

Henry George and Europe: The Far-Reaching Effect of the Ideas of the American Social Philosopher at the Turn of the Century

Author(s): Michael Silagi and Susan N. Faulkner

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Apr., 1986), pp. 201-213

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

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3486924>

Accessed: 15-02-2022 00:11 UTC

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.

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



JSTOR

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

Henry George and Europe:

The Far-Reaching Effect of the Ideas of the American Social Philosopher at the Turn of the Century

By MICHAEL SILAGI*

(Translated by SUSAN N. FAULKNER)

ABSTRACT. The progressive democratic *social philosophy* of a 19th century American *economist*, *Henry George*, has had a far-reaching effect on some *European* intellectual and political leaders. Not all adopted his practical proposal, the *single land value tax* as a substitute for other *taxes*. But the *British Liberal party*, a section of the *British Labor party* and *Danish smallholders* did. George's ideas were absorbed into the long-standing European *land reform* tradition and he became the initiator and theoretical founder of the modern movement there, as *Heinrich Erman*, the German legal scholar, held. It is a mistake to say that the *French Physiocrats* anticipated George; their *produit net* was a tax on output, not highest potential use and was aimed to achieve *stability*, not *development*. Europeans see George and Georgism the same as Americans but in a different context, that of *natural rights*.

I

Introduction

AN AMERICAN ECONOMIST'S IDEAS had a far-reaching effect on European intellectual and political leaders as the 19th century waned and the 20th dawned. He was

* [Michael Silagi, Ph.D., J.S.D., is a senior research fellow, the Institute of International Law, University of Göttingen, Nikolausberger Weg 9c, D-3400 Göttingen, Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany).] The present work is based on my Ph.D. dissertation presented to the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Munich. I am grateful for valuable help and for personal recollections of inestimable value to the following: Mr. V. H. Blundell, London; Mrs. Julia Major, New York; Mr. Robert Major, New York; Certified Architect Aladár Sós, Budapest; Minister of State Dr. Viggo Starcke, Lunby, Denmark; Dr. Sun Fo, President of the Examination-Yuan, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China. I thank the following organizations for data and source material: the German Service Office, Berlin; the Henry George School of Social Science, New York; the New York Public Library, Manuscript Division and its Henry George Collection and the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, London. A scholarship grant from the German "Studienstiftung" enabled me to undertake archival studies in the United States which greatly enriched my work. And a grant from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation funded the translation by Dr. Susan N. Faulkner, formerly of the City University of New York, whom I thank for painstaking work.

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 45, No. 2 (April, 1986).
© 1986 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Henry George (1839–1897), a journalist who had mastered the teachings of the English classical school of political economy. He became known as a land reformer and one might have expected that his influence would be felt in the controversies at that time over modernization of landownership. In fact, however, the influence turned out to be primarily ideological.

George's main concrete proposal—the public collection of the economic rent of land and all natural resources to be used to finance government and public services in lieu of taxes on labor and capital—was only the practical, though decisive, outgrowth of his ideas. But he regarded this conclusion to his investigation of the causes of such economic ills as poverty, unemployment and underemployment as fundamental to the system of ideas he developed.

George became known in Europe not as an economist—the classical school with which he identified was already well known from the work of Scottish and English members and from its French precursors—but as a social thinker. His concern was the philosophy of society and it was as social philosopher that he influenced many Europeans. Not all were swayed in the direction of his practical proposal. In Great Britain, for example, he was a spur and a catalyst to the movement for the formation of a parliamentary labor party, as well as the unwilling pioneer of Fabianism. But it was the middle class Liberal party that, as a party, sought to achieve his land reform.

However, George's influence on Europe is to be seen not only in the United Kingdom but in the Wilhelminian German Empire, the old Hungarian Kingdom, and Denmark, with each case being utterly different from the others, yet always prototypical.

In Great Britain and Ireland the Georgian influence was manifested in the field of domestic political struggles.

