

**Thomas Paine's "Neglected" Pamphlet: *Agrarian Justice***

Brent Ranalli, Ronin Institute

Author proof version of article published in *Journal for the Study of Radicalism*

vol. 14, no. 1 (Spring 2020), pp. 167-90

Keywords: Thomas Paine, *Agrarian Justice*, basic income, Henry George, universal dividends, Thomas Spence, agrarian law, Alaska Permanent Fund

As political interest in basic income (a government-guaranteed minimum income) has grown in recent years, so has interest in Thomas Paine's pamphlet *Agrarian Justice*. In what is often considered his last major work, Paine laid out a vision and a rationale for a state-managed trust fund that would provide a measure of social security to the elderly, as well as providing seed capital to young people starting out in life. Because the revenue would come from a tax on natural resources (land), Paine's vision bears a family resemblance to the most celebrated example of a basic income variant in action in our own day: the Alaska Permanent Fund, which pays dividends to all Alaska residents out of invested oil revenue. This class of basic income variants is particularly attractive from a policy standpoint, because the source of funding is baked right in (a tax on the use of natural resources), and because there is a clear ethical justification for the redistribution: it is a means by which those who privatize a common resource compensate the community for the loss of the resource.

It is an odd fact that throughout the lengthy and well-publicized debates in the 1970s that led to the creation of the Alaska Permanent Fund, no one gave a thought to Thomas Paine and his pamphlet. No one was reprinting *Agrarian Justice* in Juneau, or reading it into the Alaska House and Senate journals, or editorializing about it in Anchorage or Washington, DC, or (as far as we can tell) even reading it privately for inspiration. It was not until around the 1990s that Paine's pamphlet was cited in the basic income literature, and not until well into the current century that it became established as a canonical text for the movement.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The conclusion that the architects of the Permanent Fund were unaware of Paine's pamphlet was reached after extensive reading on the creation of the Permanent Fund and interviews with colleagues of key players. On *Agrarian Justice* as a seminal document for the basic income movement, see, among others: Philippe Van Parijs, *Arguing for Basic Income* (London: Verso, 1992); Vincent Bernard, "Thomas Paine and the Birth of the Welfare State," *Sources* (Autumn 1998): 143–52; Vincent Bernard, *The Transatlantic Republican: Thomas Paine and the Age of Revolutions* (Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Rodopi, 2005); Laurent Geffroy, "Considering Guaranteed Income with Thomas Paine," *Mouvements* 1 (2013): 19–22; J. E. King and John Marangos, "Two Arguments for Basic Income: Thomas Paine (1737–1809) and Thomas Spence (1750–1814)," *History of Economic Ideas* 14, no. 1 (2006): 55–71; Philippe Van Parijs and Yannick Vanderborght, *Basic Income: A Radical Proposal for a Free Society and a Sane Economy* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2017).

Those who are familiar with Paine's corpus will not be surprised that *Agrarian Justice* languished in obscurity while its principles were being put into action. In the twentieth century this pamphlet had a reputation as a neglected work, even among Paine scholars. Jamie L. Bronstein, for example, described it as "little studied," and Gregory Claeys called it "the most neglected of Paine's chief works . . . even major studies of Paine have paid it little heed." But as it is now in the limelight thanks to basic income, it is time to give the pamphlet its due. This article presents the first complete account of the pamphlet's composition, publication, and initial reception. We clear up common misconceptions and bring to light facts that have been buried in the archives. Most important, we seek to shed light on the question: why such neglect? Why should this pamphlet from the author of *Common Sense* and *The Rights of Man* not have sparked vigorous conversation and political action?<sup>2</sup>

For the pamphlet's neglect did not begin in the twentieth century. It is widely understood that the pamphlet's impact on contemporary intellectual life in the waning years of the eighteenth century was negligible. To be concrete: as the exceptions that

---

<sup>2</sup> On *Agrarian Justice* as a neglected work: Gregory Claeys, *Thomas Paine: Social and Political Thought* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989), 196; Jamie L. Bronstein, *Land Reform and Working-Class Experience in Britain and the United States, 1800–1862* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999); Adrian Little, "The Politics of Compensation: Tom Paine's *Agrarian Justice* and Liberal Egalitarianism," *Contemporary Politics* 5, no. 1 (1999): 63–73; also Eric Schliesser, *Ten Neglected Classics of Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

prove the rule, instances of confirmed or apparent influence on the creative activity of the first generation of readers, however slight, can be counted on the fingers of one hand:<sup>3</sup>

- Fellow English radical Thomas Spence responded to it at length in his near-contemporary pamphlet *The Rights of Infants*, criticizing Paine's proposal as a half-measure.<sup>4</sup>
- It may have been Paine's criticism of the bishop of Llandaff in the preface to *Agrarian Justice* that inspired the English poet William Blake to sketch his own critique of the bishop's book.<sup>5</sup>
- William Cobbett, Paine's nemesis-turned-apostle, rehearses an argument reminiscent of *Agrarian Justice* in his 1829 *Poor Man's Friend*.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> On contemporary neglect: David Freeman Hawke, *Paine* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1974): 328–29; Bernard, "Thomas Paine and the Birth of the Welfare State," 148; Bernard, *The Transatlantic Republican*, 132; Malcolm Chase, "'The Real Rights of Man': Thomas Spence, Paine and Chartism," *Miranda* 13 (2016): 3; Sean G. Griffin, "A Reformer's Union: Land Reform, Labor, and the Evolution of Antislavery Politics, 1790–1860" (Doctoral diss., 2017 diss., City University of New York), 34; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, *Basic Income*, 70.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas Spence, *The Rights of Infants . . . .* (London: the Author, 1797).

<sup>5</sup> David V. Erdman, *Blake: Prophet against Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977), 301.

<sup>6</sup> James Grande, *William Cobbett, Romanticism and the Enlightenment: Contexts and Legacy* (New York: Routledge, 2015), 177.

- *Agrarian Justice* may have (inadvertently) turned English radical John Bone's interests in the direction of the collectivist schemes of Robert Owen, according to Claey's.<sup>7</sup>
- The pamphlet may have influenced Charles Hall's 1805 book *The Effects of Civilization upon the People in European States*.<sup>8</sup>

Future research may turn up additional examples, but this is unlikely to change the verdict that the influence of the pamphlet on contemporary intellectual life was negligible. The present research project, the most comprehensive investigation to date, has turned up no additional examples.

