

Ingalls, Hanson, and Tucker: Nineteenth-Century American Anarchists

By JACK SCHWARTZMAN

This chapter essays an analysis of the attacks made upon the thought of Henry George by three individualist American anarchists—Joshua K. Ingalls, William Hanson, and Benjamin R. Tucker.

To one historian of the movement, American anarchism had a “double tradition.” The native tradition, running from the beginning of the nineteenth century, was “strongly individualistic” and suspicious of the state. The immigrant tradition, begun in the 1870s, “was first collectivist and afterward anarchist communist.”¹ These three critics of George were part of the native tradition.

The individualist anarchism of Joshua K. Ingalls reflected his two tenets: free individuals and free land. Born in Massachusetts in 1816, he was a Quaker, a social reformer, a minister (for a short time), and a strong champion of “land limitation.” All his life he attacked land monopoly and urged the repeal of laws that protected land titles not based on personal occupancy. In 1850 he helped organize a utopian colony in West Virginia (The Valley Farm Association), which shortly thereafter failed. In 1878 he began to denounce “capitalism,” identifying it with land monopoly. He lost faith in organized labor, continued to assail the state, criticized the growth of moneyed corporations, castigated the entrenched land monopoly, and finally endorsed the doctrine of individualist anarchism. He opposed what he termed the Henry George advocacy of state landlordism, as well as George’s “failure” to recognize capital as the enemy of labor. Ingalls’s book *Social Wealth*² became a noted anarchist classic. His antipoverty remedy was the “occupancy and use” formula of land distribution. (More about that later.) Ingalls ignored the money question, and disagreed with Tucker, who stressed it. Ingalls regarded the monetary approach as superficial. He preferred to deal with “causes” and “remedies” of social ills. He did not believe in revolutions or legisla-

tion, and urged, characteristically, reform through education. Toward the end of his life, which coincided with the end of the nineteenth century, he became extremely pessimistic.³

Very little is recorded of William Hanson. He was a contributor to Tucker's *Liberty*, and was highly regarded as an individualistic anarchist in the nineteenth century. His adverse analysis of Henry George is found in a well-written book, *The Fallacies in "Progress and Poverty."*⁴ Like Ingalls, Hanson believed in the "occupancy and use" formula. He took George to task for defending capital and interest, for proposing state landlordism, and for the comments about "unearned increment." Hanson believed in natural law, and his book is deeply religious and sincere.⁵

The most famous of the three anarchists presented in this chapter was Benjamin R. Tucker. Born in Massachusetts in 1854, of Quaker background, he was, at various times, a Unitarian, "an atheist, a materialist, an evolutionist, a prohibitionist, a free trader, a champion of the legal eight-hour day, a woman suffragist, an enemy of marriage, and a believer in sexual freedom."⁶ He finally became an individualist anarchist. He was, for a time, the "boy lover" of the notorious Victoria Woodhull, herself a professed rebel.⁷

After traveling extensively in Europe, Tucker settled down, first in Boston and then in New York. He became a journalist, and finally established his reputation with the magazine *Liberty*, which he founded. Most of his writings from that publication were gathered in a volume entitled *Instead of a Book*.⁸ A later variation of *Instead of a Book*, with some additional writings of Tucker, was titled *Individual Liberty*.⁹

Accepting some of the dogmas of the socialists, Tucker nevertheless adhered firmly, or so he claimed, to the basic principles of philosophical anarchism. He devoted his entire productive life to exposing and attacking what he considered the four prime monopolies: money, land, tariff, and patent.¹⁰ Tucker called the monopolists "a brotherhood of thieves."¹¹

Tucker, who according to a prominent social historian "won the attention and sympathetic interest of the American people more than any other anarchist in the United States,"¹² edited *Liberty* in his own characteristic fashion for a quarter of a century. He solicited articles

even from opponents of his thought. In 1908 his printing shop burned down, and he departed for Europe, to remain there for the rest of his life. His remaining years were spent in pessimistic lethargy.¹³ He died in Monaco in 1939.

When Henry George in 1887 changed his mind and refused to support the convicted anarchists in the so-called Haymarket Affair (because he believed them guilty of murder), Tucker lashed out at George, abusing him orally as well as in a vituperative pamphlet, *Henry George, Traitor*.¹⁴ Tucker accused George, who was running for public office, of allowing his political ambitions to influence his behavior. George's refusal to support the anarchists caused a rift among his followers. The debate as to whether George acted "properly" or not continues to this day.¹⁵

To return to Tucker's philosophy of anarchism: the state, he declared, was the enemy of humanity. "He who attempts to control another is a governor, an aggressor, an invader."¹⁶ Liberty was always preferable to security. Anarchism was always preferable to socialism. "The people cannot afford to be enslaved for the sake of being insured." Answering the Marxists, who accused him of not seeing that the state and society were one, he stated that they were one in the sense "that the lamb and lion are one after the lion has eaten the lamb."¹⁷

Taxation had to be resisted at all costs.¹⁸ The Henry George single tax was just as vicious a tax as any other, and had to be opposed. He advocated the "occupancy and use" formula as his panacea.¹⁹

Describing individualist anarchists, Tucker said that they were "not only utilitarians, but egoists in the farthest and fullest sense." The statement was not made apologetically.²⁰

It is now necessary to turn to the writings of these three thinkers insofar as such writings pertain to and criticize the various views of Henry George.

On Rent

Henry George in his works presented the concepts of *rent* and *unearned increment* as virtually synonymous. He defined *land value* as a capitalized form of rent. By means of the *inevitable* operation of

the "law of rent," George stated, rent or unearned increment would always exist as a mathematical differential. Since rent was unjustly appropriated by monopolistic "landlords," George proposed that the state take it through taxation for the betterment of society. Not only would each person then receive the benefit of his share of such increment but, more important, land, with the speculative shackles removed, would be opened up to individual enterprise, thus creating the condition of true freedom.

The individualist anarchists saw land economics differently. They visualized rent and its "laws" as artificial concepts having no permanency, mathematical certainty, or any validity except as an exploitative gun pointed at the producers. The *true* synonyms for rent, the anarchists claimed, were "interest," "profit," "usury," "tax," or any other "confiscation." There was no limit to such confiscations. Only when the "exploiters" were permanently gone would land be opened up to *true* individual endeavor, and each person would take as much land as he desired, provided it be used in keeping with the "occupancy and use" formula. Since the state was the supporter of the exploiters, to give it more power to tax (as George allegedly advocated) was to augment its might and bring about permanent poverty and slavery. The *true* solution would be to get rid of the landlords *and* the state.