In the German Empire it was brought to bear on colonial politics; in part it became a moving force of a supra-partisan, chiefly petty bourgeois, mass movement.

In Hungary conditions existed in many areas of political life, even up to 1918, almost like those of the era of Enlightened Despotism; there it was a single man, one risen to the upper classes, who tried—initially with surprising success—to move the Hungarian world in the direction of progressive reform by employing the message of Henry George.

In Denmark the acceptance of George's teachings was unusual too. There it was not party politicians, city folk or the intelligentsia that conveyed Georgist thinking to the general public, it was the broad class of smallholders who found in George's system of ideas the articulation of their needs.

Like so many other optimistic movements of the 19th century, whose originators hoped to win over all mankind to their doctrines whether by logical

argument or by emotional appeal, Georgism, too, lost its powerful dynamic after World War I. Thus, by its very nature, the subject has called for limiting the present work, in the main, to the time prior to 1920. This limitation has been exceeded only where the concluding portion of a biography and the gradual dissolution of a movement made a time extension necessary.

II

Henry George—the Man and His Doctrines

THE UNDERSTANDING of George and his ideas in Europe is very similar, basically, to that in the United States. For European scholars, like the American, have read and been influenced by George's leading biographers and principal expositors—George Jr., de Mille, Post, Nock, Geiger, Neilson, Teilhac, Lawrence, Barker, Rose, Cord, Oser, Andelson and Thomas.¹

But the Americans have a limited tradition of land reform. It goes back to colonial times, true; that is, to the 17th and 18th centuries. We Europeans assimilate George into a tradition that extends back to the beginnings of civilization itself, into a history dramatized by peasant wars, rebellion against the exactions of a universal church and even popular revolutions, as Franz Oppenheimer showed in his *History of Land Reform*.

To some English-speaking readers, the details of George's life and of his social philosophy are very familiar. But I recount them to show how similar, and yet, in a way, how different, is the way Europeans understand them.

At the end of 1879, a treatise of several hundred pages appeared in San Francisco and, shortly thereafter, in New York. It sought an answer to the question of why, despite ever-increasing technical progress, hunger and poverty was as great a threat or actuality as ever for many people. At its center stood the thesis that the root cause of this continuing poverty was private ownership of land and all natural resources. This was held to be unjust, since land, water, mineral deposits and other sources of raw materials and energy were gifts of nature, created without aid of mankind, and freely given to people.

The single individual could lay exclusive claim only to the products of human labor. All people, however, had an equal right to land and natural resources. The book proposed, for the assertion by everyone of his or her equal right to the bounty of nature, that land values be transferred from private property to common property by means of a tax absorbing its annualized economic rent. At the same time, all other taxes on labor and capital were to be abolished; the yield of the land value tax could provide all the revenues needed to cover government expenditures at that time.

The book became known by the terse title of *Progress and Poverty* but its author was more explicit: "Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth . . . The Remedy." It first appeared in an edition of only 500 copies, published by the author himself and set by him and his friends. Trade editions thereafter turned it into a bestseller, and not only in America. It was to have an immense effect in many parts of the world. The German economist Franz Oppenheimer, in 1902, spoke of its "unmatched success, which in fact elevates it to a kind of Bible of our time."²

The author, Henry George, was the initiator³ and, according to Professor Heinrich Erman,⁴ the legal scholar, the theoretical founder of the modern efforts to achieve land reform.

In examining the doctrines denoted by the words "land reform," one finds that they are manifold and not always compatible with each other. Common to most land reform teachings are these convictions: first, that the existent socioeconomic order is inadequate; second, that one of the principal causes of this inadequacy is a false relationship between people and the soil, people and landownership; and third, that a better socioeconomic order can be founded through the establishment of a correct relationship between mankind and land.⁵

Of critics of the prevalent conditions of landownership there has never been a lack. Benedict Friedlander, German land reformer and social democrat,⁶ speaks of "objections by numerous authors in almost every epoch against the ownership of land."⁷ But it was only recently that modern criticism developed into action, that greater understanding led to real efforts toward land reform, and that proposals for a new system of land ownership were being advanced which offered promise of a decisive improvement in socioeconomic conditions.

