

Vol 18, No 3 (Aug. 1956)

1956]

[Vol. 18

THE JOURNAL OF POLITICS

594
~~modern mass party." As a teacher, he exercised to a remarkable extent the influence he hoped for but never achieved in politics. Here he was well served by the emotional involvement, the verbal facility, and the extraordinary (though occasionally lax) memory which often led him too rapidly over serious problems in his theoretical writings. Professor Deane also attributes Laske's success with students to the appeal which Marxism had for a generation in which the triumph of logical positivism had left no other systematic political theory to deal with the human problems that concerned them.~~

~~This is a carefully written study of the writings of a political thinker who was not careful. The impression it leaves is one of devastation without malice. Laske's influence lives on in those who knew the stimulation of his presence. For those who must approach him through the printed page, the stimulation must remain partial and contradictory.~~

JAMES F. DAVIDSON

The University of Tennessee

Henry George. By CHARLES ALBERTO BARKER. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. Pp. xvii, 696. \$9.50.)

A few years ago this reviewer was in a meeting that was addressed by a Georgist. Finally, a farmer in the audience rose and asked whether his taxes would be raised or lowered by the application of a Henry George system of land taxation. After ten or fifteen minutes of cascading rhetoric, and with much flashing of the eyes, the speaker sat down. But he had not told the farmer who asked the question what would happen to his taxes. I suspect there were few converts to Henry George's philosophy that day. Yet it is well to remind ourselves that Henry George was faced with the same question and apparently did not give a more effective answer.

One may well forgive Professor Barker some affection for George. A biographer who has devoted as much energy to the creation of such a study as Barker has deserves the privilege of

love for his subject. However, the volume at hand is not a detailed biography. But it is an outstanding study of George as an economist, a leader in reform movements, and a campaigner for public office. The author makes significant clarifications in the complicated history of the Georgist movement, especially of the rather late general use of "single tax" to describe the program. In another sense, this work is a clinical study of American reformism from the time of *Progress and Poverty* to Woodrow Wilson. It should be noted, however, that the book includes the evidence that one who dislikes Georgism may use to strengthen his own position.

In many ways Henry George was not a likeable individual. Both he and some of his later followers, like Father Edward McGlynn, seem to me men without humility. Barker speaks at the end of the volume of "The Martyrdom of Henry George," but in technical sense he was hardly a martyr. One cannot go out and force down upon his own head the crown of martyrdom; Henry George courted death by his second campaign for mayor of New York, and he clearly expected to die, as he did, as a result of it. The early Christians, it may be recalled, had to legislate against the martyrdom of those who went out of their way to get condemned to death. George drifted from job to job, and Father McGlynn, for example, was a restless, and politically ambitious, priest. George attacked the principle of private property in land, and he was pained that neither socialists nor conservatives were happy about his program for reform. George and his friends finally faced the issue that most reformers face: what shall be done when the masses will not accept the proposed panacea?

Whatever one may think of Henry George, Barker has written a distinguished book, and it is one that will endure in the literature of Georgism, of reform, and in the interpretation of economic problems during the latter part of the last century. Moreover, students of Irish and English developments can use it with profit in the understanding of the rise of the labor and land movements in those countries. It is a study that shows how Georgism was turned back as it awakened the defenders of religion, state, and law. The passion of its idealism, dreary with strange blueprints, brought the conservative to life. For Georgists, crumbs are not sufficient, and it hardly justifies Georgism to note a few scattered modifications that might have come about under another

advocacy. Of such, Georgist messianic promises were not made. Georgism must be listed in a long series of proposed panaceas in the Western world. Georgism is ours, and we have exported it to other nations.

The author argues toward the end of his study that there were at George's death three kinds of Georgism: the fiscal-reform Georgism of the single tax; the political Georgism that entered into many types of reform; and the moral and intellectual Georgism, of which Tolstoy and Hamlin Garland were spokesmen (p. 621). And Henry George had fought for three main types of economic reform: free trade; municipally-owned and free utilities; and land-value taxation, however limited it might be in specific instances (p. 625). It was during the first administration of Woodrow Wilson that the Georgists in numbers came to be influential on national government affairs. While the single-tax as the summation of economic reform came late in George's career, it is the attack on the customary rights of land ownership that it is most characteristically Georgian. It was the denial of the right of the family to own property for its support that aroused the leaders of Catholic thought; it was this same attack that made the socialists feel often that they had little in common with George, since the attack on landed property was only part of the story of reform; and it was this attack that made the owners of property nervous and uncertain over what Georgist bureaucrats might do if they got into power.

Yet economists will admit that the influence of Georgism has been significant. Today we tax all surpluses, an economist told this reviewer, whether from land, capital, labor or from any source whatever. However, it might be said that there are many other reasons for the encroachment of the state on the economic surpluses of society; war, and the needs of the military economy are clearly in point. Henry George was ambivalent on whether one should confiscate land, or whether there should be simply a tax on unearned rent. It is this ambivalence that hurt immensely the Georgist crusade. It is for this reason that Georgism has fallen between different views; and it has generally tended in practical detail to run with the capitalist fox and hunt with the socialist hounds.

There are some aspects of the book where it seems Barker has let his present-day views get the better of his usual and highly-sustained objectivity. There are a number of references to "red

scars" and "red baiters" which readily imply there should be no searching out of Communists in contemporary society (e.g., p. 257). George's theory of retrogression and his prophecy of the decline of American society needs more candid treatment than is given in the volume; Barker's evaluation of George's critics is often lop-sided, as, for example, his inadequate treatment of Mallock (pp. 386-387), and his charge that T. H. Huxley was anti-democratic, even in spite of his criticism of "administrative nihilism" (p. 561); and others than Barker have seen in Colonel House's *Philip Dru, Administrator*, not a diluted Georgism, but a prophecy of Fascism. Barker, likewise, bemoans the fact that George approved the hanging of the Chicago anarchists, though he did read the records in so far as they were available to him (pp. 503 ff.). Father McGlynn is made a hero because he rebelled against his superiors; but it seems clear that Barker has not understood fully Catholic social theory, for it approved then and does now the existence of private property, though objection to a "single tax" might be slight, indeed. Modern social Christianity, Catholic or Protestant, is surely not Georgist, but it recognizes the issue of poverty amid plenty, just as fully as did Henry George. Whatever one may say, it seems to this reviewer that the modern revolution is not Georgian, although Barker would give George much credit. Is not the modern revolution Marxian at the core?

FRANCIS G. WILSON

The University of Illinois

A Half Century of International Problems: A Lawyer's Views. By FREDERIC R. COUNDERT, edited by ALLAN NEVINS, with an introduction by PHILIP C. JESSUP. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954. Pp. xiii, 352, \$4.00.)

The title of this book is unfortunately misleading. It suggests to the ordinary reader a systematic analysis of outstanding world problems in the present century. It is nothing of the sort, but rather a collection of occasional papers, addresses, and letters on matters in which any public-spirited citizen, and particularly a