

---

The Impact of Henry George on British Economists, II: The Second Phase of Response, 1883-84; Marshall, Toynbee and Rae

Author(s): Bernard Newton

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Jul., 1971, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Jul., 1971), pp. 317-327

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

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3485165>

---

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

# The Impact of Henry George on British Economists, II

## *The Second Phase of Response, 1883–84; Marshall, Toynbee and Rae\**

By BERNARD NEWTON

### V

#### The Peak of Inquiry

THE SECOND PHASE of interest among the British economists in Henry George, during 1883 and 1884, was characterized by an intense discussion of both the man and his work in personal conversations, private letters, public speeches and in published writings. As for the publicly printed analyses, the highlight of popular interest was in two public lectures delivered by Arnold Toynbee, historian and reformer, in January, 1883, shortly before his premature death.<sup>40</sup> Alfred Marshall, not quite yet the pre-eminent British economist, followed in Toynbee's wake, and delivered three public lectures on George during the following two months.<sup>41</sup> The blind Cambridge professor, Henry Fawcett, who was distinguished both as an economist and as a member of Parliament, discussed the land nationalization scheme of *Progress and Poverty* in the revised edition of his then widely used text.<sup>42</sup> Francis D. Longe, who initiated the British series of successful attacks on the wages fund theory that extended from the mid-1860s through the 1870s, wrote a pamphlet in which he intensely analysed the economic theory of *Progress and Poverty*.<sup>43</sup> John Rae, journalist and author of *Life of Adam Smith*, included an exhaustive chapter on George in his *Contemporary Socialism*, noting that George was being included in his book even though he was not a socialist,

\* For the first phase of response (1879–82) see my paper, "The Impact of Henry George on British Economists," *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.*, 30 (April 1971).

<sup>40</sup> "Progress and Poverty, a Criticism of Mr. Henry George" (*Lectures*), pp. 267–319.

<sup>41</sup> "Wealth and Want" (New York Public Library). (The New York Public Library has bound the photostated copies of reports of Marshall's three lectures, taken from two different British newspapers published during 1883, and it has given these lectures the title "Wealth and Want.")

<sup>42</sup> *Manual of Political Economy*, 6th ed. (London: Macmillan, 1883). In July of 1883, the chapter which was very soon to be placed in this book in order to evaluate the ideas both of Henry George and of the British land reformer, Alfred Russel Wallace, was published intact as a magazine article. See "State Socialism and the Nationalization of the Land," *Macmillan's*, 48 (July, 1883) pp. 182–94.

<sup>43</sup> *A Critical Examination of Mr. George's Progress and Poverty* (London: Simpkin and Marshall, 1883).

because his doctrines are in many respects closely allied with those of socialism, and because he has done more than any other single person to stir and deepen in this country an agitation which, if not socialist, at least promises to be a mother of socialism.<sup>44</sup>

Professor Joseph Shield Nicholson of the University of Edinburgh centered a discussion of "The Nationalisation of Land" on Henry George's scheme to absorb economic rents by taxation.<sup>45</sup> James E. Thorold Rogers assailed George because

a clever man had caught up a few real facts and a few doubtful theories, and had constructed from them a sketch of social life, which was characterized by growing evil and waning hope.<sup>46</sup>

In Ireland, the ethically oriented Charles S. Devas asserted that for the fame which cannot be suppressed, and the sale which cannot be restrained, of Mr. George's work on *Progress and Poverty*, shew (sic) the day is over when we could meet the Socialists with silence, or ridicule, or vituperation.<sup>47, 48</sup>

Toynbee's two lectures, which were patterned on the very last two lectures that he had given as an Oxford teacher, were presented to an audience containing a large contingent of workers.<sup>49</sup> The first lecture was devoted primarily to the relationship between George's wage theory and the conditions of California and the new world; while the second lecture is devoted both to the applicability of George's wage theory to England and the old world, and to Toynbee's reform ideas. Treated as a unit, the lectures have two fundamental aspects. First, they contain an analysis of some of the fallacies and inconsistencies in George's wage theories. Sec-

<sup>44</sup> New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1884, p. vi.

<sup>45</sup> *Tenant's Gain Not Landlord's Loss* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1883), ch. 7.

<sup>46</sup> *Six Century of Work and Wages*, pp. 531-32.

