
The Followers of Henry George

Author(s): Charles A. Barker

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Jul., 1953, Vol. 12, No. 4 (Jul., 1953), pp. 379-392

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

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3484212>

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>



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

JSTOR

The Followers of Henry George

By CHARLES A. BARKER

FIVE MEN in their relationship with a famous leader are the principal object of this study.¹ While lacking any wish to be pedantic about very simple terms, I do feel obliged to say at the outset that although no better word would come to mind when I submitted the present title, I am not satisfied with "followers." For the five men there ought to be another word, a word with some connotation of "associate" or even "partner" blended in, and with any hint of "blind follower" excluded. "Disciple" will not do, nor "colleague," so "follower" seems to be the best there is. But warning is given that the word will occur in two senses—I hope that in each case it will be plain which one. Sometimes the word will indicate simply a member of Henry George's famous general following. More frequently it will indicate one or more of the group of five. In the order of their principal connection with George, we may anticipate the names: Dr. Edward Taylor of San Francisco, an intellectual; Francis Shaw, Edward McGlynn, and Thomas Shearman, respectively a rich man, a great priest, and a distinguished lawyer, all three of New York City; and Tom Loftin Johnson, minor statesman—not too minor—of Ohio.

I

GEORGE is of course universally remembered for the single-taxers and those who voted and shouted for him in two mayoralty campaigns in New York and for many others, more or less like-minded, who all together must have totalled much the largest following ever achieved by an American social theorist and reformer. In and of that number, the five associates-and-followers were very special, not alone because they were close to George—several others, notably Louis Post, were equally close—but because, contributing vigorous special talents, they individually affected and shaped the Henry George movement in a degree not often recognized.

All of them associated with George at some time during the decade from 1878 to 1888, and every one continued a follower for the duration of life. That is, their story begins while George was bringing to advanced stage the manuscript of *Progress and Poverty*; and it becomes most im-

¹ An address presented before the American Historical Association in Washington, D. C., on Dec. 30, 1952.

portant between 1885 and 1888—the high-water level of George’s movement as a whole.

Like so much which concerns Henry George, beginnings are to be discovered on the Pacific Coast. Being a leader did not come early in his case. Though an ordinarily social person, and supplied with friends in San Francisco from the day of arrival in 1858, there is no sign that he exercised any particular ascendancy among them. He simply enjoyed, in turn, the shipmates on the vessel on which he earned his passage, his fellow printers while he was working at the case, and his fellow editors later; and as a member of San Francisco’s Bohemian Club he participated in the “high jinks” and did his duty as club officer. But nothing more like social leadership than this appears. George is to be discovered, indeed, at a twenty-five-year-old’s stage of being out of funds and of being especially wrapped up in his young family, admonishing himself to get out into the company of men, as though that were a necessary but slightly unwelcome duty. Later, after *Progress and Poverty*, when remarkable leadership did come, it was always in proportion to the acceptance of his ideas in specific places at specific times. Convictions rather than personal magnetism drew men to Henry George.

Dr. Taylor, the first follower-as-associate of the fully mature period of Henry George’s thought, was the only Californian of the five. Perspective will be gained, on his case and on the other four by analogy, if we examine a little—in this one instance of patterns forming—the background of George’s larger following. Early in 1878 was gathered the Land Reform League of California, the first of hundreds of Henry George organizations. This group began as a Sunday afternoon discussion meeting of sympathetic men. They chose for the text the now little-noticed theoretical chapters of *Our Land and Land Policy*, George’s one book so far, seven years old. In some degree the meetings seem to have served as author’s seminars, giving the working writer a chance to discuss what was going into the book in process, the not yet christened *Progress and Poverty*.

The league was well adapted for discussion purposes. As in future organizations lawyers were important. James Maguire, later a judge and still later a congressman, was a member; and at least sometimes the meetings were held in a city courtroom. There were journalists, of course, and other professional people. John Swett, the high school principal who helped George with problems of grammar and expression in *Progress and Poverty*—and said that his services were not needed—was present; and not unlikely it was he who brought John Muir to a meeting or two.

