



WORKING
PAPERS

LINCOLN
INSTITUTE
OF LAND
POLICY

9451



**A Capitalist Theology of Liberation:
The Prophetic Message of Henry George
and John C. Lincoln**

Robert V. Andelson

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy © 1993

FOUNDER'S DAY ADDRESS

19 JULY 1993

LINCOLN INSTITUTE OF LAND POLICY

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

by

Dr. Robert V. Andelson
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy
Auburn University
and
Distinguished Research Fellow
American Institute for Economic Research

Founder's Day at the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

Each year, the Lincoln Institute convenes its staff and invited guests on the lawn of Lincoln House for a special program in the Lincoln Lecture Series that commemorates the birth of John Cromwell Lincoln on July 17, 1866. A Cleveland industrialist who founded the Lincoln Foundation in 1947, Mr. Lincoln drew inspiration from the ideas of Henry George, the nineteenth-century American political economist and social philosopher.

In his 1993 Founder's Day address, Robert V. Andelson begins with the premise that the focus of liberation theology has shifted to place increasing emphasis upon liberation from exploitation, liberation from monopoly, liberation from entrenched privilege, and liberation from institutions and structures that stifle and oppress and keep people from worshipping God by leading full, free, authentic human lives. Dr. Andelson traces the contributions of Henry George to our thinking about liberation and capitalism, and the extensions of those ideas in John C. Lincoln's writings. In order to make this address widely available, the Institute is pleased to distribute it through its working paper series.

About the Speaker

Robert V. Andelson is professor emeritus of philosophy at Auburn University. He received an A.B. equivalent in humanities from the University of Chicago, and an A.M. and Ph.D. in religion and social philosophy from the University of Southern California. He is the author of *Imputed Rights: An Essay in Christian Social Theory*, editor and coauthor of *Critics of Henry George: A Centenary Appraisal of Their Strictures on Progress and Poverty*, editor and coauthor of *Commons without Tragedy: Protecting the Environment From Overpopulation—A New Approach*; and joint author of *From Waste Land To Promised Land: Liberation Theology for a Post-Marxist World*.

About the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy is a nonprofit and tax-exempt educational institution established in 1974. Its mission as a school is to study and teach land policy, including land economics and land taxation. The Institute is supported by the Lincoln Foundation.

Integrating the theory and practice of land policy—and understanding forces that influence it—are the major goals of the Lincoln Institute. The Institute seeks to understand choices for land use and development, related regulatory and tax policies, their effects on the environment and natural resources, and systems of governance by which land and tax policies are implemented.

Through its research, courses and conferences, and publications, the Institute seeks to advance and disseminate knowledge of critical land policy issues. The Institute's objective is to have an impact on land policy—to make a difference today and to help policymakers plan for tomorrow.

For copies of the Lincoln Institute's current research agenda, or of its course or publications catalogs, please contact the staff directly at:

**Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
113 Brattle Street
Cambridge, MA 02138-3400**

**telephone (617) 661-3016
fax (617) 661-7235**

I trust that you'll forgive me for beginning with a time-worn phrase that Saturday Night Live hosts have made even more trite than it was before: It's great to be here!

But I really mean it. There are the obvious reasons for my feeling that it's great to be here—the honor of being selected to present this address; the privilege of visiting a beautiful and historic community that is a veritable shrine to learning; the chance to renew acquaintance with people I respect and to make the acquaintance of members of a truly distinguished family, to the memory of whose father this event is dedicated.

But for me, there is a special and not-so-obvious reason why it's great to be here: I am a Congregationalist. In fact, although I've never occupied a pulpit except in a guest capacity inasmuch as my entire professional career has been spent in academe, I've held standing as an ordained Congregationalist minister since 1959. Yet, almost the last half of my life has been lived in a part of the country where scarcely anyone has even heard of Congregationalism. I attend the local Presbyterian church to which my wife belongs, because to worship with fellow Congregationalists would mean travel necessitating my getting up nearly two hours earlier on Sunday mornings—and I confess that my denominational loyalty is not quite strong enough to impel me to that sacrifice.

We live in Baptist territory. Auburn University, a state-supported public institution, matriculates more Baptist students than does any other university in the world. Auburn and its adjoining town of Opelika comprise a metropolitan area of 59,000. For this relatively small population, the Yellow Pages list fifty Baptist churches, and I know of several that are not listed. The Methodists, with seventeen churches, follow as a distant second. I've reached that age where I habitually scan the obituary columns. Not infrequently, the roster of the departed contains no names save those of Baptists.