<sup>47</sup> *Groundwork of Economics* (London: Longmans, Green, 1883), p. vi.

<sup>48</sup> Further manifestations of the interest of British economists in George during this period can be seen from the following examples: George received letters from the following British economists during this period: Philip Wicksteed (February 4, 1883 and April 21, 1883); John L. Shadwell (January 5, 1883); and J. E. Symes (November 22, 1883). See Henry George Collection, New York Public Library. Then, too, *The Weekly Times* (February 1, 1884) reported that Thorold Rogers of the Cobden Club feared "that the Georgian economics are finding their way into high quarters." This quotation is taken from Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 105. Also, it is noteworthy that *Progress and Poverty* was used as one of three textbooks in economics at the City of London College during this time, and that one of the courses listed in the college calendar for 1883-1884 was "Definition of Political Economy, its history and the new theories of Henry George and others . . . on the nationalisation of land, etc." *Ibid.*, p. 69. Finally, Millicent G. Fawcett, the wife of Henry Fawcett, in her *Political Economy for Beginners*, 6th ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1884) made changes in her text; "the principal among the latter are references to the theories propounded by Mr. Henry George in *Progress and Poverty*, and to recent experiments in England and the continent . . ." (Preface).

<sup>49</sup> Barker, *Henry George*, pp. 390-91.

ond, they present Toynbee's own scheme of reform. The lectures were delivered extemporaneously,<sup>50</sup> and they appear to be unclear at many specific points. Nevertheless, Toynbee's basic economic skill and his intense reforming zeal are persistently manifest.

## VI

### The Toynbee-Marshall Lectures

TOYNBEE GAVE GEORGE serious and respectful treatment. He expressed full appreciation for George's "warm and fierce sympathy" for human suffering,<sup>51</sup> and he deemed *Progress and Poverty* "remarkable" and somewhat original.<sup>52</sup> Like other writers, both before and after him, Toynbee saw George "as a child of the peculiar circumstances" of California, in which poverty existed even though the population-land ratio was low, but where there were large concentrations of speculative land ownership.<sup>53</sup> The Englishman agreed with the American that the most fundamental economic issue facing society was the relationship between the distribution of wealth and the increasing economic development.<sup>54</sup> However, Toynbee believed that *Progress and Poverty* was "fundamentally dangerous" because, despite the fact that it contained partial truths, it contained serious errors and proposed a "delusive panacea."<sup>55</sup>

One of the principal points in Toynbee's analysis was that both money and real wages appear to have risen in America<sup>56</sup> and in England.<sup>57</sup> However, the Oxford scholar accepted the argument that wages had not risen as rapidly as the growth in wealth would warrant. But he insisted that rent alone did not swallow up this entire increase in wealth, for it has been shared with profits and wages.<sup>58</sup> Taking a position similar to that of Laveleye before him, Toynbee asserted that the main cause of the inadequate share of labor did not rest in the private ownership of land, as George maintained, but rather in the existence of large employers and huge capitalists who can practically dictate terms to the workers.<sup>59</sup> Instead of land nationalization, the English reformer suggested the establishment of unions and producer cooperatives among his many reform proposals.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>50</sup> Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 391.

<sup>51</sup> Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 270.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 270-71.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 272-73.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 270.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 279-80.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 301, 304.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 279-81.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 285.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 306.

Philip Wicksteed wrote to George about Toynbee's lectures, wryly commenting that they were a great success, since they cleared out the publisher's entire stock of *Progress and Poverty*.<sup>61</sup>

Alfred Marshall's public lectures were more strongly critical of George than that of Toynbee. In his introductory remarks he announced that George "is by nature a poet, not a scientific thinker," and that the "real value" of his writing lies "in the freshness and earnestness of his views of life."<sup>62</sup> Although Marshall did not directly refer to George as a socialist, he seems to associate George with socialist thinking.<sup>63</sup> Since the lectures were public, Marshall was restricted in the amount of technical economic analysis that he could present.