The negligible contemporary impact of the pamphlet appears to require some explanation. Why would the newest pamphlet by the celebrated author of *Common Sense*, *The Rights of Man*, and *The Age of Reason* have made so few ripples in contemporary intellectual life? One possible explanation is Paine's waning reputation. In England, where he had already been convicted of seditious libel in absentia, his radical allies were on the defensive. In France, his home base since 1792, his influence had diminished after the Girondins were swept from power. In the United States, he had become persona non grata for his supposed French atheism. On this explanation, Paine's reading public had simply melted away: the pamphlet was (in the words of Philippe Van Parijs and Yannick Vanderborght), "barely noticed"<sup>9</sup>; his core audience had (in the words of Sean G.

---

<sup>7</sup> Claey's, *Social and Political Thought*, 207.

<sup>8</sup> Claey's, *Social and Political Thought*, 208.

<sup>9</sup> Van Parijs and Vanderborght, *Basic Income*, 70.

Griffin) "largely abandoned him."<sup>10</sup> On the other hand, maybe the pamphlet was read but other factors (e.g., the unconventional nature of Paine's arguments, which didn't fit neatly into existing discourses) muted readers' response. Declining readership and other factors undoubtedly both played a role. The relative weight we should assign them will depend on the answer to the question: *was the pamphlet read?*

To answer this question, we look to the archives. We find that the pamphlet was published not only in Paris and London, as usually reported, but in at least ten cities and three languages. On top of that it was serialized in newspapers. London radicals celebrated its publication with a public debate. Written responses came not only from Thomas Spence, but from many quarters, among both admirers and detractors. On the basis of these findings we can conclude that Paine still had a considerable reading public in 1797–98. His reputation had not declined quite as precipitously as previous discussions of *Agrarian Justice* would suggest. Thus, other factors (to be discussed below) loom larger as potential explanations for the failure of *Agrarian Justice* to significantly influence ongoing debates about property rights and poverty in the nineteenth century.

Paine wrote *Agrarian Justice* in Paris in the winter of 1795–96, according to the short preface he later appended to it. At the time, Paine was living at the home of James Monroe, U.S. minister to France, and recovering from maladies he had acquired in prison during the Jacobin reign of terror.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Griffin, "A Reformer's Union," 34.

<sup>11</sup> Letter to James Madison from James Monroe, January 20, 1796, in *Writings of James Monroe* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1898), 2/440ff.

The primary argument of the essay is that there are two kinds of property, “natural” and “artificial or acquired,” and that the former as a common inheritance rightly belongs to all, so it is unjust for some to hoard it (i.e., most especially, by hoarding land) while others live in destitution, deprived of a birthright. Complaints about inequitable distribution of land are as old as civilization itself. The normal remedy sought by reformers and revolutionaries over the centuries has been redistribution of land, or “agrarian law” (a term that goes back to the *Lex Agraria* of the Gracchi brothers in second century B.C.E. Rome). As the full title of the work makes clear (*Agrarian Justice Opposed to Agrarian Law: and to Agrarian Monopoly . . .*), Paine’s call for agrarian “justice” is meant to be understood in deliberate contrast to agrarian law. Rather than calling for a redistribution of land, he advocates something far less disruptive: the creation of a trust fund, by means of which landowners would provide restitution to the landless. Landowners would pay into the fund via an inheritance tax, and the fund would pay out (a) an annuity to the elderly and to the disabled, and (b) seed capital to all young men and women on reaching the age of 21. Paine wrote with a French and British audience specifically in mind, and he calculated roughly what the size of the fund and the annual payments would be for the British case, with supplemental calculations for the French.<sup>12</sup>

Due to similarity between the aim of *Agrarian Justice* and that of a brief June 1775 article in the *Pennsylvania Magazine* (of which Paine was the managing editor), which promised a plan to raise a fund to provide a “reasonable sufficiency to begin the

---

<sup>12</sup> Quotations from Thomas Paine, *Agrarian Justice . . .* (Paris: Adlard, [1797]), 6.

world with" and a pension for the elderly, it is reasonable to conclude that Paine was the pseudonymous "Amicus" who wrote the 1775 article. This would indicate that *Agrarian Justice* was not a spontaneous effusion in 1795–96 but had long germinated in Paine's mind. The proposal does not appear to have taken final shape in the author's mind much long before 1795–96, however, since Part II of *The Rights of Man*, composed in 1791–92, though it discusses both land reform (in particular, abolition of primogeniture) and financial assistance for the poor, does not connect the two issues as *Agrarian Justice* eventually would.<sup>13</sup>

In asserting that all mankind has a right of shared ownership in the Earth in its natural state, Paine draws on the tradition of natural law associated with jurists Hugo Grotius and Samuel Pufendorf—a tradition that sought to explain the origin of a right to private property against a background of primordial or Edenic common ownership. Paine might have read the work of Grotius or Pufendorf (though Claeys notes there is no positive evidence he did so), or he may have encountered the natural law principle elsewhere. Seth Cotlar provides examples of popular radical writings that touch on the theme in the decades preceding *Agrarian Justice*.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> A. O. Aldridge, *Thomas Paine's American Ideology* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984); Thomas Paine, *Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York: Citadel Press, 1945), 2:398ff.

<sup>14</sup> Claeys, *Social and Political Thought*, 200, 202; Seth Cotlar, *Tom Paine's America: The Rise and Fall of Transatlantic Republicanism in the Early Republic* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 115ff.

Paine may also have had in mind, when formulating the essay, contemporary debates in France about redistribution of land: e.g., the distribution of Church lands, and more radical "agrarian" proposals for wholesale communal appropriation. Agrarian law was such a sensitive topic that in 1793 the National Convention made advocating it punishable by death. Paine undoubtedly also had in mind current debates about the amelioration of poverty, including the social insurance proposal propounded by his friend and colleague the Marquis de Condorcet.<sup>15</sup>

Some have suggested that the contemporary French controversy over the franchise was a subtext of the essay. The French constitution adopted in August of 1795 gave the right to vote only to those who paid a direct tax (i.e., landowners and well-off burghers) or who had served in the military. Earlier that year Paine had addressed the National Convention to plead for universal suffrage. Paine referred to the issue again in the dedication he wrote for *Agrarian Justice* in 1797, arguing that the disenfranchisement of the poor had contributed to the instability of the French regime. To this extent Paine recognized a connection between the two topics (uncompensated landlessness and a