I hope I haven't bored you with these ecclesiastical statistics, but they may help you to understand why I find it so refreshing to come to a region where the Congregational Church was until 1833 quite literally the official religious Establishment, and where it remains a strong and visible presence.

You are aware, I'm sure, that the Pilgrim Fathers (or Pilgrim Mothers and Fathers, if one wishes to be "politically correct") were the original Congregationalists in the New World. When the Puritans could no longer in good conscience stay within the Church of England, they also became in name what they had already been to all intents and purposes—Congregationalists.

These folk, who settled Plymouth Plantation and the Massachusetts Bay Colony, practiced a kind of liberation theology, although they didn't call it that. The copybooks may oversimplify, but I think that they are essentially correct in asserting that the first wave of European voyagers who peopled the "stern and rocky coasts" of New England came here seeking freedom to worship God. Don't misunderstand me. They were not, for the most part, dedicated to the abstract ideal of freedom of worship. They wanted freedom of worship for themselves. So they left the Old World for a distant wilderness where no one lived except the Indians, or Native Americans if you will (who, in the eyes of most of them, didn't count), and, if others wished to join them they were allowed to do so on the understanding that they would abide by the religious arrangements instituted by the founders. To me, this seems not unreasonable.

We hear a lot about the two- and three-hour sermons, the fines and other penalties for missing service or for dozing off, the harsh proscriptions against sport or secular employment on the Lord's Day, and so forth. There can be no question but that formal observance was vitally important to these early New Englanders. But it would be a serious mistake to suppose that their idea of worship was exhausted by formal observance. To read Governor William Bradford's *History of Plymouth Plantation* (citing but one example) is to be made aware that for them worship embraced the building of what they took to be a just society. Their efforts to do this were not always well-advised. Those passages in the *History* that recount their disastrous experiment with communism are often quoted and appear in numerous anthologies. We are told that after this fiasco it was decided, to good effect, that "they should set corne every man for his owne perticuler." Often overlooked, however, are the far-sighted provisions, foreshadowing in many ways concepts advanced by the two great figures I shall shortly be discussing, enacted at Plymouth to make sure that private enterprise operated in a context that guaranteed "a fair field and no favor."

In our time, spreading from Latin America to more and more geographic and social sectors of humanity, another kind of liberation theology has come to the fore—one focused still more upon the economic order, upon freedom to worship God through wholesome productivity and through grateful enjoyment of the bounty yielded to labor by the physical universe that He created for our use. In other words, the focus has shifted to place increasing emphasis upon liberation from exploitation, liberation from monopoly, liberation from entrenched privilege, liberation from institutions and structures that stifle and oppress and keep people from worshipping God by leading full, free, authentic human lives. Drawing inspiration from the biblical Exodus motif, this liberation theology gives expression to the protests of those who have been marginalized by the bondage of these baneful structures, and seeks to empower them to achieve control over their own destinies.

Unhappily, however, although understandably enough from a historical standpoint, this liberation theology depended heavily in its socioeconomic thrust upon Marxist analysis. With the collapse of the Iron Curtain, revealing as it did to all but the most invincibly obdurate the irredeemable bankruptcy of Marxism in practice as well as in theory, this liberation theology was left adrift. In 1988, Father Gustavo Gutiérrez, its most impressive and authoritative spokesman, was even quoted as being willing to entertain the notion that there could be a *capitalist* liberation theology—albeit as a very remote and highly theoretical possibility.

In point of fact, there is a capitalist liberation theology—one that employs socioeconomic analysis far more compatible than is that of Marxism with the biblical commitment to righteous freedom that animates Father Gutiérrez and his like. It is the prophetic message of that peerless nineteenth-century American thinker, Henry George, and of his noble follower, John Cromwell Lincoln, the man we honor here today.

It may seem strange to hear this message called a "theology." As one of its exponents, I run some risk in doing so, since for many persons the term has overtones of dogmatism and fanaticism that urbane Georgists bend over backward to avoid. Yet there is a sense in which George was a theologian. Not only are all his books suffused with deep spiritual feeling. More than that, most of them have theodicy, "the justification of the ways of God to man," as at least part of their objective. His most famous work, *Progress and Poverty*, closes with an argument for personal immortality, and even his most technical economic treatise, *The Science of Political Economy*,

contains many passages (including virtually the whole of book 1, chapter 7) that seek to demonstrate the presence of divine will behind the natural order.

