

<b>Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited</b>	
Journal Code: AJES	Proofreader: Emily
Article No: 843	Delivery date: 23 July 2012
Page Extent: 27	

# Going My Way? Wending a Way Through the Stumbling Blocks between Georgism and Catholicism

By MASON GAFFNEY\*

ABSTRACT. This essay surveys the issues between Georgists and Roman Catholics in three classes: issues that are not peculiarly Roman Catholic (RC) but play out across faiths and denominations, issues that are peculiarly RC, and points of similarity and agreement. Addressed in this fashion are the tensions that arise between the social gospel and individual salvation, between specifics and glittering generalities, between *noblesse oblige* and governmental reform, between the doctrine of original sin and *tabula rasa*, between the rich and the poor, between the dignity of labor and the honor of predation, between democracy and authority, between the regulatory emphasis rooted in the philosophy of Aquinas and free markets, and between plain talk and gobbledegook.

## Introduction

There have been and are many Georgist Catholics and Catholic Georgists. The divisions inside each group are perhaps as deep as the divisions between them. This bodes well for future cooperation between at least some Georgists and some Catholics.

Some outstanding Catholic Georgists or fellow-travelers in politics have been Fr. Edward McGlynn (see Gaffney 2000), Governor Al Smith, Mayor and Governor Edward Dunne, Mayor Daniel Hoan, Union leader Margaret Haley, Presidential Advisor Joseph Tumulty, Mrs. Henry George, Governor John Peter Altgeld, and Mayor Mark Fagan. Some current Georgist/Catholics are John Kelly of Peoria, Terry Dwyer of Canberra, Bryan Kavanagh of Melbourne, and David Kromkowski of Maryland. Some of them, like McGlynn and Smith, met stiff resistance from upper echelons of the Roman Catholic Church

\*Mason Gaffney is Professor of Economics at University of California, Riverside.

1            (RCC) hierarchy, but that is one of the internal divisions we will  
2            explore. Some, like Patrick Ford and Terence Powderly, succumbed to  
3            the pressure.

4            The hierarchy has also repressed Catholic land reformers of other  
5            stripes: the Worker Priests of France and the Liberation Theologists of  
6            Brazil, for example. The knee-jerk reaction has been to cry “Marxism”  
7            and clamp down. In turn, some Catholic land reformers in power have  
8            suppressed the RCC and confiscated its lands, as in Mexico. Catholic  
9            King Louis XV of France expelled the Jesuits, who did not return until  
10           1814, under aegis of The Holy Alliance. Either way there has been  
11           considerable hostility. The hierarchy has generally allied with big  
12           landowners, while many priests, like France’s Abbé Pierre, have  
13           identified with the landless.

14           This essay surveys the issues between Georgists and Roman Catho-  
15           lics in three classes: issues that are not peculiarly Roman Catholic (RC),  
16           issues that are peculiarly RC, and points of similarity and agreement.  
17           I have not come to reopen the Thirty Years’ War. My hope and intent  
18           is to help the points of agreement override the differences.

19  
20                            **Generic Issues between Georgists and Clerics, and among**  
21                            **Clerics of All Faiths and Denominations**

22  
23                            *The Social Gospel vs. Individual Salvation*

24  
25            With the ascendancy of altar-calling evangelist Billy Graham, Prot-  
26            estant Christianity leaped far away from the Social Gospel of, say,  
27            Walter Rauschenbusch and Washington Gladden of the Progressive  
28            Era and the mild liberalism of *The Christian Century*. The Elmer  
29            Gantry phenomenon was of course well known before that, as was  
30            the “Monkey Trial” subculture of Dayton, Tennessee, but they were  
31            on the downswing. In the Cold War era, however, Protestant Ameri-  
32            cans suddenly responded en masse and without much discretion,  
33            flocking to caricatures of Graham, and televangelists like Bebe  
34            Patten, Jim and Tammy Bakker, Paul Crouch, Jimmy Swaggart, Pat  
35            Robertson, Gene Scott, Jerry Falwell and many others of like bent.  
36            They attacked the social gospel with as much vigor as they preached  
37            individual salvation.

1 Recently, in heavily churchd protestant Alabama, Professor Susan  
2 Pace Hamill, a committed southern Methodist allied with a Baptist  
3 school, sought to mobilize the churches to raise the puny property  
4 taxes levied on giant holders of timberlands, while raising the personal  
5 exemptions for the poor. She allied with popular Governor Bob Riley.  
6 They enlisted a substantial minority of the churches, but a majority,  
7 with most of the money, turned against them. The richer church  
8 leaders argued that a progressive tax system would undercut their role  
9 as charity-givers.

10 Nothing in Georgism makes one oppose individual salvation or  
11 embrace sin. George himself was floridly religious, and many clergy of  
12 all faiths took his part, while many anti-Georgist academicians sneered  
13 at his religious “emotionalism,” as they called it. Marxists, too, and  
14 those who followed their fashions, belittled George’s overt expres-  
15 sions of religious faith and feelings. Most Georgists, however, give  
16 priority to some kind of social gospel over individual salvation, which  
17 they see as rather narcissistic.

18 Some leading anti-Georgists, too, were leaders of the social-gospel  
19 movement. Protestant Professors John B. Clark and Richard T. Ely  
20 were highly visible, but their social gospel stayed well inside the  
21 comfort zone of *rentier* mainstays of the collection plate. They  
22 preached for privatizing all lands and protecting them from property  
23 taxation, while they traduced Henry George and his ideas and allies.

24 One RCC position on this, expressed by Brian Benestad (2012), is  
25 that overcoming evil deserves priority over improving human institu-  
26 tions. It is more than just “priority,” but virtual exclusion of any social  
27 gospel. Benestad holds that worldly reforms may do more harm than  
28 good by misleading people into thinking the world may be saved  
29 without overcoming personal sin.

30 There may be an element of truth in that. Some Georgists grow  
31 flippant about their personal behavior, using their underlying Georgism  
32 as an excuse. Some speculate in land, saying that institutional wrongs  
33 are not cured by individual rights. The problem is that they forget that  
34 “where your treasure is, there will your heart be also” (Matthew 6:21).  
35 The older they get the tighter they cling to that treasure. If they do not,  
36 their wives and children will. I could name names, but so could you.  
37 The point here, however, is that this issue is not peculiarly RC.

1 Some Catholics may believe that it is—that the RCC has the only  
 2 pathway to salvation. Cardinal Josef Ratzinger said as much in 2000  
 3 and later, as Pope Benedict XVI, repeated it in July 2007 (Winfield  
 4 2007). Here we meet the problem of evil within the RCC itself. Even  
 5 if one believes that the sacraments are divine, and that experiencing  
 6 them will purify one from evil, the moral authority of the RCC and  
 7 its officers has dropped in the last few years, following a long series  
 8 of sex scandals, cover-ups, and hardball litigation against complain-  
 9 ing victims. The Diocese of San Diego pleaded bankruptcy in 2007,  
 10 and apparently lied to cover up the true value of its assets, accord-  
 11 ing to Federal Bankruptcy Judge Louise De Carl Adler (Dolbee and  
 12 Sauer 2007). In one ploy, they listed their landholdings at assessed  
 13 values, far below market values. The Diocese of Los Angeles in  
 14 July 2007 agreed to pay out \$600,000,000 to victims of abuse  
 15 (Mozingo and Spano 2007). Protecting the Institution and its hier-  
 16 archs has taken priority over serving the flock and healing the  
 17 victims—a case of “goal displacement” parallel to what we see in  
 18 secular institutions.