The criticism, of course, extends back to ancient times. In the 25th chapter of the third book of *Exodus*, Moses is represented as presenting a complete program for a just system of land tenure.⁸ During the early years of the Christian era various systems prevailed in Europe and on the other continents, and history records peasant wars and wars of conquest that had their origins in disputes over land and access to land.

Since the 18th century there have been more than a few of literary polemicists advocating land reform. Thus, the Englishman Thomas Spence (1750–1814) demanded the socialization of the land without compensation to those who claimed ownership of it and its leasing to the highest bidder at a rental fee to be determined anew every seven years.⁹ The Scotsman William Ogilvie (1736–1819) did not recommend the expropriation of present landowners, but urged a shift of all taxes to the land.¹⁰ His compatriot, Patrick Edward Dove (1814–

1873) took the same position at first, but in 1850, Dove proposed, a decade before George, the elimination of land rent through taxation.¹¹ But, unlike George, Dove did not base his proposal upon the principles of political economy.¹²

Yet, as Friedlander stated in 1901, all these authors “who have been torn out of the past and, as it were, unearthed only recently, thanks to the Georgian formulations” remained voices in the wilderness; they left no impact on history.¹³

The first historically significant land reform movement in recent times was that of the *Économistes*—a French term designating writers who specialized in political economy—or Physiocrats in 18th century France. The best known representative of this school of political economics, François Quesnay (1695–1774), the son of a peasant who became a physician, drew an important inference from his observation of social conditions in the time of Louis XV. He thought that, in actuality, only agriculture was productive because agricultural land alone produced a surplus yield which he called “produit net.” Manufacture, commerce and labor, he held, were “sterile.” Therefore, he reasoned, the State should encourage agriculture above all and free it from the fetters of the old mercantilist order, government regulation. The State Treasury’s need for revenue would have to be met by a tax to be applied upon the source of wealth, the land. Thus the physiocratic system proposed a new tax, a tax on the yield of the land, with all other taxation abolished.¹⁴

The physiocratic theories are, for the most part, abstruse and highly intellectualized. The *Économistes* were so happy with the seeming nicety of the geometric construction that they did not worry about the fact that it did not correspond in the slightest to reality. Mark Blaug comments, in his history of theories of political economy, that their theorizing reached “conclusions which struck observers even at the time as slightly absurd.”¹⁵ But this overlooks their positive accomplishment.

The ideas of these men, as the German historian Franz Schnabel puts it, “destroyed, if only theoretically for the present—through the liberation of the land and the abolition of serfdom and of the guilds—the entire social order handed down over a thousand years.”¹⁶ Nevertheless they had one enormous historical effect: their negative demands, those directed at the dissolution of the old ties, were in fact met by the Executory Decree issued by the Constituent Assembly on August 4, 1789. According to Schnabel, “it was through these laws that the Middle Ages finally came to an end, and that a new society was founded, first in France and then throughout Europe.”¹⁷

With this accomplishment, however, the history-making force of the Physiocrats’ ideas was spent. The new society made no effort to realize the positive

proposals of the Physiocrats as well. While their writings were not without a certain influence on Adam Smith and later on Karl Marx,¹⁸ posterity came to look upon their doctrines as a somewhat charming and not infertile aberration.