Born in modest circumstances in 1839 to a family of strict evangelical Episcopalians, George joined the Methodist Church as a young man. He married a Roman Catholic orphan, convent-bred. The couple eventually ceased to maintain any denominational affiliation, but daily prayer and Bible reading remained regular features of their household life. For a brief time during his youth, doubtless rebelling against the suffocating pietism in which he had been reared, George was a freethinker—according to at least one biographer, an atheist. When he was drawn back to Christianity just before he came of age, it was of a broader and more liberal stamp. But there came a time when, confronted by the spectacle of human misery on every hand, and told by accepted economic theory that grinding want for the many is an inescapable phenomenon built into the very structure of the universe, he was brought to a state of utter spiritual desiccation.

Innocent of formal education beyond the first few months of high school, George at fifteen sailed around the world as an apprentice seaman. Upon returning to his native Philadelphia, he learned the printer's craft, then worked his way aboard a schooner to California, seeking to improve his lot. But he found conditions there so grim that for some years he lived from hand to mouth before finally obtaining steady employment as a newspaper compositor and eventually a journalist.

In 1868, on a visit to New York City made for the purpose of arranging wire service for the *San Francisco Herald*, George was profoundly struck by displays of ostentatious luxury such as he had never before witnessed in America, side by side with scenes of the most degrading squalor. There it was that, as he put it years later in a letter to an Irish priest, "in daylight, and in a city street, there came to me a thought, a vision, a call—give it what name you please. But every nerve quivered. And there and then I made a vow. Through evil and through good, whatever I have done and whatever I have left undone, to that I have been true."

His vow was to seek out, and, if he could to remedy, the cause that condemned ordinary people, however industrious and provident, to debasing indigence in the midst of plenty. In the course of fulfilling it, he discovered that widespread involuntary poverty stems neither from the impersonal working of mechanistic natural forces nor from the arbitrary will of a cruel demiurge, but from man's deliberate flouting of divine fiat. "Out of this inquiry," he wrote in the concluding chapter of *Progress and Poverty*, "has come to me something I did not think to find, and a faith that was dead revives."

This extraordinary volume is unlike any other treatise on political economy. Unencumbered with dry statistics and mathematical jargon, its flowing cadences are enlivened by quotations from poets and philosophers and even by Hindu aphorisms, and the luminous clarity of its analysis made vivid by picturesque and homely illustrations from the author's own experience. It approaches its topic in both breadth and depth, leaving scarcely any aspect of it unexplored, not sticking to include ethical and spiritual arguments along with purely economic ones in the assurance that "economic law and moral law are essentially one."

In 565 pages it inquires as to why, despite the increase of productive power, wages tend to the minimum of bare living; works out and correlates the laws of distribution; investigates the moral nature and ground of property; proposes and defends in detail a practical solution to the problem, anticipating and answering most objections; and rises to a grand sociological thesis as to the fall of civilizations and the formula for

human progress. Its chain of reasoning is carried forward with such charm and force that Tolstoy expressed a sentiment widely held, in saying that "he who becomes acquainted with it cannot but agree."

Of it, nearly seven decades following its initial publication, the much-beloved bishop of Rio de Janeiro, Dom Carlos Duarte Costa, was to declare: "After the Gospel, this is the book that I love and admire the most."

Obviously, a work so vast and comprehensive cannot be adequately summarized in the time available to me here. The best that I can do is to present in drastically abbreviated form what I consider to be its essence—and indeed the essence of all of George's major writings:

The fundamental cause of poverty, he contended, is the inequitable distribution of land and the private usurpation of its value (what is technically known as "economic rent"). Access to land (a term that subsumes all natural resources, not just space on the earth's surface) is essential to production; human beings cannot exist without it. But as population increases, a larger and larger share both of workers' wages and of capitalists' interest is captured as rent by the landowner.

Yet the landowner did not make the land; it was created by God as a field and storehouse of opportunity for all. Neither did the landowner as such produce its value, although he may have helped to artificially inflate it through speculative withholding. Its real value is a social product—the result of demand arising from the presence in the area of population and of community activities and services, both government and private.