19 This is not the time or place to rub salt in these wounds. We seek  
 20 reconciliation, and appreciate the many good works of the RCC and  
 21 its communicants. Neither, however, is it the time for RCC spokesmen  
 22 to preach “holier than thou.” Denial and coverup have been tried and  
 23 failed; it is time for disclosure and reform—a modern “counterrefor-  
 24 mation,” if you will. We know the RCC can do it, for they did it before,  
 25 led by the Jesuit Order itself.

#### 26 *Specifics vs. Glittering Generalities*

27 Georgists are specific—some think TOO specific—about reform.  
 28 Many of the religious, at the other extreme, expound glittering gen-  
 29 eralities but resist getting down to brass tacks. These religious are of  
 30 all faiths. It is important to see the stars above, but also to keep our  
 31 feet on the ground, muddy though it may be.

32 *Rerum Novarum* (Leo XIII 1891) (*RN*) and “The Son of RERUM,”  
 33 *Quadragesimo Anno* (Pius XI 1931) (*QA*), were more specific than most  
 34 religions are at most times. *QA* especially came at a critical time when  
 35 nations everywhere sought radical reforms, and it pointed a way. The  
 36  
 37

1 problem was that many of these specifics turned out poorly, and some  
2 disastrously.

3 In the U.S.A., Fr. Charles Coughlin, pioneer radio priest, popularized  
4 both the Encyclicals as never before. Irish Catholic laymen like  
5 Raymond Moley, James Farley, Joseph Kennedy, and James Byrnes  
6 gained great power in the early New Deal, as did also Msgr. John A.  
7 Ryan of the National Catholic Welfare Conference (NCWC). Their  
8 best-known product was the National Recovery Act (NRA), known by  
9 its logo, The Blue Eagle. NRA was a cartelization of American industry  
10 supposedly modeled on Aquinas' ideas of guilds, elaborated in *QA*  
11 The Agricultural Adjustment Act (AAA) was the farm counterpart. NRA  
12 died, but AAA survives under other names.

13 Social insurance also fitted with *QA*, although Dr. Francis  
14 Townsend, of no distinctive church affiliation, led the movement for  
15 old-age pensions. He was considered "screwball" and radical when he  
16 began, but Townsend quickly amassed millions of signatures and  
17 forced President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) to coopt his move-  
18 ment with the present Social Security program. In 1936 Townsend  
19 allied with Fr. Charles Coughlin, the radio priest who had popularized  
20 *RN* and *QA*, to push FDR further. Their politics failed, but their alliance  
21 indicates the compatibility of *QA* with Social Security.

22 Joe Kennedy, father of later President John F. Kennedy, led the  
23 new Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Generally, FDR  
24 depended on votes from big-city machines, many of them run by  
25 Irish Catholics, and wove their views into his policies. After Louis  
26 Howe died in 1936, Ed Flynn of the Bronx became FDR's chief  
27 strategist, urging FDR to the left, but still following signals from *QA*.  
28 Raymond Moley, the right-wing Irish Catholic, had pushed business  
29 cartels, modeled on Aquinas' merchant guilds (but also drawing on  
30 earlier work by Charles Van Hise and Herbert Hoover). After Moley  
31 fell, Flynn, the left-wing Irish Catholic, pushed the Wagner Act,  
32 empowering labor unions, modeled roughly on Aquinas' craft guilds.  
33 Senator Robert F. Wagner of New York was a Catholic, too (of  
34 German extraction).

35 In the postwar period some of the New Deal social safeguards were  
36 dismantled, with at least the tacit approval of the postwar "American  
37 Pope," Francis Cardinal Spellman of New York. Spellman's gospel was

1 anti-Marxism and raising money; his greatest financial angels were Mr.  
2 and Mrs. Nicholas Brady.

3 At the same time, union organizer Cesar Chavez was inspired by RN  
4 under tutor Fr. Donald McDonnell, a worker-priest, and later enjoyed  
5 support from many Catholic bishops. Chavez needed RCC endorse-  
6 ment to fend off the inevitable McCarthyite attacks, backed by Spell-  
7 man Catholics. Ironically, Fr. McDonnell's friendly persuasion was  
8 more weakening in the long run, as the guidance of RN focused  
9 Chavez on union organizing instead of tax reform, with its grander  
10 and more immanent effects.

11 In Europe, the history of *QA* was unfortunately bound up with the  
12 growth of Fascism (Rothbard 2004). Mussolini's "corporate state"  
13 supported and was supported by *QA*. Worse, most of the fascist  
14 dictators of Europe were cradle Catholics, and weaned on RERUM and  
15 later, on its sequel, *QA* (Meyers 2009): Antonio Salazar in Portugal,  
16 Francisco Franco in Spain, Adolf Hitler in Germany, Benito Mussolini in  
17 Italy, Arthur Seyss-Inquart in Austria, Msgr. Jozef Tiso in Slovakia, Ante  
18 Pavelic in Croatia, Admiral Miklos Horthy in Hungary, Marshal Philippe  
19 Petain in France . . . it is a long list, unrelieved by many exceptions.

#### 20 *Noblesse Oblige vs. Governmental Reform*

21 We saw above how the Alabama Protestant churches put down Bob  
22 Riley and Susan Pace Hamill by arguing that an egalitarian tax system  
23 would weaken their character as voluntary donors to the poor. They  
24 also worried that the poor would regard welfare as an entitlement,  
25 instead of charity, and not be properly grateful.

26 In Europe, of course, the Catholic Church had been the welfare  
27 system of the middle ages, handling charity, medicine and education,  
28 These were to be financed by voluntary contributions, and/or from the  
29 rents of church lands, which were extensive and, since the church  
30 never sold, growing indefinitely. Private landowners have ever pre-  
31 ferred voluntary donations to mandatory, since they may stop volun-  
32 tary ones at will.

33 The Catholic welfare system was perhaps workable when there was  
34 just one church. Everyone belonged, everyone feared damnation,  
35 everyone kicked in. Today, however, Catholics are a minority of the  
36  
37

1 population, with personal wealth and income below the average and  
2 falling, as Catholic Latinos enter at the bottom of the ladder. Besides  
3 Protestants and Jews there are now members of multiple Asian faiths  
4 with higher incomes and better prospects than the Latinos' (Singh  
5 2011). Asian-American incomes average higher than European-  
6 Americans in California (California Pan-Ethnic Health Network 2012).  
7 Conditions are not right to replicate the Medieval system of Europe.

8 *RN* speaks of worker associations to provide welfare for other  
9 workers, with no reference to property owners. Our Social Security  
10 system works on that basis, too, which is why it is so egregiously  
11 regressive. How about land owners? Should they not contribute to  
12 worker pensions? The original tithe that the Old Testament or Torah  
13 prescribes is on the produce *of the land*, not on wages and salaries or  
14 interest income (Meir 2007). Since *RN*, and perhaps earlier, the  
15 church's tithes have been on cash incomes, defined more or less the  
16 way the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) defines income in cash,  
17 omitting invisible incomes of the rich like unrealized capital gains, and  
18 imputed incomes of owner-occupied homes plus vast landed estates  
19 held for pleasure. Thus the churches lend their moral authority to the  
20 idea of defining tithe-able income the same way the IRS, subject to all  
21 manner of unholy lobbying pressures, defines taxable income. The net  
22 outcome is to tithe low and middle-income churchgoers to relieve  
23 landowners of their traditional tax and social obligations.