The lectures can be said to contain three principal analytical aspects. The first aspect is concerned with invalidating George's distributional theory by means of both statistical and theoretical analysis. Thus, for example, Marshall endeavored to disprove George's theory that greater wealth brings about greater poverty, by adducing statistical evidence to demonstrate that the average wages of workers had increased since the beginning of the 19th century, albeit too slowly.<sup>64</sup> As another example, Marshall attempted to demonstrate that George exaggerated the importance of rent in the distributional scheme, and he produced figures to show that rent is a relatively small part of the "total produce of industry" (a maximum of 75 millions of pounds out of an approximate total of 1,125 millions for England).<sup>65</sup> Furthermore, Marshall aimed to weaken the force of George's attacks upon the then current wage theory, and he averred that George's criticisms were not based upon the current theory, but upon the awkward phraseology of the previous generation of economists.<sup>66</sup> Then, too, he attacked George for developing a new general law that wages and interest are always jointly high, or jointly low, on the basis of the particular limited experience of America and England. Marshall maintained that it is quite possible for the proportions between labor and capital to be such that one factor may receive relatively high payments while the other may receive relatively low payments.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>61</sup> Philip H. Wicksteed to Henry George, February 4, 1883, HGC.

<sup>62</sup> *Op. cit.*, First Lecture, p. 1. (This lecture was presented at St. Philips Vestry Hall, Bristol University College, Bristol, England, on February 19, 1883. The photostatic copy of the lecture is from *Times and Mirror*, February 20, 1883.)

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, First Lecture, pp. 2-4.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, Second Lecture, pp. 1-2. (This lecture was presented at St. Philips Vestry Hall, Bristol University College, Bristol, England, on February 26, 1883. The photostatic copy of the lecture is from *Western Daily Press*, February 27, 1883.)

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, Second Lecture, p. 1.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, Second Lecture, p. 2.

The second principal analytical phase of the lectures is concerned with the most popular land reform schemes then extant in England. The plans of Alfred Russel Wallace, the great geologist and evolutionist, and Henry George received the most prominent attention.<sup>68</sup> Marshall held that George's scheme to appropriate "the net value of the inherent properties of the soil" does not alter the margin of cultivation. Therefore, "its only effect on wages, even on his own theory, would be by relieving capital and labour from the great part of the taxes imposed on them." Marshall adduced figures to show that this saving would be quite small. He then dramatically attacked George, because "for the sake of this . . . he is willing to convulse society and run the dangers of civil war; and he is willing to run the risk of driving away capital and business ability."<sup>69</sup>

In the third main analytical aspect, Marshall presented his own conceptions both of the causes of and the cures for poverty in England and America. Marshall deemed the payment of rent a minor cause of poverty.<sup>70</sup> He affirmed the chief cause of poverty to be the lack of skills and moral strength of workers. He presented a number of suggestions designed to eliminate poverty, but the principal basis for cure seems to lie in the education of worker's children; in teaching workers how to manage their "own affairs;"<sup>71</sup> and in curtailing the size of the family through later marriages.<sup>72</sup>

It is interesting to observe that Marshall and George had a personal confrontation during the question period of a lecture delivered by George at Oxford in 1884. George's speech was a simple, inspirational one that he suddenly cut short in order to answer questions.<sup>73</sup> George found himself subject to a certain amount of hostility from Marshall and others in the audience.

Marshall was the first to rise, and he noted that not a single economic doctrine in George's book was both new and true, since what was new was not true, and what was true was not new. He proclaimed that he had repeatedly challenged anyone to disprove this, but that no one had offered to do so. Marshall maintained that George had not understood a single economist that he had criticized in *Progress and Poverty*. Then, Marshall went on to state that he did not censure George for this because

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, Third Lecture, pp. 5-6. (This lecture also was presented at St. Philips Vestry Hall, Bristol University College, Bristol, England, on March 6, 1883. The photostatic copy of the Lecture is from *Times and Mirror*, March 7, 1883).

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, Third Lecture, p. 6.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, Second Lecture, p. 4.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, Second Lecture, p. 5 and Third Lecture, pp. 7-8.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, Third Lecture, p. 7.