Thus each side stressed individualism, liberty, and the removal of land monopoly—yet each side took a sharply opposed position as to how these goals should be achieved. Which one was right? Before a detailed discussion of the controversy is begun, the reader must first be made aware of one more anarchistic criticism of George and the rent question. The individualist anarchists attacked George for his supposed "Malthusianism." Even though they applauded him, on the one hand, for writing a masterful "exposé" of the Malthusian doctrine, they claimed, on the other, that George actually revived the doctrine by his espousal of the Ricardian law of rent. He contended, for instance, that "the pressure of population" drove the margin of land to the zero point, thereby causing rent to rise. George, according to the anarchists, should have "demolished" *both* the Malthusian and the Ricardian theories.

The topic of rent and its allied concepts will now be more thoroughly examined.

Henry George, in his classic *Progress and Poverty*,²¹ stated that private property in land was the cause of maldistribution of wealth and the resulting poverty and misery. "Historically, as ethically," he asserted, "private property in land is robbery."²²

Ingalls accused George of inability to see that "landlordism" was no longer the main oppressor of labor but only a tool of "capitalism." George was especially criticized for adhering to Ricardo's law of rent, which was declared to be but a "buttress of the Malthusian theory" of overpopulation.²³

In 1817 David Ricardo had defined rent as "that portion of the produce of the earth which is paid to the landlord for the use of the original and indestructible power of the soil."²⁴ George followed that definition when he wrote that rent "is the share in the wealth produced which the exclusive right to the use of natural capabilities gives to the owner."²⁵

"Nothing can raise rent," wrote Ricardo, giving the world its first glimpse of his famous theory, "but a demand for new land of an inferior quality. . . . It is this necessity of taking inferior land into cultivation which is the cause of the rise of rent."²⁶ Again, George, in paraphrasing what he called the "sometimes styled 'Ricardo's law of rent,'" declared "*The rent of land is determined by the excess of its produce over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use.*"²⁷

Was Ricardo's "law" a "buttress" of the Malthusian doctrine as the anarchists claimed? Ricardo himself gave due credit to Malthus, but did so for the latter's *theory of rent*, not for his theory of population. "Whatever cause may drive capital to inferior land," stated Ricardo, "must elevate rent on the superior land; the cause of rent being, as stated by Mr. Malthus . . . 'the comparative scarcity of the most fertile land.'"²⁸

The anarchists pointed to George's own comments to prove that he was a "Malthusian." George had written that the Malthusian doctrine received support "from the current elucidations of the theory of rent," and that the population theory of Malthus and the rent

promulgation of Ricardo were “made to harmonize and blend.”²⁹ George had also said that the increase of population tended to increase rent, and, at the same time, “to diminish the proportion of the produce which goes to capital and labor.”³⁰ When George further stated that “the most valuable lands on the globe, the lands which yield the highest rent, are not lands of surpassing natural fertility but lands to which a surpassing utility has been given by the increase of population,”³¹ he was again reproached for his “Malthusian” remark. Ingalls replied that it was not the increase of population that caused the margin to be pushed down, thus raising rent, but, on the contrary, it was the “artificial” creation of rent that pushed labor to the marginal lands.³² This artificiality of rent, Ingalls complained, was created by the landlords’ arbitrary demands caused by “exclusive land ownership,” and *not* by some mathematical difference or some “mysterious power” that created value “independent of labor.” Rent as he defined it, was an “immoral tax,” paid as tribute to landlords, and was synonymous with interest, profit, usury, and tax. Landlords could draw “fabulous wages” without regard to any (nonexistent) economic law.³³

George’s statements that rent did “not arise spontaneously from land,” and was “due to nothing that the landowners have done,” being only “the price of monopoly,”³⁴ sparked off another controversy. The anarchists claimed that they were bewildered by George’s “dual” definitions of rent. Did he not say, they questioned, that rent was a “difference” or an “excess”? (That it was, they violently denied.) Did he not now say, they inquired, that rent was “the price of monopoly”? (That it was, they heartily accepted.) What *did* George mean?

The anarchists seemed unable to comprehend George’s view: that rent actually *was* a “difference,” but that monopoly of land placed this “difference” in monopolists’ hands.

Hanson defined rent as the “cause” of “profit,” which in turn was the “cause” of “interest.” All of these (rent, profit, interest) came into being because of the existence of state-enforced land monopoly. Like Ingalls, Hanson believed that rent was an “immoral tax.” If the protective power of the state were taken away, the landlords would not be able to enforce the collection of rent. The so-called law of rent was a myth.³⁵

Tucker's criticism of George's concept of rent seems ironic, since Tucker actually believed in a "dual" concept of rent. He claimed that there was such a thing as "economic rent," which would persist even under "Liberty" (his term for his proposed utopia of the future), but that such "economic rent" was different from "moneyed rent," his name for arbitrary exaction. Liberty, Tucker rapturously declared, would do away with moneyed rent and other iniquities; and, eventually, *all* rent (including economic rent) would become merely nominal because of genuine competition.³⁶

(An evaluation of the anarchists' views of rent will appear at the end of the discussions of "unearned increment" and "land value.")

A term equivalent to the concept *rent* bothered the anarchists even more. Hanson was annoyed by George's use of the term *unearned increment*, which Hanson attributed to John Stuart Mill. George, claimed Hanson, wanted the state to "become the landlord, and then tax the unearned increment and appropriate it as rent paid to the State."³⁷ Tucker, too, ridiculed George for his acceptance of the term.³⁸

What was meant by *unearned increment*?

John Stuart Mill spoke of it as an "increase in land values."³⁹ "There is," he declared, "a kind of income which constantly tends to increase, without any exertion or sacrifice on the part of the owners." It was this "increased income" or "unearned increment" that he proposed to tax because "it would merely be applying an accession of wealth, created by circumstances, to the benefit of society, instead of allowing it to become an unearned appendage to the riches of a particular class."⁴⁰

Arthur Nichols Young believes that although the idea of taxing the "unearned increment" was favorably discussed by Adam Smith, the earliest thorough consideration of the concept should be credited to James Mill, John Stuart's father.⁴¹ "This continual increase," the elder Mill had written, "arising from the circumstances of the community, and from nothing in which the landholders themselves have any peculiar share does seem a fund peculiarly fitted for the appropriation to the purposes of the State."⁴²

Henry George's definition of "unearned increment" was the same as that of the Mills: it was another name, he declared, for rent.⁴³ "Here

is a fund," George pointed out, "which the State may take while leaving to labor and capital their full reward."⁴⁴

Hanson, referring to George, inquired: "Has he not proven that the monopoly of land is the cause of rent? Why then, does he now assume that it is the unearned increment which is the cause of rent?"⁴⁵

(One may point out, in passing, that George never did say that unearned increment was the *cause* of rent. He stated, as was seen, that it *was* rent. The *cause* of rent, for George, was to be found in Ricardo's law.)