---

<sup>15</sup> Peter M. Jones, "The 'Agrarian Law': Schemes for Land Redistribution during the French Revolution," *Past and Present* 133 (1991): 96–133; Éric Teyssier, "La vente des biens nationaux et la question agraire, aspects législatifs et politiques, 1789–1795," *Rives Méditerranéennes* 5 (2000): 45–62. Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, marquis de Condorcet, *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain* (Paris: Chez Agasse, 1795).

property-qualified franchise). But there is no evidence that the issue of the franchise inspired or played a role in the composition of the essay itself.<sup>16</sup>

The main argument of *Agrarian Justice* (that landholders should compensate the landless for loss of a birthright) is supplemented by a couple of subsidiary arguments. Paine contrasts the modest but dignified standard of living of Native Americans with the extreme poverty observed in Europe, and he argues that for civilization to be considered a blessing it ought to leave no member of society worse off than the savage. He further argues that as no man can make a fortune in the absence of society, it would be justified to tax even a portion of wealth *not* derived from the commons for the benefit of society at large.

Why the two supplementary arguments? Claeys has proposed that Paine included these supplementary arguments because the main argument was hobbled by a stale theism, based on the Genesis story, that was not credible coming from a professed deist.

---

<sup>16</sup> John Keane, *Tom Paine: A Political Life* (New York: Grove Press, 1995), 427; Vincent, "Thomas Paine and the Birth of the Welfare State," 148; Vincent, *Transatlantic Republican*, 132; Yannick Bosc, "Le conflit des libertés. Thomas Paine et le débat sur la déclaration et la constitution de l'an III," *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française* 327 (January–March 2002): 99–105; Yannick Bosc, "Droit à l'existence et appropriation. Introduction à *La justice agraire* de Thomas Paine" *Tracés: Revue de Sciences Humaines* 33 (2017): 211–23; Henri-Pierre Mottironi, "Un Retour sur *Agrarian Justice*: Thomas Paine comme Penseur de la Démocratie des Propriétaires," *Revue Française d'Histoire des Idées Politiques* 2, no. 46 (2017): 205–26.

Unfortunately for this explanation offered by a preeminent Paine scholar to whose insights the present study is much indebted, in this case the premise is weak. The natural law argument that Earth is a common inheritance may have been originally formulated by orthodox Christians, but in his essay Paine offers what appears to be a perfectly respectable deistic adaptation. (A single allusion to the Genesis story—in a flippant remark aimed at Bishop Watson—appears in the preface, which was composed long after the body of the essay itself.) A more compelling explanation for Paine's inclusion of the two supplementary arguments, I would suggest, is as follows: the first (involving the comparison of man in the primitive and civilized state) frames the problem of human origins squarely in terms of Scottish Enlightenment anthropology, with its early "hunter" phase, making appeal to the Genesis story unnecessary. Further, it presents Paine with an irresistible opportunity to cut down European prejudices in an area where he, as a person who had spent time in the Americas, could claim authority. The second supplementary argument (declaring that society has a claim on a portion of every man's personal property as well as his land) is a crutch, necessitated by the fact that Paine bases his financial calculations on the sum of all personal and real property rather than real property alone (presumably because those were the figures he had readily available).<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Gregory Claeys, "Paine's Agrarian Justice and the Secularisation of Natural Jurisprudence," *Bulletin of the Society for the Study of Labour History* 52, no. 3 (1987): 25; Gregory Claeys, "Paine's Rights Reconsidered," in *New Directions in Thomas Paine Studies*, ed. S. Cleary, I. Stabell, and Quinlan Short (New York: Springer, 2016), 95; c.f. Claeys, *Social and Political Thought*, 196–208.

There is considerable confusion in the literature about when and under what circumstances *Agrarian Justice* was published. One point that has tripped up even eminent Paine scholars is that although the work was composed in the winter of 1795–96, it was not published until 1797. In the spring of that year Paine arranged for it to be released in both Paris and London. The first French edition, published “A Paris chez la citoyenne Ragouleau près le Théâtre de la République No 229 Et chez les Marchands de Nouveautés” (we may call this the “Ragouleau” edition), was printed in Paine’s absence. Paine had left Paris for Havre-de-Grace (modern Le Havre) on about March 22, expecting to sail to the United States. At the coast he changed his mind about making the crossing, fearing interception by British authorities. A note appears in this first French edition, saying that “The sudden departure of Thomas Paine has prevented his supervising the translation of this work to which he attached great value. He entrusted it to a friend. It is for the reader to decide whether the scheme here set forth is worthy of the publicity given it.”<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Sources that misstate the year of publication as 1795 include: Isaac Kramnick and Michael Foot, eds., *The Thomas Paine Reader* (New York: Penguin, 1987), 471; King and Marangos, “Two Arguments for Basic Income,” 57, 59–60; Cotlar, *Tom Paine’s America*, 124; Geffroy, “Considering Guaranteed Income with Thomas Paine.” Philip S. Foner, in his 1945 *Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*, described it as “published in the winter of 1795–1796” (1:605). Philip’s nephew Eric Foner misstated the year of publication as 1796 on page 251 of *Tom Paine and Revolutionary America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), and others followed suit (e.g., Sean Wilentz, *Chants*

Paine gave the essay a short preface and a somewhat longer dedication. The dedication, addressed "To the Legislature and the Executive Directory, of the French Republic," appeared in the early French editions and was more or less unknown in the English-speaking world until Paine's biographer and editor Moncure Conway translated it in the 1890s. The preface, addressed to Paine's reading public, was included in all the early English editions (but not in the Ragouleau).

