard hireling labor as distasteful (33). Land on the other hand, is the passive factor, the "great fountain-head from which the material elements in production are derived" (34).

In land is embraced all raw material not affected by human activity: "The earth forms the foundation of all industry of the man and is the point where his activity meets and co-operates with the heat, the light, the air, and the moisture, indispensable to production and to all life. Only upon the land has he any means of contact with them, and otherwise can have no stable existence" (35). It thus follows that if land and labor are the only factors in production, there must be complete freedom from any and all arbitrary control over them. Any control over the soil, for example, other than by the cultivating occupant "can but fetter and cripple labor and retard production."

"The freedom of man without freedom of the land can benefit neither" (36). To accept a system of land tenure, to reconcile industrial life with it, and to base a system of economics upon it is as preposterous, then, as to accept the mythologies, theologies, astrologies, and alchemies of the past which existed in the absence of any scientific method of arriving at the truth (36). Exclusive dominion of the land divorces the true factors. Its results can be seen on the one hand in extended private domain, poorly and but partially cultivated in even the most populous districts, and on the other, in the crowding of people, dispossessed of their inheritance, into the cities. Here, "vast accumulations of absorbed wealth invite to employment, sometimes useful but often hurtful to the man, to social well being, and precarious to the unskilled or improvident" (38).

#### IV

PART OF INGALLS' ICONOCLASM, even within the radical land reform movement, can be explained by his extreme distrust of government and the political process. Control of land, he says, is the basis of all political power. The difference between monarchy and democracy is one of degree only; as long as inequitable distribution of land prevails,

equality of citizenship is impossible (39). He cautions workers not to be drawn into movements for the adoption of specious remedies for minor evils. This will lead to the diversion of the minds of the workers and thus make them the dupes of political aspirants:

“Political power is sought mainly for personal or class aims, seldom from a desire to promote the public good. Its attainment is at the expense of industry, and it is idle to suppose that it will be wielded in the interest of labor. In any question as between the worker and the holder of privilege, it is certain to throw itself into the scale with the latter, for it is itself the source of privilege, the creator of class rule” (40).

Privilege, whether in the hands of the politician, the capitalist, or even the ex-worker, is certain to be used to increase itself at the expense of the rest of society. The impulse toward governing is the same as the impulse toward slave-holding and exclusive land-holding: to gather the fruits of someone else’s labor without returning an equivalent service or product (40): “Power, once conceded to a czar, king and parliament, president and congress, governor and legislature, or any coercive rule, opens the Pandora’s box of all wrongs and despotisms . . . few can resist the ever-present temptation to use power to promote personal uses” (42).

The wise wealth producer will “direct his thought and that of his fellows to the economic rather than to the political aspect of affairs,” and to strive for the day when “all power to create artificial values, enforce rent, interest, or inequitable contract of any kind, has been withdrawn from the legislature and eliminated from the functions of government altogether” (43).

The problem is not that politicians are worse than other men, but rather that they themselves have become “purchasable commodities” and subject to the “law of the market.” This proves “the utter idiocy of essaying salutary reforms through political dicker” (44). Voting and legislation are too uncertain to be depended upon as long as “error and passion” sway men’s minds. Principles, not power politics, are what must be relied upon, for “a matter determined at the ballot box, or by a show of hands to-day, could be reversed to-morrow by the same process, while a principle once made clear would remain unaffected by popular caprice or misapprehension” (45).

Later he says that history illustrates that collective rule develops all the evils attendant with personal rule and that improvement has been gained primarily through relief of the individual from the spirit

of invasion, whether by the monarch or the majority (45). Still Ingalls is not an anarchist, for the complete subjugation of society to the individual results in just as much invasion of individual liberty as does the opposite extreme of complete subjugation of the individual to society.

He provides a general statement of the role of government in society: "there would only be courts of equity, as to matters of personal interests and relations. No laws of master and slave, of landlord and tenant, of creditor and debtor, of husband and wife, of superior and inferior; but only of persons, equal before the tribunal. And with real jury trials wherever penalties or damages are involved; the law as well as fact being submitted to their judgments, and equal freedom and equal justice to constitute the standard, by which all decisions should be tested" (47).

