

## 1888-1890

### -1-

One of the revisions of the Henry George story that this biography undertakes is to put into historical perspective the place which the single tax occupied in his life and thought. Today, two full generations after his death, George is usually remembered as the single-tax man; and the common recollection retains little else about him unless it is an impression that, as the author of *Progress and Poverty*, he gave the single tax to the world in more elevated style than reform ideas are usually delivered.

These estimations by Mr. Everyman are, of course, not altogether mistaken, but they do involve such errors of limited perspective and want of information as grossly misrepresent Henry George — his ideas and his influence on history. The misapprehensions are entirely natural, for the single tax of 1888 and after became the most particular and the most organized phase of George's communication to the public, and the name itself is not readily forgotten. Much scholarship has abetted the common errors, moreover, by a misapprehension of its own. Though economists and historians have recognized that the single tax came late in Henry George's life, and concerned him for just one decade and during that short period occupied only part of his attention, they have been wont to say that the one reform nevertheless distills the meaning of his thought and effort — that the single tax was the essential result toward which all his ideas flowed.

No recapitulation of the Henry George story in California, or in Ireland and Great Britain, or in New York through 1887, would be in order in this chapter. But, against the common errors and against the conforming error of certain scholars, readers may be reminded: that the first large idea of economic policy which George's mind ever seized was free trade in 1866; that, though he was stimulated by San Francisco debates over the possibility of a city's establishing public ownership of a great share of the land it

occupied, until 1873 George, the West coast editor, asserted dogmatically that traditional forms of landholding ought to be maintained; and that thereafter he contemplated not one but two or three drastic ways of escaping the harmful effects of land aggregation and monopoly. Readers are reminded also that George did not become seriously interested in taxation as a method of social improvement until his Sacramento editorship in 1870, and that thereafter he proposed three types of taxes as useful and desirable; and that even in *Progress and Poverty* he offered land-value taxation only as strongly as the preferred 'application' of his 'remedy.' The remedy itself was not taxation but the displacing of private property in land, by common property.

Readers should remember in addition: that George became convinced in favor of the public ownership of industrial monopolies, beginning with telegraph and railroads, before he became convinced about land; and that, concurrently with formulating his major economic proposals, he developed kindred eloquent sets of democratic political and social ideas, and of idealistic religious and philosophical ones. One may judge that the single tax, when it was offered, was logically consistent with the many phases of Henry George's thought and effort, but one cannot believe that it assimilated or contained them all.

For envisaging in biographical perspective George's role after 1887, no reminder to the reader is more essential than that from first to last Henry George, with only the slightest waverings of inconsistency, had always been a pro-capitalistic thinker. George was radical but not unusual as an opponent of monopoly, and he was both radical and unusual in wanting to transform the institutions of property in land. But he was always conservative as to capitalism, whenever business was competitive, and conservative as to our institutions of church and state. Such are the cross-

hatchings of the lines of thought which give moderate tone to the ideological portrait.

Readers of the first part of this biography will remember that by the time *Progress and Poverty* was published George had made himself a spokesman for what this century calls a 'mixed economy' and an 'economy of abundance,' both. And recent chapters have indicated that two books of the '80s, *Social Problems and Protection or Free Trade*, made him a mixed-economy man still more completely. The earlier book called for

public ownership where natural monopolies exist, the products of certain phases of machine technology; and the later one spoke for free trade and free enterprise, wherever possible. Present readers, who will be representative Americans if they believe that abundance is the principal glory of our industrial economy, and who will also be likely to accept a mixture of free enterprise and public ownership as a desirable way of doing things, will have no difficulty in understanding that when the history of Henry George separated somewhat from the history of labor, he easily discovered new middle-class followers for his ideas.

To say that the single tax was born in 1888, a late fruit in its parent's fiftieth year, is not to say that George had not mentioned the name, more or less definitely, long before the birth. To review once more: the phrase 'single tax,' though without the definite article, does appear in *Progress and Poverty*; and George did put the phrase in print, two or three times at least, before 1887. 'The single tax,' as George used the words, did signify the growing particularity of his reformism after 1882. Not by accident, we may be sure, the phrase appears contemporaneously with his separating from socialism, and from land nationalization as a practical reform movement. Up to 1888 the essential element still lacking to the single tax as history knows it was any political content: there was yet absent any connection of the phrase with organization, propaganda, and vote getting. The Land Restoration Leagues overseas did not speak of the single tax, and, if possibly the Free Soil Society had done so, this was a forgotten whisper.