#### 24 *Genetics versus Unjust Policies as Cause of Inequality and Poverty*

25  
26  
27 Leo XIII (1891) writes in *RN* that differences in wealth arise from  
28 differences in "ability," meaning ability to serve mankind by producing  
29 more goods and services than others. Given that *RN* is considered a  
30 milestone of liberalism in the RCC, one can imagine what attitudes  
31 prevailed earlier.

32 Protestants held similar ideas. James Madison (1787: #10), a Calvin-  
33 ist, wrote as follows:

34 The diversity in the faculties of men from which the rights of property  
35 originate, is not less an obstacle to a uniformity of interests. The protection  
36 of these faculties is the first object of Government. . . .

37 The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; . . . the  
38 most common and durable source of factions, has been the various and

1           unequal distribution of property. Those who hold, and those who are  
2           without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. . . .

3           To secure the public good, and private rights, against the danger of such  
4           a faction, and at the same time to preserve the spirit and the form of  
5           popular government, is then the great object to which our enquiries are  
6           directed.

7  
8           Such attitudes, coupled with racism, still prevail in the kinds of  
9           Protestant Alabama churches that rejected the theology and turned  
10          back the egalitarian tax reforms advanced by Professor Susan Pace  
11          Hamill and Governor Bob Riley. The (mostly) Protestant champions of  
12          eugenics believed the same, although Hitler, the greatest ethnic  
13          cleanser of modern times, was a cradle Catholic.

14          In the French Revolution, the anti-clerical leaders of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Estate  
15          proclaimed the “Theory of previous accumulation”, meaning we all  
16          started free and equal, and then some saved more, accounting for their  
17          wealth—for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Estate represented successful merchants, not pro-  
18          letarians. This idea harks back at least to the Stoics and Epicureans,  
19          who saw it as an ahistorical assumption. It evolved later into a  
20          self-evident axiom, requiring no proof. “Rationalism (as of the Stoics)  
21          is essentially unhistoric, even anti-historic”, said sociologist Franz  
22          Oppenheimer (1928).

23          Since then social scientists have found that differences in wealth are  
24          much too great to be explained that way. Marginal differences in  
25          height, strength, speed, or intelligence cannot begin to explain  
26          quantum differences in wealth, which spring from an acquisitive  
27          attitude, not a gene. Economic writer Amartya Sen (1981) has found  
28          that death by famine occurs almost solely in nations without demo-  
29          cratic governments.

30          Many modern talk-show pundits preach that academics are “liberals”  
31          and “eggheads,” meaning at once elitist and egalitarian. Overlooking  
32          the oxymoron, the fact is that the Department of History at Columbia  
33          University was for years the center of intellectual racism in America,  
34          under Professors William Archibald Dunning, John W. Burgess and  
35          Claude Bowers, who dominated the history of Reconstruction until  
36          recent times. For an idea of their views, see the 1915 film *The Birth of*  
37          *a Nation* or dip into Bowers’ (1929) racist diatribe, *The Tragic Era*.  
38          Henry Steele Commager, Amherst historian, was considered a liberal

1 stalwart, but when writing with Allan Nevins of Columbia, in their  
2 standard *A Pocket History of the United States* (Nevins, Commager, and  
3 Morris 1992), he signed on to the following sentiments, presented as  
4 objective history, assigned to millions of students:

5 Slavery “was designed to regulate the relationships of black and white  
6 rather than of master and slave” and the backwardness of the South was  
7 caused by “the presence of cheap and ignorant black labor—a situation  
8 that persisted long after emancipation” (p. 196). In 1850, Webster’s support  
9 of the fugitive slave provisions of the compromise was “statesmanlike,” a  
10 “great service to the nation,” and “required high courage” (p. 201). In 1861,  
11 a southern advantage in the civil war was the “efficiency and organization  
12 of its agriculture” (pp. 217–281). In 1868, the impeachment of Andrew  
13 Johnson was “a disgraceful attack upon the constitutional integrity of the  
14 president” (p. 231). Emancipation should have been gradual, and “with  
15 due compensation to the slaveholders” (p. 234). Carpetbag regimes were  
16 extravagant, thieving and insouciant. Under sharecropping, “Farmers fur-  
17 nished their tenants with . . . land . . . The system seemed to work well and  
18 was so convenient” (p. 244). The landlord got 2/3 of the crop.  
19

20 This is not just pre-civil rights literature. Nevins and Commager’s  
21 *Pocket History* was reissued in 1996 by the Trustees of Columbia  
22 University themselves, acting for the deceased Nevins. Even more  
23 recently, academic eugenics is rising again, in works like Herrnstein  
24 and Murray’s (1994) *The Bell Curve* and Gregory Clark’s (2007) *A  
25 Farewell to Alms*.

26 The point here is that genetic determinism is not peculiarly RCC.  
27 It may not be RCC at all, any more, for it is not clear that Leo’s  
28 rationale for inequality represents either a majority or an “official”  
29 RCC view today. Georgist Robert Andelson, a professor of philoso-  
30 phy and an ordained Protestant minister, also preached eugenics, but  
31 on the whole his views are rare among Georgists. Most of them  
32 believe that nurture generally overrides nature in determining the  
33 fate of mankind.  
34

### 35 *Sanctifying Land Tenures Derived from Invasion and Conquest*

36 Europeans of all faiths used religion, among other things, to rationalize  
37 their invasion and seizure of heathen and “empty” lands around  
38 the globe. Their Bible taught them that God Himself mandated the  
39

1 Israelites' invasion and seizure of the Holy Land, and vindicated it by  
2 promising it to them. Other peoples' gods may have promised it to  
3 them, too, but these were lesser gods. Modern Zionists, of course, are  
4 replicating this ancient movement, leading to strife without visible end  
5 or resolution.

6 In 1095 Pope Urban II called for the Crusades (Readings in European  
7 History I 1904: 312–316): “Wrest the land from the wicked race” quoth  
8 he, “and subject it to yourselves.” We are paying the price today. In 1208  
9 Pope Innocent III blessed Simon de Montfort’s genocidal internal  
10 crusade against the cultured but heretical Albigensians and Waldensians  
11 of Toulouse and Languedoc. This paved the way for Louis IX to annex  
12 southern France and be sainted. Pope Gregory IX then assigned to  
13 Dominicans the long task of mopping up remaining heretics, beginning  
14 with The Papal Inquisition. It took a century or more. In 1486 Pope  
15 Innocent VIII confirmed Tomas Torquemada as Grand Inquisitor of  
16 several kingdoms of Spain which quickly absorbed the entire nation,  
17 rooting out Moors, Jews, and various egalitarian heretics, and of course  
18 seizing their lands, an important collateral benefit.

19 In 1494 Pope Alexander VI (Roderigo Borgia) rather immodestly cut  
20 the western hemisphere in two, between his native Spain and Portugal,  
21 pole to pole. The indigenes were not consulted—heathens were a  
22 nullity, and their lands regarded as no-one’s. This presumption,  
23 however, was not peculiarly RCC. Soon Dutch, French and English  
24 empire-builders (and a few Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Belgian, and  
25 Russian rivals) sent their missionaries to convert the heathen they had  
26 “discovered”.

27 Imperialist religion was ecumenical. Protestant England built the  
28 widest empire of all, “bearing the white man’s burden” of civilizing  
29 savages and spreading English versions of The Bible. Among other  
30 conquered victims were the Catholics of Ireland, whose lands were  
31 divided among the provocatively named “Protestant Ascendancy”. Not  
32 until the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829 could Catholics even serve  
33 in Parliament; and not for a century after that, if ever, did land reform  
34 rid Ireland of the Protestant Ascendancy.

