1881-1882

-1-

The Ireland toward which the liner *Spain* bore Henry George in late October 1881, was suffering from the worst festering of social and political sores during the nineteenth-century history of the British system. There were of course larger areas of economic anguish in the eastern reaches of empire, but in Ireland the poison and the danger lay close to Britain's heart. The infection was deep and so old that some could say the system tolerated it. It had broken out last in the politics of Physical Force, which had been organized in the Fenian Brotherhood during the late '50s, and which aimed for Irish independence to be achieved by revolution.

As of the '70s, on the economic side the Irish situation compares with California, in even more ways than Henry George had said. The opening years of the decade had been prosperous, and, with a mild land reform enacted by Parliament in 1870, political tensions had decreased. The brotherhood by no means broke up. But where the recent hottest Irish nationalism had disbelieved in Parliament and reform had seemed a mirage, now both Home Rule and ideas of economic amelioration were taken to Westminster in hope that wrongs could be made right after all by constitutional processes. New Irish leadership, notably in the persons of Charles Stewart Parnell and Michael Davitt, represented the new situation.

Parnell, the acknowledged Irish leader in Parliament after 1875, was a Protestant and a property holder and never a Fenian. But always a patriot he associated somewhat with laboring class elements and with persons more radical than himself, and presently he was identified with the Irish Land League.

If Parnell represented the upper-class side of Irish protest, and much of the fascination of leadership, Michael Davitt, who was still more of the heart and center of the Land League, represented the common substance. Davitt derived from working-class origins (as a child he lost an arm in a

textile factory), he had been for years a Fenian, and in 1880 he had been elected to Parliament— in a membership, sometimes interrupted by jail sentences, which would last for nineteen years. This man better than anyone else exhibits the paradoxes of 1881. He voiced Ireland's protest in the Commons according to ancient rules of order, and also he associated with out-of-doors protest where violence merged into crime; he embraced a radicalism compounded of despair and nationalism, and yet he was constrained by Catholic loyalty and faith.

In the large, though the Irish Sea had not been bridged solidly either by political institutions or by good faith and mutual understanding, and never has been even yet, the situation of the '80s tells no story of complete frustration. This passage of history offers, rather, the annals of solutions proposed and compromised, of imperfect successes, incomplete failures, and continuing hopes. As things stood when George drew near, Ireland may be estimated to have been half-assimilated into the British system. Though the smaller island had its members in Parliament and its justices of the peace across the counties, it had developed no such full habits of political participation as Britain had. Underlying the incidents of protest the question always remained: Was Irish resistance outside the channels of loyalty and constitutionality a necessary recourse? Or would cabinets and parliaments, mainly British and heavily Protestant and always conservative on property rights, actually achieve the vision to understand Irish problems deeply and act forthrightly? Under Victoria, would government have the capacity to solve Irish questions as it had not solved American ones, during the age of George III eleven decades earlier?

In all truth the prospect in 1881 could not be called promising. In the last four years agricultural prices had brought Ireland to a stage of deprivation to be compared with the potato famine of the '40s; in the western counties during 1879 there had been a 75 per cent failure of that crop. Agrarian suffering was due in part to competition from the American West. The very moderate provisions of agricultural credit which had been set up by Parliament's Land Act of 1870—the law which Henry George must have had in mind when he said that tenants' rights were more amply protected in Ireland than in Britain and America — supplied no reservoir sufficiently available or sizable for the tenants' needs. Evictions rose in four years from an ordinary 2400 or 2500 to more than 10,000 in 1880, out of

about 600,000 tenants on the land and perhaps 100,000 vulnerable. As farmers simply could not pay their rents, Ireland's recurrent *jacquerie* broke out into more appalling violence than for 200 years. This was the human urgency behind the Land League's slogans, 'Down with landlordism!' and 'The land for the people!' This was the condition of affairs that justified the 'New Departure' which the league represented in Irish politics: a unifying shift of emphasis from Home Rule to radical land reform.

Unfortunately the stand of British politics in late 1881 was as little encouraging as the economic situation. The Irish pressures had built up while Disraeli was still in power. But the six-year Conservative government ran out in 1880 (and the extraordinary leader died the next spring), and the Conservative party's impulse for humanitarian legislation did not include the urge to change the institutions of land, in Ireland or anywhere. The time for practical hopes that parliamentary action would accomplish substantial relief for the peasants of Ireland occurred between April 1880, when Gladstone won a huge victory at the polls, and the summer of 1881, when the prime minister put through a famous land act.

But the painful months of decision — which coincided with Henry George's first year in New York — ground out a checkered record. The auspices of 1880 were good. The great Liberal carried from his first government of a decade earlier the record not only of land reform but also of having disestablished the Church of England in Ireland. And recently he had associated with young Radicals of intelligence and strength, Joseph Chamberlain, Charles Dilke, and others; and the Radical element was the most friendly in England to lenient treatment for Ireland. But when Gladstone assembled his second government he drew principally from the Whigs, and brought in only two Radicals, Joseph Chamberlain, whom he made president of the Board of Trade, and John Bright, who served in a limited, consultative capacity. Thus the inner conflicts of the Liberal party became stumbling blocks to Irish relief and reform. When a bill to assist Irish tenants was introduced it passed the Commons, but the vote was less than three-to-two. A number of Liberals opposed it; and it failed in the House of Lords.

Meanwhile anguish piled on anguish in Ireland. During late 1880 and early 1881 evictions mounted to perhaps 1000 a month, and violence increased across the land. This was the time when peasants in the Land

League country created the verb ‘boycott’ in our language. By reducing Captain Boycott to isolation on his acres — denying him field labor and household servants, preventing him from receiving mail and telegrams — they worked out a technique of social pressure. The reaction in England was to strengthen the elements in Parliament that demanded a new act to coerce Ireland. With the premier in the minority of his own cabinet, a force bill was passed, and habeas corpus was suspended before the Liberal government accomplished any relief measures.

Then at mid-1881 Gladstone came forward with his new land act. It reduced the freedom of Irish landlords, in exercising their property rights, to sterner control by the state than that to which recent labor legislation under Disraeli had reduced industrial employers. A judicial commission was established with power to fix rents, on the application of either tenant or landlord. Based on the ‘three F’s’ which had marked the maximum demands of Irish land reform before the Land League, the new law made practical provisions for the tenants to have Fair Rents, Fixity of Tenure, and the Free Sale of whatever improvements they might put upon the land they occupied. By the standards of the ’80s this was an astonishing law: ‘The most revolutionary measure that passed through Parliament in the nineteenth century,’ according to J. L. Hammond, and the ‘beginning of the end’ of Ireland’s underlying problem, in the observation of Joseph Chamberlain’s biographer. Never before had a government in the Anglo-American tradition in time of peace so forcefully asserted the general interest overproperty rights; and the House of Lords which enacted the reduction of rents spelled out the doom of its own class elsewhere than just in Ireland.

Had Irish politics, both parliamentary and outdoor varieties, followed amiably in the logic of Parliament’s strong action, Henry George might have had the happy but inappropriate task of reporting for the *Irish World* a deep improvement in the land to which he was assigned. Indeed the Irish members of Parliament had been surprised at Gladstone’s bill. But a little familiarity with it bred contempt in Parnell; and of course by the standards of Land League ideology the land act conceded too little and came too late. In Parliament the Irish leader and his men withheld and gave their votes in the shrewdest way to extract gains, and when the law was passed advised against much use of the tribunals it instituted. In short the Parnellites played

to keep the agitation going and American funds coming. Parnell's political convenience was not disserved when he was thrown in Kilmainham Jail, a martyr, 11 October. Davitt had already been in Portland Prison in England for eight months.

We know now that a turning point in Irish social history had been reached. In due course the peasants were going to assimilate gradual land reform and abandon more revolutionary goals. By November 1881, in fact, the new land courts were clogged with thousands of applicants, even in the regions where the Land League was strongest. Henry George's arithmetic for the Irish World, estimating that if sixty-five decisions were reached a day, the business would be complete by A.D. 2154, pictures the situation. Before long, however, the Irish Land League was going to disintegrate, more because reforms were removing the need for it to survive, than because the government had prosecuted it.