There *was* no such thing as "unearned increment," Hanson reiterated. Whatever "excess" there existed in the produce of one land over another, belonged, in a free society, to the producer on the superior land. "The produce of work is the natural recompense of work."⁴⁶

Yet it is interesting to note that a modern writer remarks that historically "landowners themselves accepted the charge of John Stuart Mill and Henry George that rent was an 'unearned increment.'"⁴⁷

Concurrently used with the concepts of *rent* and *unearned increment* was the term *land value*. George commented: "It is this capacity of yielding rent which gives value to land. Until its ownership will confer some advantage, land has no value." He repeated: "The value of land is at the beginning of society nothing, but as society develops by the increase of population and the advance of the arts, it becomes greater and greater. . . . The demand for land fixes its value."⁴⁸

The anarchists, after criticizing George for his "population" remark, responded. "Land value," declared Ingalls, was an "artificial capitalization of the land," not based on "values of utility or service," but on the power to monopolize land. Such value embraced the entire product of labor "minus the necessary amount required to keep the stock of labor supplied."⁴⁹ (Shades of Marx's surplus-value theory! Compare that remark with a similar one by Tucker.⁵⁰) It was labor, emphasized Ingalls, that gave value to land, not some imaginary law of rent.⁵¹

Criticizing George somewhat differently (especially for his single-tax proposal), Hanson emphatically denied the concept of land value altogether. Land was free and had "no value in economics, any more than man has. Land values are purely arbitrary. . . . How then are land

values ordained of God for taxation?" They were "flagrant violations of God's natural laws."⁵²

In attempting to elucidate the meaning of land value (while justifying the single tax), George declared that a tax on land values was "the taking by the community of that value which is the creation of the community,"⁵³ causing Hanson to answer: "As well think of selling lightning by the *obm*; or air by the cubic foot; or light by the square yard. Because there is a demand for these things have they 'a value which is created by the community as a whole?'"⁵⁴

(Hanson should have lived a century later. He would have been shocked by the "values" of air space and air time.)

It was already seen that Tucker recognized two different kinds of rent. Even though he protested that land had no value, he did concede that under "Liberty," some people would get "superior" and some "inferior" land. Thus there would be differences, and even "favoritism" in land distribution. However, said Tucker, "free" competition would tend to reduce the differences.⁵⁵ "Equality," he proclaimed, "if we can get it, but Liberty at any rate!"⁵⁶

Let me now try to summarize and evaluate the arguments dealing with the rent question.

The individualist anarchists attacked the concepts of rent, law of rent, unearned increment, and land value. Yet, even among themselves, they could not agree. There were contentions that only labor gave value to land; that land value was an artificial capitalization; that land value was basically surplus value; that land value was another name for economic rent; and, finally, that there was no such thing as land value altogether. Confusion reigned in anarchist ranks. Even more confusion prevailed when they attempted, without justifiable evidence, to "synonymize" rent with interest, profits, and tax.

However, they all agreed that rent was an arbitrary demand by monopolists, and not some eternal "differential."

The anarchists' rent philosophy appears naive and (if one may pardon the pun) valueless. Glance where one may, rent (land value) exists (and has existed, and will exist). Should this statement appear to be one that merely justifies the status quo, another example may suffice and possibly be more clarifying. The demand for today's oil, for instance, has given fabulous valuation to Arab lands. Once the

demand for oil is replaced by a demand for another commodity, the current land value of Saudi Arabia may plunge to nearly zero. It is communal demand and need that give rise to rents (land values). No amount of anarchist denials will disprove the apparent facts of economic history.

By claiming that the producers on superior lands (in a "free society") would be entitled to the "excess" produce as their "wages," the anarchists merely gave another name to the term *rent*. The "producers" would become "landlords." (The Ricardian law of rent would operate even in anarchist utopias.)

Concerning the anarchist's contention that George's advocacy of Ricardo's law of rent was an extension of Malthusianism, one can only repeat what George had often observed. In an unjust condition of land monopoly, population would be compelled to push the margin to zero. As George once stated: "The phenomena attributed to the pressure of population against subsistence would, under existing conditions, manifest themselves were population to remain stationary."⁵⁷

Ricardo's law of rent appears to be (at least to this writer) as valid as ever.

In any case, to the anarchists the main problem lay in the "strife" between "capital" and "labor." Even if land were freed from monopolistic control, insisted Tucker, it would be useless to the workers without capital.⁵⁸

It is to the discussion of capital and interest, therefore, that one must now turn.

On Capital and Interest

More than for any other economic utterance, George was excoriated by the anarchists for his definitions and stand on capital and interest. Since he recognized capital as a necessary factor of all but the most primitive production, and justified interest as a valid return to capital, he was bitterly attacked by his three critics.

To the anarchists capital was a parasite on the body economic. Accepting the socialist view, they both defined and condemned capital as a monopoly or as an inert substance that had no right to

be included in any economic partnership. Interest was identified with usury or rent, or merely charged off as robbery.

George had written that “land, labor, and capital” were the factors of production. He termed capital “wealth in course of exchange,” explaining that exchange was not only the passing from hand to hand but the fact of reproductive transmutation. He summarized his viewpoint by defining capital as “all wealth used to produce more wealth.” That part of the produce that represented the return for the use of capital he called “interest.”⁵⁹

The anarchists were angered. There were only *two* factors of production, Ingalls retorted, and capital was not one of them. Capitalists were usurers and enemies of labor; capitalists and landlords were one and the same. The ownership of capital was just as oppressive as that of land. In fact, it was the capitalists who foreclosed on small property holders.⁶⁰

One could answer the last criticism immediately by stating that, in the economic sense, the foreclosers (mortgagees) were the true landlords and the “small property holders” (mortgagers) merely tenants.