But the circumstances which led to the gathering of the Land Reform League did not encourage mere study and discussion. 1878 was a time for action. Though the depression of that decade came late to California, conditions had become alarming with the famous bankruptcies of 1875—the year when George lost the *Post* and its subsidiary newspapers. During 1877 Dennis Kearney emerged as demagogue, the Sand Lot Riots broke out, the Workingmen's Party began its spectacular spread, and altogether San Francisco was treated to tension and disorder not known since the vigilance committee of 1856. What might today be called a labor fascism threatened seriously—and before 1880 won such victories at the polls as to bring San Francisco and California nearer to being run by a labor party than any city or state in the age of Jackson. Kearney was of course not a communist, but was called one, as were many others of degrees of radicalism including the Patrons of Husbandry. As a University of California scholar has recently said, the state's first big red scare was on full blast.

Henry George himself, whose record as pamphleteer and writer of editorials and articles gave him standing as the ablest pro-labor thinker in the state, flatly refused overtures to join and to run for office as a member of the Kearney party. He rejected the party chief as lacking in mind and principle; and he refused allegiance to the organization which, as it prohibited dissent and discussion within, he believed to threaten free government under law, in proportion to its numbers.

Under these conditions George was persuaded by the Land Reform League to put aside the big manuscript and deliver a public address intended to transform the league from a discussion society into a reform movement. This was the still-reprinted lecture, "Why Work is Scarce and Wages are Low," which diagnosed and prescribed for economic ills by a presentation of the depression theory soon to be incorporated in *Progress and Poverty*, Book V. But unfortunately for the success of the Land Reform League, the address did not succeed at all brilliantly. He repeated the lecture more than once, on request, but no very large protest-movement followed. And again, in 1878 neither George's past distinction as editor and as a minor leader of the Democratic Party, nor his recent reputation as orator, and no enthusiasm on the part of San Francisco followers sufficed to elect him to the state convention which presently wrote the constitution which still governs California. Though every major act of Henry George's earlier public and journalistic life argued that he should want to participate in that bit of social reconstruction, actually he fought a reluctant and

ineffective campaign to be a delegate. Evidently he knew that he was defeated before he started.

The moral of the California story, which concerns the problem of followers-and-associates, could be derived as well from other segments of the biography of Henry George. Between him and his larger following—and perhaps this would be true in many reform movements—there naturally occurred a tension: a tug and pull between his wish to apply his doctrines more or less ideally, and the group's wish to apply them more or less in haste. The tension came up most interestingly in 1886, when he demanded 30,000 signatures on a petition before he would run for mayor of New York, and then rewrote the labor party's platform according to his own ideas; and the tension worked the most damage the next year, when George let himself be persuaded against his own better judgment to run in the state campaign. Within that area of tension lay the natural place for followers-as-associates to make themselves felt. They could, and in succession the five did, affect the direction in which George's energies and the energies of the movement were directed.

What would have been the best advice for Henry George in 1878 is now self-evident. He might soon be a great man, or he would be a small man, according to whether or not he completed his manuscript and the publication were successful. Dr. Taylor saw the point. Quite different from those who urged George into campaigns for reform this friend cautioned him (at least once) against too much public speaking, and also helped him to have the right surroundings for thinking and writing, and assisted him with manuscript and proof. Among the five followers-and-associates, Dr. Taylor is the only one whose counsels distinctly differed from the large group's pressures. The nearest thing was Tom Johnson's generous provision, a dozen years later, to save George's time and keep him at the desk, thinking and writing.

The friend with a medical degree was now a practising lawyer, a member of the firm of ex-Governor Henry Haight, distinguished in the city. He gave the hospitality of the firm's law library, and George did a great deal of work there. A rare comradeship matured. Dr. Taylor counselled George in what detail there is no indication but with an intellectual intimacy no other associate ever quite equalled.

The one certified specific contribution by Dr. Taylor, incorporated in the text, is the poem opening Book VIII, in which George recommends alternative methods for abolishing the private monopolizing of land, as the means for conquering poverty. The following lines are Taylor's:

Shall we in presence of this grievous wrong,
In this supremest moment of all time,
Standing trembling, cowering, when with one bold stroke
These groaning millions might be ever free?
And that one stroke so just, so greatly good,
So level with the happiness of man,
That all the angels will applaud the deed.