Produced commodities respond to increased demand with increased supply, and, as supply increases, prices decrease. But the supply of land is inherently inelastic. Economic rent, therefore, reflects a monopoly value. This value is created by society, as we have seen. The practical way in which to deal with this monopoly is not to abolish it, but to make those who enjoy it pay society what it is worth.

To allow private individuals and corporations to continue to arrogate unto themselves the socially created value of land, instead of transferring it to the community as their payment for the privilege of monopolizing locations and natural resources, is to condone a kind of robbery. In this connection, Henry George gave a notable address entitled, "Thou Shalt Not Steal," and John C. Lincoln wrote a pamphlet entitled "Stop Legal Stealing."

George's remedy is not confiscation and collectivization or redistribution of land but rather public appropriation of economic rent by means of the tax mechanism. He characterized this as "the taking by the community, for the use of the community, of that value which is the creation of the community." At the same time, the fruits of private effort and initiative would now be left to their producers—not only by the proportionate reduction and ultimate abolition of taxes on returns to labor and capital, but also by the fact that access to natural opportunity would no longer be restricted by artificially inflated rent, since the reform would eliminate any incentive to withhold land for speculation.

Such is the gist of George's theses. To him, it was much more than a theory of public revenue. It was a plan of social justice, invented by no human brain but arising in the eternal counsels of omniscient Deity. Consider the following passage from "Thy Kingdom Come," a sermon he delivered in the City Hall of Glasgow, Scotland:

In the great social fact that as population increases, and improvements are made, and men progress in civilization, the one thing that rises everywhere in value is land, we may see a proof of the beneficence of the Creator.

Why, consider what it means! It means that the social laws are adapted to progressive man! In a rude state of society where there is no need for common expenditure, there is no value attaching to land. The only value which attaches there is to things produced by labour. But as civilization goes on, as a division of labour takes place, as men come into centres, so do the common wants increase and so does the necessity for public revenue arise. And so in that value which attaches to land, not by reason of anything the individual does, but by reason of the growth of the community, is a provision intended—we may safely say intended—to meet that social want. Just as society grows, so do the common needs grow, and so grows this value attaching to land—the provided fund from which they can be supplied. Here is a value that may be taken, without impairing the right of property, without taking anything from the producer, without lessening the natural rewards of industry and thrift. Nay, here is a value that must be taken if we would prevent the most monstrous of all monopolies.

The land monopoly is "the most monstrous" because it is, as Winston Churchill put it, "by far the greatest of monopolies, a perpetual monopoly, and the mother of . . . other forms of monopoly." Yet if its value is taken by society, it not only ceases to be "monstrous" but becomes a positive source of human good. Instead, in the words of John C. Lincoln, "Our land laws enable landowners to appropriate what belongs to the community, thereby compelling the government to appropriate what belongs to individual citizens."

And what is the result of this? Listen again to Henry George:

If I have worked harder and built myself a good house while you have been contented to live in a hovel, the tax-gatherer now comes annually to make me pay a penalty for my energy and industry, by taxing me more than you. If I have saved while you have wasted, I am mulct while you are exempt. . . . We punish with a tax the man who covers barren fields with ripening grain, we fine him who puts up machinery, and him who drains a swamp.

To abolish these taxes would be to lift the enormous weight of taxation from productive industry. . . . Instead of saying to the producer, as it does now, "The more you add to the general wealth the more shall you be taxed!" the state would say to the producer, "Be as industrious, as thrifty, as enterprising as you choose, you shall have your full reward! You shall not be fined for making two blades of grass grow where one grew before; you shall not be taxed for adding to the aggregate wealth."

Here is liberation, indeed! Liberation of latent creative potential—released from the burden of tribute to the landlord, released from the burden of tribute to the state, released to flower in myriad innovative ways, alike to the profit of the individual producer and to the enrichment of the social whole.

A land value tax is really not a true tax at all, but rather what Walter Rybeck aptly calls "a super user's fee." For the privilege of exclusive access to and disposition of a site and its resources, the owner pays an indemnity to those who are thereby

dispossessed—an indemnity reflecting precisely the market value of his privilege, collected through the tax mechanism and relieving them of the burden of payment for public services. What could be more fair?

Interestingly enough, this approach was prefigured in Mosaic law. As recounted in the Book of Numbers, the land of Canaan was distributed among the tribes of Israel according to their population, and within the tribes by lot among the families. The historian, Josephus, tells us that the territory was divided into shares, not of equal size but of equal value. To guard against permanent concentration, the Jubilee was instituted, providing for restoration of alienated holdings every fifty years. Since the priestly tribe of Levi was not included in the division of the land, its members were entitled to an indemnity from the eleven tribes that received shares that would otherwise have gone to them. This indemnity was given concrete expression in the tithe—one-tenth of the product of the land occupied by the eleven other tribes.