35 Robert J. Miller’s (2006) *Native America, Discovered and Conquered*  
36 gives a detailed account of how the doctrine of discovery worked its  
37 way into American law.

*Original Sin versus Tabula Rasa*

1 Original Sin is not a peculiarly RCC doctrine. It is prominently asso-  
2 ciated with John Calvin of The Reformation. New England Puritans  
3 followed it. James Madison of Virginia was a Calvinist: he believed in  
4 original sin, and set up checks and balances to hold it and the popular  
5 will in check. The “sin” he most guarded against was the sin of  
6 dividing landholdings among all the people. He also tried to guard  
7 against an imperial presidency, an issue that hangs in the balance  
8 today in spite of all his efforts.

9 John Locke (1841), whom most Georgists revere, did not believe in  
10 original sin. In his classic *An Essay Concerning Human Understand-*  
11 *ing* he pictured the newborn’s mind as a blank slate, or *tabula rasa*,  
12 to be filled up with experience and reflection, unbiased by either  
13 inborn sin or virtue. Locke also disputed the divine right of kings, who  
14 at that time in England were the RCC Stuarts, but there had been and  
15 would be Protestant monarchs as well.

16 It is from this presumption of a free, self-authored mind that Locke’s  
17 doctrine of “natural” rights derives, and Locke’s idea of property. The  
18 idea is that we own ourselves, and therefore own what we produce  
19 with our own labor.

20 The *tabula rasa* idea does seem to rule out original sin, but here we  
21 must reckon with St. Thomas Aquinas, whose ideas Leo XIII elevated  
22 as official RCC doctrine. Aquinas expounded *tabula rasa* long before  
23 Locke revived it. Aristotle (disputing Plato) published it even longer  
24 ago, and of course Aristotle influenced most of the early churchmen  
25 or “scholastics.”

26 George had a more optimistic view of human nature; hence  
27 his faith in democracy, as direct as possible. This, however, is not  
28 a peculiarly RCC issue, since Calvin and others shared the RCC  
29 belief in original sin, and the RCC seer Aquinas expounded *tabula*  
30 *rasa*.

31 Rousseau believed we are born good; Rome banned his works.  
32 Machiavelli apparently believed people are born bad, and Rome  
33 also banned his works. Perhaps there is some kind of common  
34 principle behind that, but without more evidence it is not clear what  
35 it might be.  
36  
37

*The Rich versus the Poor*

1  
2  
3 Cardinal Josef Ratzinger was sent to Latin America to put down  
4 liberation theology by tarring it as Marxist and therefore atheist and  
5 therefore sinful. He succeeded well, and returned to be chosen as Pope  
6 Benedict XVI. Returning to Latin America in 2007, Pope Benedict  
7 disappointed hopeful landless Latins by focusing his criticism on  
8 political leaders who purport, at least, to represent the landless. He was  
9 silent on the slaughter of 200,000 Guatemalans by landlord death  
10 squads following the CIA coup overthrowing President Jacobo Arbenz-  
11 Guzman, the *Contra* war against the Sandinistas of Nicaragua, the  
12 assassination of Archbishop Romero and various nuns and priests, the  
13 Colombian war against the peasantry, the violent seizure of lands from  
14 Brazilian indigenes to free absentee owners to rape the Amazon, the  
15 crimes of Augusto Pinochet advised by faculty at the Catholic University  
16 in Santiago allied with Chicago economists, the “disappearances” in  
17 Argentina, and similar outrages. Peccadillos of the poor are magnified  
18 into menaces to civilization; mortal sins of the rich are overlooked.

19 One could probably match those Papal faults case by case by  
20 looking back in history at England’s rape of Catholic Ireland, Russia’s  
21 rape of Catholic Poland, the Southern protestant Church’s support of  
22 slavery, Jackson’s expulsion of the Cherokees, and so on. One could  
23 cite Jewish evictions of Palestinians.

24 In recent times the Protestant tyrannies have perhaps become more  
25 subtle, more indirect and worked through remote control, but none  
26 the less real. The smuggest, most reactionary sermon I ever heard was  
27 in the high-society New York Presbyterian on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue near 55<sup>th</sup>  
28 Street. “Storefront” churches for the poor have been diverted from  
29 social issues into escapist mythology and, in some cases, orgies of  
30 mass hypnosis, while the richer fundamentalists, like those cited  
31 earlier, have merged their ideas of personal salvation with a new kind  
32 of social gospel that entails taxing the poor to help the rich.

*Dignity of Labor versus the Honor of Predation*

34 Catholics see dignity in work. So do many Protestants: “Work is Wor-  
35 ship” is an old Puritan theme, part of the so-called “Protestant Ethic.”  
36  
37



1 they inspire their people to behave better, and they patronize charity  
2 and education.

3 Georgists do opine, however, on *how* best to exempt churches, if  
4 that is to be done. What Georgists, along with most economists, object  
5 to is exempting institutions from property taxes while continuing to  
6 tax them on hiring and paying personnel. Other economists call this  
7 the “bricks and mortar” bias, but that name in turn reveals the bias  
8 other economists harbor against distinguishing land from buildings.  
9 Georgists favor exempting the bricks and mortar, the better to tax the  
10 land. What Georgists object to is the parking-lot and prime-location  
11 bias. Many a church whose attendance has dwindled occupies prime  
12 central land far costlier than its present congregation would pay for  
13 against other bidders.

14 One of the strongest arguments against taxing church buildings is  
15 that it is not possible to assess the market value of most of them,  
16 anyway. There is little market in used churches, especially those  
17 tailored for particular denominations. However, there is always a  
18 market for the land under churches.

19 It may have been this realization that explains the high heat of New  
20 York Archbishop Michael Corrigan’s persecution of Fr. Edward  
21 McGlynn during and after 1886. Fr. McGlynn mobilized a huge fol-  
22 lowing behind Henry George’s program of exempting buildings and  
23 raising the tax rate on land values. This would have nullified one of  
24 Abp. Corrigan’s grounds for exempting his (and other) churches from  
25 the property tax.

26 There is also a bias for long-term land speculation. Land appreciates  
27 over time and Georgists recognize the wisdom of taking these  
28 unearned increments in taxation. A century is but a moment in the life  
29 of the Catholic Church, which sees itself as eternal and takes a very  
30 long view. The Sisters of the Divine Word, a Catholic order, has owned  
31 a vast tract of land west of Winnetka, IL, between Northbrook and  
32 Glenview, since 1895, when it was just farmland, and rather swampy  
33 too. Now it is one of the most valuable locations in greater Chicago  
34 with its own post office, Techny. They lease parcels to major industries  
35 and merchants. The Cardinal of Chicago is often seen visiting. They  
36 have never had to sell, but if they did they would be exempt, like  
37 other eleemosynaries, from any capital-gains tax, as of today. If

1 Georgists had their say, they would have been taxed not just upon  
2 sale, but upon rising market values year after year, for the last 113  
3 years.

4 This issue is not, to repeat, peculiar to RCC lands. Everything said  
5 about Techny can be said in spades about Stanford University, a  
6 secular eleemosynary, and in a smaller way about the Loma Linda and  
7 California Baptist sectarian campuses in Riverside, California. It is,  
8 however, a source of uneasiness in the eleemosynary world, secular  
9 and sectarian, which helps explain their coolness to Georgist ideas.