Agreeing with Ingalls, Hanson claimed that without the “superintendence of labor,” capital was as powerless to produce as “stone.” Since capital was but inert matter (Hanson’s definition), it was labor alone that was the producer; therefore, it was labor alone that was entitled to the produce.⁶¹

Capitalism, added Tucker (identifying it with monopoly), abolished the free market, but labor was forced to depend on capital in order to survive.⁶²

The anarchists (using *capital*, *capitalist*, and *capitalism* interchangeably) called the capitalist an arch-villain, and denounced him. Their argument was circular.

A capitalist, according to Ingalls, was “one who becomes clothed with legal rights over the land, or over the man, which authorize him to take from the laborer or from the land the fruits of industry to the production of which he has not contributed.”⁶³ A capitalist, to Hanson, was an idler;⁶⁴ to Tucker, a usurer.⁶⁵

Being thus defined by the anarchists (sometimes with great inconsistency), the capitalist became a monopolist, a usurer, an idler, a parasite, a landlord, a robot, and a robber. Small wonder then, that,

according to George's three critics, the capitalist was entitled to nothing. Imagine their indignation, therefore, when George, propounding his "reproductive modes" theory of interest, not only justified interest as a legitimate return to capital, but gave it a "life" of its own.

George commenced his presentation by denying that interest was simply "the reward of abstinence." Abstinence in itself produces nothing. Also, if all wealth consisted of but "inert matter," and production were but the "working up" of "this inert matter into different shapes," then "interest would be but the robbery of industry." But all wealth is not inert. "It is true that if I put away money, it will not increase. But, suppose, instead, I put away wine. At the end of a year I will have an increased value, for the wine will have improved in quality." Now, this "increase," although it required "labor to utilize it," is "yet distinct and separable from labor—the active power of nature; the principle of growth, of reproduction, which everywhere characterizes all the forms of that mysterious thing or condition which we call life." "It is this," argued George, "which is the cause of interest, or the increase of capital over that due to labor." Speaking "meta-physically" (as he was accused of doing), George stressed that there were "certain vital currents" in "the everlasting flux of nature" that aided man "in turning matter into . . . wealth." Since wealth is interchangeable, "the power of increase which the reproductive or vital force of nature gives to some species of capital must average with all."⁶⁶

In another book George observed that "the principle that time is a necessary element in all production we must take into account from the very first."⁶⁷ "Time," writes Geiger in paraphrasing George's argument, "is also essential in production, for it makes possible taking advantage of the reproductive power of nature. As applied to capital it justifies interest."⁶⁸

George's theory of interest not only antagonized the anarchists but caused disagreement in the Georgist ranks. Some thought that his theory of interest was not so clear as his concept of rent. Others set forth their own theories. Still others felt that since capital was a valid factor of production, it was entitled to a return, and there was no

need for any intricate or elaborate explanation (except, possibly, that capital was stored-up labor).⁶⁹

As far as the anarchists were concerned, Ingalls questioned George's presentation of capital and on that account also his consequent theory of interest, and asked whether capital, in its nature, was competent to give increase, or "borrowed" such power from other means. The implication was that only nature—land—was capable of "increase," and therefore, since there was an increase (as in wine), the return was not interest but *rent* (and thus unjustified).⁷⁰ Ingalls devoted an entire chapter of his book to attack the "time" theory.⁷¹ He felt that labor should get any "increase" in capital production, since labor "initiated" the production process. Criticizing George's statement justifying interest because "the seed in the ground germinates and grows while the farmer sleeps or plows new fields,"⁷² Ingalls contended that "nature everywhere repudiates the crudity, born of capitalistic assumption, that anything can be obtained for nothing. Only at the expense of labor can this be realized."⁷³

Obviously agreeing with Ingalls, Hanson stated: "Idleness produces nothing, and is therefore entitled to nothing."⁷⁴ Tucker called an "idle man" a "parasite," and assailed the "proposition that the man who for time spent in idleness receives [justifiably] the product of time employed in labor."⁷⁵ "The services of time," he added, "are venal only when rendered through human forces; when rendered exclusively through the forces of nature, they are gratuitous."⁷⁶ Hanson concluded: "The theory of interest, promulgated by Henry George, . . . is thereby utterly overthrown."⁷⁷

The anarchists, in their turn, proceeded to define interest. Ingalls named it "a fraudulent claim of one party to an exchange, by which a charge is made for the 'flight of time' between the inception and the completion of an exchange."⁷⁸

Tucker called interest usurious, and labeled it "a deduction from the earnings of other men." Tucker also attacked George for the latter's "silly and forced distinction between interest considered as the increase of capital and interest considered as payment for the use of legal tender."⁷⁹

Tucker further criticized George for the latter's "failure" to see that

capitalists controlled currency, thus “causing” high interest to exist. His utopia of the future would feature “free money” and “free competition in currency,” thereby ensuring “both low interest and high wages.”⁸⁰ To George, on the other hand, the solution of economic problems through regulation of money was only a superficial means toward the solution of the ills of society. Admitting that money was “conveniently important,” he warned that it was easy to “overestimate that importance and to forget that men lived and advanced before money was developed.” In any case, true interest was not derived from any monetary manipulation, and capital was not to be confused with money.⁸¹

Hanson contended that rent, profit, and interest were all “caused” by land monopoly, and would vanish once it were removed.⁸² He concluded: “But as no moral reason can possibly be adduced why interest should be paid, it logically follows that interest is *robbery*.”⁸³

As if in anticipation, George had already explained: “The belief that interest is the robbery of industry is . . . in large part due to a failure to discriminate between what is really capital and what is not, and between profits which are properly interest and profits which arise from other sources than the use of capital.” He devoted almost three pages to demonstrate that the term *profit* had no meaning in economics, and was used interchangeably and confusedly with interest, wages of superintendence, and insurance.⁸⁴

Before a summary and critique of the capital-interest controversy are attempted, the reader must be made aware of one more topic (related both to the rent and the interest problems) that agitated the anarchists. They criticized George for his “equilibrium” presentation: namely, that interest and wages were naturally “related”; that both represented “equal returns to equal exertions”; that both varied directly with each other and inversely with rent; that both rose as rent fell; and that both fell as rent rose.⁸⁵

Ingalls, especially, reproached George for the latter’s “inability” to see that interest and wages varied inversely.⁸⁶

Commenting on the fact that George’s equilibrium theory, when tied to the Ricardo theory of rent, “caused bitter criticism” in economic circles, a prominent Georgist wrote that “much of this criticism has slighted the significance . . . of George’s synthesis of the laws of

distribution,” noting that the “synthesis” prompted John Bates Clark (as the latter readily admitted) to develop his influential views on diminishing returns and marginal productivity.⁸⁷

To me, George’s equilibrium observations appear quite valid. In hard times wages and interest fall, men lose their jobs, and businesses fail. In good times both interest and wages rise. In the long run rent always rises.