Paine had postponed publication for over a year, he explains in the preface, on account of the war between England and France. What prompted him to publish in the spring of 1797, even though the war was still raging? In the preface he claims it was

---

*Democratic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984); Claeys, "Paine's Agrarian Justice and the Secularisation of Natural Jurisprudence," 21; Gregory Claeys, "The Origins of the Rights of Labor: Republicanism, Commerce, and the Construction of Modern Social Theory in Britain, 1796–1805," *Journal of Modern History* 66, no. 2 (June 1994): 263; Van Parijs, *Arguing for Basic Income*, 11; Van Parijs and Vanderborght, *Basic Income*. Foner (*Tom Paine and Revolutionary America*, 249) incorrectly places the composition of the pamphlet after the suppression of the Babeuf conspiracy (which took place in May of 1796), and Hawke (*Paine*, 327) incorrectly places composition of the dedication after the events of 18 Fructidor (which took place in September of 1797). Estimated date of departure based on a letter to Thomas Jefferson dated April 1, 1797, in which Paine says he left Paris about ten days earlier (Foner, *Complete Writings*, 2/1386). Translation from the French by Moncure Conway, in his *The Writings of Thomas Paine* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1895), 3:322.

receipt of a critique of *Age of Reason* written by Richard Watson, bishop of Llandaff. (This has caused some confusion. Several commentators assert that the bishop's critique prompted Paine to *compose* the pamphlet. In fact, as Paine explains, the bishop's provocation merely prompted him to *publish* the already written essay.) However, the timing of Paine's travel plans may have been an even more decisive factor. Given his imminent departure from Europe, he could delay publication no longer. We have already seen from the note in the Ragouleau edition that Paine's hurried departure from Paris in March of 1797 required him to leave final preparations for the first French edition in the hands of colleagues. That the first English edition was also prepared and published immediately before his departure in March (and not, say, later in 1797 when Paine had settled once more in Paris) can be seen from several converging lines of evidence. The diary of Irish nationalist Theobald Wolfe Tone refers to a "reply to the Bishop of Llandaff" that Paine was "preparing for the press" in Paris at the beginning of March. On March 13, as we will see below, London radicals had already staged a debate on the merits of the pamphlet. Finally, the preface of Thomas Spence's *Rights of Infants*, which refers to Paine's newly published *Agrarian Justice*, is dated March 19, 1797, in London.<sup>19</sup>

Given that the English edition was already in London by the time Paine left Paris, while the French edition was still in preparation, it is clear that (despite what has often

---

<sup>19</sup> Theobald Wolfe Tone, *The Autobiography of Theobald Wolfe Tone 1763–1798*; Ed. with an Introduction by R. Barry O'Brien, Volume 2 (London: T. F. Unwin, 1893), 189. Spence, *Rights of Infants*, title page.

been assumed) the English edition was completed and printed first. It makes sense that Paine would have completed the English edition first, because that was the language in which he composed it (his French language skills were limited) and the language of his primary reading public.

Cuts were made in the early English editions published in London, almost certainly due to fear of the British censors. (Publishers of seditious or sacrilegious material were liable to prosecution. Shortly after putting out his own edition of *Agrarian Justice*, the publisher Thomas Williams was tried and imprisoned for blasphemy on account of his publication of Paine's *Age of Reason*.) There were gaps in two consecutive sentences late in the essay, for example, where several words were replaced by asterisks. Conway, thanks to his access to a French edition (viz., the Ragouleau) when preparing his 1895 edition, was able to fill those gaps using his own translation. The sentences in question spoke of the "horrid" and "unjust" state of civilization and the necessity of "revolution."<sup>20</sup>

Even more severe cuts were made in the preface by the London publishers. Several lines of asterisks appeared together in two spots in the short preface, evidently in place of entire sentences. These redactive asterisks were faithfully reproduced in other early English editions and have been maintained (sometimes in the form of ellipses) in anthologies up to the present day. The publisher R. Carlile explained in his 1819 reprint that "considerable pains have been taken to procure a perfect copy of this pamphlet, but it

---

<sup>20</sup> On the persecution of Thomas Williams: Foner, *Complete Writings*, 2:727. Quotations from Conway, *Writings of Thomas Paine*, 3:341.

does not appear that any such thing was ever printed in England. The publisher is therefore reluctantly compelled to insert the hiatuses, as in the former edition." Conway had no better luck in the 1890s.<sup>21</sup>

And yet a "perfect copy" of the pamphlet does exist, we note with satisfaction. Carlile was correct that it was not printed in England. Harvard's Houghton Library has a specimen of *Agrarian Justice* published in English in Paris, "Printed by Adlard, Rue Menilmontant, No. 113; and sold by Desenne, Palais Égalité, No. 2." This edition includes complete versions of both the preface (which was bowdlerized in the London editions and omitted from the Ragouleau) and the dedication to the French government (which was omitted from the London editions). This was presumably the version that Tone reported was "in press" in early March of 1797 under Paine's supervision. Thus, this would be the version that is authoritative when it comes to Paine's intentions.

Consistency of the London editions in omitting the dedication, and in other respects, makes it appear likely that transmission of William Adlard's Paris edition to Britain was channeled through a single original London edition. Family connection and internal evidence (e.g., the way the page is laid out at the beginning of each new section) make the most likely candidate the edition published by James Adlard, marked "Paris: printed by W. Adlard, Rue Menilmontant. London: reprinted and sold by J. Adlard, No. 39, Duke Street, Smithfield and J. Parsons, No. 23, Paternoster."

---

<sup>21</sup> R. Carlile, ed., *Agrarian Justice* . . . (London: R. Carlile, 1819), iv. Conway, *Writings of Thomas Paine*, 3:327.

Comparison of the William Adlard (Paris) edition and the London editions printed by James Adlard and others makes it clear that James Adlard was not shy about making editorial changes to soften Paine's provocative language. The asterisks in the preface and the body should not be understood, therefore, as an effort to draw attention to departures from authorial intent. Rather, the most likely explanation is that certain redactions were made at the last minute, and James Adlard or an assistant judged it more expeditious to replace the offending text with asterisks than to reset entire pages of type.

A second French edition was published "Chez les marchands de nouveautés, an 5 de la République" (we may call this the "year 5" edition). This one contains both the preface and the dedication, and appears to be a fresh, complete translation of the William Adlard Paris edition. Publication of this second French edition was presumably supervised by Paine himself when he returned to Paris. (Judging by his correspondence, the return took place sometime after May 14.) "Year 5" in the Republican calendar lasted from September 22, 1796, to September 21, 1797, so publication of this edition presumably took place sometime between May and September of 1797.