The change which will be delineated in the third section of this chapter, and which may be called the birth of the single tax, was that land-value taxation now became an organized effort, a new reform movement in America and elsewhere. Henry George had long cherished the idea; and in time he came to cherish the movement. Even so, events beyond his control had more to do with the development of the single tax than any efforts he sought to make.

Not even in the crucial years, 1888, 1889, and 1890 would the single tax occupy a great share of his attention and thought. A derivation from him, it would be less his concern than the concern of his followers, especially lawyers and businessmen.

‘George, do you see the hand of the Lord in this?’ asked Louis Post on election night, 1887, as the two took a horsecar to a labor-party meeting originally planned as a celebration. ‘No,’ replied the candidate whose party had broken into pieces, ‘I do not see it, but I know it’s there.’

He himself was a shade slower than certain colleagues to acknowledge the completeness of the defeat at the polls. In the first issue of the *Standard* after the election, William Croasdale, who had opposed George’s running for secretary of state and who disliked the ‘whirling dervishes’ of Anti-Poverty, had a signed editorial on ‘The Driftwood Washed Away’; and two weeks later he, and then Louis Post, said that the United Labor party should abandon thought of a presidential ticket in 1888. But George himself was still not ready to abandon the plan: ‘All that we who are in these early days rallying round the cross of our new crusade care for in politics is the opportunities political action gives for missionary work.’

Still a ULP man at the end of 1887, he replied to those who wanted to know how to help the cause by giving familiar advice. If you can speak or write, do so; establish an Anti-Poverty Society in your community; have a reading club, women as well as men. Study *Progress and Poverty*, or *Social Problems* if the big book seems too difficult; and discuss *Protection or Free Trade*. Or help with the mechanics of propaganda: distribute tracts and recruit subscribers to the *Standard*.

Only to an old friend did he say things which reveal the depths of his confusion and uncertainty. Writing to Gutschow, he blamed the setback on the Catholic opposition. In the same letter, trying to be hopeful, he observed that, if he had won the number of votes he expected, he would now be embarrassed by a following

of ‘half-educated men.’ ‘Now we have only those who know what they are about, and politics is of course with us not an end but only a means.’ February had come before he admitted publicly that he ‘felt as though a sand slide had made impossible the road I hoped to travel.’

George’s political anguish was of course compounded of something in addition to his regrets for the fading of the ULP. His whole experience in the East with the major party into which he had been born, and to which he had returned after nine years as a Lincoln Republican, was unpromising, in the fall of 1887, for one who might return once more. Even if his own



exodus from the Democratic party for the two labor campaigns could have been overlooked, he would have discovered, in the party of Governor Hill and Mayor Hewitt and Boss Croker, little likelihood of having again the satisfactions he had enjoyed from being a Democrat for Haight and Irwin, during the '70s on the West coast. The one hope George had recently entertained for the Democratic party, that Cleveland's election would force the issue of tariff, remained for three years entirely unfulfilled. Continued disappointment makes intelligible both George's interest and his wariness when a new light of economic statesmanship did appear in Washington.

The event, which came at a most effective moment for George, was President Cleveland's state-of-the-nation address of 6 December 1887. Less than a year before the national election — the one in which George had dreamed of being himself the man to bring economic realities into politics — the President called for tariff reduction. He pictured protectionism as a breeder of monopolies. His attack was pragmatic, not in the least doctrinaire; in the address he uttered his best-remembered phrase, 'It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory.' The speech caught the headlines and became the biggest event of the administration's history.

Though, to the theory-minded author of *Protection or Free Trade*, Cleveland's change gave the signal that practical men would soon need theory in spite of themselves, George's first comment was guarded. He said simply that the address was better than expected, a fair presentation of tariff realities; and, quoting his own book, he observed that the President did not realize how the tariff connects with underlying economic problems. But a week later, in the editorial quoted in the last chapter, in which George wove

his way through double negatives to deny that he had decided against running for President, he came out with a fairly positive endorsement of the message. The Republican Tribune enjoyed mentioning the dilemma of the doctrinaire free traders at this point, the paradox of being for Cleveland's cause, for reasons different from his own.