In the first edition this poem was made anonymous, apparently at the author's request; later George delighted in inserting the writer's name. Dr. Taylor at one time confessed that he lived always with the disappointment that his verses were unequal to the cry within. His lack of confidence is perhaps one reason for the lack of evidence about how extensively he helped George. But unless (incredibly) George were insincere in the almost fulsome inscription he wrote into Dr. Taylor's gift copy of *Progress and Poverty*, and unless lifelong gratitude means less than seems possible, Dr. Taylor supplied much more than one poem, and more than routine services of reading manuscript and proof. Did he perhaps discover for the author whose own reading was spotty that wonderful line of Hindu lore, so appropriate for *Progress and Poverty* that George wove and reweave it in the text? "To whomsoever the soil at any time belongs, to him belong the fruits of it. White parasols and elephants mad with pride are the flowers of a grant of land." One might suggest many quotations and other inclusions in the book—for instance, striking passages from Plutarch and Marcus Aurelius—which seem very likely to have been Dr. Taylor's suggestions, and feel confident of the general point and yet be absolutely sure of none of them as particulars. But demonstrably something, and by all the signs and comparisons much of the special charm and eloquence of *Progress and Poverty* should be attributed to the friend and follower who gave gifts from a cultivated Victorian taste and talent Henry George himself had no resource to equal.

II

IN THE PERIOD of his life just after publication, in New York City during the year-and-a-half beginning August 1880, the little-recognized author suffered no embarrassment of routine-minded followers making premature demands, like those of the Land Reform League of California. Entirely the contrary: he had no coherent group of New York followers. In that city the event was the reverse of that in San Francisco: a rich crop of two followers-as-associates allied themselves with Henry George before there appeared any large or organized effort to march behind him.

Opening his mail must have been exciting business during the spring and summer of 1881. George was ready to go wherever and do whatever the acceptance of his book might indicate as best; and from the year before leaving California he had been hoping that *Progress and Poverty* would interest the Irish, as indeed presently did happen. Invitations and appreciations were exactly what he was waiting for—interminably it seemed at first. But very soon he discovered that *Progress and Poverty* was making deep conversions. One letter early in 1881 opened his intimate connection with the elderly Francis Shaw of Staten Island; and about simultaneously Thomas Shearman took the initiative which led—to be sure by way of a six-year period of limited association—to the single-tax name, idea, and reform government. Mr. Shearman's stage of fully creative followership, that is, waited on the appearance of mass following in Britain and New York. But Mr. Shaw's services became available at once.

In the case of Francis Shaw there is no deflating of a story of idealism in saying that the special gift he had to offer was money. Mr. Shaw became more than an investor, a real partner in Henry George consolidation and expansion. He had resources, both spiritual and financial, which belonged to him as member of a Massachusetts reformist family. He was the father of the celebrated young Colonel Robert Gould Shaw who was killed while leading the first contingent of Negro troops into action against the Confederacy. Of all possible appreciations there was none to gratify better the author's own sense of historical continuity and destiny than Mr. Shaw's salute: that reading *Progress and Poverty* he had had, for the first time in years, a feeling that the old spirit of liberation was marching on once more.

He himself wanted to contribute. Immediately Mr. Shaw proposed to buy newspaper space for printing large sections of *Progress and Poverty*, but accepted good advice when George recommended instead that he underwrite a cheap edition of the book and pay for its wide distribution among public libraries. He helped George pay debts and contributed to expense money so that he could accept a sixty-dollars-a-week journalistic assignment in Ireland and Britain. And half-a-year later, while George was still abroad, he and his brother subsidized the cheap British editions of *Progress and Poverty* and the *Irish Land Question*.