#### 10 **Issues That Are Peculiarly RCC**

##### 11 *Democracy vs. Authority*

12  
13 The word “authority” resounds through much RCC teaching, usually  
14 with a good ring. To many democrats and libertarians and creative  
15 thinkers and scientists the ring is bad. It evokes repression and tyranny  
16 and corruption of power and backwardness. It evokes Crusades,  
17 persecutions, inquisitions, Falangists, suppression of science, male  
18 chauvinism, tortures, burnings, stonings, massacres of Anabaptists and  
19 Cathars and Albigensians and witches, superstition, worship of relics  
20 and graven images . . . a panoply of evils sponsored by “authority”. It  
21 sounds un-American and, well, authoritarian.  
22  
23

24 That is to overstate the case, however. The views of many Catholics  
25 are more nuanced than the above suggests. Professor Charles Clark  
26 (2001) and others champion the “Principle of Subsidiarity”: authority  
27 should reside in the smallest units that can handle the functions that  
28 require authority. Applied to governments, this principle suggests  
29 weakening national governments in favor of local governments.

30 I wonder, though, if Professor Clark would also apply the Principle  
31 to church organization? Here, it would seem to suggest less “ultra-  
32 montanism” and more independence of American Catholics from  
33 Rome, as Fr. Edward McGlynn believed. Carried further, it would lead  
34 to congregationalism, obviating the Vatican itself.

35 Applied to multinational corporations it would suggest breaking  
36 them up, as the Progressive administrations once broke up Standard  
37 Oil, in the golden age of anti-trust policy. Otherwise, if we weaken

1 national governments by applying Clark's Principle of Subsidiarity,  
2 while abiding or fostering corporate giantism, we are left with  
3 unbridled corporate rule, which we seem to be approaching at high  
4 speed anyway.

5 As to authority vs. democracy, the choice is not as simple or clear  
6 as some of our popular democratic slogans would have it. Democracy  
7 can degenerate into plutocracy, as we observe today. Many primitive  
8 and half-literate citizens are easily misled into voting against their own  
9 interests. The Age of Enlightenment, supposedly democratic, actually  
10 fruited in the Age of Benevolent Despotism. A French Catholic monar-  
11 chical agent like A.R.J. Turgot could see and speak the truth more  
12 plainly and directly than "democratic" writers like John Locke and  
13 Adam Smith, for in England one needed a rich patron whose personal  
14 interests were adverse to most other citizens.

15 Smith's patron, the Duke of Buccleuch, was England's biggest  
16 landowner. Smith had to tiptoe around His Grace to lay it between the  
17 lines. He also had to reckon with his friend Charles Townshend,  
18 author of the Townshend Acts, excise taxes that helped trigger the  
19 American Revolution. Today, extension of our "democracy" into  
20 unwilling foreign nations is widely regarded as a sham, a cover for  
21 plutocratic imperialism, petrocracy, and kleptocracy.

22 Modern public schools, originally so promising, come increasingly  
23 under the sway of small-minded petty bourgeoisie who suppress any  
24 teaching about economic justice such as the Catholic monarchist  
25 Turgot (1913) urged, and instead are reviving the anti-scientific spirit  
26 of Dayton, Tennessee and the Scopes Trial.

27 Turgot and the Physiocrats, some of the clearest economic thinkers  
28 of all time, were part of the French monarchy. Turgot championed,  
29 among other things, a school system where sound economic studies  
30 (like his) would be required of all students. Napoleon, the autocrat,  
31 probably did more to spread ideas of economic justice around Europe  
32 than any democrat. More recently some of the best examples of  
33 applied Georgism, as in Hong Kong, Kiaochoo, Taiwan and Sin-  
34 gapore, were imposed by foreign powers.

35 The ancient Jews set up a separate class of Levites who owned little  
36 land, and whose job was to teach The Covenant to others who did.  
37 Thus it is conceivable that the Catholic school system might become

1 a vehicle for conveying Levitical ideas of justice to a new generation  
2 of students. If so, however, it would call for a different set of directives  
3 from the new Pope Benedict XVI than he has ever uttered. It would  
4 call for a new College of Cardinals and probably an entirely new way  
5 of screening papal candidates.

#### 6 *Aquinas versus Free Markets*

7  
8  
9 Aquinas, endorsed by Leo XIII and all of his successors, believed in  
10 substantial regulation of free markets, without much or any confisca-  
11 tion or taxation of land rents. This belief was applied with religious  
12 zeal in the 1930s in FDR's New Deal, and, with a fascist twist, in  
13 Mediterranean and Central European nations. Following the Great War  
14 it was reapplied by post-fascists in the social democracies, where  
15 leaders like Schumann, De Gasperi, Adenauer, and others had learned  
16 their Encyclicals early on. (English and Scandinavian socialism had  
17 other roots.)

18 Ludwig Erhard, father of Germany's free market *Wirtschaftswunder*,  
19 was a Protestant. He was an academic product and disciple of Franz  
20 Oppenheimer (1928), a scholar whose works criticizing the right of  
21 conquest, large landholdings, and the exploitive state contain many  
22 Georgist themes. Erhard was often at odds with Adenauer, who aimed  
23 to unify the Catholic nations of Europe.

24 Modern Georgists lean more towards *laissez-faire*, free markets, and  
25 the price system. They count on taxing land values to achieve social  
26 justice and economic security, reasonably free of regulations and price  
27 controls. Let us not overstate this difference, however. Henry George  
28 himself remained a labor-union member to the end. He favored public  
29 regulation or outright ownership of rails and public utilities—burning  
30 issues in his day. So did most politically active Georgists throughout  
31 the Progressive Era.

32 George, married to a Catholic, allied with socialists in the election  
33 of 1886. Following that, the extremists on both sides set to feuding  
34 until their alliance exploded in faction. (One suspects the work of  
35 *agents provocateurs* on both sides.) It is not that modern Thomists  
36 would accept the “socialist” label, which to them carries baggage they  
37 reject. However, with a little semantic sophistication on both sides, a

1 little distinguishing of the essential from the incidental, and careful  
 2 avoidance of *agents provocateurs*, it should be possible to unite on a  
 3 common core of beliefs.

4 It is worth remembering that the mayors of Milwaukee from 1910–  
 5 1912, and again 1916–1950, were nominal “socialists” who imple-  
 6 mented a good deal of Henry George’s program. Morris Hillquit of  
 7 New York, a doctrinaire socialist, dismissed them and Mayor Dan  
 8 Hoan with a sneer as mere “sewer socialists”. Socialist Mayor Daniel  
 9 Hoan (originally Hogan) (1916–1940) was also a Catholic. Milwaukee  
 10 was and is heavily RCC (German, Polish, Italian, and Irish). These  
 11 good Catholics were not scared by the fright-word “Socialist!” Socialist  
 12 Norman Thomas always included a Georgist plank in his platform.  
 13 Upton Sinclair fused Georgism with quasi-socialist programs.

14 Aquinas believed in “just price” enforced by controls if need be.  
 15 Georgists who believe in the price system preach against such con-  
 16 trols. My advice is, leave that to ordinary neo-classical economists; it  
 17 is their main stock in trade. Georgist time is too precious and our task  
 18 is harder. Remember, also, the violent reaction against Turgot when he  
 19 suddenly decontrolled the price of grain, 1774–1776. Sometimes a  
 20 good idea must be eased in and explained at length. There are always  
 21 ignorant and excitable spirits out there, studiously stirred by calculat-  
 22 ing ones, to make trouble for good leaders.