The widespread notion, by the way, is incorrect that the Physiocrats had proposed the same remedy for the social ills with their *impôt unique*, as Henry George was to do later, though their goals differed. Thus we read in the George biography by Charles Albro Barker of the "famous similarities"¹⁹ between the doctrines of the Physiocrats and of the American social thinker, without, however, further elaboration. Stephen Cord, in his book about George, believes that it is a matter of the "same conclusions,"²⁰ and Vernon Louis Parrington even speaks of "identical conclusions."²¹ But in reality, the *impôt unique* of the physiocrats was a tax on the land yield (*produit net*), in other words, on work performed, on the land's output, on the product of the land in its present use. That is why the German writer and land reformer Bernard Eulenstein said that the land yield tax of the Physiocrats resembled Henry George's land value tax as much as "an egg a plum."²² But even when *produit net* and land value (*i.e.* the potential land rent) might be seen as similar quantities, the two taxes are actually not comparable: the physiocrats wanted to remove by taxation only a part of the *produit net*, George the whole land rent. Because of this difference in levels, Emile Rivaud calls the *impôt unique* "a measure of social conservation,"²³ George's Single Tax, on the other hand, "a revolutionary means."²⁴ The "famous similarities" of which Barker speaks are, in fact, limited to what Rivaud calls the "destructive consequence,"²⁵ namely the abolition of all other taxation.

As far as the more recent land reform movements are concerned, the Physiocrats were indeed their precursors, but not their ancestors. The ancestor, the father of the new land reform campaigns, is the American Henry George.

III

George's Life

HENRY GEORGE was born on September 2, 1839, in Philadelphia.²⁶ His father, Richard, was a customs official and from time to time bookseller and publisher for the Episcopal Church. As the second of ten children, Henry George was raised in quite modest circumstances. Although in his childhood his parents gave him spiritual instruction, he was not provided with a formal higher education.²⁷ He attended school only until his 14th year. In 1855, George went as cabin boy to Australia and India, and fifteen months later, back again in Philadelphia, he began a printer's apprenticeship.

At the age of eighteen, in 1857, he moved to California, where he first became

a gold miner, then was active, except for short interruptions, until 1880 as printer, journalist, and author. It was in newly settled California that he followed attentively a development which, in his opinion, passed within a few years through all those stages for which the American East Coast and Midwest and the nations of the Old World had required decades, if not centuries: In the beginning the freedom and wealth of the pioneers, then the influx of ever greater masses of people into the still free land, followed by the seizure of the land by an unscrupulous minority (in California these were partly speculators, partly the large railroad companies), and finally the poverty of the masses along with the enrichment of the few. As several historians have put it, George witnessed the telescoping of history.

Henry George began to seek the causes of these defects. He writes that in 1869, while horseback riding, he had a sudden insight akin to an "illumination"²⁸. These evils persisted because a selfish minority monopolized the riches of nature, especially the land, despite the equal natural right of all men to the earth.

In 1871, George published his first program, *Our Land and Land Policy*,²⁹ and in 1879 he completed *Progress and Poverty*, his most successful work. It was the latter book which, as Parrington reports, "for thousands of Americans removed economic theory from the academic closet and set it in the thick of political conflict."³⁰

In the following year George returned to the East Coast, where he settled in New York. From then on he lived and worked exclusively for his ideas, which he sought to popularize in a series of books and essays, in meetings throughout America and overseas, and as a candidate, though always unsuccessful, for political offices in the city and the state of New York. In 1886 he ran for mayor of New York City, the next year for secretary of state of New York State, and in 1897 again for mayor. During the last campaign, however, on October 29, 1897, he died of a stroke. Several hundred thousand New Yorkers paid him the last honors.³¹

IV

George's Social Philosophy

WHAT MADE Henry George's program special? What were the fundamental ideas on the strength of which this program became so popular that George as "Third Party" candidate in the New York mayoral elections of 1886 received more votes than the Republican candidate, Theodore Roosevelt?³²

For the answer to these questions we shall present George's theories somewhat differently than is commonly done (*i.e.* by George R. Geiger and Charles A.

Barker) in considering the structure of *Progress and Poverty*. For in this work George presents his ideas in a way which will serve propagandistic ends—he wants to impress, persuade, and win for himself, not only the general public but also the professional economists.