But this state of affairs had not arrived when Henry George reached Ireland. Not peasant proprietorships nor Home Rule, both reserved for the twentieth century; nor harmony of any kind. The old want and suffering had come to no abatement; the griefs of three years of bloodshed were mounting, not diminishing; coercion was waxing ever more stern. While the *Spain* was in midocean, Parnell and his brothers in Kilmainham Jail had composed their famous 'No Rent Manifesto.' In reduced form it follows: 'Fellow-countrymen, the hour to try your souls and to redeem your

pledges has arrived. The Executive of the National Land League, forced to abandon the policy of testing the Land Act, feels bound to advise the tenant farmers of Ireland ... to pay no rents under any circumstances to their landlords until the Government relinquishes the existing system of terrorism and restores the constitutional rights of the people ... You have to choose ... between the Land for the Landlords and the Land for the People.'

To the No Rent Manifesto Henry George's employer in New York quickly responded in a cablegram: 'A thousand cheers for the glorious manifesto. It is the bravest act of the Land War.' And, in the columns of the *Irish World*: 'We believe that the No-Rent manifesto is the initiation of a mighty revolution that is destined not to end till the disinherited, not only of Ireland but of all lands, are restored to the inheritance of which they have been robbed ... The present is big with hope.'

Had he still been in New York, say consulting with Ford about *Irish World* politics, Henry George would have argued with the editor we may be sure. 'No rent' was the opposite of his economic belief; he wanted rent to be socialized. Yet against Ford's accepting the present tactics of the men of Kilmainham, George would have made no protest. And as things were George would, we may believe, have wished to change places with no other journalist in the world.

-2-

George's tickets read for Liverpool, but when the Spain put into Cork he quickly changed his mind. An agent who identified himself as a Land Leaguer advised him to adopt another name and change the markings on his trunks, for he was sure to be 'dogged' whenever his presence became known. The prophecy proved true; but the advice was not accepted. The American newspaperman settled his ladies in a Cork hotel, and at once went on alone to Dublin.

No one interfered directly while he searched for bearings. He took in the sights, and his first letter for publication in the *Irish World* mentioned the impressive houses of Dublin. He reported the many redcoats everywhere, and the trouble he was put to to meet Land Leaguers during the day of arrival in Cork, until he discovered a priest who trusted him and talked freely. In private

to Ford on 10 November he expressed his full reaction: 'I got indignant as soon as I landed and I have not got over it yet. This is the most damnable government that exists today outside Russia.' Even Ford, he thought, could have no idea of the reign of terror; and with the Land League outlawed and people afraid to talk, he could not see how he was going to get his feet down.

At first he concentrated all efforts to visit the famous prisoners in Kilmainham. Three days of waiting seemed interminable; and he wished he could alternate the irony of Dickens (in the manner of the description of the 'circumlocution office') with the eloquence of Mill on liberty, to convey his feeling of how the jail was operated and to what purpose. At last he was permitted a few minutes with the prisoners, political talk forbidden, out of their daily ration of a quarter-hour for visiting. He and Parnell managed to communicate about present politics by seeming to discuss the persecution

of the early church and the triumph of Christianity. Perhaps, as George believed, they deceived 'the gold-banded chief warden.' The correspondent came out deeply impressed with the quality of Parnell — not a durable impression as we shall see; and he was gratified a little later, on visiting the Parnell country home, to realize the privileges the leader had risked for his country.

Immediately on arrival in Ireland, George had discovered that as the Land League faded the women of the movement took over, operating partly for the men and in contact with the underground, and partly above board in their own new Ladies Land League. Miss Anna Parnell, the jailed man's sister, was the most prominent; and associated with her was Miss Helen Taylor, the stepdaughter and literary executor of John Stuart Mill. This wonderful lady — Henry George thought her the most intelligent woman he ever knew — came from England to persuade Miss Parnell to go there and avoid arrest, while she herself at less risk should undertake direction of affairs in Ireland.

Even Annie George, a non-political woman thus far, caught the spirit. In December, when her husband had gone off to London, she was invited to take the chair of a Dublin meeting. The Ladies Land League was not proscribed, but Miss Parnell had been warned not to appear this time. One may readily believe that Mrs. George was quite as nervous as her daughter says, but she was nevertheless able on the morning of the meeting to write hersons, as though about equal events, of Jennie's having a hotel beau, and of her own plan for the afternoon. She might be arrested, she said. 'Of course they can't keep me — so I'm going to see if they try it — this is the most strangely governed place ever heard of I think. Dreadful as matters are one can't help laughing — they are so funny. All speak of being arrested as an honor. So if I am honored don't get alarmed. It will sell Papa's book like hotcakes ... By the way we all went to the theater ... and some man in the balcony hollowed three cheers for Mrs. George. So you see I share Papa's popularity.'

Meanwhile George himself, greatly admiring the women and their work, had cut to the inner operations of the resistance. His findings could not be put in the paper, he wrote Ford after three weeks in Ireland, but the men of Kilmainham 'still keep direction,' though prison portals were becoming increasingly difficult to pass. Out of jail one leader, Patrick Egan,

had gone to Paris to receive and distribute money — mainly the funds coming from America. At home, 'Maloney is a sort of head center outside jail,' with Clancy as a kind of lieutenant. Sixteen men and ten or so women, members of the Ladies Land League, were traveling the counties, he said, and 'communications are received under cover and destroyed when read.' Under Miss Parnell, the 'ladies run the whole business of relief and its support.'

The writer expressed no repugnance for the conspiratorial procedures of the Irish. He seems to have had none to express, except for the crime and terror which the Land League disavowed and at least on the surface discouraged. But he did become very critical of the looseness of the underground's organization and the waste in its handling of funds. 'Sometimes it seems to me,' he wrote Ford with respect to his impressions of both Irish radicals and a group of British socialists, 'as though a lot of small men had found themselves in the lead of a tremendous movement, and finding themselves being lifted into importance and power they never dreamed of are jealous of anybody else sharing the honor.'

To see the root of the matter, George traveled west into King's County to witness a group eviction. He described it eloquently for the *Irish World*: a miserable group of tenants were driven from their hovels, then readmitted as caretakers, while a land agent, a sub-sheriff, three priests, 150 police, and a company of soldiers stood by to see that nothing went amiss. Such was the testimony of continuing land crisis and of coercion as George reported them. Yet his political comments show that within a couple of months he pretty well realized that the Land League movement was just about collapsing, and that the No Rent Manifesto was a failure.

In the nature of the case George's assignment involved more than ordinary reporting, it involved what naturally accompanies an exportation of American funds and American interest. 'Radicalization' is the word George selected to express Ford's and his own intention to influence events. Yet there were many limitations on how much he could say. It was not simply that detectives followed his every move always with the threat of more than watching, but there was also the sense which grew on him that the *Irish World* represented an American influence not altogether wanted in Ireland even by Land Leaguers, an outside interference in inside affairs.

The matter came up in practical form very soon after George's arrival in Dublin.

Ford had wanted immediate arrangements made for him to lecture in the city. But among those in charge doubts occurred, and hesitations postponed the event about a week. Yet when the lecture did come off, at mid-November in the Rotunda, it was a personal triumph. According to the speaker, the affair gave Dubliners the first opportunity in a long time to show their feelings, and at the end they went 'wild with enthusiasm.' Leaving the building he fought off men who wanted to unhitch his carriage and draw him through the streets. Tribute in such a form seemed undemocratic to George. But when the affair was over he feared that he had brushed aside a demonstration which would have won him much attention in the papers.

Though he gave no other speech in Ireland for nearly a year, and he was aware always of the weakening of the resistance, George let himself become more and more involved emotionally in the movement. His sympathies, he told Ford at year's end, were 'so strongly aroused in this fight against such tremendous odds that it is impossible for me not to find myself in it.' His letters at this time take over from his associates the phrase 'Spread the Light,' a slogan common among socialists. There was urgency in the air wherever he went.

The most interesting ideological discovery of George's first few

weeks in Ireland was the existence there of an ancient critique of private property in land. This tradition had not been rendered into high theory, yet it was an idea better designed to please George than simple anti-rent talk. I have caught no mention to indicate that he ever heard of James FintanLawlor, a journalist like himself who a generation earlier had put the idea into eloquent words for the incitement of the Physical Force party. George tells us that the critique came to him from a Catholic bishop; and of course a Christian source of social protest was the kind to please him best. Certainly he was delighted when the politically active Bishop of Clonfert saluted him, 'God bless you, my son,' as the author of *Progress and Poverty.* 'Your doctrines are the old belief of our race ... Our people have bowed to might; but they never have acknowledged the right of making land private property. In the old tongue they have cherished the old truth,

and now in the providence of God the time has come for that faith to be asserted ... There is no earthly power that can ever stop this movement.'