<sup>73</sup> Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 403-4.

he lacked the special economic training necessary to understand these writers. George's response was that the truth in his book could not be new, for it has always existed and always would. George also attempted to respond to a number of Marshall's questions.<sup>74</sup> Marshall rose often. The meeting became disorderly when Marshall asked why *Progress and Poverty* showed that workers could not improve their position by means of thrift, and George then unresponsively replied that he was not there to answer questions about *Progress and Poverty*, and that besides it was some time since he had read his own book. When Marshall asked him to prove that landlordism was responsible for poverty, George merely answered that poverty existed in the country.<sup>75</sup> Marshall also attacked the depression theory of *Progress and Poverty*.<sup>76</sup> At one point in the proceedings, Marshall announced that the speaker had failed to answer his questions.<sup>77</sup> While others had merely asked George questions, Marshall had been the only one to debate with George.<sup>78</sup>

## VII

## Fawcett and Longe

ALTHOUGH HENRY FAWCETT had received a copy of *Progress and Poverty* from George, along with a personal letter in 1880,<sup>79</sup> he did not react with an article until 1883, when general interest was high. Unlike Arnold Toynbee and Alfred Marshall, Fawcett devoted scant attention to George's analytical framework. Fawcett was concerned with a number of different plans for "state socialism" which involve the "nationalisation of land and other instruments of production."<sup>80</sup> Because the proposals of Henry George secured the widest currency, Fawcett gave him more attention than he gave to any other reformer. The Englishman found George's proposals vague. He coupled George's scheme with that of Alfred Russel Wallace and, therefore, he assumed that George would wish the State to take possession of the lands. Fawcett noted that unlike Wal-

<sup>74</sup> Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1930; reprint of the original—1900—edition), pp. 435–36.

<sup>75</sup> Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles*, p. 71.

<sup>76</sup> Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 403–4.

<sup>77</sup> George, Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 436.

<sup>78</sup> Elwood P. Lawrence, "Henry George's Oxford Speech," *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 30 (June, 1951). Marshall's attitude of hostility to George is seen from the records of Mrs. Mary Paley Marshall who wrote: "At that time Henry George's 'Progress and Poverty' roused much interest. Alfred gave three lectures on it at Bristol which Mill Elliot said reminded her of a boa constrictor which slobbers its victim before swallowing it." See John Maynard Keynes, *Essays in Biography* (new edition; New York: Horizon Press, 1951), p. 337.

<sup>79</sup> Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles*, p. 7.

<sup>80</sup> Fawcett, *op. cit.*, p. 279.



lace, George would give either no compensation or a very small compensation to the dispossessed landlords. Fawcett then asserted that, before George, no one made a proposal involving outright confiscation. "Nothing, in our opinion, can be more unjust than for the State to take possession of land without paying full market price to the owners."<sup>81</sup> Fawcett agreed that reform was necessary, but that it should involve the abolition of restrictions on the private transfer of land, such as primogeniture and entail.<sup>82</sup> Fawcett was correct in supposing that George had suggested nationalization, for George had written that "*we must make land common property.*"<sup>83</sup> George claimed that the latter can be achieved "by at one stroke abolishing all private titles, declaring all land public property, and letting it out to the highest bidders in lots to suit, under such conditions as would sacredly guard the private right to improvements."<sup>84</sup> However, a reader of Fawcett would secure a partial and somewhat distorted view of George's approach, for the American reformer maintained that "it is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent"<sup>85</sup> by means of land taxation.<sup>86,87</sup>

Francis D. Longe, lawyer and self-taught economist, analyzed Henry George's "powerfully written"<sup>88</sup> *Progress and Poverty* with respect and intensive care. *In toto*, Longe differs significantly with George on the latter's reformulation of basic English classical concepts; on his analytical conclusions derived from his restatement of the English classical theory, and on his practical solution to the problem of poverty.

As for George's reconstruction of certain English classical concepts, Longe cannot accept George's thesis that labor employs capital rather than vice versa;<sup>89</sup> nor can Longe agree that an increase in population tends to bring a more than proportional increase in productivity, for he believes that the Malthusian population doctrine has partial validity.<sup>90</sup> However, the Englishman does note with approval that "George has thrown some

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 280.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 287.

<sup>83</sup> George, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 362.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 364.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>87</sup> Both the British press and the socialists had assumed that George favored direct land nationalization. Up until 1887, he did not disavow the term "land nationalization" as an appropriate label for his scheme, because he believed that taxation of land values was essentially the same thing as nationalization. Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles*, p. 78. It was not until the end of 1888 that George promoted the term "single tax" in Great Britain. *Ibid.*, pp. 53, 57.