A protectionist counterblast to Cleveland from James G. Blaine, who had headed the Republican ticket in 1884 and still held the dominant influence in the party, helped George find his own position. In the first issue of the *Standard* of the election year, he said that American free traders could, if they would, assume the historic role of the Physiocrats a century

preceding: they had the power, as leaders in ideas, to speak for the future according to their light.

While national politics opened the road back to the Democratic party for George, hostilities within the United Labor party diminished the reasons for his remaining there. His own insistence had put a free-trade plank in the labor platform, though many members opposed it; but the question was one that could be disregarded while the ULP campaigned for nothing higher than state office. The trouble was that, as 1888 arrived, Father McGlynn and others wanted to continue to let the tariff question sleep. This was treason to all that George believed about the right choice of issues for a presidential year, and in the *Standard* he threatened that the United Labor party might be disbanded.

Besides the immediate question of the life or death of the ULP, and his own decision whether or not to return to the Democratic party, George was dealing with a most difficult personal situation. The priest whom he had championed in his defiance of archbishop and pope had recently blurted out some incredible things. Saying that the pope in politics amounted to no more than 'a bag of skin and bones,' like the rest of mankind, was one of his indiscretions. Now McGlynn turned his scorn on Henry George. The Syracuse convention had charged United Labor's executive committee to prepare for a national campaign, he said. The authority was the committee's, and they would be sidetracked by no one, not even by the party's first leader.

The conflict led first to a little Canossa. Henry George journeyed with a few associates and advisers to Cooper Union, where Father McGlynn and his committee had an office. No reconciliation was

possible. Instead of having to make a difficult decision himself, to disband the ULP, Henry George had to accept a decision made for him. Like the socialists five months earlier, George and his associates on the *Standard* were read out of the United Labor party.

After this the political history of Father McGlynn, and the history of the ULP, both, are brief. From proposing to suppress the tariff issue in the party, the excommunicated priest shifted first to announcing for protection; from declaring for the minor party, he shifted second to Harrison and Republicanism; and during the summer he complicated things further by proposing No Rent resistance, Irish Land League style, against the

landlords of New York City. Without George and without McGlynn, the United Labor party meanwhile held a national convention in Cincinnati, with delegates from a dozen states; and it nominated a Chicagoan, Robert H. Cowdery, for President. Henry George's final words on labor-party politics in 1888 were to suppress a new third-party movement among his own followers, and to make wry editorial comment on Mr. Cowdery's candidacy. He liked the man, but regarded the effort — Cowdery received 3000 votes in November — as fatuous.

With the United Labor party collapse, the Anti-Poverty Society fell into fragments also. Immediately on breaking with McGlynn, George resigned as vice-president; and the surviving organization turned against him completely. On the heels of this, which must have amounted to a Catholic-and-Protestant separation, Hugh Pentecost set up the Unity Congregation in New York. Going beyond Anti-Poverty to assume the character of a new and separate church, Unity Congregation became the religious home of many George followers, though not of Henry George's own family. After some hesitation, because he preferred a third party, Mr. Pentecost followed George and spoke for Cleveland in the presidential campaign. Unity Congregation proved much less a political phenomenon than Anti-Poverty, but for the time being it did help sustain the evangelical phase of the George movement.

The breakups occurred in New York early in 1888. About ten months later, just before election, Henry George put his intimate, and bitter, reflections on the man who had caused them, in a letter to California. He could in no way have avoided a fight with McGlynn, he told Gutschow. 'The truth is that the Dr. whom I

first thought an exception, has all the weaknesses that seem inseparable from the life of the priest. So far from urging him forward [against church discipline] as is generally supposed, I always tried to influence him to prudence; and when I seemed to [urge], as when I advised him in the Standard not to go to Rome, it was only to pick ground for what I knew to be his determination.' McGlynn had turned against him, George said, as early as 1887, and had tried machine building within the ULP. 'The whole matter was a great pain and anxiety to me,' he concluded, and it all led to 'a selling out of the movement and our influence, for Republican

money.' Four years were to pass before the two men would have anything more to do with each other.