George's most popular lecture, "Moses," pays tribute to that towering figure who not only led his people into freedom but gave them a formula for preserving it—one that, sad to say, was honored more in the breach than in the observance.

Just as Joshua carried forth the work of Moses, so did John C. Lincoln carry forth the work of Henry George. Like George, he was born into a poor but cultured family of evangelical Protestant persuasion. Whereas George's father was a small-scale publisher of Episcopal prayer books and Sunday School literature, Lincoln's father was a Congregationalist pastor, whose uncompromising convictions made it necessary for him to move frequently from one parish to another.

This is neither the time nor the place to do more than mention a few highlights of Mr. Lincoln's long and illustrious career as an engineer, an inventor, an industrialist, and as a mine and real estate developer. From 1891 to 1961, some fifty-five patents were granted to him. Among other things, he, more than any other single individual, pioneered and perfected the process of arc welding. He made it commercially feasible to produce the zigzag spring used in General Motors cars and in Jeeps, as well as in much upholstered furniture. He transformed the Bagdad copper operations in Arizona from abysmal failure to resounding success, using an electrolytic method of his own devising. And he bankrolled that unique, world-class resort hotel, the Camelback Inn.

It is no denigration of Mr. Lincoln to say that he scarcely ranks with Henry George as a literary stylist; after all, how many authors do? His writing was straightforward, and did not aspire to eloquence. Yet, in at least two instances, he actually improved on George in clarity of exposition.

The first of these was his refusal to adopt George's unfortunate and misleading slogan, "We must make land common property," which has hung like a millstone around the neck of the Georgist movement from the outset. George used the phrase to mean "We must secure our common rights to land by collecting its rent for public purposes," but many who read or heard it out of context jumped to the false conclusion that he wanted to abolish private land titles and institute collective ownership. For his effort to rectify this, Mr. Lincoln ought to be commended.

The second instance is his explicit assertion of a key point that George, to my knowledge, stated only obliquely and by implication—namely, that land is often used most efficiently when monopolized, and that the monopoly of land can be fair and even beneficial if the monopolizer pays into the public treasury a sum equivalent to the annual market value of his privilege.

Some might wish to add Mr. Lincoln's consistently maintained distinction between ground rent and land value, a distinction made but oftentimes ignored by George. But the two terms have been used interchangeably in the literature for so long that, at this stage, I fear that any effort to keep them separate would be a game not worth the candle.

Despite some physical resemblance, especially height, no ties of blood have been established between John C. Lincoln and the Great Emancipator. Like Henry George, he was an ardent admirer of the latter, as was his father, the Reverend William Elleby Lincoln, a fiery Abolitionist. Because President Lincoln never joined a church or publicly professed Christ as his personal Saviour, the hard-shell William Elleby was moved to remark: "It is too bad that Abraham Lincoln had to go to hell. He was such a good man."

This anecdote, no less than John C. Lincoln's scientific turn of mind, may shed some light on why he, even as Henry George before him, departed from his father's rigid fundamentalism. Nevertheless, he was an active churchman, and an avid and indefatigable reader of the Bible.

It was, in fact, his reading of the Bible that led him, in his sunset years, to write *Christ's Object in Life*, which advances the proposition that Jesus sought, through moral suasion, to establish a literal reign of justice on this earth. There is surely nothing contrary to Christian orthodoxy in this, for, while Jesus is recorded as having said that his kingdom is not *of* this earth, he taught us to pray for the coming of the kingdom *on* this earth. But the book goes on to reject two venerable Christian doctrines—Original Sin and the Substitutionary Atonement. As one who believes (quite apart from whether or not there was once a couple named Adam and Eve who ate of the forbidden fruit) that the doctrine of Original Sin offers a soberly realistic picture of human nature, and as one who is, moreover, author of a volume that bases human rights upon the atoning work of Christ at Calvary, I should be less than candid if I failed to register my view that Mr. Lincoln threw a couple of very important babies out with the bathwater. George was more circumspect; he simply made no reference to these doctrines, at least, so far as I have been able to ascertain.