Hardly less interesting to George than the fact of the tradition was a second discovery, namely, that besides Clonfert a sizable and important number of the clergymen of the island, rather than the Land League or any other secular group, were making themselves the present-day disseminators of the idea. Not long before he landed in Ireland another bishop, Dr. Thomas Nulty, had addressed his diocese of Meath. 'The system of land tenure in Ireland,' this churchman had said, 'has created a state of human existence which in strict truth and justice can be characterized as the twin sister of slavery.' Very like the distributive economics of *Progress and Poverty*, Nulty's argument derived from labor theory: labor creates and justifies private property in things, and opportunity for labor demands common property in land. Every child of God, the reverend bishop told his flock, has an equal original right in what God has given; only the improvers of land have a right to hold it; and usufruct should be the highest form of tenure. Rent belongs to the community.

Bishop Nulty especially gratified George because he spoke publicly and independently, making his own application of Christian conscience to affairs. On this point the diocesan letter was very specific. In a passage which George chose to remember —and to use in his later conflicts with an American archbishop — Nulty asserted that he exercised as bishop no divine right to direct his flock in their conceptions of civil rights and political economy. Rather he advised them in paternal concern for their temporal welfare. To the visiting American believer in a commonwealth based on Christian principles, the Bishop of Meath represented the best influence at work in Ireland.

A little awkwardly, however, this warm appreciation on George's side led to embarrassments. When his reports about Dr. Nulty, or more strictly when garbled versions of those reports were printed in the *Irish World*, the bishop was seriously put out. Yet George felt free to use the bishop's ideas, when he decided from something heard at an interview that Dr. Nulty really favored the No Rent movement. George took the liberty of having the diocesan letter distributed by the Ladies Land League; and before Christmas it was printed and posted, all over the land. Doubtless George regarded this cross-connecting of ideas and politics in Ireland as an errand

in ‘radicalizing’ the resistance, but it definitely displeased the bishop, and imposed a new strain on all concerned.

The episode ended some weeks later. When Nulty had finished reading *Progress and Poverty*, he wrote handsomely that he believed it to be ‘the best book ever written on political economy since the *Wealth of Nations*.’ Yet there was dismissal in his comment that George's strength lay in ‘scientific writing,’ and that his thinking ran too deep for great success in journalism. In retrospect of his connection with the Bishop of Meath, George felt that he had learned, from one of the best and strongest, something about the ‘timorousness of prominent men’ and the unfreedom of churchmen.

In this vein, after three months of observing in Ireland, the correspondent writing privately to his editor added a trial balance of impressions. He recognized that, like the Catholics of England, most of the upper members of the church hierarchy in Ireland stood on the side opposed to Nulty. He blamed Rome, principally, for this economic conservatism; and in general he felt obliged to qualify his original hopes that the clergymen of Ireland would emerge in time as the true leaders of a social reconstruction.

Even so, George retained the impression that the parish priests were not complacent, and that they served the cause of resistance and in a degree offset the conservatism of the majority of bishops — an opinion sustained by modern historical research. In the history of George’s opinions, about how reform may be achieved, though the Catholic Church in Ireland failed to come up to his conception of what Christian performance should be, what he saw on this visit represented his first interest since childhood in church efforts of size and consequence. Henceforward we shall find him, so different from during the California years, always ready to regard the commitment and vitality of the churches, both Protestant and Catholic, as containing an enormous potential for social justice, a potential that should be able to be put to practical effect.

-3-

By the end of January 1882, George’s three-month contract with the *Irish World* had run out. Lacking notice he continued and was paid for his weekly letters. His relationship with his employer and editor remained satisfactory, even though his $60 a week was not enough. Hotels and travel,

though Mrs. George and the girls did not move about as much as he did, took all he earned. His greatest discouragement, he confessed to Francis Shaw, was with his own performance. 'I have never felt so dissatisfied with myself as since I have been here.' He was swamped with people to see, things to do, and letters to write. He would have given much to have Harry to take his dictation and act as general secretary. 'Nor have my letters to the World satisfied me. In short I have felt to use one of our expressive Americanisms "all up in a heap" ever since I have been here.' The constant strain on the 'perceptive faculties' was the heart of the trouble, he decided, and he regretted that his mental habits were not good for quick work of a large sort.

This did not mean that he wanted to hurry home. He preferred to return no sooner than the fall lecture season — early for the season, he decided, as a wave of Irishmen could be expected to cross the ocean to explain Ireland to listening Americans. He hoped that he would be able to earn enough quick money on the platform to afford time later on for writing the handbook of political economy he planned, to be done according to the governing ideas of *Progress and Poverty*.

For all his doubts about himself in a foreign land, George's confidence increased that events in the British Isles were actually developing according to the diagnoses and prognosis in *Progress and Poverty*. 'Things are moving so fast that ere long they may want a series from you for the *Nineteenth Century*,' he heard from a new socialist acquaintance, H. M. Hyndman, whom he had not yet come to distrust. He himself made a series of predictions about Britain, negative and positive. On the negative side, he was more pessimistic than the events of the next few years would justify. He said, two years before the Fabian Society drew together, that he 'had little hope of the literary class here,' and, four years before Gladstone rounded out Liberal policy for Ireland, he added that he had no hope 'at all of the men who have made their reputations.' But on the affirmative side he foresaw accurately what he believed in, the rise of labor in public affairs. Tell Youmans, he instructed A. J. Steers, that far from encountering difficulty in discovering friends with a common mind, he was having an easy time. Not in Ireland alone, where he sensed 'a great blind groping forward,' but in Great Britain too he believed that 'the beginning of *the revolution* sure' was on.

Naturally he liked to go to London whenever he could. This was not hard to arrange, for the capital city fell within the natural area of his assignment from the *Irish World*. He managed a short visit in December and a good deal of time there during the later winter and spring. But in London he was mainly concerned with publishing, and only secondarily with letters for his newspaper. Kegan Paul had consistently good news now; and George's sense that the times were justifying his social analysis enlivened his hope that *Progress and Poverty* would rapidly catch on. Once the first indifference had vanished, in the autumn, according to Mr. Paul, 'purely on its own strength the book began to make its own way.' The first English edition ran out in December, and a second was issued, and by spring a third was needed. The author had hardly dreamed of better.

What he now wanted was a cheap English edition, parallel to the Appleton one. George found encouragement from the fact that the Glasgow and London edition of *The Irish Land Question* was selling well, better than *Progress and Poverty*; he believed that the popularity of the tract would lead readers to the treatise. But Mr. Paul was not easily persuaded to go ahead. So George investigated on his own the publishing arrangements which distributed standard novels in cheap editions by way of the newsstands everywhere in Britain. It took until June to win his point. Mr. Paul's final decision for a cheap edition, unprecedented for a work on political economy, George believed to be forced by his own threat to go to another publisher.

About every phase of publishing Henry George kept in constant communication with his wealthy patron on Staten Island. As early as April Mr. Shaw, to whom he had written something about the tension and strain of what he was doing, had sent a subsidy of £100 simply to strengthen George's position and enable him to work without anxiety. On George's own motion half of this money was assigned toward paying the cost of the cheap edition. The gift seemed 'like a fulcrum for a lever that will move the world,' he wrote the giver.

But Mr. Shaw was ready to do still more for *Progress and Poverty*. The £100 had hardly gotten across the Atlantic when he sent further word that he had from an anonymous source $3000 more for the distribution of the book. Though he maintained secrecy at first, he soon acknowledged that his brother was the giver. The Shaws originally planned to use this money in

the United States, but when George asked they readily assigned half to Britain. ‘Even from an American standpoint,’ George said, the immediate thing should be ‘a cheap edition here, and force the question into discussion, as England reacts on America.’

So when late in June he received £300, the author concluded very special publishing arrangements. A sympathetic new friend and a Radical, James C. Durant, undertook to print an 88-page quarto edition of *Progress and Poverty*, bound in paper; and Kegan Paul, Trench and Company agreed to act as the distributors. The price was fixed at sixpence. At the same time George managed to buy in the plates of The Irish Land Question, and at an extra outlay of fifteen pounds to have 15,000 copies printed, with a four-page tract by Mr. Shaw himself included, for distribution at threepence.

Free copies of both *Progress and Poverty* and *The Irish Land Question* were sent to every member of Parliament, and to Land League organizations, working-men’s clubs, and newspapers in long lists — the last intended to bring out reviews in the provincial press and so to force the attention of the metropolitan newspapers.