In that way he contributed to international history. For it was not only that George's set of social ideas made their way by the ordinary processes of reading and discussion in Britain, nor was it simply that those processes were accelerated by the author's prominence as participator

in the Irish crisis. Aside from its general timeliness, the tremendous impact of *Progress and Poverty* derived in part from its unique history as a publishing effort. Mr. Shaw's subsidy primed the pump for a flow of more than one hundred thousand copies into every level and area of British society. No previous economic work had ever been so distributed, nor so widely discussed in working class and radical circles. The sales forced the attention of the journals, which had been slow with reviews; and between late 1882 and early 1885 *Progress and Poverty* became much more nearly a national issue in Great Britain than it ever did in the United States.

When historical accounts are cast, one's sense of timing will affect one's judgment about whether Mr. Shaw's contribution of love and money was a major factor enlarging the influence of *Progress and Poverty* in England and Scotland. Without that subsidy we may assume the response would have been slower. Was speed important? Would slower interest in the book have been less interest or less effective interest? Altogether likely it would have been both. The Fabian leaders—Shaw, Olivier, and Webb—are unanimous that *Progress and Poverty's* influence on their group, and Webb says earlier on the trade unions, was immediate, as early as 1883; the effect was even more immediate on the land nationalization movement led by Alfred Russel Wallace. And beginning about 1885 the concentration of certain Radicals on housing improvement and on the taxation of urban land values, as urged by Joseph Chamberlain after he had been "electrified"—the word is J. L. Garvin's—by *Progress and Poverty*, followed and was affected by the mass publication of the book and Henry George's early visits.

Call Dr. Taylor's contribution qualitative and Mr. Shaw's quantitative. With the two men behind him George took his place near the head of the march of the eighties in what Bernard Shaw remembered as the "liberative war of humanity," and their two presences rendered him a stronger man, and one more changed from the recent editor of the San Francisco *Post* than personal development alone would just suffice to explain.

The Henry George wave in Britain drained off in many channels—in Fabian and Christian socialism and in pro-labor Radicalism as already noticed, and in others as well. Nor is there doubt about *Progress and Poverty's* permeation: the evidences of Henry George ideas which appeared a quarter-century after his visits, in Liberal land-reformism before the First World War, and again later in Labor Party thought and policy, testify to his book's having been assimilated more broadly into British

social thought than in American. Yet as of the years 1882 to 1885, when George made his principal visits, the pressures and activity of what he was doing precluded his finding there any such follower as Dr. Taylor. For a time, indeed, in a limited but important way Joseph Chamberlain could be called a follower; and Thomas Walker, a manufacturer of Birmingham, made himself a lesser Francis Shaw in England. But it is entirely appropriate that, after his concentration on British affairs, George discovered his next principal follower-as-associate in an American of Irish derivation, a Catholic priest of New York City.

III

GEORGE FIRST HEARD of Father Edward McGlynn while he himself was on the British side of the water, in the spring of 1882. The link between them was Michael Davitt, leader of the Irish Land League, who was for the moment in New York to get fresh support for his countrymen. In prison Davitt had read *Progress and Poverty* a third and fourth time; and just before leaving for New York—shortly after Phoenix Park tragedy—he had associated much with Henry George. Though George was exhilarated by indications that Davitt would soon identify Ireland's protest with the principles of *Progress and Poverty*, he had felt obligated to write New York that politics required that these indications be played down. The Parnellites would object, George was sure.

This previous anxiety adds piquancy to the story of surprise and stimulation he felt when news came back across the Atlantic, that the priest of the largest downtown parish in Manhattan had announced for the doctrines of *Progress and Poverty*. Speaking on the same platforms with the visiting Irish leader, Father McGlynn had asserted with forensic mightiness peculiarly his own that the new gospel according to Henry George was, to quote, "a good gospel, not only for Ireland, but for England, for Scotland and for America, too. . . . If I had to fall into the arms of anybody, I don't know a man into whose arms I would more willingly fall than into the arms of Henry George."

This was commitment all-out, achieved without incident of personal connection, and won entirely in the free trade of social ideas. It was won, rather, against the purchasing habits of Catholics in the market, for church leadership had already displayed resistance to George in Ireland. And presently a suspension for having spoken contrary to the doctrines of the church opened the decade-long story of Father McGlynn *versus* the hierarchy in New York. If the priest's victory in the end, when excommunication was lifted, suggests recognition from Rome that George was

no Marx, no materialist, and no eternal enemy of the church, then also the decade of battle signifies what manner of man had volunteered behind George.