In light of Ingalls' attitudes about the political process and government in general, his proposals for correcting the evils of the present order are not surprising. He views the power of taxation as the very essence of despotism (47), a despotism in which the form of government is of only incidental importance. Taxes on land are not taken from rent, as George believes, but rather "are an additional extortion perpetrated upon labor" (49). Taxation is merely an enforced exchange, as is any unearned increase. Land taxation, of which the single tax plan is one variant, then is an attempt to substitute one type of enforced exchange for another. This is hardly a "solution" to the problem.

Through usurped dominion of the land, class privilege, and private rights created by arbitrary will, barbaric custom, and chicaneries of trade, rendered possible of achievement by "fostering legislation" and a purblind jurisprudence, labor is compelled to part with its natural wages, and receive in return whatever capitalism and the government vouchsafe it. This state of things our tax reformers do not expect at all to abolish by taking away these arbitrary powers and class privileges, but propose to equalize things by another compulsory exchange, and so enable the laborers to get square with those who have plundered and overreached them. It will not work (50).

Land nationalization is likewise rejected by Ingalls, although he indicates that it would be more sensible than the George scheme. This is particularly true for a country such as England where absolute private property in land never has been accepted historically. The only problem is the method of redistributing the possession or occupancy of nationalized land. The most likely method would be a system of

leases from the government. These,

open to competition, and unlimited in extent, would result no way different from the present system of deeds allodial or in fee simple. In fact, it would greatly enhance the power of capitalism to engross the control of the land, since it would relieve it of the necessity of applying large amounts in purchasing the land which it could secure the same control of by lease. . . . It would greatly augment and promote the reign of capitalism and displace the independent worker who now cultivates his own acres, but who would be then unable to compete with organized capital, employing machinery and every facility which ready means would yield, and would be compelled to give up his holding and sink into the ranks of the proletariat (51).

Ingalls' plan is very simply to repeal old laws relating to land ownership rather than to pass new ones. He would leave "occupancy and use" as the only title to land, as it was originally. This "would greatly encourage self-reliance and self-help, and tend to the equalization of possessions and the more exact remuneration of labor" (52). This would have to be done gradually and peacefully; for example, "those in present legal possession of land to remain so during life or for a certain term of years; but no titles created or derived subsequent to such a change to extend beyond *strict occupancy and use* . . . no one would be dispossessed of any right he now enjoys, but only be denied the privilege of acquiring rights hereafter which are detrimental to the enjoyment of the natural rights of others, and to the public welfare" (53).

Thus, in Ingalls' mind, removing legislative sanction from the concept of private property is the basic reform needed. This would break the back not only of "class privilege" but of capitalism and its concomitant exploitation of labor as well. In addition, it would be beneficial to remove "such laws as discriminate against the worker . . . the natural ownership of the worker in what he has produced (would then) be allowed to have its operation. Nearly every extensive enterprise in the country is the creature of statute law. Charters, 'acts of incorporation,' subsidies, especial privileges, are the means by which some are enabled to thrive and prey upon the public. These all should . . . be put an end to" (54).

In the meantime, such corporations should pay labor by an eight hour standard and credit employees with shares of stock in the corporation in accordance with the nature of their employment, risk to health and life, etc. By so doing, the laborer would have a title not just to his wages, but also to dividends. These, however, are in the nature of suggestions for the gradual attainment of equity rather than abstract principles (55).

## V

IT WOULD OBVIOUSLY BE NAIVE to suggest Joshua K. Ingalls as a candidate for enshrinement as a figure worth remembering in the history of economic analysis. He failed to proffer any improvements in the method of the economic theorist and he was unaware, even as late as the 1890s, of the significance or apparently the existence of the marginal revolution. Worse still, he was writing about the land question without even comprehending the Ricardian rent theory.