George wished that there had been enough money to send copies to the libraries also, as in America, but he was grateful and well satisfied. With your help the movement *has* begun, he wrote Shaw, and discussion is the next essential. ‘When that point is reached the movement takes care of itself.’

Mass-scale publication was the one piece of essential business, over and beyond his work for the *Irish World*, that George had planned for the trip. But to his present satisfaction, as the year before in New York, he was invited to do a certain amount of circulating and speaking. In February he gave an address at Liverpool. He made a St. Patrick’s Day speech in Glasgow for an Irish audience, and a second appearance in that city; there was also an appearance in Manchester, about which more later; and in June he was back in Dublin, speaking in the Rotunda for the benefit of the political prisoners. As occasion made it possible, he used his public appearances to announce his program and ideas as his own, apart from the Irish crisis.

Again as in New York, he was sought out occasionally by interesting individuals. Indeed, on his first day in London, he encountered, on Fleet Street, Mr. J. Morrison Davidson of the Middle Temple, who as writer was

later to propagate single-tax ideas. The two had dinner together at the Old Cheshire Cheese. To Mr. Davidson that day Henry George communicated a great feeling of vitality, and of events about to occur. That the 'Hour had brought the Man,' that the Irish question had made Henry George, that this American possessed more color than did his book — such were the impressions he caught from George.

The earliest important new connection George struck up in London was one with that curious rich man of the left, Henry Myers Hyndman. At this time a strong friend of Irish resistance, Hyndman is remembered principally as the chief leader, a colleague of William Morris, in the Social Democratic Federation, and as the author of a socialist book, *England for All*. Both were new in 1882; and organization and book represent the first serious effort to adapt and apply Marxian doctrines for the practical political guidance of Englishmen. There is high irony in the likelihood that Henry George and Henry Hyndman were brought together, each hoping to convert the other to his own way of thinking, by Miss Helen Taylor — two naturally opposed spokesmen for social recon-struction introduced by the literary heir of the late historic read juster of classical economics, John Stuart Mill.

Circumstance forbade George's ever knowing Karl Marx personally, nor could he ever have known *Das Kapital* well had he had the inclination. In 1882 the great author of modern socialism was out of England, though he was to die there the next year. Only one volume of the big treatise had been published at that time, and years were still to pass before it would be put into English; the posthumous second and third volumes would not be translated during George's lifetime. But Marx had formed a judgment about George at least as early as 1881, and, partly because Hyndman knew what it was and followed it, it must be inserted here. It is expressed in full in a letter to Friedrich A. Sorge, dated 30 June 1881. 'Theoretically the man is utterly backward!' said Karl Marx. 'He understands nothing about the nature of *surplus value* ... We ourselves, as I have already mentioned, adopted this appropriation of ground rent by the state among numerous other *transitional measures* which ... are and must be contradictory in themselves ... The whole thing is therefore simply an attempt, decked out with socialism, to *save capitalist domination* and indeed to *establish it afresh on an even wider basis* than its present one ... On the other hand

George's book, like the sensation it has made with you, is significant because it is a first if unsuccessful, attempt at emancipation from the orthodox political economy ... He is a talented writer (with a talent for Yankee advertisement too) as his article on California in the *Atlantic* proves, for instance. He also has the repulsive presumption and arrogance which is displayed by all panacea mongers without exception.'

As a guest in the Hyndman house on Portland Place, where he experienced for the first time a very expensive way of living, Henry George confronted, also for the first time, a strong spokesman for Marxist ideas. Not improbably he recalled his first intimation of those ideas, which had come by way of the immigrant International during the early months of editing the Post. Certainly Hyndman did much to please the Georges, and communication between the two men must have been made easier because the Englishman had traveled in America, and knew persons and places on both coasts familiar to George. But from the host's own account we are assured that he invited the Georges to stay with him, 'because I hoped, quite mistakenly as it afterwards appeared, to convert him to the truth as it is in Socialist economics.'

Hyndman soon discovered the nature of George's resistance. The guest proved 'as exasperating as Kropotkin' to the socialist by reason of his 'bump of reverence ... of cathedral proportions,' and because he could not be induced 'to admit that he only captivated his audience by clever manipulations agreeably put.' This estimate of George's mental operations is retrospective. As of the moment, George tried and persisted in a counter-offensive. Though he observed and was amused by Hyndman's humorless formal manners, and though he understood the man's surrender to Marxist 'mental influence' — ample signs of a stiff-necked personality — George did not have the capacity to give up arguing his own case. He even persuaded himself that he was winning a little against his host's materialistic philosophy.

The skirmish for ascendancy does not mean that either man foresaw that one day they must break. Certainly they maintained common fronts in several different directions. Their minds met when Hyndman showed George a discovery he had made in the British Museum, a lecture by Thomas Spence, dated 1775, 'The Real Rights of Man,' which declared for common rights in land and for land- value taxation. George turned it over to

the *Irish World* for publication; and he made an effort to have an article by Hyndman published in America. Hyndman it was who took the Georges to an elegant London reception, where they had the satisfaction of seeing Tennyson and Browning. This was rather like George's playful notion of travel and mingling with the mighty. But at the same party George met Herbert Spencer and had his first disillusionment from that philosopher. The great man astonished and angered him by discussing Irish land problems from an entirely conservative point of view.

There was intellectual drama in the drawing-room event. Three years earlier, working on his manuscript in San Francisco, it will be recalled, George had reinforced his argument for common property in land by discussing English land nationalization, and by attributing to it merit almost equal to land-value taxation. By borrowing the authority of the British social theorist most appreciated in America — by quoting *Social Statics* — he had assured his readers that *Progress and Poverty* accorded with acknowledged leaders and ideas. In view of what followed presently and in 1892, Herbert Spencer's snubbing Henry George at a party is to be understood as more than a snub. It was a real rejection of the American reformer. On the other side of the situation, Henry Hyndman's playing host signifies the sponsorship of one pro-labor theorist by another. As Dr. Elwood Lawrence has neatly pointed out, George during this first visit to Britain, very different from after 1886, made no effort to prevent people from connecting him with socialism, and none to prevent them from identifying him with land nationalization. Though not at all overwhelmed by Hyndman, he did go a certain distance with him politically as well as personally. On the speaking trip to Scotland, George and Miss Taylor stood on the same platform with the Marxian socialist on behalf of the Social Democratic Federation, in an effort to establish a new branch.

During the London visits George developed other connections, and other signs of recognition appeared. From one direction, Mr. Thomas Briggs, a future patron, befriended George and entertained him — in a 'magnificent house' in West Dulwich, according to the guest's appreciation. At about the same time, a number of agreeable letters came in from Germany. The news did not include the word George wanted most, that sales of *Fortschrittund Armuth* were good; but with benefit of Mr. Shaw's bounty the author was able to pay off a debt to Gutschow, and he was

pleased to receive a request for biographical data to appear in an article in *Die lllustrierte Zeitung*. From close at hand came the most flattering compliment of all. After three months of acquaintanceship Miss Taylor told the Georges that she believed that, had John Stuart Mill lived, he would have accepted *Progress and Poverty* as she herself now did.

In the spring, journalistic duty led to a trip to Paris, to visit Irish Land League officials in exile. There George met Patrick Egan and liked him personally. He made a critical report, nevertheless, to Patrick Ford. The treasurer, whose funds came for the most part if not all through the offices of the *Irish World*, was disbursing them too much for relief and too little for reform propaganda, George believed. The journalist saw at least something of Paris in April, outside the sphere of duty; and so too did Mrs. George and the girls, who crossed the channel with Miss Taylor.

One suspects that the costs of this expedition were borne in part by Mr. Shaw's subsidy, which certainly helped purchase some English outfitting for the family at about the same time.

Six weeks or so after returning from Paris, George made what must have been his earliest contact with land nationalization as a practical movement with a leadership worthy of that of John Stuart Mill. This reform stood on its own feet, quite distinct from any variety of socialism; and the present leader was Alfred Russel Wallace, the scientist whose good opinion of his own work George had learned, just before leaving home for Ireland. As of the spring of 1882, we know that Wallace sought George's help in getting a reputable New York paper to review his new book on *Land Nationalisation*, and that he said in another letter that he must not be understood as endorsing Michael Davitt's ideas. He preferred for himself no such close association with Irish protest as George had ventured.