A fighting priest, not really heterodox but uncommonly independent, does seem to have been quite as natural for Henry George followership and counsel during the middle Eighties, as a modest scholarly man was for 1878 and 1879, or a rich one for 1881 and 1882. While George himself could never work up more than lukewarm concern with the problems of organization, Father McGlynn had a passion for them. And, though the underlying religious quality of *Progress and Poverty* is one of its plainest characteristics, George as public speaker was only half-developed in expressing the religious side of his thought. True, he had repeated many times his address on "Moses," particularly in Scotland, and he gave other lectures of Biblical title. But in the eastern United States as in earlier days in California, he spoke, especially at first, more as economist and social critic, and less as moral revivalist, in action. In Father McGlynn the center of gravity was situated on the other side.

The priest labored as he could in the mayoralty campaign of 1886, though Archbishop Corrigan tried to stop him entirely. But 1887, the year when suspension was changed to excommunication, revealed McGlynn's quality and influence in the movement. While Henry George's new weekly, the *Standard*, spoke for Catholic freedom in politics, the unfrocked priest threw himself into organizational work and speaking for the George movement. To be sure he overextended. In 1887 his urging more than anything else persuaded George to blunder into the state campaign; and later the two became for a period quite estranged.

But Father McGlynn made his welcome contribution, and in the troubled year, 1887, entirely to George's satisfaction, he founded and became genius as president of the Anti-Poverty Society. This organization—which spread from New York to other cities—approached interestingly close to becoming a religious sect of Henry George meaning—in a way the effort is reminiscent of the cult of Positivism in London. The meetings occurred on Sunday; addresses very like sermons were the principal thing; choir and audience-singing were part and parcel; and collections were taken—and remarked on by critics as the anti-poverty program of the collectors. Not really a sect, the Anti-Poverty Society occupies, so far as I know, a unique place in American religious history because it blended in individual evangelical intensity the social consciences of Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. In Father McGlynn's society no family could have

been more symbolic than Henry George's own: Protestant husband and father, nominal Catholic wife and mother, ardent Catholic older daughter—the other children not so plainly characterized as to religion.

On balance, Edward McGlynn as follower-and-associate of Henry George affected the leader and the movement both negatively and positively. His cause deflected for many years a large share of George's energy into particular conflict with the Catholic hierarchy; but also McGlynn made the movement larger, and more political and more evangelical than without him it would have been. And so doing, Thomas Sugrue tells us, he indicated to many Irish Americans that citizenship in the United States demanded a reconciling with Catholic loyalty different from the one which the bishops—those of the stamp of Archbishop Corrigan—often contemplated.

IV

THOMAS SHEARMAN, who ranks fourth in order of effective contribution as follower-and-associate of Henry George, represents an utterly different situation in society from Father McGlynn, and an opposite mentality. Member of a distinguished law firm and the writer of successful treatises for his profession, recipient of fees from the Erie Railroad, and active leader in Plymouth congregation and successful counsel for the defense of Henry Ward Beecher in the famous scandal, Shearman united in himself many of the well-to-do, Protestant, and intellectual elements which gathered behind George, not in large but in increasing number. Neither first appreciations nor later commitments to Henry George relaxed a guarded and critical approach to the leader and his ideas. In the first letter of record (I think the very first he ever wrote) to George, he presented compliments and said in a general way that he accepted the argument of *Progress and Poverty*. He entered a caveat also. He was not sure, he said, about the book's central proposition against property in land. In that one reservation lay implicit the divergence of years in the future: the difference between the "single tax limited," his idea of what should be, and the "single tax unlimited," Henry George's.

But this goes ahead of the principal fact of Shearman's followership. In 1887, while Father McGlynn was working desperately to weld a state, and even a national, labor party out of the already buckling girders of the last year's mayoralty campaign, Mr. Shearman was taking the lead towards the single-tax movement. That spring year he contributed to the *Standard* the article which blueprinted a design to make George's reformism attractive to people like himself, business and professional people.