Yet he is of interest, and indeed significance, in what Pedro Schwartz has described as the "history of opinions" branch of the history of economic thought(56). A study of Ingalls re-establishes the sometimes forgotten fact that land reform was a part of the radical movement in 19th century America for an extended period of time and was also part of the beginnings of the progressive movement that was to blossom in the early 20th century.

Ingalls is a reminder that there was an intellectual precedent as early as the 1840s for the popularity of Henry George. For an historian of ideas, this compensates for the fact that land reformers in general were fighting a losing battle at a time in American history when the industrial labor force was becoming larger than the agricultural labor force, thus obscuring land as the resources question.

Finally, although not necessarily as a direct result of Ingalls' publicism, land leasing is now used successfully as a desired method of allocating certain resources. Broad examples of this are grazing rights and mineral exploration of public land, oil exploration rights offshore, and in the disposition of numerous urban sites by legislative action. Ingalls' argument did not prevail but neither did it become wholly extinct.

1. James J. Martin, *Men Against the State* (DeKalb: Adrian Allen Associates, 1953).

2. See Bowman N. Hall, "The Economic Ideas of Josiah Warren, First American Anarchist," *History of Political Economy* 6 (1974), pp. 95-108.

3. Other than the Martin work, the only worthwhile treatment of Ingalls is the brief mention in Joseph Dorfman, *The Economic Mind in American Civilization* (New York: The Viking Press, 1959), Vol. 3, pp. 37-39.

4. Joshua K. Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian in the Fields of Industrial and Social Reform* (Elmira, N.Y.: Gazette Company, 1897), p. 9.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 25, 24.

6. He reports: "Returning to New York . . . I found the Land Reformers completely disorganized—the pseudo 'Free Soil' party having by the usual duplicity of catch words and phrases succeeded in alluring many. . . . It soon became evident, that Land Reform, and every progressive movement, must experience a set back from the reactionary tendency of things. I could keep the Landmark going, but it could no longer keep me going." *Ibid.*, p. 37. The paper was suspended in 1849, and "*Young America* was declining. . . . Numerous papers through the country dropped Reform advocacy, or confined themselves to the support of pure anti-slavery sentiment." *Ibid.*, p. 35. With financial backing

from Gerrit Smith, Ingalls also published a paper, *The Land Reformer*, in 1858, but the "time was unpropitious" and publication was almost immediately suspended. *Ibid.*

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 38-39.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 42.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
11. Ingalls, "Man and Property; Their Rights and Relations," *The Spirit of the Age*, Vol. I, p. 115.
12. Ingalls, "Relations, Existing and Natural, Between Man and Property," *ibid.*, p. 243.
13. Ingalls, "Motives to Duty," *The Spirit of the Age*, Vol. 2 p. 42.
14. Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian*, p. 67.
15. Ingalls, "Henry George Examined. Should Land be Nationalized or Individualized?" *Liberty* (Supplement), October 14, 1882.
16. *Ibid.*
17. Joshua K. Ingalls, *Social Wealth: The Sole Factors and Exact Ratios in Its Acquisition and Apportionment* (New York: The Truth Seeker Company, 1885), p. 68.
18. *Ibid.*, pp. 68-69.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 74-75.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 75.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 171.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 55.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 165.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 177, 179.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 186.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Ibid.*, p. 187.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 187-88.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 188.
39. Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian*, p. 172.
40. Joshua K. Ingalls, *Economic Equities: A Compend of the Natural Laws of Industrial Production and Exchange* (New York: Social Science Publishing Co., 1887), pp. 61-62.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 62.
42. *Ibid.*
43. *Ibid.*, p. 63.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 59.
45. Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian*, p. 52.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 172.
47. *Ibid.*, p. 155.
48. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, p. 258.
49. *Ibid.*, p. 256.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 263-64.
51. *Ibid.*, pp. 280, 282-83.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 287.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 288.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 295.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 295.
56. Pedro Schwartz, "Teaching the History of Economic Thought: Report of a Symposium at Bristol, 1973," *History of Political Economy*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Spring, 1975), p. 113.