Yet for future understanding, and because *Land Nationalisation* was a considerable event in the cross-connecting of Henry George's ideas, and because Alfred Russel Wallace was a very special person, the exchange between scientist-reformer and journalist-reformer demands a filling-in of background. George would have been exhilarated to know that a year earlier letters had passed between Wallace and Charles Darwin about *Progress and Poverty*. Wallace had explained to the senior scientist that the book's anti-Malthusianism involved no rejection of such use of population doctrine as they both had made in their scientific writing. 'Mr. George,

while admitting the main principle [of Malthus] as self-evident and as actually operating in the case of animals and plants, denies that it ever has operated or can operate in the case of man, still less that it has any bearing whatever on the vast social and political questions which have been supported by a reference to it.' To which Darwin replied: 'I will certainly order "Progress and Poverty" for the subject is a most interesting one. But I read many years ago some books on political economy, and they produced a disastrous effect on my mind, viz. utterly to distrust my own judgment on the subject and to doubt much everyone else's judgment! So I feel pretty sure that Mr. George's book will only make my mind worse confounded than it is at present.'

Beginning with the persuasion that George's anti-Malthusianism did not offend science, Wallace let *Progress and Poverty* affect his *Land Nationalisation* considerably. He quoted at length, and he wrote an extra chapter: 'Chapter VII. Low Wages and Pauperism the Direct Consequences of Unrestricted Private Property in Land.' One of Wallace's interesting findings was that during the '70s Professor J. E. Cairnes, an Irish follower of Mill whom George had cited on interest, had published ideas in 'quite independent accordance with the special views of Mr. George — an accordance which must add greatly to the weight of their teaching.' Wallace had been more acute than George in noticing this support.

As his own goal the naturalist announced that he would set forth conclusions 'reached by an examination of the actual condition of the people' of the British Isles; and he asserted that in comparison *Progress and Poverty* set forth general theory. He believed that the two books reinforced one another. For, 'if, as I maintain, [my] conclusions have now been demonstrated by induction from the facts, that demonstration acquires the force of absolute proof when exactly the same conclusion is reached by a totally distinct line of deductive reasoning founded on the admitted principles of political economy and the general facts of social and industrial development.' Though it is possible to say of Wallace that he was too much of a humanitarian to be a fully effective scientist, and too much of a naturalist to be a great expert in social questions, there can be no doubt that his book's endorsement strengthened George's intellectual credit in England.

Meanwhile George had had an invitation and spent an evening which indicates that in England he had established the capacity to interest men nearer to power and less extreme in persuasion than either Land League Irishmen or rich socialists or scientist philosophers. The invitation came from Walter Wren, an Oxford man and intellectual of means who had previously entertained Mr. and Mrs. George in his London home. He gave a dinner for four at the Reform Club. The other guests were John Bright, the ancient leader for free trade and political reform who at present enjoyed the distinction of a thirty-five-year record of speaking for justice and mercy in Ireland, and Joseph Chamberlain the rising Radical star in Gladstone's cabinet.

'We started on Irish affairs with the soup,' the guest of honor wrote Patrick Ford, 'for Bright asked me point blank what I thought of what I had seen in Ireland, and I had to tell him, though it was not very flattering. We kept it up to half past ten, when Bright had to go down to the House, having left his daughter in the gallery. Mr. Chamberlain remained until nearly twelve.' From certain allusions George gathered that the cabinet member had some familiarity with his letters in the *Irish World;* and Chamberlain's reply when George hinted that he would like permission to visit Michael Davitt in Portland Prison seemed to indicate that before long the Irish radical would be released — as he was not too long after this conversation. Chamberlain laughingly told George 'to look out when I went back to Ireland that I did not get reasonably "suspected."'

Altogether George was entranced by the personable statesman and was ready as many were to see in him the man of Britain's future. He wished that he could repeat the confidences heard at the Wren dinner, he told Ford. During the following summer George must have felt confirmed in his good opinion when an Irish nationalist made that dinner public, as though the news were sensational. Chamberlain wrote then that he had no objection to its being known that they had spent such an evening together.

In the same area of intellect as the conversation with the distinguished Radicals, George found his first opportunity for magazine writing in England. Occasion offered in the *Fortnightly Review*, which was edited by John Morley, the liberal lawyer, essayist, and biographer. This brilliant man was already closely connected with Chamberlain, and the next year would enter Parliament as a strong Gladstone supporter. When the *Fortnightly*

wanted George to do an article on Ireland, he was naturally more than willing. He took time off from the *Irish World*, in order to do the work.

When the article appeared, by chance a month after the horrifying Phoenix Park murders in Dublin, it could be read as support for the Gladstone government's first bold refusal to be stampeded into deeper coercion. George wove together a great deal about local and general government in Ireland; he demonstrated the actual dominance of the landlords at every level; he pictured the lord lieutenant in the castle as no true ruler — 'The machine runs him.' The article analyzed Irish society to show the factors that prevented the growth of vigorous commercial and industrial classes, and most effectively it argued the wrong-headedness of Englishmen who attributed mischief in Ireland to some inherent racial or national characteristics. The article was as tough and sinewy as any George ever did, and it is reminiscent of his analyses and exposures of economic and political abuse in California.

The summer of 1882, when George returned to Ireland for most of the remainder of this visit, would be too early in his career in England to attempt a summing up of all the directions of his influence there — on labor, on land nationalization, on the socialist movement, and so on. But his approach toward the young Radical element demands a final word. Though there is nothing to indicate, up to the time when George talked with Joseph Chamberlain and corresponded with John Morley, that either man had read *Progress and Poverty*, it is clear that very soon thereafter both did read it, and that the book caught on in their group.

According to J. L. Garvin, Chamberlain's masterful biographer, speaking of the end of the calendar year 1882, *Progress and Poverty* 'electrified' the cabinet member. And 'the effect on Morley was the same. They both read likewise the simultaneous plea of Alfred Russel Wallace for nationalisation of the land, and they compared ideas from time to time. They believed that the whole English land question, with its urban aspects of housing, overcrowding, ground rents, and the rest, may have to be "the great business." Chamberlain was against nationalisation; he thought it predatory; but he was keener than ever for multiplying small owners on the soil, for breaking up big estates to the extent required, and began to meditate on taxing urban property to abolish the slums. To promote social reform in general, he aimed especially at taxing wealth automatically

increased in towns by the growth of the community without effort to the owner ... He would levy on all "unearned increment" and bear hard upon comfortable possessors of slum property.'

'A book had been born' is this same writer's phrasing for what occurred. 'Reborn, in England,' would of course be a more accurate statement.

-4-

According to George's letters in the *Irish World*, not very much happened in Ireland from the end of 1881 until the following May. The journalist wrote his dispatches about coercion; and in fact he was doubly obliged to do so because a number of Americans had been thrown into the Irish jails. The *Irish World* itself was now excluded from Ireland.

George knew in detail also, what he could say only privately, that with the disintegration of the Irish Land League and the No Rent impulse, new dangers were confronting the cause of amelioration in Ireland. He understood that, with the more responsible leadership in jail, the less responsible elements were rising. With the passing months, terror broke out in many places. To Francis Shaw, George wrote no more cheerfully than to pledge that 'We must "spread the light" without [the Leaguers]. But sure as we live, the light is spreading.'

Secretly at top level meanwhile, the Liberal government was taking steps along lines not inconsistent with what George had heard at the Reform Club dinner. Though the cabinet was still divided, and the prime minister himself was immersed in the budget, Gladstone permitted the Radical president of the Board of Trade to go ahead with what became this government's last effort for a general settlement in Ireland — the Liberals' last effort prior to the climactic decision of Gladstone's third government, in favor of Irish Home Rule. Though ill-starred from the beginning, the scheme that Joseph Chamberlain now arranged scarcely deserves the bad reputation it has gathered under the dark misnomer of the treaty of Kilmainham.

It was no more nor less than a political bargain between the government and the Parnellites in jail. The crown would release the Irish leaders from Kilmainham; and they would pledge themselves to support, instead of No Rent and the destruction of landlordism, such moderate

reforms as had already been enacted or might in the future be worked out along lines of law and order. For the jailed leaders this meant accepting the program of the Land Act of 1881, which was precisely what great numbers of their countrymen were doing in practice; and for Britain it meant a policy of reduced coercion, a step in the direction Radicals and prime minister alike wanted.

So much outlines what may be called the practical side of the matter. Before considering other aspects, it should be stated that later, in midsummer, though the treaty of Kilmainham still distressed him, Henry George had the fairness to say that the government's land reforms were actually taking hold and doing good.