Once his own dazzling ambition for 1888 had been destroyed, George was happy, and generous with space in the Standard, first to justify, then to participate in, the campaign for Grover Cleveland. In late winter he said in an editorial that the decision to be made in June, the renomination or not of Cleveland, as a tariff reformer, would be a more important decision than the election in November. The nomination would return the Democratic party to first principles. He wrote an elaborate analysis of the Mills Bill. That this tariff-reduction measure, supported by the administration, would really become 'an entering wedge,' sufficient to open a seam for a great change, was Henry George's endorsement. This was what a theorist could do for a President. When the nomination was actually made, the Standard gave unqualified support, and George sent personal assurances to Cleveland that a courageous stand against the tariff would not lose working men's votes.

A series of Standard editorials wove and rewove the connections of economic logic between free-trade and land-value taxation. The pattern of ideas resembles that of the old San Francisco Post, except that George went out of his way to taunt Terence Powderly when the K of L man spoke in favor of a policy of restricting immigration. The editor stood by his old opinion that Mongolians and any others who might not be assimilated into our culture should be excluded, but he believed that the new immigrants from southern and central Europe should be made welcome, and that the Irishman who wanted American portals closed was a shortsighted protectionist twice over.

George was heartened to notice that men of mind felt as he did about Cleveland, and about tariff reduction. Seth Low, the recent Mugwump mayor of Brooklyn, who was soon to become president of Columbia and who would oppose George for mayor of New York in 1897, the Standard saluted especially, because he refused to go for Harrison, and made a public declaration for President Cleveland. 'A foremost representative of what is really the best element in the Republican Party,' said George. A liberal convergence was taking place, he believed. 'To me, this Fourth of July

comes with more hope than any I have known. Freedom is not here, but she is coming. It is ours to clear the way.'

His commitment notwithstanding, George had a difficult moment in September when President Cleveland released his letter of acceptance of the Democratic nomination. Though this message developed the idea of tariff duties as effecting a reduction in the hiring of labor, George could not pretend to be satisfied with the President's thought. Accordingly he envisaged his own role much as he had pictured it in earlier days, when he had been adviser to Governor Haight and the Democrats in California, or when he had counseled the Radicals in Britain. He paid Cleveland the tribute of having political sagacity and regarded himself as playing an ideological part. 'My great desire in this campaign,' he said privately, 'is to utilize it for the propagation of radical ideas. I do not think [I] ever will be content to palter with the truth, but I believe in taking every opportunity that offers to push ideas that seem to me essential.'

A month later George was campaigning again upstate, much as he had done the year before. He spoke in many of the same places: Dunkirk, Lockport, Syracuse, and Rochester, and at campaign's end in Binghamton and Ithaca; and he went to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as well. Once again combat raised his spirits. As the vote drew near, he felt confident 'beyond peradventure' of Cleveland's re-election, and predicted that the President would carry New York, New Jersey, and Indiana, and also Connecticut, Michigan, and California. He felt equally assured that the right principles had been carried so far into the common awareness that a free-trade party would soon emerge.

Too quickly optimistic, George's judgment oscillated extremely after the election. At first, Cleveland's defeat and Harrison's victory shifted him to dire expectations. But the President's near-victory, with a popular vote larger than Harrison's, justified a recovery of hope. From the perspective of the middle Atlantic, about a fortnight later, Henry George managed to write for publication that the gain of 1888 had been all that single-tax people 'most desired.' That is: 'the opening of the great question of taxation as related not merely to the general prosperity but to the rate of wages, to the distribution as to the production of wealth ... Our true policy [now] is simply to throw our strength from time to time with the party that comes nearest to going our way.'

Naturally the Standard was delighted when on 15 December 1888 the New York Tribune discovered ‘a good deal of Progress and Poverty’ in the state-of-the-nation address which President Cleveland delivered not long before he surrendered office. It was an accurate discovery, and a flattering one.

### -3-

Readers who have noticed that the Henry George story of 1888, as related so far, lacks the usual amount of his perennial effort to achieve utopia, have envisaged already the place the new single-tax movement occupied in his life that year. It is reasonable to say that he could not have done without it. George could gladly be a Democrat again, as he had been one for more than a decade in California. But he would never, not even for a single year, confine all, or the dearest part, of his political effort into the mold of a national party.