Capital and labor ride up and down the same elevator, kicking each other in the shins. The question is: *Should* they?

Invisibly behind the apparent contestants stands the land monopolist, controlling the elevator ride.

The basic reason for the controversy between George and the anarchists is the failure to agree on definitions. Since capital, according to the anarchists included all forms of oppression, it was almost an impossible task for George to make the anarchists really *understand* that the source of social inequity lay in land monopoly—even though Hanson, as we have seen, had said it did.

To George, nothing could have been more simple than the theory, which he set forth with great clarity, that both capital and labor (partners in production) were victimized by the inability to utilize land for production without payment of a premium. This was owing not so much to the fact that landowners controlled land privately (George was basically an individualist who strove for each person’s right to control his share of the universe) as to the fact that land monopoly *prohibited* labor *and* capital from using natural resources to produce goods and services.

The word *capitalist* has so deeply seeped into the unconscious layer of public awareness that most people today probably think of the capitalist as a sinister being of incalculable wealth whose power over human destiny is autocratic and well-nigh infinite.

On the other hand, nothing supports George’s justification of capital and interest more than the obvious operations of lending and borrowing. Who would lend to a stranger any part of one’s wealth, or who would borrow, knowing that he would have to repay the loan with interest, unless the two parties were aware that a benefit would accrue to *both* from the transaction? From where would interest come? Is there not an “increase” somewhere? Interest is not a subtraction,

as Tucker claimed; it is an addition. The anarchists were poor mathematicians.

Harry Gunnison Brown once stated (and I very much agree): "There is no intention, here, of expressing the slightest sympathy with the socialist notion that interest on capital . . . is an unearned income or the gain of exploitation. . . . The person who works and saves and who thus is instrumental in bringing capital into existence, does more to increase the output of industry than does the person who works with equal efficiency but does not save. If, doing more for production, he receives a larger part of what production yields, this does not rob anyone else. The socialist view that interest is an illegitimate income cannot be endorsed."⁸⁸

On Copyrights and Patents

Another topic that occupied the attention of George and the anarchists pertained to copyrights and patents. Originally, George argued that the "temporary monopolies created by the patent and copyright law," since they were "recognitions of the right of labor to its intangible productions," would be "unjust and unwise to tax." They were "necessary" monopolies, and should be left alone.⁸⁹

Ingalls attacked such "exclusive right in invention,"⁹⁰ and Hanson claimed that patents and copyrights contravened "the Law of Nature which has ordained that the utility of all products . . . shall be had without price." Invention could be measured only by work. Patents and copyrights were "robbery."⁹¹

In 1888 George, acknowledging that he had made a partial mistake, now felt that a patent was "in defiance" of man's "natural right." "Discovery," he wrote, "can give no right of ownership, for whatever is discovered must have been already here to be discovered."⁹² A copyright, on the other hand, was a right "to the labor expended in the thing itself," and was "morally" right.⁹³

Tucker sardonically attacked this distinction, contending that neither copyrights nor patents should exist. "The same argument that demolishes the right of the inventor," Tucker emphasized, "demolishes the right of the author."⁹⁴

As usual, the controversy that had begun a century ago still con-

tinues. The argument rages in Georgist ranks as well. As editor of a magazine, I have specifically forsworn the principle of copyright in the masthead of the publication. To each his own!

On George's "Remedy"

The most important "debate" revolved around George's proposed "sovereign remedy." The anarchists were horrified when they read his words: "To extirpate poverty, to make wages what justice commands they should be . . . *we must make land common property.*"⁹⁵ George proposed to accomplish this "remedy" by utilizing the method of the "single tax." There are indications that he was not too pleased with the name,⁹⁶ but he himself had written that "the advantages which would be gained by substituting for the numerous taxes by which the public revenues are now raised, a single tax levied upon the value of the land, will appear more and more important the more they are considered."⁹⁷

Ingalls was indignant. To him George's remedy smacked of state socialism. It was merely another "land nationalization" scheme, "minus the fixity of tenure, and limitation by 'occupying ownership.'" The single tax to him was just a tax: a supertax. "The power to enforce taxation is the power to take the earnings of labor and make such return as it pleases, or none at all." Furthermore, he claimed, the single tax would not work.⁹⁸

To Hanson the single-tax idea was abhorrent. "If an individual can not have property in land," he questioned, "how can the community or the State?" Since there was no land value, "Mr. George's grand panacea," the single tax, would fall on the poor: "on my neighbor's potatoes." And since there was no "unearned increment," he concluded (somewhat contradictorily), "the State will have nothing to appropriate."⁹⁹

George's plan would bring land nationalization, Tucker exclaimed, that would cause "a concentration and hundred-fold multiplication of the landlord's power."¹⁰⁰ To Tucker the municipality to which people had to pay "tribute" was "not a bit more defensible than the State itself,—in fact, is nothing but a small State."¹⁰¹

Tucker, seeing in the single tax nothing but "robbery," characterized

the single taxers as future "inquisitors." He preferred, he said, "if I must be robbed . . . to be robbed by the landowner, who is likely to spend it in some useful way, rather than by an institution called government, which will probably spend it for fireworks or something else which I equally disapprove."¹⁰²

The anarchists never understood George's plan. The abolition of all taxes on production and exchange, he held, would result in a tremendous spurt of economic activity. The placing of the one tax on land values would likewise result in an economic upsurge. It would do away with land withholding and speculation. Thus production would be aided in two different ways.