That is why he places at the beginning a discussion of those theories of political economy which he designates as dominant, then continues with Ricardo's Law of Rent, and finally derives the rest from these principles. In fact, he himself learned of the theories of political economy as well as of Ricardo's Law only after he had already worked out the basic insights and programmatic ideas for himself.³³

At the beginning was his unbiased, detached view of his American environment. "He was a free-lance . . . , thinking as if he were the first man who ever thought,"³⁴ according to Parrington's apt formulation, and according to George's own description of how he came up against the question of why hunger and misery remained undiminished in the midst of increasing wealth:

When, after growing up here [*i.e.* in California], I went across the continent . . . and in the streets of New York for the first time realized the contrasts of wealth and want that are to be found in a great city; saw those sights that to the man who comes from the West, affright and appall, the problem grew upon me. I said to myself there must be some reason for this; there must be some remedy for this, and I will not rest until I have found the one and discovered the other.³⁵

In the course of the search for causes and of the discovery of the solution for his problem, George based his reasoning, as we shall show in detail, on foundations inherited from the doctrine of natural right of the European Enlightenment and further developed in America during the 18th century. George was not necessarily conscious of this relationship; he described his perception of the root cause as a sort of illumination:

Absorbed in my own thoughts, I had driven the horse into the hills until he panted. Stopping for breath, I asked a passing teamster, for want of something better to say, what land was worth there. He pointed to some cows grazing off so far that they looked like mice and said: "I don't know exactly, but there is a man over there who will sell some land for a thousand dollars an acre." Like a flash it came upon me that there was the reason of advancing poverty with advancing wealth. With the growth of population, land grows in value, and the men who work it must pay more for the privilege. I turned back, amidst quiet thought, to the perception that then came to me and has been with me ever since.³⁶

It was George's chief aim to eliminate those causes which, despite material progress, had led to persistent, even growing, want and misery for many people. "This association of poverty with progress is the great enigma of our times . . . , the riddle which . . . not to answer is to be destroyed."³⁷ For George was convinced that this situation was incompatible with natural rights, *i.e.* with

the to him synonymous will of God. In other words, either the persistence of poverty was in harmony with the will of God and the laws of nature, or man was evading, through ignorance and a religious belief corrupted by egotism, the rights of nature.³⁸ If poverty is not destined for us by God, then it represents a crime for which society must be held responsible.

If poverty is appointed by the power which is above us all, then it is no crime; but if poverty is unnecessary, then it is a crime for which society is responsible.³⁹

George could not believe that God could have willed a condition where, even in the most advanced countries, a large part of the population must suffer want. There were, indeed, clergymen who wanted to make us believe that this was part of the creative scheme—as if the Almighty and All-Knowing had blundered at the creation of the world, like an architect who builds a theater in which only one-tenth of the spectators can hear and see.⁴⁰

But that was out of the question: only when all possibilities for production were exhausted, when nature given to man by God had been used up to the limits of its capacity and still could not produce enough for everyone—only then could one call poverty natural and justified. But, in fact, everywhere one could see land lying fallow, unemployed labor forces, unused capital—in short, there existed a waste of productive power which, George was firmly convinced, only had to be fully utilized to produce enough, yes more than enough, for all.⁴¹

But certainly it was not a lack of goods that was responsible for want. George made this observation even in America: Here, material progress and an immense growth of the production of goods did not only leave poverty untouched, but actually increased it.

Material progress does not merely fail to relieve poverty—it actually produces it. . . . It is in the older and richer sections of the Union that pauperism and distress among the working classes are becoming most painfully apparent.⁴²

But although it was becoming particularly evident in America that the fault for persistent misery did not lie in an inability to produce enough goods for the entire population, George found that this was true as well of the rest of the world. In *Progress and Poverty*, he argued in great detail against the doctrine, which he called “current,”⁴³ that nothing could be done about poverty, since production could never increase rapidly enough to keep pace with population’s tendency to multiply. Book II of *Progress and Poverty* is given over to this thesis, known as the Malthusian doctrine, and to its refutation. George examines the causes of recurring famine in a few countries (India, China, and Ireland) and shows that, in each instance, it is neither overpopulation nor reaching the limits of natural productivity which leads to misery and poverty.