Demand for the work in London was such that it was reprinted in at least eight editions there in the first year or so after its initial appearance, and it was reprinted again in pamphlet form in London as late as 1819. London radicals celebrated the pamphlet's publication by staging a public debate on March 13, 1797, at the Westminster Forum on the question, "Would not the plan proposed by Mr. Paine to the French Nation in his last new pamphlet called 'Agrarian Justice' effectually eradicate the evils of Poverty—prevent, in a great measure, the Commission of Crimes—and alleviate the Distress of Old Age and Infirmity?" (The description of the plan as addressed "to the French Nation"

could have been a way of skirting the Seditious Meetings Act's prohibition on public debate of political topics. Alternatively, it could mean that this group had in front of it the Paris edition of William Adlard, which, as we have seen, unlike the London editions included the dedication "To the Legislature and the Executive Directory, of the French Republic.")<sup>22</sup>

English radicals' enthusiasm for the pamphlet can be seen in the handful of documented reactions that have come down to us. Thomas Hardy, the shoemaker who had founded the radical London Corresponding Society, wrote to Paine in 1807, in a letter that was reprinted in newspapers, that *Agrarian Justice* was "one of the best little things you ever wrote. . . . There the foundation principles are laid down and most clearly described. If the people had but that, they may be said to have got all." Another English radical, John Bone, wrote to a correspondent soon after the pamphlet's appearance that *Agrarian Justice* "met the Approbation of those I have conversed with about it, and think it does win them to our Cause." Bone asked his correspondent to send him fifty copies, which he pledged to sell. The anonymous author of the pamphlet *The British Crisis*, published in London in 1797, wrote that "Paine's *Agrarian Justice* best reconciles the

---

<sup>22</sup> "London Debates: 1797," in *London Debating Societies: 1776–1799*, ed. Donna T. Andrew (London: London Record Society, 1994), 351–71, as cited in *British History Online*, <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/london-record-soc/vol30/pp351-371> (accessed August 14, 2017). On the Seditious Meetings Act: James Chandler and Kevin Gilmartin. *Romantic Metropolis: The Urban Scene of British Culture, 1780–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 99.

difficulty arising from the extremes of natural and acquired right to the soil." These positive reactions stand in contrast to the better-known verdict of Thomas Spence, who, on the eve of publishing his *Rights of Infants*, added a preface and appendix to chastise the recently published *Agrarian Justice* for being insufficiently radical. Spence at once vented his spleen at the celebrity colleague in whose shadow he worked and rode Paine's coattails by linking his own publication to Paine's.<sup>23</sup>

The appetite for *Agrarian Justice* went far beyond London and Paris. That the pamphlet appeared in editions elsewhere is hardly surprising, but it has rarely been appreciated. A survey of archives reveals that English editions of the pamphlet were published in 1797 or soon after in Edinburgh, Scotland; in Dublin and Cork in Ireland; and in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Albany in the United States. Furthermore, a German translation of the original "Ragouleau" French edition was published in 1798 in the town of Neustrelitz. (A list of known pamphlet editions of *Agrarian Justice* is presented in Table 1, below.)

In addition, extracts were printed in several American newspapers, including the *Diary* in New York City, the *American Mercury* of Hartford, Connecticut, the

---

<sup>23</sup> *Aurora General Advertiser* (Philadelphia), December 30, 1807, 2; Elbridge Colby, "Letters from Thomas Hardy to Thomas Paine," *The Nation*, 106, no. 2759 (1918): 590. *Report of the Committee of Secrecy of the House of Commons. Ordered to be printed 15th March, 1799* (London: J. Plymsell, 1799), 53. *The British crisis; or The disorder of the state at its height. With prognostic signs of recovery or dissolution. By no Royal Physician* (London: J. S. Jordan, 1797), 39–40. Spence, *Rights of Infants*.

Philadelphia *American Universal Magazine*, and the *Kentucky Gazette*. The essay was serialized in full in newspapers in New York City and Dublin, Ireland. The pamphlet was circulated by a Book Society (a subscription-based lending library) in York.<sup>24</sup>

Given the evident demand for the pamphlet in at least ten cities and five nations, what did Paine's first generation of readers think of it? Here we offer a sampling of the critical response. This collection is undoubtedly incomplete, but it suggests the range of

---

<sup>24</sup> Excerpts printed in: *The Diary; or, Loudon's Register* (New York City), June 24, 1797, 2; "Extract from Mr. Paine's *Agrarian Justice*," *American Mercury* (Hartford, CT), July 31, 1797, 4; *American Mercury* (Hartford, CT), August 7, 1797, 2; *The American Universal Magazine* (Philadelphia, PA), June 13, 1797, 371; *The Lexington Herald* (Lexington KY), January 13, 1907, 1. Cf. Cotlar, *Tom Paine's America*, 241, which offers a similar list of American journals publishing excerpts. Serialized in: *Time Piece and Literary Companion* (New York City), July 21, 1797, 225 and July 28, 1797, 237; *The Press* (Dublin, Ireland), November 2, 1797, 4, and November 4, 1797, 4. News of the pamphlet's publication in Paris and reprinting in London reached the United States in April, and copies had arrived in New York by June, according to notices in: *The Diary; or, Loudon's Register* (New York City), April 20, 1797, 3; *Greenleaf's New York (NY) Journal*, April 22, 1797, 3; *Connecticut Gazette* (New London), April 27, 1797, 3; *Rising Sun* (Keene, NH), May 9, 1797, 3; *The Diary; or, Loudon's Register* (New York City), June 22, 1797, 3. Book Society (York, England), *The laws of a Book Society, established at York; with a catalogue of the books, etc.* (York: E. and R. Peck, 1797), 15.

contemporary reactions and it demonstrates conclusively that Paine was not writing in a vacuum. *Agrarian Justice* was read by contemporaries.

We have already seen that English radicals both praised it in the highest terms and criticized it. The substance of Thomas Spence's critique in *The Rights of Infants* was that Paine was proposing a mere half-measure. Spence argued that great landed estates should not merely be taxed, they should be handed over to the community to be managed for the benefit of all.<sup>25</sup>

There were also "establishment" critiques. For example, the June 1797 issue of *The Monthly Review* of London provides a fairly accurate description of Paine's proposal, and then summarily dismisses it as "too wild, and . . . pressed with too many objections, to merit a particular discussion." The objections are left unspecified. A German review in the *Oberdeutsche allgemeine Litteraturzeitung* is similarly vehement and vague in its criticism: "It would lead us too far, and would not be worth the effort, if we were to take a closer look at the hypotheses laid down. The plan will in any case never be realized, and disintegrates into itself as a moral-political absurdity."<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Spence, *Rights of Infants*.

<sup>26</sup> *The Monthly Review* 23 (June 1797), 173. "Es würde uns zu weit führen, und sich doch der Müthe nicht lohnen, wenn wir uns in eine genauere Prüfung der hier zum Grunde gelegten, niemahls erweislichen Hypothesen einlassen wollten. Der Plan wird ohnehin nie realisirt werden, und zerfällt als ein moralisch-politisches Unding wieder in sich selbst." *Oberdeutsche allgemeine Litteraturzeitung*, October 8, 1798, 682–84.