George did not favor the *nationalization of land* as his proposed remedy. His leaning was toward individualism. "In form," he declared, speaking of his plan, "the ownership of land would remain just as now."¹⁰³

"It must be stated at this point, clearly and emphatically," writes Geiger, "that George's 'common property' in land did not mean common ownership in land. That is to say, George was in no sense a land nationalist and did not suggest . . . that land was to be owned by the State, or that it should be held in joint ownership by the citizens. . . . All such concepts were distinctly repudiated by him."¹⁰⁴

In a later book George made his meaning quite clear: "To make a redivision every year, or to treat land as a common, where no one could claim the exclusive use of any particular piece, would be practicable only where men lived in movable tents and made no permanent improvements, and would effectually prevent any advance beyond such a state. No one would sow a crop, or build a house . . . so long as any one else could come in and turn him out of the land in which or on which such improvements must be fixed. Thus it is absolutely necessary to the proper use and improvement of land that society should secure to the user and improver safe possession."¹⁰⁵

In actuality George regarded the state with the same suspicion as did the anarchists. "The more complex and extravagant government becomes," he wrote, "the more it gets to be a power distinct from and independent of the people."¹⁰⁶

His "remedy" did not imply government aggrandizement. It was merely a method to open up land and opportunities for all. George

was attacked because his critics did not understand him. "I myself am classed as a socialist by those who denounce socialism, while those who profess themselves socialists declare me not to be one."¹⁰⁷

His own mind was crystal clear.

On the Incidence of a Land-Value Tax

To the individualist anarchists, the most unanswerable criticism of the single tax was that the tax would simply be shifted to the backs of the poor.

"The successful capitalist would then, as now," asserted Ingalls, "be able to shift the tax to shoulders of toil, plus the profits upon the capital necessary to meet his dues to the government."¹⁰⁸

"The merchant, tradesman, or manufacturer," declared Hanson, "who is obliged to pay rent for the use of land, will necessarily put the rent, or distribute it in the price of merchandise he sells."¹⁰⁹

"When I reflect that under a Single-Tax system," mused Tucker, "the occupants of superior land are likely to become the politicians and to tax back from the people . . . what the people have taxed out of them as economic rent . . . I prefer to leave it in the pocket of the landowner."¹¹⁰

"A tax on rent," John Stuart Mill had once written, "falls wholly on the landlord. There are no means by which he can shift the burden upon any one else. It does not affect the value or price of agricultural produce."¹¹¹ Or, one might add, of other commodities.

The anarchists paid no heed to Mill's utterance. Their persistent complaints caused George to write an editorial, subsequently reprinted as a booklet. After cautioning the reader not to confuse a tax on land with a tax on land values (or rent), George added that it "was conceded by all economists of reputation" that the tax on rent could not be shifted. "Rent," he pointed out, "is the highest price that anyone will give. . . . Now, if a tax be levied on that rent or value, this in no wise adds . . . to the ability of the owner to demand more. To suppose . . . that such a tax could be thrown by landowners upon tenants is to suppose that the owners of land do not now get for the land all it will bring; is to suppose that, whenever they want to, they can up the prices as they please. This is . . . absurd."¹¹²

Even more than when George wrote, the nonshiftability of a tax on land values is regarded by professional economists as virtually beyond dispute.¹¹³ To George's critics, however, he indulged in "sophistry." To them, the most important "remedy" was "occupancy and use." That will be the next topic of discussion.

On "Occupancy and Use"

The only way to establish justice, Ingalls claimed, was to abolish land ownership, repeal all laws that protect it, encourage true education, and distribute land according to the principle of "occupancy and use." As much land as was necessary for each person, that is how much land each person would get. How would this be accomplished? He explained: "I find nature . . . gives or parts with no thing. . . . Her invariable price for its use is the labor necessary to avail oneself of its benefits. She [neither] exacts nor permits rent, interest, or taxation, but repudiates them wholly. . . ." ¹¹⁴

"Nature," as thus personified and deified, was a creation of Ingalls. There would be no state to supervise any division or occupancy. Education would accomplish this, just as education brings about cooperation necessary to build bridges. Ingalls attacked George and his followers because they were "ignorant" of "the law of use" and, instead, relied upon the mandatory appropriation of land values by society through government. Like George, Ingalls believed in natural rights but he repudiated the use of organized physical force in their protection.

Similar to Ingalls's approach to "occupancy and use" was that of Hanson. He felt that the state would "wither away" once true education prevailed. "Ignorance is the bane of mankind. And the rich are as ignorant as the poor in their relation to these vital questions." His plan envisioned a utopia where rents and interest would tumble to zero; land would be chosen by lots; and the state would have nothing to tax, especially since there would be no state and no tax. "There should be a voluntary relinquishment for the public weal of land monopolized for speculative ends. . . . This should be done as a social and religious duty, just as one should voluntarily refrain from highway robbery, stealing, perjury or murder. Landlords should also voluntar-

ily cease taking unrighteous rent." "Occupancy and use" would not guarantee equality, but inequality of production would teach thrift, management, and better production.¹¹⁵ Hanson, like George and Ingalls, believed in natural law and natural rights.

Both Ingalls and Hanson might be labeled "visionaries," since both believed in accomplishment through education only. There could be no solution, they claimed, until the mind first grasped the necessary idea. Yet they did not fully understand George's ideas; and he, in turn, could not argue with people so trustingly childlike in their faith in human nature.

A more cynical approach was taken by Tucker, who summarily pronounced: "All economic reforms, including the Single Tax, are a delusion and a snare."¹¹⁶

Most of the individualist anarchists, including Ingalls, Hanson, and Tucker, followed the "occupancy and use" formula of Josiah Warren, which was in turn based on the views of the New York land reformer of the 1820s, George Henry Evans.¹¹⁷ The anarchists' vagueness in attempting to define *occupancy and use* was best exemplified in the correspondence between Tucker and Stephen Byington (who subsequently became a "disciple" of Tucker's). Byington wanted to know what would happen to occupiers of land or buildings when they would be away from their premises for a period of time. Tucker, reducing his answer to an absurdity, replied that the very last user and occupier would not only lose his land but his personal property as well.¹¹⁸

Trying to explain to Byington (in still another controversy) what *occupancy and use* meant, Tucker wrote: "Occupancy and use is the only title to the land in which we will protect you; if you attempt to use land which another is occupying and using, we will protect him against you; if another attempts to use land to which you lay claim, but which you are not occupying and using, we will not interfere with him; but of such land as you occupy and use you are the sole master, and we will not ourselves take from you, or allow any one else to take from you, whatever you may get out of such land."¹¹⁹

The "we" sounds ironic, coming as it does from an antistatist!

Concerning the single tax, Tucker may have deliberately distorted its meaning. This is what Henry George would say to a prospective

land occupier, Tucker told Byington: "You may hold all the land you have inherited or bought . . . and we will protect you in such holding; but, if you produce more from your land than your neighbors produce from theirs, we will take from you the excess of your product over theirs and distribute it among them . . . or we will make any use of it, wise or foolish, that may come into our heads."¹²⁰

Deliberate or not, it was not only a cruel distortion of George's meaning, but it turned an individualistic proposal to spur production into a socialistic deterrent!