While the news is old that *Progress and Poverty* does not contain the rubric, "the single tax," the fact of history is not so widely understood that when the formula was offered the book was eight years old, and that a little-remembered lawyer, not Henry George, was author. Rather it has been assumed that Henry George had been in fact a single-tax man from the California beginnings of his thought, and that only the name and organization came later. Anyone's careful reading of *Progress and Poverty* might have cast doubt on that legend. And now fresh knowledge about George's mission in Britain should exterminate it altogether. As Dr. Elwood Lawrence has recently pointed out,² George overseas repeatedly waived opportunity to stand out for land-value taxation exclusively, and many times permitted himself to be identified with land nationalization, and even for a time to be associated with Marxists. When one remembers also that he refused invitations to run for Congress and to run for Parliament, where he might have worked for tax legislation, but did run twice for mayor of New York, where he could have symbolized a program but have done little more about it, one begins to see in due proportion that the single tax was not only a late phase of his life but also a limited one.

This is not to say that George was less than enthusiastic about Shearman's idea and the organized movement which presently occurred. He did speak for it, about as the common supposition takes for granted. He took the formula to Britain on his later, less important, visits, and introduced it in competition with other reforms. But there were limits to his enthusiasm. More than once he said that the name "single tax" lacked the dimensions of the underlying idea. And when inevitably the "single tax limited" came to open debate with the "single tax unlimited," the real issue was no less than whether or not *Progress and Poverty's* central proposition, that the land belongs to all the people and that economic rent should return to the community, the book's whole claim in the name of justice, would stand or fall.

The temptation is irresistible to venture a might-have-been. Except that by 1887 George had been completely disenchanted about Marxist socialists and socialism, and except that general labor politics of the order of his own United Labor Party was for the present rendered all but hopeless by Haymarket and the consequences of Haymarket, and except for the present loss of New York Catholics among his supporters, Henry George might well, it seems to me, have proved to be an indifferent

² E. P. Lawrence, "George's Remedies for Britain's Land Problems," *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.*, 10 (July, 1911), p. 357 ff.

single taxer instead of a strong one. Had this been so, the single-tax movement, quite limited, would have been Mr. Shearman's special deviation, and today Henry George would carry a different label in Mr. Everyman's catalog of history.

V

CERTAINLY TOM LOFTIN JOHNSON of Cleveland, who was fifth among the followers-and-associates of Henry George and who became a sort of coadjutor at the end, is final proof that there was no ultimate channeling of Henry George ideas and loyalties all into the single-tax stream. As is well known Johnson had accumulated a fortune mainly in urban rail-ways and in steel—that is to say, from operations in monopolies or near-monopolies deriving from city growth and the private control of natural resources, the very first objects of Henry George's protest for economic justice. Yet this factor aside, Johnson had just the qualities of an inventive, resourceful, and generous capitalist George had admired in certain cases in California and always praised as an economic type; and to these virtues he added a certain humility and the doing of penance. Reading *Social Problems* in 1884 converted him, then *Progress and Poverty*. To Henry George he proposed a certain division of labor: George to do the thinking, writing, and talking for the movement, while he should undertake much of the hurly-burly of organizing and fund-raising.

For his leader and the movement as he found it he did much—the word "disciple" applies better to Tom Johnson than to the other followers-and-associates. He sat in the councils of the campaigns; he subsidized the *Standard* and other Georgist papers; he assisted George in sickness and in travel; he provided him a home overlooking New York harbor; and arranged security for Mrs. George. But, talented for politics as well as business, he performed services for the expansion of the movement of a quality which George himself could not equal. He became center man of the small group of congressmen, followers of Henry George, elected in 1890 and 1892; as a Democrat of influence, mediating at the Chicago convention between the country's principal free-trade doctrinaire and an unideological candidate, he deserves much of the credit for the low-tariff plank in Cleveland's platform in 1892. Most of all as the beloved leader of the civic revival in Ohio during the decade after George's death, Johnson read Henry George ideas into the performance of practical twentieth-century progressivism more effectively than any other follower did.