Conceding this much, he did not retract his deeper criticism. For Ireland as for California he believed that piecemeal reform would finally prove insufficient, and he argued that land nationalization could accomplish far more good than shoring up peasant tenures. Impatience toward Gladstone, whom he thought greatly lacking in imagination, and criticism of rent reduction and estate subdivision, indicate Henry George's final estimate of British economic statesmanship toward Ireland in 1882.

For a man of his sympathies the appalling thing about Kilmainham was what it did to Irish politics. The Irish leaders' accepting the bargain, their acting individually in such a way as to demoralize more radical associates and to undermine 'radicalization' upset Henry George extremely. As early as January he had begun to revise downward his admiration of Parnell. Now he suffered a real disillusionment, and when the Bishop of Meath said that by acquiescing in the treaty of Kilmainham the parliamentary leader had become an apostate, George bitterly concurred. He had reverted to his earliest, long-distance impression about Parnell, the estimate he had put in the *Bee* in 1879: 'an educated Dennis Kearney.'

The treaty of Kilmainham was an event of policy, and the better-remembered tragedy which coincided with it, the Phoenix Park murders, was an act of crime. But during the first week in May the two events rolled into one, a combination of horror and defeat for men with the sympathies of Henry George.

On the fourth of the month, two days after the cabinet decided to release the prisoners, Lord Frederick Cavendish, a moderate, and a relative and favorite of the prime minister, was appointed chief secretary of state for

Ireland. He crossed at once to Dublin. On the sixth he went with the undersecretary to walk in Phoenix Park, in sight of Dublin Castle. There the two were murdered in cold blood. It appeared later to have been the work of a murder club, and the undersecretary had been the particular object of wild Irish vengeance. The horror of the event revolted the public, and even certain of the Fenians. The result was pure loss for every cause except coercion.

Henry George had been in Dublin, and save for orders from New York he would have been present to report firsthand the scene and situation of the crime. But much interested in the news of the cabinet change, and learning that Davitt was about to be released from Portland, Patrick Ford cabled him to go at once to England and to interview certain members of Parliament. So George was traveling on the fateful day, a Saturday. He met Davitt, whom he had not seen since November 1880 in New York, in a London railroad station. The hour was too late for talk, and they made an appointment for Sunday. Perhaps no one in the capital city, outside top government circles and the men in certain clubs, heard of the assassinations that night.

The news came to George by telegram from Dr. James Kelly, the medical man and patriot at whose home he had been staying in Dublin. Under burden of emotion and with great trouble to get conveyance, he went as rapidly as possible to the Westminster Palace Hotel, and at five o'clock he found and wakened Davitt. The Irishman remembered the American as coming in with open telegram and 'a scared look in his kindly big blue eyes. "Get up, old man," were his words. "One of the worst things that has ever happened for Ireland has occured."' And, according to George, Davitt reacted in the same way as he scanned the message: 'My God, have I got out of Portland to hear this? For the first time in my life I despair. It seems like the curse that has always followed Ireland.' George broke the news to Dillon, who was in the same hotel; and Dillon went for Parnell.

According to George's reports of Sunday's events, Davitt was the writer of the manifesto to the Irish people which the three leaders issued that day. They denounced the murders and called for due punishment of the criminals; once the manifesto was written it was submitted to the Parnellite members of Parliament; then it was signed by the three — Davitt, Parnell,

and Dillon — and released for publication. Only much later was it suggested that George had been the real author.

The purpose of writing and publishing the manifesto was of course to persuade the public to disassociate the politics of Irish protest from the assassination, a purpose toward which George was peculiarly sympathetic. His news report suggests rather than specifies that the three leaders took for granted that the murder had been committed by a secret society, and that that society was not the Fenian brotherhood but some organization unknown to them. Not by reason of any intimation from George himself, but because of a

letter written a full half a century later by a priest who remembered the event, did Anna George de Mille recently make public the suggestion that the manifesto was really her father's idea and phrasing. She offers the possibility but refuses to endorse it, in her biography. I am inclined to think the suggestion quite probable. As Father Dawson said, phrases in the manifesto do sound like George; and it certainly would have been natural for him to act as a sort of public-relations man for the group that day. Indeed the role would have been practically prescribed for him, by his job as Irish World correspondent. According to Davitt, moreover, George presently went so far in the same vein as to embarrass him toward fellow Fenians, by attributing to him a more complete repudiation than he liked of the idea of some necessity for physical force in a revolutionary movement.

Speaking in another instance for moral coherence between ends and means, George pleaded that Parliament should exercise forbearance. In the *Irish World*, he made himself one of the first to say that the English reaction was not vindictive; and he chose to hope, as Lady Cavendish was the noblest to do, that the deaths in the park would become martyrdoms for reconciliation — the Lincoln theme again — not acts for which one nation would try to punish another.

At first there was room for hope; the government refused to be stampeded. But by early summer cabinet and Parliament took the old course of tightening the screws. A Prevention of Crimes Act was passed, the effect of which George himself was soon to feel. Hopes sank for any early or rational solution of the Irish problem. 'I never felt more like celebrating the Fourth of July than this year,' he commented in the columns of the *Irish World*.

Under these circumstances, George's appreciation of Michael Davitt increased. He liked the fact that this leader was not sold out of his old Land League-ism as the men of Kilmainham were; and he was more attracted as he sensed that Davitt might make up his mind for a program very like, possibly exactly like, his own. He was delighted, before May was out, to report that the Irishman would promote the coming cheap edition of *Progress and Poverty* — he had read the book four times, twice in Portland Prison. And George was gratified also that Davitt was willing to take the chair at the meeting he himself was scheduled to address in Manchester. 'I think in that historic place I'll make a good speech.'

As the affair turned out, teamwork proved to George's disadvantage for once. Davitt arrived late, and when he came on the platform received an ovation and took time for a stirring pronouncement on Kilmainham — the event which sliced down to paper thinness his already none-too-stout connection with Parnell. All this stole Henry George's show. The principal speaker of the evening was left with only fifteen minutes, and with injured feelings about an opportunity lost in Liberalism's home city.

But he was compensated within a fortnight. In a much noticed speech at Liverpool, Davitt announced for land nationalization. The procedures he advocated sound more like Alfred Russel Wallace than like Henry George's preferred reform, but George was credited with having made a great convert, and he professed not to care about procedures this time. To Francis Shaw George wrote on 8 June: 'Now by St. Paul, the work goes bravely on! I think that we may fairly say that we have done something, and that our theory is at last forced into discussion ... I have gained the point I have been quietly working for, and now those who oppose us most bitterly will help us most. Well, after all the toil and worry and the heartsickness, when the devil comes to whisper, "You are doing nothing!" there are some half-hours that pay for all.' And to Ford: 'At last the banner of principle is thrown to the breeze, so that all men can see it, and the real, world wide fight begun ... Davitt proposes compensation. Of course neither you, nor I, nor Bishop Nulty agree to anything of that sort; but that makes no difference ... I don't care what plan any one proposes, so that he goes on the right line.'

George's excitement and, this once, his uncommon indifference about compensation for landholders are both easy to understand. He believed that his full ideas would prevail in time, anyway; and he saw in Davitt a great

and dynamic leader to bring the essentials forward in discussion and thought. When Davitt went very soon to New York, George wrote ahead urging that he be given money and backing, and yet warned Ford to play down the idea that he had become 'disciple' or 'trumpet' of Henry George.

George foresaw American events but could not control them. Before Davitt landed, Parnellites in New York reached and persuaded him to deny the impression that he had been captured by George or anyone else. But this only fired a spokesman for the op-posite side. At the first Davitt meeting in New York, Father Edward McGlynn, Irish American priest in charge of St. Stephen's huge downtown parish, an earlier pro-Negro spokesman, rose up to chide his visting countryman. Why apologize, or explain away Henry George? he demanded. 'I quite agree with Michael Davitt to the full and with Henry George to the full,' pronounced this orator, 'and lest any timid scrupulous soul might fear that I was falling into the arms of Henry George, I say that I stand on the same platform with Bishop Nulty, of Meath, Ireland. But for that matter — to let you into a secret — my private opinion is, that if I had to fall into the arms of anybody, I don't know a man into whose arms I should be more willing to fall than into the arms of Henry George.' Reports of such words, spoken at three separate appearances from the same platform with Davitt during his short tour and thunderously applauded, were the first knowledge George ever had of his coming gifted lieutenant, the pastor of St. Stephen's.