In one more important respect did Tucker and George differ. Starting off as a believer in natural rights, Tucker subsequently embraced the egoistic philosophy of Max Stirner. This in turn led to utilitarianism and opportunism,¹²¹ as well as to pronouncements that smacked more of nihilism (such as a mother's right to throw her baby into a fire)¹²² than of libertarian individualism. The man who had once held that "the first of all equities is not equality of material well-being, but equality of Liberty"¹²³ later declared: "In times past . . . it was my habit to talk glibly of the right of man to land. It was a bad habit, and I long ago sloughed it off. . . . Man's only right over the land is his might over it."¹²⁴

Tucker's utterance about "rights" should be compared with the one made by George when he said: "There can be to the ownership of anything no rightful title which is not derived from the title of the producer and does not rest upon the natural right of the man to himself."¹²⁵

I cast my vote for Henry George.

Summary

The time has come to summarize the respective philosophies of George and his three critics. The following "table" may be helpful:

HENRY GEORGE

INDIVIDUALIST ANARCHISTS

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Capital, a specialized form of labor (“stored-up labor”), is one of the three factors of production. Only two of the three factors are entitled to shares in the produce: labor and capital.2. Interest is justified, as explained by the “reproductive modes” theory, but also by the concept of capital as “stored-up labor.”3. Private appropriation of land is the great iniquity. Land monopolists prey on labor and capital.4. Rent is payment made to landowners because of the relative value of monopolized land. However, even under the “sovereign remedy,” rent will continue to exist, but will be paid to the community as a premium for the privilege of exclusive possession.5. Under the “sovereign remedy,” land will become common property (but not socialized).6. Private property in land will assume a different form. Rent (except for a small “brokerage fee”) will be paid to the community. | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Capital is a parasite feeding on the produce of labor on land. Only one of the two factors of production is entitled to a share in the produce: labor.2. Interest is never justified. It is robbery.3. Capitalism is the great evil preying on labor. Landlordism is but a species of capitalism.4. Rent, as payment to any landlord, private or public, is always robbery. In a free commonwealth, according to Ingalls and Hanson, all rent will be abolished. According to Tucker, only “economic” rent will remain.5. Under “Liberty,” land will become private property (but not monopolistic property).6. Private property in land will exist and be practiced, within the limits prescribed by the “occupancy and use” formula. |
|--|--|

HENRY GEORGE

INDIVIDUALIST ANARCHISTS

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>7. Government will be utilized as the arm of the community for the purpose of some services and the collection of rent. Monopoly landlordism will be abolished.</p> <p>8. Patents, as long-range monopolies, will be ended. Copyrights will remain.</p> <p>9. Private enterprise will exist, with labor and capital free to pursue their own aims because land will become more readily available to those who wish to use it. There will be no equality, in the socialistic sense, only liberty.</p> | <p>7. The state will be abolished and so will capitalism and landlordism. Community and society, as used by Henry George, are vague and ambiguous terms.</p> <p>8. Both patents and copyrights will be abolished.</p> <p>9. Free land will exist, with labor free to pursue its own aims. An attempt will be made toward equality. Liberty, however, will be the prime goal.</p> |
|--|--|
-

Notes

1. George Woodcock, *Anarchism: A History of Libertarian Ideas and Movements* (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1962), p. 453.

2. Joshua K. Ingalls, *Social Wealth: The Sole Factors and Exact Ratios in Its Acquirement and Apportionment* (New York: Social Science Publishing Co., 1885).

3. For a summary of his life and ideas, see (besides *Social Wealth*) Joshua K. Ingalls, *Reminiscences of an Octogenarian in the Fields of Industrial and Social Reform* (New York: M. L. Holbrook, 1897). See also James J. Martin, *Men Against the State: The Expositors of Individualist Anarchism in America, 1827-1908* (DeKalb, Ill., 1953), pp. 142-52. For a comment that labeled Ingalls a "disciple" of Josiah Warren, see Corinne Jacker, *The Black Flag of Anarchy: Antistatistism in the United States* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968), p. 63.

4. The complete reference title is: William Hanson, *The Fallacies in "Progress and Poverty," in Henry Dunning Macleod's Economics, and "Social*

Problems,” with the *Ethics of Protection and Free Trade and The Industrial Problem Considered a-Priori* (New York: Fowler and Wells Co., 1884).

5. For scattered comments about him, see Martin, *Men Against the State*, pp. 225, 267, and 286. On p. 246 Martin called Hanson “next to Ingalls the most competent of anarchist critics of Henry George.”

6. Jacker, *Black Flag of Anarchy*, p. 120; Charles A. Madison, *Critics & Crusaders: A Century of American Protest* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947), pp. 194–95.

7. Johanna Johnston, *Mrs. Satan: The Incredible Saga of Victoria C. Woodhull* (New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1967) various pages; Jacker, *Black Flag of Anarchy*, pp. 121–22; Madison, *Critics & Crusaders*, p. 195; Martin, *Men Against the State*, p. 223.

8. Benjamin R. Tucker, *Instead of a Book By a Man Too Busy to Write One* (1897; reprint ed. New York: Gordon Press, 1972).

9. Benjamin R. Tucker, *Individual Liberty* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1926). (It was edited by “C. L. S.”—Clarence Lee Swartz.)

10. Atindranath Bose, *A History of Anarchism* (Calcutta: The World Press Private Ltd., 1967), p. 380.

11. Madison, *Critics & Crusaders*, p. 204.

12. Eunice M. Schuster, *Native American Anarchism*, quoted in Madison, pp. 197–98.

13. Madison, *Critics & Crusaders*, pp. 211–12.

14. Benjamin R. Tucker, *Henry George, Traitor* (New York: Benjamin R. Tucker, writer and publisher, 1896).

15. *Ibid.*, pp. 1–16; see also Madison, *Critics & Crusaders*, p. 209; Martin, *Men Against the State*, p. 221; Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), pp. 503–06; Henry David, *The History of the Haymarket Affair* (1936; reprint ed., New York: Russell & Russell, 1958), pp. 400–03; Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (1900; reprint ed., New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1960), p. 498 n., and pp. 501–02 n.

16. Bose, *History of Anarchism*, p. 382; Jacker, *Black Flag of Anarchy*, p. 124; Martin, *Men Against the State*, p. 212.