*The Critical Review*, another British publication, also reviewed the pamphlet in 1797. Calling the essay a combination of “strong assertions, bold truths, and strange misrepresentations, blended together in the usual manner,” the reviewer gives Paine the benefit of a thorough critique rather than a dismissal. He accuses Paine of romanticizing primitive life. He considers Paine’s proposed estate tax and trust fund an “impracticable scheme,” and proposes that a much simpler solution to the problem of poverty would to take up a collection among the wealthy and use it to clean up the unsightly poor neighborhoods that Paine considers more degraded than savage life. (That is, the reviewer is advocating gentrification: “A few merchants, subscribing no great sum, might make a street, where there is now nothing but filth and dirt: the houses would let well,—would be well tenanted, —and by degrees, instead of being the resort of thieves and pick-pockets, it would become a respectable neighbourhood.” On the fate of the evicted poor he is silent.)<sup>27</sup>

A second German reviewer suggests that in no country other than England would an inheritance tax yield a fund of size sufficient for the purpose, but that “the exposition of this plan, because it is intended to improve the situation of the whole of mankind, and comes from a man who has caused many a sensation and who still has many followers, will not be unwelcome to most readers.” A review in the *Salem Gazette* of Salem,

---

<sup>27</sup> “Monthly Catalogue. Literature, etc.,” *The Critical Review* 20 (August 1797), 446–48.

Massachusetts, is brief and charitable: "As in the proposal he [Paine] cannot be suspected of any interested view, we must certainly give him credit for his benevolent intentions."<sup>28</sup>

*Agrarian Justice* reached a far wider audience than has been previously understood. The fact that it was published in at least ten cities in three languages, and that contemporary periodicals serialized it, printed excerpts, and printed both friendly and hostile reviews, indicates that Paine's reading public in 1797–98, if diminishing, was (at least outside of France) nevertheless substantial, more substantial than scholars have generally appreciated. To account for the pamphlet's slight impact on contemporary intellectual life, then, more explanation is needed. Here we offer some informed speculation, and suggest several factors that may have played a role.<sup>29</sup>

### **An Inopportune Moment for Publication**

---

<sup>28</sup> "Rec. glaubte, dass die Darlegung dieses Plans, da solcher die Lage der gesamten Menschheit verbessern soll, und von einem Manne kommt, der viel Aufsehen gemacht hat und noch viele Anhänger hat, den meisten Lesern nicht unwillkommen seyn werde." *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung* 330 (October 31, 1798), 283. *Salem Gazette* (Salem, MA), June 24, 1797, 2.

<sup>29</sup> Oddly enough, there appears to be no trace of the pamphlet having been read in France. Paris journals printed a notice of the pamphlet's publication (*Journal d'économie publique, de morale et de politique* 3 (1797): 313–14), but—as far as I have been able to detect—not a single review. This reflects, no doubt, Paine's isolation in Paris as a non-French-speaker whose network of sympathetic colleagues had been shattered by the Terror.

We have seen that English radicals, Paine's core constituency, thought highly of the pamphlet on the whole (despite Spence's negative reaction) and actively sought to promote it through distribution, public debate, and praise in print. The pamphlet happened to land in London at a time when this constituency was being actively suppressed by the government. Many Paineite radicals emigrated to the United States. It is possible to imagine that if the pamphlet had appeared in Britain at a different political moment, the radical community there would have championed it in a sustained manner as an answer to the nation's poverty and economic (and ultimately political) inequality, and we would not today think of the pamphlet as "neglected" at all.<sup>30</sup>

In the United States, though Paine's reputation had suffered on account of his outspoken deism and presumed atheism, there was still, as we have seen, a healthy appetite for the latest pamphlet in 1797. Why, then, did the first generation of readers of the pamphlet in the United States not make more of it? Seth Cotlar points out that *Agrarian Justice* arrived during the midst of an extended national conversation about property and economic inequality, and in fact arrived nearly simultaneously with major pamphlets by Constantin François Volney and William Godwin. Though Paine enjoyed celebrity status, his voice was only one in a crowded field, and the remedy he offered (land tax and trust fund) was only one of many up for consideration. On top of which, Paine's pamphlet arrived almost too late. Cotlar notes that 1796–97 was a "high point" of debates about political solutions to economic inequality in the United States. "As the revolutionary energies of the 1790s waned" and the Democratic Party assumed control of

---

<sup>30</sup> On migration of English radicals: Foner, *Revolutionary America*, 263–64.

the federal government in the years that followed, radical visions of reforming economic inequality "drifted to the margins of American political discourse."<sup>31</sup>

### **In England and on the Continent, Poor Mesh with Emerging Political Discourses**

The program Paine offered in *Agrarian Justice* was so unconventional, sweeping, and self-contained that it would have been difficult to assimilate it into prominent early nineteenth-century radical (and other) discourses. Ruling out expropriation of real property, it stood in opposition to the collectivism of Thomas Spence and Gracchus Babeuf. It had even less in common with the collectivism of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels that was to emerge later. In offering a comprehensive national policy, Paine's program stood in contrast with the incremental, association-driven reform efforts of Robert Owen and Charles Fourier and Henri de Saint-Simon (as well as differing from these programs in other ways). From the survey of contemporary reviews presented above, it would appear that some readers indeed had trouble getting their arms around Paine's argument, even for the purpose of a critique.

The fact that Paine's program was such an outlier also helps to explain why even readers who grasped it and were in sympathy with it would have failed to advocate it as a reform program. As a cerebral compromise between conservative property rights and radical egalitarianism, it was not calculated, as were the offerings of revolutionary collectivists, to win a constituency by stirring up the passions of the masses against their oppressors. And not being incremental, it may have seemed highly impractical in comparison with so-called utopian socialism: implementing Paine's proposal was not a

---

<sup>31</sup> Cotlar, *Tom Paine's America*, 150, 158–59.

task for restless active hands today, but for government ministers someday in the distant future.

### **In the United States, Unripe/Unsuitable Objective Conditions**

An additional reason why Paine's proposal did not take quick and deep root in the United States, why it did not stand out as the most compelling solution to the problem of economic inequality to its first generation of American readers, is that objective conditions in the young United States were arguably not yet ripe for it.