23 Aquinas would also cap interest rates, and *RN* and *QA* echo that.  
 24 This is a tougher nut to crack. My first hope is that most Catholics have  
 25 moved on from this position. My greater hope is that more people will  
 26 realize that land speculators, above all men, love low interest rates,  
 27 because they push up land prices. This is a point on which ordinary  
 28 neo-classical economists are remarkably obtuse. It wants constant  
 29 reaffirmation: land rents vary *inversely* with interest rates. In addition,  
 30 price/rent ratios vary inversely with interest rates, redoubling the  
 31 effect.

32  
 33 *Who Owns Us: Ourselves, God, or the State?*

34  
 35 Georgists follow John Locke, who posited that we own ourselves and  
 36 therefore the things we make. That is the basis of property rights, said  
 37 Locke.

1 Brian Benestad (2012) writes that Catholics do not believe we own  
2 ourselves. That is why suicide is a sin. However, suicide is so rare that  
3 that is hardly the main point. What it does is help rationalize forms of  
4 taxation that take from labor. It might help rationalize military drafts.

5 More recently, the idea we do not own ourselves helped rationalize  
6 the payroll tax introduced in the peak of RCC influence on the New  
7 Deal. (Francis Townsend, who instigated the system, had wanted a  
8 sales tax, which is bad enough, but at least would have raised money  
9 from rentiers as well as workers.) Then it rationalized withholding of  
10 taxes from payrolls (Beardsley Ruml, a Czech-American Catholic and  
11 Rockefeller man, and Milton Friedman, of Jewish extraction but  
12 unknown religious views, teamed to introduce withholding). Note that  
13 Friedman and Ruml subjected only wage income to withholding.  
14 Property income soon evolved into the major tax shelter.

15 Catholic Georgist economist Terence Dwyer (1980) of Australian  
16 National University points out that it is God, not the state, who owns  
17 our bodies. He sees the RCC doctrine as a safeguard against state  
18 slavery, not an adjunct to it. Surely there are cases in point, from  
19 Thomas More to Martin Luther King, Jr. The first *levée en masse* was  
20 introduced by anti-clericals in the French Revolution. There are also  
21 opposite cases, as when we are urged to pay taxes and support tyrants  
22 and murder strangers “for God and Country.” One might conclude that  
23 neither organized religion nor patriotism can substitute for individual  
24 wisdom and judgment and responsibility. This brings us back,  
25 however, to the point that we own ourselves, even to the point of  
26 choosing when to serve God or the state.

27 Now, however, rentiers who craft and dominate our public philoso-  
28 phies have reframed them so that property in land is sacred, while  
29 labor’s civic duty is to pay taxes, including huge debts incurred to  
30 enhance land values and spare property from taxes. Thus the state  
31 owns a major equity in labor, including unborn laborers, but may not  
32 tax property at rates above very low caps. The Catholic Church seems  
33 to have gone along with this, at least in part. In 1992 the Catholic  
34 catechism was changed to make tax evasion a sin. Perhaps this was  
35 aimed at rich evaders, but an article in the *New York Times* by David  
36 Cay Johnston (2007) couples this with implied Catholic support for  
37 jailing tax-protesting pacifists.

*Gender Issues*

1 Clerical celibacy is under increasing attack. It is hardly found in other  
2 religious institutions, not even in the Greek Orthodox communion,  
3 which considers itself to be the true and original Catholic Church.  
4 Critics are linking the pedophilia problem to celibacy (Sommer 2011),  
5 although many earnest defenders deny that (Crisis E-Letter 2002).  
6 Opposition is nothing new: Fr. Edward McGlynn, the Georgist Catho-  
7 lic, spoke out against it as long ago as the 1880s, and it has withstood  
8 other attacks. In our times the growing shortage of priests and nuns  
9 may yet force changes. Meantime, clerical celibacy in the RCC remains  
10 a “peculiar institution” in modern society. While it sets Catholics apart,  
11 it does not by itself block understanding and cooperation between  
12 Georgists and Catholics. However, to the extent it is part of a Gestalt  
13 denying women’s rights, there is an issue.

14 George and his followers led prominently in movements for  
15 women’s rights. Carrie Chapman Catt led the successful struggle for  
16 the 19<sup>th</sup> Amendment (votes for women) and went on to found the  
17 League of Women Voters. It is less well known that Newton Baker  
18 tried in 1920 to enlist her to run with Brand Whitlock or William  
19 Gorgas on the Single Tax ticket for Vice-President of the U.S.

20 However, Georgist causes have gone downhill ever since women  
21 got the vote, and there may be some causal connection. Many older  
22 widows, in particular, are small rentiers since men have the better  
23 jobs, and die younger. Women actually own (slightly) more property  
24 than men. As women become more independent, and win equal pay  
25 for equal work, these attitudes may slowly change, but meantime  
26 Georgists face a major problem.

27 The movement against exploitation of child labor had brought  
28 feminist and Georgist leaders together. Jane Addams, Julia Lathrop,  
29 Louis F. Post, and Scott Nearing worked together for this cause. *RN*, on  
30 the other hand, pulled back from demanding a “family wage” for adult  
31 male workers, thus leaving open the interpretation that women and  
32 children should join the hired labor force, as children did then, and  
33 women do now. Employers were simply not to assign them tasks  
34 beyond their capacity, presumed to be inferior. “Rosie the Riveter” did  
35 not come along until World War II.  
36  
37

1           The RC priesthood is closed to women. So then, of course, are all  
2 the leadership positions in the hierarchy. It is an exclusive men's club;  
3 women may not even exert indirect influence as priests' wives. Female  
4 religious are mostly restricted to serving as nuns. To the outsider this  
5 seems like an anachronism. Some Georgists would not make an issue  
6 of it, so long as the RCC women accept it voluntarily, but others are  
7 feminists who see such male bastions as unworthy of tax exemption  
8 or subsidies.

9           One could argue, with RC writer E. Michael Jones (1993) that  
10 employer interests fostered feminism in order to lure women into  
11 the work force, lowering wages and weakening labor unions. Jones  
12 weaves a fascinating thesis combining St. Augustine, Freud, adver-  
13 tising guru Eddie Bernays (Freud's nephew), Freudian A.A. Brill,  
14 the Rockefellers, behaviorist John Watson, G.W. Hill of American  
15 Tobacco, Protestant and liberal-dominated Madison Avenue, Robert  
16 Yerkes, Joseph Goebbels, British agent William Stephenson, Beard-  
17 sley Ruml, Vance Packard and Alfred E. Kinsey. On the other hand,  
18 Jones does not take into account *RN's* unwillingness to advocate a  
19 "family wage". It would take a career to unravel Jones's interwoven  
20 plots, but they contain enough truth to be evocative and challeng-  
21 ing. Watson, for example, was the Dr. Spock of the 1920's, yet  
22 has now, but for Jones, been thrust down the memory tubes of  
23 history. I pass no judgment on Jones' claims, other than that they  
24 are novel and challenging. It is true, however, that the combined  
25 competition from female, immigrant and foreign labor, encouraged  
26 by employing interests, has lowered normal male wage rates in the  
27 last century.