17. Bose, *History of Anarchism*, pp. 383, 387, 382.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 388–89.

19. Madison, *Critics & Crusaders*, p. 205; Martin, *Men Against the State*, p. 220.

20. Bose, *History of Anarchism*, p. 389. For a thorough discussion of the biography and thought of Tucker, the reader is directed, in addition to his three texts here mentioned, to *idem*, pp. 378–90; Madison, *Critics & Crusaders*, pp. 194–213; Martin, *Men Against the State*, pp. 202–73; Jacker, *Black Flag of Anarchy*, pp. 117–27; Woodcock, *Anarchism*, pp. 459–60; Johnston, *Mrs. Satan*, pp. 185, 207–16, 265, 269–70; Carl Watner, “Benjamin Tucker and His Periodical, *Liberty*,” *Journal of Libertarian Studies* (Fall 1977), pp. 307–18.

21. Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, 75th anniversary ed. (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1954).
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 336–46, 328, 370.
23. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 31, 68.
24. David Ricardo, *The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (London; 1817), chap. 2.
25. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 166.
26. Ricardo, *Principles*, chap. 32.
27. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 168; italics original.
28. Ricardo, *Principles*, chap. 32.
29. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 230–31.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 234, 243.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 242.
32. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, p. 69.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 68–69, 316, 71. For further criticisms of George's views of rent, see Ingalls's *Reminiscences*. He devoted the entire chapter 12, written in dialogue form, to "expose" George's rent concept.
34. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 421, 167.
35. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 76, 77, 92, 97, 99, 100, 36.
36. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, pp. 343–48; Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 190–91.
37. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 88.
38. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 238–39.
39. George Raymond Geiger, *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p. 203; Edmund Whittaker, *A History of Economic Ideas* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1940), p. 231.
40. John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy, with Some of Their Applications to Social Philosophy* (London, 1848), bk. 5, chap. 2, sec. 5.
41. Arthur Nichols Young, *The Single Tax Movement in the United States* (Princeton University Press, 1916), p. 22.
42. James Mill, *Elements of Political Economy* (London: 1826), chap. 4, sec. 5.
43. Henry George, *The Science of Political Economy* (1897; reprint ed., New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1968), pp. 150–51.
44. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 436.
45. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 88–89.
46. *Ibid.*
47. Spencer H. MacCallum, *The Art of Community* (Menlo Park, Calif: Institute for Humane Studies, 1970), p. 100.
48. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 166, 406, 437.
49. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 253, 282.
50. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 87–88.
51. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 73–75.

52. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 108–10, 99.
53. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 421, 365.
54. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 110.
55. For a prolonged discussion of the subject, see Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, pp. 343–48; idem, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 181, 191, 197, 217, 239; Martin, *Men Against the State*, pp. 220–21.
56. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, p. 217.
57. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 231.
58. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 197, 239.
59. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 48, 162.
60. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 191, 105, 172, 165, 57, 285.
61. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 79–80.
62. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, p. 202.
63. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 313, 14.
64. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 166.
65. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, p. 275.
66. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 176, 180–82.
67. George, *Science of Political Economy*, p. 370.
68. Geiger, *Philosophy of Henry George*, p. 116, n. 44.
69. For a thorough discussion of the theory of interest among Georgists, see *ibid.*, pp. 114–19; Gaston Haxo, *The Philosophy of Freedom* (New York: Land and Freedom, 1941), p. 63 n.; Max Hirsch, *Democracy Versus Socialism*, 4th ed. (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1966), p. 143; Harry Gunnison Brown, *The Economic Basis of Tax Reform* (Columbia, Mo.: Lucas Brothers, 1932), pp. 103–04.
70. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, p. 168.
71. *Ibid.*, chap. 5.
72. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 184.
73. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 66–67.
74. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 165.
75. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, pp. 208, 202.
76. *Ibid.*, p. 204.
77. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 166.
78. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, p. 315.
79. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, pp. 202, 208.
80. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 190–91.
81. George, *Science of Political Economy*, pp. 505–06.
82. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 75–77.
83. *Ibid.*, p. 79; italics original.
84. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 156–58.
85. *Ibid.*, pp. 199, 203.
86. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 191, 61.
87. Geiger, *Philosophy of Henry George*, pp. 118–19.

88. Brown, *Economic Basis of Tax Reform*, pp. 103–04.
89. George, *Progress and Poverty*, pp. 410–11.
90. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, p. 85.
91. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 163.
92. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 411 n.
93. George, Jr., *Life of Henry George*, p. 593 n.
94. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 287–88.
95. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 328; italics original.
96. George, Jr., *Life of Henry George*, p. 496 n.; Young, *Single Tax Movement*, pp. 109–11; Geiger, *Philosophy of Henry George*, pp. 43–44 n.; and Barker, *Henry George*, pp. 519–20.
97. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 433.
98. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 258, 261–64, 281–83.
99. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 86, 90, 95.
100. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, p. 300.
101. *Ibid.*, p. 306; *idem*, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 185–86.
102. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, pp. 232, 238, 188–89.
103. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 406.
104. Geiger, *Philosophy of Henry George*, p. 130.
105. Henry George, *Protection or Free Trade* (1886; reprint ed., New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1962), p. 279.
106. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 303.
107. George, *Protection or Free Trade*, pp. 302–03 n.
108. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, p. 282.
109. Hanson, *Fallacies*, p. 75.
110. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, p. 189.
111. J. S. Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*, bk. 5, chap. 3, sec. 2.
112. Henry George, *Why the Landowner Cannot Shift the Tax on Land Values* (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, n.d.).
113. See Brown, *Economic Basis of Tax Reform*, pp. 57–60, 155–56; Whittaker, *History of Economic Ideas*, pp. 236–37; Geiger, *Philosophy of Henry George*, p. 154.
114. Ingalls, *Social Wealth*, pp. 287, 186, 261.
115. Hanson, *Fallacies*, pp. 92, 141–42, 93–94, 110–11, 138.
116. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, p. 221.
117. Martin, *Men Against the State*, pp. 27, 142.
118. Watner, “Benjamin Tucker and His Periodical,” p. 315.
119. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, p. 351.
120. *Ibid.*
121. Martin, *Men Against the State*, pp. 237–50.
122. Watner, “Benjamin Tucker and His Periodical,” p. 312.
123. Tucker, *Individual Liberty*, p. 207.
124. Tucker, *Instead of a Book*, p. 350.
125. George, *Progress and Poverty*, p. 335.