Naturally this event turned him toward America. Was the time peculiarly right to go home again? He was worn out, and Mr. Shaw was begging him to come. On the other hand there was no practical reason for hurry; rather the contrary. *The Irish World* was still taking his letters, and he thought the family could enjoy the summer in Ireland. Why not forget any notion of going to Avignon with Miss Taylor, he suggested to Annie, and instead take the children to some convenient Irish watering place for the summer. He proposed that on the way the four do a little sight-seeing in central England. This much went according to plan. They stopped at Stratford, Warwick, and Coventry and a few other places, as Americans have always liked to do.

Henry George's course as journalist was meanwhile changed by an invitation which attracted him. Bishop Duggan of Clonfert proposed that he visit the Carmelite priory at Loughrea in Galway. This would take him into

an area of Ireland where coercion was operating in force, and he would see many things firsthand. George hoped that his publisher Kegan Paul, who as an ex-clergyman and a Radical was interested, would go with him and meet some of the Land Leaguers and others with whom George would be able to make contact. Though Mr. Paul declined, he sent in his place a young Eton master, Mr. J. L. Joynes, who was interested in observing economic and political problems firsthand.

The two men met in Dublin. Joynes made it his first business to interview people in the city. He talked to Davitt, who had returned from America, and to members of the Ladies Land League; and, on the other side, to a sufficient number of men in the landlord connection to get a vivid impression — a little different from George's emphasis — that they all hated Gladstone and believed that his one purpose under the law of 1881 was to reduce rents, under the name of fair rents. Traveling west, George and his companion went first by rail third-class. On the train they talked with a laborer who had come miles from home to make four shillings, in harvest wages, and who had suffered a bad scythe cut in earning them. He would spare no money for treatment, nor would he buy tobacco; and the sympathetic travelers helped him on both scores. It amused them to watch the poor man struggle with one of Henry George's cigars.

After detraining at Ballinsloe, they hired a cart to take them cross-country to Loughrea. But they paused first to call on Matthew Harris, a Land League man who had been arrested when Parnell was, and they watched the police watch them. The next fifteen miles struck them as beautiful but depressing. The soil looked wonderfully rich, but it was little occupied, and they noticed where old farmsteads had once made it fruitful. Now cattle and sheep, not men, occupied the land; they talked with a sheepherder along the way about his work and wages. Coming into the village at last, they noticed the relief huts put up by the Land League, and counted seven police 'fortresses' or huts placed in interesting nearness to one another. They drove to the one hotel in Loughrea.

But they were given no chance to enter. 'I arrest you under the Crimes Act as a suspicious stranger,' was the police officer's formula. The two men had to remount. Preceded, flanked, and followed by police, they drove to headquarters like a military funeral, Joynes said, 'a sight for all beholders.' George felt that the schoolmaster was unbearably embarrassed, but he

himself was more amused than anything else. 'The whole thing struck me as infinitely ridiculous.' He wished that Mr. Paul had come with him to Loughrea.

The sight-seers were detained three hours. Their bags were searched and copies of the *Irish World, The Irish Land Question*, and Mr. Shaw's *A Piece of Land* were turned out; Joynes squirmed while the officers spelled their way through a bit of doggerel he had written. They were allowed no dinner, nor given prison bread and water when they asked for it; but a policeman brought glasses of milk at his own expense, against the rules George assumed. When at last a resident magistrate came, Mr. Joynes' statement of who he was turned the trick for release, actually too fast to suit Henry George, who enjoyed dramatizing the American factor in his own case. When asked whether he was a subject of the United States, he responded 'No, Sir! ... A citizen!' He used all the formality he could as he demanded of Magistrate Byrne why they had not been allowed to identify themselves and state their business, before the indignities of detention and search. 'Going through everything like a parcel of monkeys' was his phrasing of the matter, for Annie.

At last the couple had their night's sleep in the hotel; and the next morning they visited the priory. This gave opportunity for reflection as they saw the sandaled Carmelites, vegetarians by rule, leading their ancient life of Christian communism on Irish soil. During the course of the day they noticed how the soldiers and policemen 'savarmed' about, and they estimated that Loughrea was supporting about the equal of its population in this kind of law and order. They visited little shops that belonged to some resident 'suspects' who had been thrown in jail. They chose the cool of the evening for the next leg of their journey, the short distance to Athenry where they planned to take the train. 'Had a very pleasant drive,' Henry George wrote his wife, 'and didn't get arrested, much to my disgust — for I want to see this Englishman in jail again — though the police dogged us pretty well.'

In Athenry the sight-seeing was permitted first, but they did not escape 'the Bastille.' Looking around, George counted one water pump, which was adequate for the population, and twenty-six constables and at least fifty-six soldiers, to keep order. The two men called on the village priest and visited the abbey. Before going to the station George bought a collar button, as it

chanced in a store operated by a lady Land Leaguer. Minutes later, as they were about to board the train, George was approached by a sub-inspector, a polite man with hair parted in the middle (the victim noted), and was arrested under the Crimes Act for the second time in three days. Though Joynes was not picked up, he stayed with George by his own choice.

This time the police took George direct to the magistrate's own residence. The writer on Irish social controls noticed that the judge was a gentleman landlord, living in the midst of rural beauty but not ready for duty. He was away from home when the prisoner arrived, and on return not free for court business. The party was obliged to go back to town. Magistrate Byrne was brought over from Loughrea, and at George's suggestion he called the session in the railway hotel. The officer charged association with suspicious characters, and offered evidence that the prisoner had had some connection with Parnell and Davitt. Some of George's notes on the Land League were read in court. George laughed aloud at certain charges.

After the judge had lectured and discharged him, George handed around copies of *The Irish Land Question* to judge, sub-inspector, and constables. He had two copies of the *Irish World* with him, the issue that told how the priest of New York's largest Catholic parish had welcomed Davitt with the proposition that he ought to be proud to be a disciple of Henry George, but he could not persuade himself to give those away. Later, when he made his complaints to newspapermen and to government at highest level, George made a good deal of the fact that the delay in Athenry had set his schedule back a full day. Still later, when he had been told some things he could not know while in Ireland, he acknowledged that telegrams sent to local officials in Athenry from the new chief secretary for Ireland, George Otto Trevelyan, perhaps better accounted for his quick discharge than did his own remarks, or Magistrate Byrne's common sense, in court.

Because Henry George's arrests made international news, James Russell Lowell, then the American minister in London, was obliged to act with such promptness and force as many earlier arrests of Americans in Ireland had failed to command. George in due time heard a story that indicates what the Boston Brahmin diplomat's attitude toward him and his book was — it came to him from Francis Shaw, whose daughter was married to Lowell's son. 'Why, who in the world buys such a book as that?'

Lowell had asked one of the Appletons. 'Well, one man who buys it is a friend of yours — Francis G. Shaw. He bought a thousand, and then came back and bought another thousand.' To which Lowell replied: 'Goodness: He is a dear, good friend of mine — but he must be getting eccentric.'

Whatever his disrelish for Henry George and *Progress and Poverty*, Lowell detested the Prevention of Crimes Act of 1882. Stimulated by pressure from Washington, he acted in George's behalf before he had any information except what was in the newspapers. He made connection with the American consul in Dublin, and, short-cutting the British foreign office for the moment, he wrote direct to the secretary for Ireland. Secretary Trevelyan conveyed immediate assurances that the law would not move very far or very hard against the *Irish World's* correspondent in Ireland.

Naturally George, who had managed to get just about what he wanted, did what he could to keep the matter alive. Within days after his release he wrote President Arthur reciting the events of his arrests, and he urged that other innocent Americans had been much more harassed. With intention to criticize Lowell — that is, of saying to the highest authority what he had already said in the *Irish World* — George asked that the government be more forward than in the past to watch and speak for the rights and freedoms of American citizens. George's following-up kept the events of Loughrea and Athenry active as state-department and foreign-office business, and kept them reappearing in the journals through September and into October — that is, until after he reached home. In the end he received by way of Washington an official apology from Her Majesty's government. The Foreign Office believed that George had actually been guilty under the Crimes Act, yet regretted that he had been disturbed.

As the dramatization of an idea is an essential part of presenting it, the Irish arrests must be rated as a real triumph of Henry George's visit to Ireland and England. It was the third great success. The earlier two had also been successes of propaganda, namely, the arrangements for mass publication of *Progress and Poverty* and *The Irish Land Question*, and the conversion, or near-conversion, of Michael Davitt to his way of thinking. A fourth was coming, in the month which remained, a success of a different order.

