

## Reply to Professor Griffin

THOMAS FLANAGAN *University of Calgary*

I welcome Professor Griffin's comments on my article.<sup>1</sup> Readers can make up their own minds as to whether I attributed too much "abstract logical consistency" to the agricultural argument.<sup>2</sup> I would, however, remind Professor Griffin and other readers that my article did not propose the agriculture argument as a satisfactory justification for the European appropriation of North America. After trying to tease out the implications of the agricultural argument, I concluded that the real issue "was not private ownership but public sovereignty."<sup>3</sup> I think Professor Griffin would agree that that question has not yet received the treatment it deserves.

- 1 Nicholas Griffin. "Reply to Professor Flanagan." this JOURNAL 22 (1989). 603-06.
- 2 Thomas Flanagan. "The Agricultural Argument and Original Appropriation; Indian Lands and Political Philosophy." this JOURNAL 22 (1989). 601.
- 3 Ibid., 602.