28           The parochial school system has depended heavily on the work of  
29 celibate nuns receiving minimal compensation. The women's libera-  
30 tion movement of the 1960s found a ready audience among many  
31 such nuns who began to see themselves as exploited. Some left their  
32 orders; recruitment fell off, and schools had to replace them with lay  
33 teachers at competitive salaries. Tuition then rose, attendance fell,  
34 and the system has shrunk, in spite of the modern political move-  
35 ment for replacing public schools with private and religious ones.  
36 The RCC response is to agitate for a voucher system that does not  
37 bar the use of vouchers in religious schools. Individual Georgists

1 may support or oppose that for their own reasons, but Georgism *per*  
 2 *se* would ask only that the vouchers be financed from taxes on land  
 3 value.

4 It is past time the Vatican redirected its energies from damning gay  
 5 marriage to damning pedophilia and alcoholism among its own shep-  
 6 herds. A few years ago Catholic World News (2002) reported that the  
 7 rate of AIDS among priests was four times the national average.  
 8 Catholic novelist Graham Greene has made the “whisky priest” a  
 9 literary type.

10 As to abortion, there is no clear “Georgist” position on that tortured  
 11 question, nor have I authority to declare one. As for my own opinion,  
 12 it is mixed. I would resist having a child of mine aborted in the womb,  
 13 but then, I’ve never had a womb or a pregnancy, which narrows my  
 14 perspectives. My feelings should carry less weight than the females’,  
 15 for they are more directly involved. I am impressed by some modern  
 16 feminist writers who document the history of forced maternity in the  
 17 slave-breeding states, 1808–63, and who liken modern enforced  
 18 maternity to the older slave-breeding industry. Like all analogies,  
 19 however, this one is imperfect, and I will leave it unresolved here.

20 It would be good if we could somehow make women alone eligible  
 21 to vote on abortion laws, but that is probably impractical. Meantime,  
 22 it seems somehow wrong to give much weight to the RCC position so  
 23 long as it is determined by men alone, and celibate men at that, as  
 24 now.

25 Whether Georgists and Catholics can breach these barriers depends  
 26 on motivation, and the quality of leadership on both sides. The  
 27 challenges are daunting, but not irresolvable, for there are no irre-  
 28 solvable problems.

### 29 **Points of Similarity and Agreement**

#### 30 *Natural Law, Rights, and Justice*

31 Both Catholics and Georgists give great weight to natural law and  
 32 rights. These ideas have been rejected by professional philosophers,  
 33 and much of the intellectual world, leaving Catholics and Georgists as  
 34 natural allies to defend them.  
 35  
 36  
 37

1 We are not alone, however. There are millions more Catholics than  
 2 professional philosophers, and millions more Protestants and Muslims  
 3 and others who believe in natural rights. These “have legs,” going  
 4 back at least to Lao-tze in 500 B.C., and are firmly embedded in our  
 5 culture: in Jewish and Christian doctrine, the English Bill of Rights  
 6 (1689), the American Declaration of Independence (1776), the Mas-  
 7 sachusetts Declaration of Rights (1780), the French Declaration of the  
 8 Rights of Man (1789), the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Amendments to the U.S.  
 9 Constitution (1789), the Gettysburg Address (1863), the United Nations  
 10 Declaration of Human Rights (1946), and more orations and sermons  
 11 than you could count. The Declaration of Independence never made  
 12 it into the U.S. Constitution, but it is found in many state constitutions,  
 13 including California’s. As unlikely a source as Rush Limbaugh opines  
 14 occasionally that there are natural rights, God-given and unalienable.

15 Ironically, the Enlightenment philosophers, who are thought to  
 16 have undermined Catholicism with their Deism, also generally  
 17 believed in Natural Law and Rights. Turgot the land-tax champion  
 18 declares it specifically. Some champions of the legal Public Trust  
 19 Doctrine even claim that it somehow precedes and trumps all man-  
 20 made laws.

21  
 22 *Plain Talk versus Gobbledegook*

23 Both Georgists and Catholics view much modern economic literature  
 24 as pretentious trash. Alas, the disdain is mutual, for most professional  
 25 economists today see us as “outside the mainstream”—mainstream  
 26 meaning themselves. Their hostility long preceded the rise of tech-  
 27 nobabble, however, and has other causes like the spontaneous comity  
 28 of property (Gaffney and Harrison 1994). Our reasons for disdain are  
 29 nothing new, and were expressed long ago by Erasmus (1876), by  
 30 Baruch Spinoza (1883), by Jonathan Swift (1892), and by the very John  
 31 Locke we have been discussing. Here is Locke (1841: The Epistle to  
 32 the Reader):

33  
 34 It is ambition enough to be employed as an under-labourer in . . . remov-  
 35 ing some of the rubbish that lies in the way to knowledge, which certainly  
 36 had been much more advanced in the world if the endeavors of ingenious  
 37 and industrious men had not been much cumbered with the learned but

1 frivolous use of uncouth, affected, or unintelligible terms. . . . Vague and  
 2 insignificant forms of speech, and abuse of language, have so long passed  
 3 for mysteries of science . . . that it will not be easy to persuade either those  
 4 who speak or those who hear them that they are but the covers of  
 5 ignorance, and hindrance of true knowledge.”

6  
 7 Open almost any modern economics journal and you will see how  
 8 little the world has advanced since 1690, in spite of Locke’s efforts. If  
 9 the intellectuals ever heeded him, they have regressed. It’s a massive  
 10 herd behavior, hard to stem.

11 The Catholic *Review of Social Economics* is one of the few journals  
 12 that maintains some readability, and Notre Dame has long been a  
 13 haven for “heterodox” economists who strayed from the flock. Alas, its  
 14 administration finally caved under the pressure of methodological  
 15 correctness and reined in its heterodox Department—much as the  
 16 University of California Riverside Administration did 15 years ago.

17 The Georgist-inspired *American Journal of Economics and Sociol-*  
 18 *ogy* is another haven for independent individualistic writers. Perhaps  
 19 the editors of these two journals should get together and explore their  
 20 common interests.

#### 21 *Anti-Malthusianism*

22  
 23  
 24 Georgists and Catholics both deny that population control is the  
 25 panacea for apparent resource scarcity. The Georgist position goes  
 26 back to George’s long campaign to get good lands used better, with  
 27 the corollary of constraining settlement sprawl: not just urban, but also  
 28 rural, sylvan, extractive, hydraulic, and what have you. It needs  
 29 tweaking today to incorporate the role of taxes based on extraction  
 30 and pollution. I will let others articulate the RCC position. To an  
 31 outsider it looks like a tradition too single-mindedly based on the  
 32 sanctity of the individual human life, without much thought for the  
 33 aggregate and long-term effects on human or non-human life.

#### 34 **Conclusion**

35  
 36  
 37 I was pleasantly surprised, as I worked along, how few of the  
 38 stumbling blocks I had listed are peculiar to Roman Catholicism;

1 and how many are passable without stumbling. The ones listed in  
 2 as “Peculiarly RCC” may remain, but I am optimistic that with good  
 3 will on both sides we may find pathways through, over, around or  
 4 under them, to work together towards our common goals. I have  
 5 not minced words to avoid tough problems, but tried to define  
 6 issues clearly as a prelude to resolving them. Catholics of good will  
 7 will not take offense, but detect the search for reconciliation  
 8 beneath my frank words. I look to Catholic Georgists like John  
 9 Kelly, Bryan Kavanagh, David Kromkowski and Terry Dwyer to  
 10 carry this resolution further.