In the first place, in the United States there was (if one discounted, as most did, the rights of native peoples) an indefinite amount of land available for the taking. Debates about how a landed class could or should subsidize a landless class could wait: much more urgent was the question of how as yet unclaimed land was to be settled: by whom, in plots of what size, and on what terms.

We see this even more clearly in the response of later generations to the pamphlet. George H. Evans, founder and leader of the National Reform Association, which played a key role from the 1840s to the 1860s in promoting broad-based land ownership via successful lobbying for state and federal homestead laws, emerged from the radical Paineite community in New York City. A printer by trade, Evans had in 1835 published *Agrarian Justice* in an edition of Paine's complete political works. Evans claimed that he had come to his views on land reform before having read *Agrarian Justice*. Nevertheless, he celebrated the affinity of his own ideas with Paine's. At a Paine dinner in 1850, Evans declared that *Agrarian Justice* was "excellent material for building up democratic and social republics." And he liberally quoted the pamphlet in his own writing. Nevertheless, despite evident affinity and affection for *Agrarian Justice*, Evans and his fellow

reformers took from it only the general natural law principle that Paine shared with Pufendorf, Grotius, Locke, Spence, Babeuf, Jefferson, and uncountable others: the idea that the Earth is by right a common inheritance. Evans had no use for Paine's proposal of a tax and a trust fund. His ideal of agrarian justice, conditioned by the American context, was for every individual to hold title to an equal share of the earth's surface. As a practical matter, his organization lobbied for policies that would create and preserve broad-based landownership: e.g., by making title conditional on occupancy, limiting the amount of land one person could own, and preventing forced sale of homesteads due to debt.<sup>32</sup>

It was only when objective conditions had changed that the specific remedy proposed by Paine began to appear relevant in the United States. Henry George became

---

<sup>32</sup> George Henry Evans, ed., *The Political Writings of Thomas Paine . . .* (New York: G. H. Evans, 1835). This was an expanded reprint of George Davidson, ed., *The Political Writings of Thomas Paine . . .* (Charlestown, MA: G. Davidson, 1824), which may have been the first appearance of *Agrarian Justice* in nonpamphlet form in the United States. In Britain, *Agrarian Justice* appears to have been first anthologized in W. T. Sherwin, ed., *The Political Works of Thomas Paine* (London: W.T. Sherman, 1817). Evans's nonreliance on Paine: Helene Sara Zahler, *Eastern Workingmen's and National Land Policy, 1829–1862* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941), 22. Evans's appreciation of Paine: Foner, *Revolutionary America*, 268. An example of Evans quoting Paine: "Rich and Poor," *The Subterranean and Working Man's Advocate*, November 16, 1844, 2.

the champion of U.S. land reform in the late nineteenth century. In his best-selling 1879 *Progress and Poverty*, he laid out a program that involved taxing land values and using the revenue to benefit the public. The epiphany that led George down this Paineite path came when George was literally standing on the far edge of the continent, overlooking San Francisco Bay, contemplating the abyss of the Pacific Ocean and the fact that the frontier had effectively closed. George saw that from now on there would be two permanent classes in American life: the haves who in their role as landowners unproductively extract rent from the economy and the have-nots who pay the rent.<sup>33</sup>

George proposed to use the revenue from his proposed land tax to fund government operations. We might well ask: if George had retraced Paine's steps as far as proposing to tax land, why did he not follow Paine one step further and propose distributing the revenue directly to individuals? This is not an idle question. One of the most common and obvious criticisms levelled at George in his own day was that if his "single tax" was implemented in the United States, the revenue raised would be far in excess of what government operations would require. (Later, after the New Deal, critics of Georgeism would make the reverse argument: a "single tax" on land would not provide enough revenue to support the emerging welfare state.) George could have

---

<sup>33</sup> Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (New York: Doubleday and McClure, 1900), 210.

addressed the objection by taking a Paineite approach and proposing to refund the money to the people. But he did not do so. Why?<sup>34</sup>

There are several possible reasons. It may be that he was aware of Paine's program and sought to differentiate his own—to avoid being seen as a copycat, or to avoid association with a figure still regarded in the late nineteenth century as a notorious atheist. It may be that George would have worried that dividends from his single tax would be large enough to create a "moral hazard," fearing that easy money would undermine recipients' work ethic (a concern that basic income advocates struggle with even today).

The United States's ethnic heterogeneity and open borders might have been another factor militating against a dividend. A proposal for a dividend that would benefit not only Mayflower descendants but also Irish domestics and Chinese railroad laborers, not only Southern landowners but also their tenant farmers and former slaves, would have been a political minefield, and (to mix military metaphors) it would not be surprising if George had little interest in dying on that particular hill.

---

<sup>34</sup> On criticism of the "single tax": Steven B. Cord, *Henry George, Dreamer or Realist?* (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1984). The closest George came to proposing dividends was the rare off-hand acknowledgment that support for widows, orphans, and the elderly and disabled would be an appropriate use of the funds. See: Henry George, "Knights of Labor Speech," *The Complete Works of Henry George*, Vol. 8: *Our Land and Land Policy: Speeches, Lectures, and Miscellaneous Writings*, ed. Henry George, Jr. (New York: Doubleday and McClure, 1901), 217.

The nation's heterogeneous population and open borders would have been a serious political obstacle to implementing a system of dividends in the U.S. in Paine's day as well as in George's—and for that matter they make Basic Income advocacy an uphill battle in the U.S. today too. Americans are sensitive to being "taken advantage of" by allowing government benefits and services to be delivered to those seen as underserving, and many Americans fear that a generous social safety net would attract freeloaders. Alaskans entertained precisely that fear in the 1970s—fear of freeloaders from the lower forty-eight states. If the Supreme Court had not struck it down, Alaska would have implemented a system that made the size of dividends proportional to length of residence in the state, designed precisely to discourage freeloaders from swarming to the Land of the Midnight Sun.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, in Paine's own time, a range of objective conditions made the United States an unlikely staging ground for the program outlined in *Agrarian Justice*. Land "free for the taking" in the west provided a temporary safety valve for the landless, and the heterogeneity of the population and the nation's open borders would have made the dividend scheme a tough sell in the political arena. France and Britain, by contrast, were "full" nations (in which landlessness was for the most part a permanent condition) with

---

<sup>35</sup> As it worked out, Alaska's dividend program (equal annual dividends to all Alaska residents, with a simple one-year residency requirement) did not result in torrential rates of in-migration (Scott Goldsmith, "The Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend: An Experiment in Wealth Distribution," Basic Income European Network 9<sup>th</sup> International Congress, Geneva, Switzerland, September 12–14, 2002).

relatively stable and ethnically homogenous populations. For these reasons it made sense that Paine would have addressed his proposal to the French and British nations rather than to the United States, despite his attachment to his adopted homeland and his strong (if declining) readership base there.