<sup>88</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 21, 40.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 16-17.



useful light' in his attack on the wages fund theory.<sup>91</sup> As for the American economist's analytical conclusions, Longe cannot accept George's determination that progress necessarily brings increasing rents to the landlords. In fact, as Longe discerns matters, the increases in productivity have related primarily to manufactures, railroads and shipbuilding, rather than to agriculture. He finds that the value of agricultural lands in England, reflecting changes in rents, have hardly risen, and may even fall in the future.<sup>92</sup> In addition, he cannot accept George's thesis that increasing progress leads to a fall in the general level of wages. Like other of George's critics, Longe points out that George himself states that wages fall only relatively, and that they may remain constant or even rise absolutely.<sup>93</sup> Longe accepts the fact that poverty still exists, but only in the lowest ranks of labor, and because of the operation of the Malthusian population doctrine rather than from increases in rents.<sup>94</sup>

Longe considers George's solution to the problem of poverty to be "the futile chimera of a theorist deluded by his own false generalizations."<sup>95</sup> Like other English economists, Longe finds that the revenue accruing from taxing the entire rent of land would be insufficient to meet the needs of government.<sup>96</sup> Furthermore, he believes that the taxation of the entire rent would adversely affect capital, which is the prime source of progress and of employment for labor.<sup>97</sup>

As for George's entire theory, Longe, like other British economists, maintains that it is derived from the experience of the "incipient stages of progress exhibited in the Western States of America."<sup>98</sup> He agrees that George probably has a good basis for maintaining that speculation in the best lands by large speculators excludes the poor from the opportunity of securing a livelihood on the land. However, Longe asserts that the cause of this evil is not the rent payments, but the right of speculators to engross the lands.<sup>99</sup>

## VIII

Rae and Devas

JOHN RAE GAVE *Progress and Poverty* a closely organized and intensive

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 12-14.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 29-31.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 5, 29, 33-36. The quotation is from page 5.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 36-38.

analysis which manifests care, respect and a substantial degree of difference in theoretical positions. He carefully divided his discussion into four logically related sections, namely, an introduction, "Mr. George's Problem," "Mr. George's Explanation," and "Mr. George's Remedy." In discussing "Mr. George's Problem,"<sup>100</sup> Rae asserted that George commits the error of assuming that progress brings poverty when he should actually prove this.<sup>101</sup> In order to contradict George's belief that progress brings about poverty, Rae submitted George's own much quoted statement that it is the *relative* rather than the absolute wage share of the distributional product that must fall.<sup>102</sup> Furthermore, Rae also adduced as contrary evidence the statistical findings of various authorities in order to demonstrate that for the long-run in Great Britain, living standards had risen;<sup>103</sup> the percentage of workers on relief, although high, had diminished;<sup>104</sup> the proportion of rent to the total produce had fallen;<sup>105</sup> and the proportion of wages to total produce had some tendency to increase.<sup>106</sup>

In the section entitled, "Mr. George's Explanation,"<sup>107</sup> Rae examined what he considered to be the limitations in George's rejection both of the Malthusian population theory and the wages fund theory; and he engaged in an elaborate and adverse criticism of the American economist's dynamic distributional model. As for the Malthusian theory, Rae agreed that the population doctrine is not always applicable, but like Wicksteed and Longe before him, he insisted that it has some degree of validity.<sup>108</sup> Furthermore, he challenged George's contention that increases in population bring about *increasing* returns to the food supply by attempting to demonstrate that this concept is inconsistent with the idea of a long-run rise in rents, for the latter is fundamentally dependent upon the contrary force stemming from the operation of the law of *diminishing* returns upon the lands.<sup>109</sup> As for George's attack upon the wages fund theory, Rae agreed that the old version involving a *rigid* capital fund was incorrect.<sup>110</sup> While he was in accord with George that the amount of wages are dependent upon the size of the current product, he, like Leslie and Laveye a few years before, maintained that wages are *not* paid from the

<sup>100</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 385-405.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 386.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 396-97.

<sup>103</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 390-91.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 391-92.

<sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 398-99.