### 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41

- Benestad, B. (2012). “A Catholic Response to Henry George’s Critique of Pope Leo XIII’s *Rerum Novarum*.” *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* (this issue).
- Bowers, C. G. (1929). *The Tragic Era: The Revolution after Lincoln*. New York: The Literary Guild of America.
- California Pan-Ethnic Health Network (2012). “Median Household Income, (California, 2006).” [http://www.cpehn.org/demochartdetail.php?btn\\_viewchart=1&view\\_137.x=47&view\\_137.y=14](http://www.cpehn.org/demochartdetail.php?btn_viewchart=1&view_137.x=47&view_137.y=14).
- Catholic World News (2002). “The Gay Priest Problem” (June 3). <http://www.catholicculture.org/news/features/index.cfm?recnum=20565>.
- Clark, C. (2001). “Catholic Social Thought and Economic Transition.” *Review of Business* (Fall).
- Clark, G. (2007). *A Farewell to Alms: A Brief Economic History of the World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Crisis E-Letter (2002). “10 Myths about Priestly Pedophilia.” <http://www.catholiceducation.org/articles/facts/fm0011.html>.
- Dolbee, S., and M. Sauer (2007). “Judges Tears, Rebuke Close Case.” *Union-Tribune* (November 2). [http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news2007/11\\_12/2007\\_11\\_02\\_Dolbee\\_JudgesTears.htm](http://www.bishop-accountability.org/news2007/11_12/2007_11_02_Dolbee_JudgesTears.htm).
- Dwyer, T. M. (1980). “A History of the Theory of Land Value Taxation,” Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Gaffney, M. (2000). *Henry George, Fr. Edward McGlynn, and Pope Leo XIII*. New York: The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation.
- Gaffney, M., and F. Harrison (1994). *The Corruption of Economics*. London: Shephard-Walwyn.
- Johnston, D. C. (2007). “Professor Cites Bible in Faulting Tax Policies.” *New York Times* (December 25). <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/12/25/business/25tax.html>.

- 1 Leo XIII (1891). "Rerum Novarum." In George, H., 1941, *The Land Question*  
2 *Etc.*, New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation: 109–151. Also in  
3 Molony, J., 1991. *The Worker Question. A New Historical Perspective*  
4 *on Rerum Novarum*. North Blackburn, Victoria, Australia: Collins Dove.
- 5 Jones, E. M. (1993). *Degenerate Moderns: Modernity as Rationalized Sexual*  
6 *Misbehavior*. Fort Collins, CO: Ignatius Press.
- 7 Locke, J. (1841). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, 29<sup>th</sup> edition.  
8 London: Thomas Tegg.
- 9 Madison, J. (1787). "The Federalist No. 10: The Utility of the Union as a  
10 Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection." *Daily Advertiser*  
11 (November 22). <http://www.constitution.org/fed/federa10.htm>.
- 12 Meir, A. (2007). "Anti-Aristocracy." *Jewish World Review* (August 6). [http://](http://www.jewishworldreview.com/jewish/ethicist_tithing.php3)  
13 [www.jewishworldreview.com/jewish/ethicist\\_tithing.php3](http://www.jewishworldreview.com/jewish/ethicist_tithing.php3).
- 14 Meyers, W. P. (2009). "Pius XI and Fascism in Austria." Point Arena, CA: III  
15 Publishing. [http://www.iiipublishing.com/religion/catholic/popes/](http://www.iiipublishing.com/religion/catholic/popes/pius_xi_austria.html)  
16 [pius\\_xi\\_austria.html](http://www.iiipublishing.com/religion/catholic/popes/pius_xi_austria.html).
- 17 Miller, R. J. (2006). *Native America, Discovered and Conquered: Thomas*  
18 *Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, and Manifest Destiny*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- 19 Mozingo, J., and J. Spano (2007). "\$660-Million Settlement in Priest Abuses."  
20 *Los Angeles Times* (July 15). [http://articles.latimes.com/2007/jul/15/local/](http://articles.latimes.com/2007/jul/15/local/me-priests15)  
21 [me-priests15](http://articles.latimes.com/2007/jul/15/local/me-priests15).
- 22 Nevins, A., Commager, H. S., and Morris, J. (1992). *A Pocket History of the*  
23 *United States*, Ninth Revised Edition. New York: Pocket Books.
- 24 Oppenheimer, F. (1928). *The State: Its History and Development Viewed Socio-*  
25 *logically*, tr. J. Gitterman. New York: Vanguard Press.
- 26 Pius XI (1931). *Quadragesimo Anno: Encyclical of Pope Pius XI on Recon-*  
27 *struction of the Social Order*. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/pius\\_xi/](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-)  
28 [encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19310515\\_quadragesimo-](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-)  
29 [anno\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/pius_xi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19310515_quadragesimo-).
- 30 Rothbard, M. N. (2004). "Catholicism and Capitalism." Auburn, AL: Ludwig  
31 von Mises Institute. [http://www.lewrockwell.com/rothbard/rothbard59.](http://www.lewrockwell.com/rothbard/rothbard59.html)  
32 [html](http://www.lewrockwell.com/rothbard/rothbard59.html).
- 33 Singh, R. M. (2011). "American Religious Affiliation versus Household Wealth."  
34 [http://americanturban.com/2011/05/12/american-religious-affiliation-vs-](http://americanturban.com/2011/05/12/american-religious-affiliation-vs-household-wealth/)  
35 [household-wealth/](http://americanturban.com/2011/05/12/american-religious-affiliation-vs-household-wealth/).
- 36 Sommer, J. C. (2011). "Clerical Celibacy and Pedophilic Priests." [http://www.](http://www.humanismbyjoe.com/clerical_celibacy_and_pedophilic.htm)  
37 [humanismbyjoe.com/clerical\\_celibacy\\_and\\_pedophilic.htm](http://www.humanismbyjoe.com/clerical_celibacy_and_pedophilic.htm).
- 38 Spinoza, B. (1883). *Ethics*, tr. R.H.M. Elwes. Murfreesboro, TN: Middle Ten-  
39 nessee State University Philosophy WebWorks. [http://frank.mtsu.edu/](http://frank.mtsu.edu/~rbombard/RB/Spinoza/ethica-front.html)  
40 [~rbombard/RB/Spinoza/ethica-front.html](http://frank.mtsu.edu/~rbombard/RB/Spinoza/ethica-front.html).
- 41 Swift, J. (1892). *Gulliver's Travels*. London: George Bell and Sons.
- 42 Tawney, R. H. (1961). *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism*. New York: Penguin  
43 Books.

- 1 Turgot, A. R. J. (1913). "Memorandum on Local Government." In *Oeuvres de*  
2 *Turgot*, ed. G Schelle). Paris: Alcan. [http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/](http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/255/)  
3 [255/](http://chnm.gmu.edu/revolution/d/255/).
- 4 Veblen, T. (2006). *The Instinct of Workmanship and the State of the Industrial*  
5 *Arts*. New York: Cosimo, Inc.
- 6 Winfield, N. (2007). "Protestant Leaders Upset by Benedict's Vatican II Cor-  
7 rection." *Union Tribune* (July 11). [http://www.signonsandiego.com/](http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20070711/news_1n11church.html)  
8 [uniontrib/20070711/news\\_1n11church.html](http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20070711/news_1n11church.html).

## AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for publication, the questions listed below have arisen. Please attend to these matters and return this form with your proof.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query References	Query	Remark
q1	AUTHOR: A running head short title was not supplied; please check if this one is suitable and, if not, please supply a short title of up to 40 characters that can be used instead.	