Thus, for example, the Irish people, using practically the same agricultural methods throughout, suffered the same hunger when they numbered two million, namely at the beginning of the 18th century, as at the time of the great famine in the middle of the 19th century, when their number had multiplied four times, to eight million.⁴⁴ Yet, at the same time, Ireland's agriculture was producing for more than merely the domestic market. At the very time when the population had reached its greatest number, Ireland was still exporting food products. The American author gives an impressive description of this fact: "Even during the famine, grain and meat and butter and cheese were carted for exportation along roads lined with the starving and past trenches into which the dead were piled."⁴⁵

This showed that it was not the parsimony of nature, that it was not God the Creator who was to be held responsible for poverty—he who still thought so was either blind or blasphemous.⁴⁶ For God, in fact, has showered His gifts upon man, more than sufficient for all:

Though it may take the language of prayer, it is blasphemy that attributes to the inscrutable decrees of Providence the suffering and brutishness that come of poverty; that turns with folded hands to the All-Father and lays on Him the responsibility for the want and crime of our great cities. We degrade the Everlasting. We slander the Just One. A merciful man would crush with his foot such an ulcerous anthill! It is not the Almighty, but we who are responsible for the vice and misery that fester amid our civilization. The Creator showers upon us His gifts—more than enough for all.⁴⁷

The poverty in the world, in other words, is not divinely ordained, but an evil caused by man. He could, if he wished, abolish need and poverty: "Human will is the great factor, and . . . taking men in the aggregate, their condition is as they make it."⁴⁸ Of this Henry George, the American social philosopher of the second half of the 19th century, is convinced. Indeed, he is filled with the same confidence that the German historian Fritz Valjavec described as the "predominant trait of the Enlightenment."⁴⁹ "It lies within man to overcome difficulties. He can master them because the nature of things enables him to do so."⁵⁰ For George, as for the men of the Enlightenment, "evil is not a metaphysical power, but an unfortunate aberration, a flaring up of human weaknesses. It is not God who tests man through Satan; rather man tests himself."⁵¹

What is required is to understand the all-embracing law of nature and to act in accordance with it; then there would be no more poverty. That there is such an absolute right is self-evident: It is after all the law of the Creator which He has imprinted upon nature, and which unfolds itself through nature.⁵² George does not see social progress directed either by a special destiny or by a merciless fate, but rather by this law which is both unalterable and well-disposed toward man.⁵³

For George, progress is a function of social arrangements. ("The advances in which civilization consists are . . . secured . . . in the constitution of society."⁵⁴ Genuine progress can be made only when social institutions are in accord with the laws of nature. The author of *Progress and Poverty* denies, on the other hand, any biological advance of man, be it of the individual or whole races: "There is nothing whatsoever to show any essential race improvement. Human progress is not the improvement of human nature."⁵⁵ The engine of each human forward movement is, more correctly, the natural law.⁵⁶

Notes

1. Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (1900), (New York, 1960); Anna George de Mille, *Henry George, Citizen of the World* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: 1950); Louis F. Post, *The Prophet of San Francisco* (1904) (New York, 1930); Albert Jay Nock, *Henry George, An Essay* (1931), (New York, 1939); George Raymond Geiger, *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York, 1933); Francis Neilson, "The Gospel of Justice" in *The Cultural Tradition and Other Essays* (New York, 1957) and his *From Ur to Nazareth* (New York, 1959); Elwood P. Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles* (East Lansing, MI, 1957); Ernest Teilhac (trans. by E. A. J. Johnson), *Pioneers of American Economic Thought in the 19th Century* (New York, 1936); Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York, 1955); Steven B. Cord, *Henry George: Dreamer or Realist?* (1965) (New York, 1984); Edward J. Rose, *Henry George* (New York, 1968); Robert V. Andelson, ed., *Critics of Henry George* (Teaneck, N.J., 1979); Jacob Oser, *Henry George* (New York, 1979); John L. Thomas, *Alternative America* (Cambridge, MA, 1983).