Acknowledgments: The author wishes to thank Peter Barnes, Michael Crowder, Michael Howard, Duncan Kelly, Nora Slonimsky, Phillippe Van Parijs, Karl Widerquist, and several anonymous reviewers for reading the manuscript in one form or another.

**Table 1: Extant pamphlet editions of *Agrarian Justice***

No.	Edition	Publication Location and Date	Language	Notes
1	Paris: Printed by Adlard, Rue Menilmontant, No. 113; and sold by Desenne, Palais Égalité, No. 2	Paris, [March 1797]	English	Complete, presumably supervised by Paine.
2	Paris: printed by W. Adlard, Rue Menilmontant. London: reprinted and sold by J. Adlard, No. 39, Duke Street, Smithfield and J. Parsons, No. 23, Paternoster	London, [March 1797]	English	This edition, presumably based on the Adlard Paris edition (#1), appears to be the basis for all other early English editions.
3	Paris: printed by W. Adlard. London: re-printed for T. Williams, No. 8, Little Turnstile, Holborn, 1797	London, 1797	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
4	Paris, Printed by W. Adlard, Rue Menilmontant; London, Reprinted for T.G. Ballard, No. 7 Little May's Buildings, St. Martins Lane; and Evans and Bone, No. 120, Holborn Hill, 1797	London, 1797	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
5	Paris: printed by W. Adlard, Rue Menilmontant. London: re-printed and sold by the	London, [1797?]	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on

	booksellers of London and Westminster			the J. Adlard edition (#2)
6	London: printed for Evans and Bone, No. 120. Holborn-Hill, 1797	London, 1797	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
7	London: Printed for T.G. Ballard (removed from Little May's Buildings to) No. 46, Chandos-street, St. Martin's Lane	London, [1797? Some library catalogues suggest 1798]	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
8	Paris: printed by W. Adlard, Rue Menilmontant. London: reprinted and sold by J. Adlard, No. 39, Duke Street, Smithfield and J. Parsons, No. 23, Paternoster	London, [1797 or later]	English	Labeled "Second Edition" on title page, otherwise identical to the first J. Adlard edition (#2). May have been a re-issue (of already printed sheets) rather than a reprinting
9	London: F. Farrah	London [1798?]	English	Presumably based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
10	London: Printed by W.T. Sherwin, 183, Fleet Street.	London, 1817	English	Presumably based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
11	London: Printed and published by R. Carlile, 55, Fleet Street, 1819	London, 1819	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2); Carlile indicates that he consulted multiple British editions
12	Edinburgh: printed for and sold by Alexander Leslie, 1797	Edinburgh, 1797	English	Presumably based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2). The National Library of Scotland catalogue describes its copy as "sixth edition."
13	Cork: Printed at the late Gazette-Office; (No. 10), Grattan-street,	Cork, [1797?]	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
14	Dublin, Printed for, and sold by, the booksellers, 1797	Dublin, 1797	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
15	Philadelphia: Printed by R. Folwell for Benjamin Franklin Bache	Philadelphia, [1797]	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)

16	Baltimore: Printed for George Keatinge's bookstore. 1797	Baltimore, July 1797 <sup>i</sup>	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
17	Albany: Printed by Barber & Southwick, M,DCC,XCVII. Sold at their bookstore, two doors north of the city-hall, Court Street, and at Faust's Statue, State Street	Albany, June 1797 <sup>ii</sup>	English	Appears to be based directly or indirectly on the J. Adlard edition (#2)
18	A Paris chez la citoyenne Ragouleau près le Théâtre de la République No 229 Et chez les Marchands de Nouveautés, 1797 [At the end: DE L'IMPRIMERIE DE POUGIN]	Paris, 1797 [in March-May timeframe]	French	Preface omitted. Includes a note saying that it was printed without Paine's supervision
19	Paris: Chez les marchands de nouveautés, an 5 de la République	Paris, between May and September 1797 ("Year 5" is the period from 22 Sept 1796 to 21 Sept 1797.)	French	Appears to be complete fresh translation of the W. Adlard edition (#1), supervised by Paine
20	Thomas Payne an die Gesetzgeber und an die Direktoren der Republik Frankreich. Ein Plan zur Verbesserung der Lage der gesammten Menschheit. Neustrelitz, bey dem Hofbuchhändler Michaelis	Neustrelitz, 1798	German	Appears to be based on French Ragouleau edition (#17)

Notes on other possible pamphlet editions:

1. *Greenleaf's New Daily Advertiser* of New York City advertised *Agrarian Justice* as published on 23 June 1797 and for sale at T. Greenleaf's printing office.<sup>iii</sup> An example of this edition has not been located.
2. Gregory Claeys states that the pamphlet was also published in Manchester, England, but I have been unable to locate a copy.<sup>iv</sup>
3. There may have been a third French edition. The *Allgemeiner litterarischer Anzeiger*<sup>v</sup> refers to a 1797 French edition published by "P. Gide."

4. The pamphlet was also advertised for sale in Troy, New York and (some years later) in Boston, but there is no positive evidence that new editions were printed in those cities.<sup>vi</sup>

---

<sup>i</sup> Month (July) based on a notice in the *Federal Gazette and Baltimore Daily Adviser*, Baltimore, MD (18 July 1797), 4.

<sup>ii</sup> Month (June) based on a notice in the *Albany Register*, Albany, NY (26 June 1797), 3.

<sup>iii</sup> E.g., *Greenleaf's New Daily Advertiser*, New York City (28 June 1797) 4; *Greenleaf's New Daily Advertiser*, New York City (22 August 1797), 4.

<sup>iv</sup> Claeys, *Social and Political Thought*, 207. My gratitude to Professor Claeys for his assistance in my attempt to track down this edition.

<sup>v</sup> *Allgemeiner litterarischer Anzeiger*, Leipzig (19 February 1798), 293.

<sup>vi</sup> Advertisement by Nathaniel Patten, *American Spy*, Troy, NY (14 November 1797), 4; flyleaf of Orestes Brownson, *The Labouring Classes* (Boston: Benjamin H. Greene, 1842).