It is too little noticed that numbers of men whose minds or consciences

had been lifted by Henry George came into national influence when Woodrow Wilson was elected. Secretary of Interior Franklin Lane and Congressman William Kent were among the number, both from the West Coast, where George had never been forgotten. Louis Post came to public service from Chicago and Joseph Tumulty from New Jersey, where the George tradition preceded Wilson in the progressive impulse. But the largest cluster of Henry George consciences in Wilson's administration were old devotees of Tom Johnson in Ohio: Newton D. Baker, Frederic C. Howe, and Brand Whitlock. Wilsonian idealism was sometimes second-generation Henry George idealism, though the historian-president himself seems hardly to have discovered the fact.

VI

IN THE RECORD as history, the five followers-as-associates amply demonstrate the urban and educated-class content of the impulse for social reform which stemmed from Henry George. Their character makes more poignant and paradoxical the fact that from George's very earliest published writings, a letter addressed to the editor of California's ephemeral first labor newspaper, he himself thought first of labor. He reasoned always from the labor theory of value of classical economics—like Marx in this alone—and he always spoke in behalf of the working classes—not exclusively but with special emphasis. But in his hour of history, in which 1886 and 1887 were crucial moments and a turning point, it is plain that others than members of the American labor movement were better equipped to understand and accept *Progress and Poverty*. Not the indecisive Powderlys, but the McGlynns, though Powderly campaigned in 1886; not the pragmatic Gompers', although Sam Gompers worked hard as high lieutenant in that campaign, but the Johnsons and Shearmans represented Henry George's more natural and durable following. It seems fairer to say that organized labor abandoned social theory and reform politics after 1886, than to say either that it rejected Henry George particularly, or that George abandoned labor.

In the record as biography, finally, the five followers-as-associates establish George's character as the idealist, the source of inspiration and idea, hardly at all the disciplinarian, of a social movement. They indicate him to have been one from whom it was natural to move out in loyalty, yet choose one or several directions towards social reconstruction. Their roles help revise the old portrait of single-track mind with a one-tax program. At center George was a Christian democratic moralist: a speaker for justice, for freedom, for equality, and for cooperation. To him and

to the followers who understood him well, the particulars of his economic and political thought were guidelines outward, from center to a number of areas of action. He had strong preferences about which guidelines and which areas were most important. The largest generalization about his economic protest would be his utter opposition to all forms of private monopoly. But it would be truer to say that he permitted his followers, and permitted himself, to work towards a confusing number of goals, than to say that he concentrated narrowly on one reform, formula or effort.

The Johns Hopkins University

The High Cost of Autarchy to Denmark

FROM UNPUBLISHED DATA by the Danish statisticians, Kjeld Bjerke, Colin Clark, the Australian economist now at Oxford, has calculated for Denmark the changes in productivity per man hour over the past fifty years. His estimates, as summarized by Herbert Gross in *Handelsblatt* of Dusseldorf, show a real decline in the marginal increase of productivity for each year since 1918. At about the same time marginal productivity was increasing greatly in the United States and in Great Britain.

In Denmark the average increase in productivity per man hour was 2.2 per cent per year in the period 1918-20. It dropped from this level to about 1.2 per cent, a level which is between a half and a third less than the long-time average for the United States, and, of course, very much less than the level maintained in the United States in periods of high productivity. The 1.2 per cent level has persisted in Denmark, unfortunately.

Bjerke and Clark believe that the decline in Denmark's productivity level has its basic cause in the country's turn to high industrial tariffs in 1920. Up to 1918, Danish productive resources were devoted to agriculture. In the preceding period, increasing output was obtained not only from the land but from industry also. Tariffs were low. Only those industries survived which could show a productivity increase similar to that of the export branches of agriculture. They were high wage and high profit industries.

When high tariffs were adopted in 1920, an increasing part of the labor force was drawn into the protected industries. These industries proved to be relatively inefficient. Agriculture now had to buy, at higher cost, domestically-produced industrial goods. In consequence, the marginal productivity of agriculture also began declining.

The maintenance, by high tariffs, of inefficient industries exacts a high toll in Denmark and every country that has adopted the policy.

W. L.