In a way we are dealing with the splitting of a political personality. In New York, and in Ireland and Great Britain, from 1881 through 1887, Henry George’s activities had been better integrated than at any other stage of his public life. As writer of books, as missioner overseas, and as ULP leader at home, his principles and his political practices for these seven years pretty well merged into a single and consistent effort. That was the period when a just redistribution of economic opportunity seemed to him — as not before Progress and Poverty — to be attainable quite soon. He believed there could be social reconstruction in his day.

But then the old dichotomy reasserted itself. On the West coast, when the practical politics he shared with the Haight, the Booths, and the Irwins failed to satisfy him, he wrote utopian editorials,

developed a system, and produced a book. Now in New York, when Grover Cleveland’s Democratic party satisfied him only in part, he turned again, but in a new way, to more doctrinaire types of political endeavor. But at this stage of life and leadership, something over and above writing and speaking was required: his reform ideas were ready to be put to work in the United States. Unless action followed speech, George believed, the ideas themselves would surely wither. ‘The political art, like the military, consists in massing the greatest force against the least resistance,’ he had said in Progress and Poverty, ‘and to bring a principle most quickly and effectively

into practical politics, the measure which presents it should be so moderate as (while involving the principle) to secure the largest support and execute the least resistance. For whether the first step be long or short is of little consequence. When a start is once made in the right direction, progress is a mere matter of keeping on.'

Thomas Shearman was the man, rather than George himself, who transformed 'the single tax' from useful phrase into name and slogan. The corporation lawyer took the initiative on the occasion of an address before the Constitution Club of New York, in January 1887. In the antiphonies of propaganda which followed George's defeat by Abram Hewitt, the speaker sounded a note that was just as well keyed to middle-class ears as were Father McGlynn's proposals to the hearing of Irish working men. But the single-tax movement did not pick up as quickly, from the single-tax speech, as the United Labor party did from the efforts of the priest and his associates. The Standard, indeed, did not print the address until 28 May, five months after it was delivered; and though the three words did appear together sometimes, they seem not to have caught on immediately. While the ULP was wearing itself out, Shearman appeared in the role of student rather than leader. In October he contributed to the Standard a series of articles on 'The Distribution of Wealth.' Refuting an attack on George's economics by Edward Atkinson, the New York lawyer analyzed the flow of tax money in the United States with such thoroughness as George himself had never equaled.

But, in the last issue of the Standard for 1887, just at the time when he was coming to grips with the situation created by the recent defeat, Henry George wrote an editorial under the notable

heading, 'Socialism vs. the Single Tax.' This seems to have been the occasion when he definitely adopted the term. In a letter to William Lloyd Garrison II, moreover, he brought together with complete self-awareness the difficult double decision: to abandon labor politics, and to speak his message under the new title. 'I went into politics reluctantly,' he said, looking back to 1886, 'and only because circumstances seemed to point to that as the best way, for the moment, that attention could be drawn to principle. It seems to me now that circumstances have changed.'

That the single tax was not theoretically perfect, George admitted to his friend. 'You say that you do not see in the single tax a panacea for

poverty. Nor yet do I. The panacea for poverty is freedom. What I see in the single tax is the means of securing that industrial freedom which will make possible other triumphs of freedom ... It is the old, old battle we are fighting, the same battle, of which your father in his time led the van. It is this that makes the sympathy of his son so cheering.'

In the course of about a year George worked out a justification for the new term. He made his fullest statement in the 2 March 1889 issue of the Standard, in which he spoke entirely candidly about his reservations. 'The term single tax does not really express all that a perfect term would convey. It only suggests the fiscal side of our aims ... Before we adopted this name, people, even intelligent people, insisted on believing we meant to divide land up ... Since we have used the term single tax this kind of misrepresentation seems to have almost entirely disappeared ... [It links] us to those great Frenchmen, ahead of their time, who, over a century ago, proposed the "impôt unique" as the great means for solving social problems and doing away with poverty ... Our proper name, if it would not seem too high flown, would be "freedom men," or "liberty men," or "natural order men," for it is on establishing liberty, on removing restrictions, on giving natural order full play, and not on mere fiscal change that we base our hopes of social reconstruction ... This idea is more fully expressed in the term single tax than it would be in land rent tax or any other such phrase. We want as few taxes as possible, as little restraint as is conformable to that perfect law of liberty which will allow each individual to do what he pleases without infringement of equal rights of others.' In other sentences in the same editorial,

George said what he and his followers were often to say, that actually the single tax was a tax in name only — that is, that it was not a levy on something belonging to the payer, but a withholding of something never rightfully the payer's own. 'The term itself is a misnomer,' he told a Chicago audience, after seven years, yet 'somehow or other the name stuck.'