After the adventure in western Ireland, George made a couple of crossings to London before he sailed for home. He traveled now without his family, for Jennie, the older girl, had taken desperately ill of typhoid and needed such time to convalesce as delayed de-parture. George's first business in London concerned publication; and already the news was wonderfully encouraging. Twelve thousand copies of the cheap edition of *Progress and Poverty* had been printed, he wrote Shaw on 12 September, at a cost of no more than £100 in excess of the subsidy; 2000 copies had been distributed to newspapers and men and organizations according to plan. He hoped that sales at sixpence would pay off the printing debt. Very soon that kind of question vanished. Within a week he was able to write that 5000 copies had sold, or 7000 in all 'gone out,' and by the first of October that the edition was almost exhausted and a new run of 20,000 was being prepared. There was no precedent in economic literature, said the happy author. A dealer in Melbourne took 1300 copies and 300 were sent to New Zealand. 'Thanks to you, and to your Boston friend,' George told his patron, 'I think I have this year done a bigger work (or rather started bigger forces) than any American who ever crossed to the old country. I say this freely to you ... ' There was no comparison to make.

Up to the middle of September, however, the major British newspapers and magazines had made a record of neglecting to review *Progress and Poverty* which exceeded that of the papers and magazines of the eastern United States after the earliest editions. Kegan Paul had no Professor Youmans or *Popular Science Monthly* with which to force attention. So it was pressure from the Irish excitement, and response to the subsidized edition, that must have brought the wanted change. The Irish factor was acknowledged in the review in the most important newspaper in the English-speaking world.

On 6 September the London *Times* printed a letter submitted by George, and made editorial comment. George pleaded for moderation in Ireland: his own case proved how inept coercion was, he said, and how incompetent to achieve the purposes of Parliament. *The Times'* editorial comment ran long. It acknowledged George to be a force in agitation and politics, but it had no word of toleration for his ideas. It classified him and all land nationalizers as essentially the same as socialists and communists. They were less sound reasoners even, the paper said, because they failed to

perceive that having denied private property in land they were obliged to deny the rightness of any private property. The editorial gave George more space, and credited him with more importance, than the San Francisco *Alta* had done, but the judgment of ideas was identical.

George must have been astonished, therefore, at the event of 14 September, the full-size review in the same newspaper. Though the reviewer began with the comment that George would have 'no reason to regret the temporary inconvenience which he has suffered' in Ireland, he then shifted focus completely from the American as agitator to his books as argument. One column on *The Irish Land Question* stressed the universalism of the argument. It credited George with assessing blame for violence in Ireland on both landlords and tenants, and it noticed that he represented landownership as everywhere the result of conquest, and as often the privilege of persons absent from the soil. 'We gladly recognize the large amount of sound sense his appeal contains, and we should be still more glad if his appeal bore good fruit.'

The columns devoted to *Progress and Poverty* were mostly summary, and loaded with quotation. There was friendly, or at least neutral, explication of the critique of wages-fund and Malthusian doctrines; and George was praised as an American who refused alike to take the road of a Carey toward a special economics for the United States, and to blame poverty on the political institutions of the old world. George's Ricardian assumptions, and his logic of economic distribution, the review passed lightly by. It acknowledged the community between *Progress and Poverty* and *Social Statics* on land nationalization; and its one sharply adverse comment was to place George's work in line with the utopian tradition, and to say that despite Thomas More and Brook Farm the world spins on unaltered.

The conclusion of *The Times* review requires quoting: 'Mr. George's idea will long be found in the book only; nevertheless, *Progress and Poverty* well merits perusal. It contains many shrewd suggestions and some criticisms of economic doctrines which future writers on political economy must either refute or accept. Mr. George's reading has evidently been wide; he has reflected deeply; he is an acute reasoner, and he is the master of an excellent style. The readers of his book may dissent from his statements and

conclusions without regretting the time they have spent over it, and, if conversant with economic doctrines and interested in the prob-

lems of social science, they will find in its pages much to ponder with ease and much that is highly suggestive.'

Naturally the author was transported. He cabled at once to Francis Shaw, saying that the great paper had been 'exceedingly appreciative' and that the review would lead the provincial press to give the book attention; and he sent a copy to Dr. Taylor, as concerning the book the *Alta* had said would not be read. Probably John Russell Young, now United States minister in Peking, phrased Henry George's feeling as well as his own. 'A review like that is the blue ribbon of critical approbation, whether bad or good. The spirit of the review did not interest me. The fact was all — it ranks you among the thinkers of the age, whose words are worth hearing in England.' It was 'an achievement,' Young assured his friend, 'of which you may feel proud — no one of your friends feels more pride in it than I.' His own expectations were increased, Young went on. 'I have so much faith in your courage and sincerity and integrity, that without having the least comprehension of your philosophy, I am sure it will have a following and make its mark on the age.' The friend had troubled to reread the book in China. 'It grows,' he confessed. 'God bless you.'

Besides The Times review, which was the fourth and final public triumph of the visit, George won victories of the spoken word during the month before he sailed, and one of them was to produce enormous reverberations. This was his address, 'Land Nationalisation,' before the Land Nationalisation Society, which invited him to make his first platform appearance in London. Alfred Russel Wallace took the chair; and the speaker had the blessing also of Professor F. N. Newman, who had thirty years earlier written a little book with a solution much like George's, and now sent a letter which commended both P*rogress and Poverty* and *Land Nationalisation*, and welcomed George as coadjutor in a great work. There was a good audience and discussion at the end. The house passed appropriate resolutions offered by Sir John Bennett and by the Reverend Stewart T. Headlam, who was the founder of the Guild of St. Matthew, a Christian socialist organization within the Church of England.

But the inner interest of the meeting derives from a listener, a twenty-five-year-old critic, who dropped in late. Since the critic was George

Bernard Shaw, he must tell the story himself. As he wrote Hamlin Garland a quarter of a century later, he knew at once that the speaker must be an American, for four reasons: 'Because he pronounced "necessarily" — a favorite word of his — with the accent on the third syllable instead of the first; because he was deliberately and intentionally oratorical, which is not customary among shy people like the English; because he spoke of Liberty, Justice, Truth, Natural Law, and other strange eighteenth-century superstitions; and because he explained with great simplicity and sincerity the views of the Creator, who had gone completely out of fashion in London in the previous decade and had not been heard of there since. I noticed also that he was a born orator, and that he had small plump and pretty hands.'

But Shaw's mind caught unquenchable fire that evening. He listened while George spoke about the rents of London, and linked the land question with the labor question. Some magic of personality and mind, says Shaw, enlisted him then 'a soldier in the Liberative War of Humanity.' George's logic of the law of rent captured him for life. 'The result of my hearing the speech, and buying from one of the stewards of the meeting a copy of *Progress and Poverty* for sixpence (Heaven only knows where I got that sixpence!) was that I plunged into a course of economic study, and at a very early stage of it became a Socialist and spoke from that very platform on the same great subject, and from hundreds of others as well ... And that all the work was not mere gas, let the feats and pamphlets of the Fabian Society attest. When I was thus swept into the great Socialist revival of 1883, I found that five-sixths of those who were swept in with me had been converted by Henry George.' George certainly did not know of Bernard Shaw in 1882 and perhaps never learned of him, and he was never to love the socialist revival when it came. Yet this meeting and one or two others in September — a working men's two-shilling banquet in his honor, a three-hour conference with a group of clergymen — were undoubtedly what he had in mind when he wrote friends that he had discovered those locations in English society where he thought he could plant his ideas with excellent prospects of growth. The working class, he specified, and the clerical profession both Protestant and Catholic, and some spots where wealth and education were blended together with conscience were ready for the best he

had to give. Scotland, he sensed, was readier than England; and Great Britain, the governing island, readier than Ireland after all.

When George at last got his family in health aboard ship, 4 October at Queenstown, he had a warm invitation he had not been able to accept from Thomas Walker, a manufacturer, to visit him at his home in Birmingham. By a small subsidy of the popular edition of *Progress and Poverty*, Mr. Walker had already indicated that he might become a second Francis Shaw to Henry George. George had an invitation also from Professor F. Max Muller, the great Orientalist, to come to Oxford. In a sense the business which had brought him across the Atlantic was done. But in the sense that concerned him most, it seemed as he turned home to have just begun.