<sup>106</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 399-401.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 406-39.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 410.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 411-15, 427-29.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 409-10.

current product. Rather, wages are paid out of a variable fund of capital.<sup>111</sup>

In his section on "Mr. George's Remedy,"<sup>112</sup> Rae agreed with George only in that he believed that changes were needed in land tenure and use in England.<sup>113</sup> This was because private ownership in land, unlike that in trade and manufactures, does not guarantee the most productive use.<sup>114</sup> However, the English writer averred that nationalization would fail to achieve the necessary reforms. Beyond that, he deemed George's recommendation of nationalization without compensation to be repugnant to a healthy national sense.<sup>115</sup> Furthermore, repeating the argument that was presented the year before by Marshall, Longe, and Nicholson, Rae submitted that taxing rents alone would yield a smaller revenue than was then secured by the total of all the current taxes.<sup>116</sup>

In conclusion, John Rae's attitude toward George's writing can perhaps best be expressed in his statement on George's chapters on population and the wages fund:

Nowhere else does he display more strikingly his remarkable acuteness, fertility, and literary power, and nowhere else are these high qualities employed more fruitlessly from sheer want of grasp of the elements of the problems he discusses.<sup>117</sup>

Joseph S. Nicholson's discussion of George was concerned only with his "nationalization" proposal, which "has attracted most attention in recent years,"<sup>118</sup> and "which has caused a good deal of sensation amongst people not very well read in socialistic literature."<sup>119</sup> Nicholson had two main arguments against George's scheme. The first was an assertion that the American reformer had the unproven belief that *all* the ills of society can be corrected simply by appropriating rents through taxation.<sup>120</sup> The second, buttressed by the garnering of statistics, was that the taxation of all of the rents would fall short of the total of the then current tax revenues.<sup>121</sup> Nicholson does see some need for land reform, especially because "results which are mainly due to economic causes are attributed to preferential laws, and a feeling of class hostility is aroused and per-

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 418-20.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 439-55.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 443-44.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 450-51.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 444.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 443.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 420.

<sup>118</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>120</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 80-81.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 81-82.

petuated."<sup>122</sup> He concludes about *Progress and Poverty* that theoretically it rests upon a complete misapprehension and perversion of economic doctrine, and that practically the proposals which it advocates would do nothing towards effecting the end in view.<sup>123</sup>

Professor James E. Thorold Rogers devoted only a brief discussion to George. He noted that George's doctrines were "eagerly accepted as a new gospel" by multitudes of intelligent workers who blame the English land system for the aggravation of their difficulties.<sup>124</sup> The Oxford professor did admit that the existing land system had some "evil" features.<sup>125</sup> He maintained, however, that the solution was not to be found in George's remedy, which like that of the "owner of patent medicine," is "single and complete," and which is based on "narrow or exceptional experiences."<sup>126, 127</sup>

Charles S. Devas, in his sociologically and ethically oriented *Groundwork of Economics*,<sup>128</sup> found *Progress and Poverty* to be a "useful book for its destructive criticism, but (like other socialist works) of little avail for construction;"<sup>129</sup> and he found George to be a "fanatic."<sup>130</sup> Devas praised George first, for having exposed the fallacy that "capital supports labourers,"<sup>131</sup> and second, because much of his criticism of the Malthusian Law of population was correct. However, Devas believed that George went too far, particularly in denying the law of diminishing returns.<sup>132</sup> Finally, Devas disagreed strongly with George on his conclusion that economic injustices are derived from the private ownership of land rather than from "what human nature is."<sup>133</sup>

(Continued)

Long Island University  
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11201

<sup>122</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 165.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 166.

<sup>124</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 532.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 528.

<sup>126</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 532.

<sup>127</sup> Interestingly, George held Rogers in rather high esteem. In a letter to a friend, George wrote: "I have been reading Thorold Rogers 'Work and Wages' with much interest. . . . It seems to me, the most effective book against the aristocracy of England that has been written in many a day. . . ." Henry George to Thomas F. Walker, June 13, 1884, HGC.

<sup>128</sup> This work is not in the same formal analytical category as the other works cited in this paper. For example, it has a chapter entitled "Food and Drink"; the index is called "Index of Criticisms on Errors"; and the book has a "Christian perspective." However, the second edition of the book, retitled *Political Economy* (1901) involves a complete rewriting, and fits more snugly into the category of standard economics texts.

<sup>129</sup> *Groundwork of Economics*, p. 546n.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 647.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 546n.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 616, 617n, 618n.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 647-48.