2. Franz Oppenheimer, "Henry George und sein Werk," *Neu Freie Presse*, No. 13641, (Vienna, 1902), p. 10.

3. Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York, 1955), p. 312 ff.

4. Heinrich Erman, *Die Bodenreform in der Reichsverfassung* (Berlin, 1930), p. 7.

5. Compare: Adolf Damaschke, *Die Bodenreform*, 19th ed. (Jena, 1922), *passim*, and Heinrich Niehuus, *Geschichte der englischen Bodenreformtheorien* (Leipzig, 1910), *passim*.

6. On Friedlaender see Adolf Damaschke, *Aus meinem Leben* (Leipzig, 1924), pp. 329 ff.

7. Benedict Friedlaender, *Die vier Hauptrichtungen der modernen sozialen Bewegung*, 2nd part, (Berlin, 1901), p. 145.

8. On land reform movements in general: Damaschke, *Die Bodenreform*, *passim*, and Samuel Milliken, "Forerunners of Henry George," *Single Tax Year Book* (New York, 1917), pp. 306 ff; on England: Niehuus, *op. cit.*, *passim*; on the Bible: Frederick Verinder, *My Neighbour's Landmark*, memorial ed. (London, 1950), *passim*, and Adolf Damaschke, *Bibel und Bodenreform* (Berlin, 1929), *passim*.

9. On Spence see H. R. Tedder, "Spence, Thomas," *Dictionary of National Biography (DNB)*, Volume 53 (London, 1898), pp. 338 ff., and also Niehuus, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 ff., and J. Morrison Davidson, *Concerning Four Precursors of Henry George and the Single Tax*, (London, 1899), pp. 25 ff.

10. On Ogilvie, see J. R. MacDonald, "Ogilvie, William," *DNB*, Volume 42 (London, 1895), p. 211; and also Niehuus, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 ff., and Davidson, *op. cit.*, pp. 1 ff.

11. On Dove, see "Dove, Patrick Edward," *DNB*, Volume 15 (London, 1888), pp. 379 ff.; and also Niehuus, *op. cit.*, pp. 111 ff. and Davidson, *op. cit.*, pp. 379 ff.

12. On the comparison between Dove's and George's doctrines, Niehuus, *op. cit.*, writes: "His

excluding from consideration the difference in land quality and the law of diminishing land yield precluded him [*i.e.* Dove] from penetrating more deeply into the highly complicated problem of land rent. It remained for George, because of his attention to these points and to the teachings of classical economics, to erect a closed system," p. 123.

13. Friedlaender, *op. cit.*, p. 145. Also see Henry George, *The Science of Political Economy* (New York, 1968), pp. 185 ff.

14. Mark Blaug, *Economic Theory in Retrospect*, rev. ed. (Homewood, 1968), pp. 25 ff.; G. Weulersse, "The Physiocrats," in "Economics," *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. V (New York, 1953), pp. 348-51.

15. Blaug, *op. cit.*, p. 26.

16. Franz Schnabel, "Das 18. Jahrhundert in Europa," *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte*, Vol. VI (Berlin, 1931), p. 234.

17. Schnabel, *Deutsche Geschichte*, Vol. I., 5th ed. (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 116 ff.

18. Blaug, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

19. Barker, *loc. cit.*

20. Stephen Cord, *Henry George: Dreamer or Realist?* (Philadelphia, 1965), (New York, 1985) p. 125.

21. Vernon Louis Parrington, "The Beginnings of Critical Realism in America," *Main Currents in American Thought*, Vol. III (New York, 1958), p. 126.

22. Bernhard Eulenstein, *Henry George's 'Single Tax'-Nur eine einzige Steuer!* (Berlin, 1894), p. 11.

23. Emile Rivaud, *Henry George et la Physiocratie* (Paris, 1907), p. 80.

24. *Loc. cit.*

25. *Op. cit.*, p. 92.