Actually, through a close analysis of the Synoptic Gospels, which authorities consider to be more factually reliable than that of John, Lincoln makes a fairly plausible scriptural case for his position. But Albert Schweitzer, certainly no fundamentalist, shows, even more plausibly to my thinking, that what little can be known of the historical Jesus is inseparable from an eschatological worldview that is completely alien to the modern mind. Schweitzer concludes that "It is not Jesus as historically known, but Jesus as spiritually arisen within men, who is significant for our time and can help it. Not the historical Jesus, but the spirit which goes forth from Him and in the spirits of men strives for new influence and rule, is that which overcomes the world."

With all due respect, let me say that I think that there is a dimension to the person and work of Christ that eluded John C. Lincoln and to which Henry George paid scant attention. The Gospel is more than just a social gospel, and Jesus was more than just a social reformer—even a social reformer capable of performing miracles, as, I gather, Lincoln viewed him. Still, the Gospel does have social implications, and Jesus (whether from eschatological assumptions, as Schweitzer maintains, or independently of such assumptions, as C. H. Dodd maintains) did teach and point the way to social justice. So Lincoln and George present, even as do the liberation theologians of the

present day, a needed corrective to religion that is escapist and otherworldly and merely private, not to mention religion that undergirds inequity by hallowing the status quo. And for this, if for nothing else, we should be grateful to them.

There is a further point of contact deserving of mention that Lincoln and George have with the contemporary liberationists. That is the intimate connection they both manifest between what liberationists term *theoria*, on the one hand, and *praxis* on the other. A hallmark of liberationism is that authentic theology is not a matter of abstract speculation. Instead, it is forged out of the struggles and hardships of people in concrete historical situations, where God meets them in the midst of strife and helps them to find meaning in travail and to give practical expression to the commitment that arises as they apprehend that meaning. Thus Henry George was not content to pen treatises and utter discourses, however masterful, but, when he thought that it would best promote his cause, threw himself into three campaigns for public office, the last of which resulted in his martyrdom. And John C. Lincoln, although he, too, wrote books on religion and on social and economic theory, ploughed the fortune earned by his scientific genius and his business acumen into tangible, real-world efforts to better the condition of humankind—efforts of which this Institute that bears his name is but one, although perhaps the most salient, example.

My remarks this afternoon are subtitled "The Prophetic Message of Henry George and John C. Lincoln." From a biblical perspective, the word "prophet" has two meanings. A prophet is not merely a foreteller but a forthteller—one who steps forth boldly without fear or favor and "tells it like it is."

In this sense, their common message was, indeed, prophetic. But it was also prophetic in the accuracy of its predictions. The words of Raymond Moley, published in 1975, are, if anything, truer still today:

Many of the inequities which George assailed have reappeared in land ownership. Urban areas are still retained as slums by owners whose assessments are low and who are making enormous profits by the outpouring of government money for housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal. Our vast new highway systems, like the railroads of George's time, are enriching land owners who happen to have holdings along their routes. For reasons best known to themselves, assessment authorities generally increase land valuations only at the expense of those who build productive improvements of their land. Over all are the vast sums spent by Federal and state governments in acquiring unproductive land for public improvements, allegedly to help the poor by providing better housing and to beautify the cities and their environs. But such grants also provide windfalls in unearned increments.

It is also true that in farming areas where government subsidies are paid there is a tremendous inflation in land values not justified by the productiveness of the land itself. . . .

This opportunity for the gaining of unearned fortunes by land owners and speculators, as anyone can see by an inspection of the cities and suburbs, results in haphazard and uneconomical city and suburban growth. Housing develops in spots, while great areas are kept in slums in the urban areas and in weeds in suburban areas by those who expect to gain unjustifiably high prices.

Thus if ever a prophet is justified by the passage of time, it is Henry George.
And that vindication deserves to be shared by John C. Lincoln, one of the most
perceptive and valiant of George's disciples.

Mr. Lincoln gave his eldest son the middle name of "Gladden" to honor Washington
Gladden, in his day a famous Congregationalist pastor and advocate of social justice.

I can think of no more appropriate way to close than by quoting the second stanza of a
hymn written by Washington Gladden in 1897:

O Lord of life, to thee we lift
Our hearts in praise for those,
Thy prophets, who have shown thy gift
Of grace that ever grows,
Of truth that spreads from shore to shore,
Of wisdom's wid'ning ray,
Of light that shineth more and more
Unto thy perfect day.