

owner. However, George wanted to focus attention on what was for him just one

. . . simple truth: That as land is necessary to the exertion of labor in the production of wealth, to command the land which is necessary to labor, is to command all the fruits of labor save enough to enable labor to exist. . . .

There are pictures which, though looked at again and again, present only a confused labyrinth of lines or scroll work—a landscape, trees, or something of the kind—until once the attention is called to the fact that these things make up a face or a figure. This relation once recognized, is always afterward clear. It is so in this case.<sup>61</sup>

Henry George wanted to be sure that the reader of *Progress and Poverty* saw the face or figure in the picture. In this he succeeded, but what the critics are saying is that in doing so George lost sight of the landscape in the picture. However, Henry George wrote one of those rare coincidences of language, a book that lives and is as relevant today as the day in which it was written. George was successful in his effort by his own estimation, and it remains for those who go with him in thought to make the multi-form applications of his political economic philosophy. This was, after all, what George intended. We can only hope, however, that the applications of his political economics will not be too few and too late for the preservation of our country.

Denver, Colo. 80231

<sup>61</sup> George, *op. cit.*, p. 294-95, n. 3.