26. On what follows cp. Barker, *op. cit.*, *passim*; Henry George Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (New York, 1900), *passim*, and Edward J. Rose, *Henry George* (New York, 1968), *passim*.

27. To this George R. Geiger writes in *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York, 1933): "George's schooling seems almost nonexistent," p. 20.

28. Henry George, *The Science of Political Economy*, p. 163.

29. George, *Our Land and Land Policy* (New York, 1904).

30. Parrington, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

31. Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

32. George received 68,110 votes, Roosevelt only 60,435. But it was the Democrat Abraham S. Hewitt who was elected with 90,552 votes (Rose, *op. cit.*, p. 122).

33. Niehuus is mistaken here when he asserts that the "point of departure" for George had been Ricardo's Law of Rent theory (*op. cit.*, p. 7). Already George's [auto]-biography shows this view to be erroneous.

34. Parrington, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

35. Henry George, "Justice the Object-Taxation the Means," *Our Land and Land Policy-Speeches, Lectures and Miscellaneous Writings* (New York, 1904), p. 300.

36. Quoted in George Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 210.

37. Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, (1879) (New York, 1898), p. 10.

38. "Either it is in accordance with the will of God, either it is the result of natural law, or it is because of our ignorance and selfishness of our faith that we evade the natural law." in "Justice the Object-Taxation the Means," *op. cit.*, p. 302.

39. Henry George, "The Crime of Poverty," *Our Land and Land Policy*, p. 190.

40. Henry George, *Social Problems* (New York, 1898), p. 72.

41. "If there is not wealth sufficient to go around, giving everyone abundance, is it because we have reached the limit of the production of wealth? Is our land all in use? is our labor all employed? Is our capital all utilized? On the contrary, in whatever direction we look we see the most stupendous waste of productive forces—of productive forces so potent that were they permitted to play freely the production of wealth would be more than sufficient for all," *op. cit.*, p. 73.

42. *Progress and Poverty*, p. 9.

43. *E.g., Ibid.*, p. 17.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 126.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 125.

46. "Yet who can look about him without seeing that to whatever cause poverty may be due, it is not due to the niggardliness of nature," *Social Problems*, p. 73.

47. *Progress and Poverty*, p. 546.

48. *Ibid.*, p. 558.

49. Fritz, Valjavec, *Geschichte der abendländischen Aufklärung* (Vienna, 1961), p. 102.

50. *Loc. cit.*

51. *Ibid.*, p. 103.

52. "There are some facts so obvious as to be beyond the necessity of argument. And one of these facts is that there are rights between man and man which existed before the formation of government, and which continue to exist in spite of the abuse of government; that there is a higher law—to wit, the law of the Creator, impressed upon and revealed through nature." *Social Problems*, p. 92.

53. *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 557 ff.

54. *Ibid.*, p. 560.

55. *Loc. cit.*

56. About the significance for Henry George of the Enlightenment's natural rights, Parrington, *op. cit.*, states: "The foundations on which [he rests] is the eighteenth-century conception of natural law, all-comprehensive, beneficent, free, enshrined in the common heart of humanity, and conducting to the ultimate of social justice" (p. 132).

A New Edition of Cord's Major George Study

STEVEN B. CORD's *Henry George: Dreamer or Realist?*¹ is a second edition in the proper sense that it is a reissue in paperback form by a different publisher of the original 1965 version.

While it carries an additional preface, the text is photographically reproduced from the first edition put out by the University of Pennsylvania Press. This determination was only made after the book was read and the earlier edition obtained and compared. And this was done because of the puzzlement the book engendered as it referred to "recent" studies etc. which in 1985 seemed rather remote in time.

The reader wonders what has happened since 1965 that bear on the theme, well-expressed in the title. The preface to the second edition, when turned to for some help, says more current information (only on the application of land