While the ULP faded away in 1888, the single-tax movement gained body and strength. George discouraged a meeting proposed for late spring in Chicago, which would have been the first national single-tax conference, partly because as we have seen he feared a new third-party impulse, and partly because he wished to avoid further subdivision among his followers



on the subject of the tariff. But in August a meeting took place in Cleveland, for which Louis Post went out to be chairman, and George was delighted that the old-time ardor sprang up again. In the Standard he recommended that other meetings be held on a local basis, but that fees and anything like a party organization be avoided. During late summer and early fall a series of meetings were arranged in Jersey City, Newark, Brooklyn, Elizabeth, and Philadelphia; and several were held in Cooper Union. At one of them James Archibald, Irish labor leader who had been prominent when the Central Labor Union first sought out Henry George in 1886, won a huge round of applause by a free-trade declaration. But in general labor leaders were conspicuous by their absence from single-tax beginnings in New York City. Besides George himself, such men as Post, lawyer-editor, Pentecost, minister, and William Lloyd Garrison II, lawyer down from Boston, did most of the speech-making.

As defeat in the New York state election of 1887 may fairly be said to have given the signal for the single-tax movement to come alive, Cleveland's defeat in 1888 may be judged to have given it a more specific role and function. Up until election time the movement had been as spontaneous as possible, and lack of organization had seemed to George a virtue. But when Cleveland lost, and the party of moderate reform was put out of office, solidly constructed procedures seemed necessary to keep alive the ideas and loyalties centered on Henry George. When he himself returned, at the end of 1888, from the quick trip across the Atlantic which he had

intended to be a vacation, he faced up to the problem in the new terms.

Though he remained determined against third-party efforts, he was readier than usual to encourage sizable and durable reform organizations. Presently, out of what in 1887 had been the United Labor Party Association of the Tenth Assembly District, and in 1888 had been the Free Trade Club of the Ninth Congressional District, there emerged the Manhattan Single Tax Club — the first and most important organization of its kind. In this final form the organization developed into a vigorous pressure group; it became a center for civic reform generally, as well as a tax-reform effort. It operated, says Louis Post, as 'a propaganda agent along business lines, in business circles, and by business methods.' Thomas Shearman, Lawson Purdy, and Bolton Hall were probably its most distinguished members.

The second to start, the Chicago Land and Labor Club turned itself into the Chicago Single Tax Club, under the leadership of Warren Worth Bailey, a journalist who later became editor of the *Johnstown Democrat* and a congressman from Pennsylvania. The snowball rolled, and by the end of 1889 the *Standard* could list 131 single-tax organizations in the country. There were 22 in the state of New York, and, in the following states, the numbers of organizations indicated: Ohio, 14; Pennsylvania, 13; Massachusetts, 12; New Jersey, 9; Indiana, 6; and California, Colorado, Illinois, and Iowa, 5 each. The list shows how very largely George's followers were established in the industrial rather than the agrarian states. There were only 12 single-tax organizations in the South, and 23 scattered through the states not mentioned.

In the early stages of growth, the single-taxers had difficulties in reaching agreement about strategy. For years, in the columns of the *Standard* and elsewhere, they discussed whether they ought to concentrate their combined political energies in one small state, or undertake a national campaign. If the first, the procedure would probably be to try to capture the legislature of New Jersey or Delaware, and so establish a beacon to the world, an actual one- state utopia. The other choice would be to circulate a grand national petition, which would pray Congress to raise 'all public revenues by a single tax upon the value of land, irrespective of

improvements, to the exclusion of all other taxes.' A New York attorney, Samuel Clarke, had said in the *Harvard Law Review* of January 1888 that Congress had ample authority to do just that, by acting under the welfare clause.

Perhaps in strictest logic there was nothing to prevent the early single-taxers from advancing in both directions at once: toward one or several state legislatures, according to local strength, and toward Capitol Hill. Yet common sense and Henry George's principles, alike, warned against too much dispersing of energies. George himself inclined, according to his Jeffersonian tastes, toward state-government action. But under the chairmanship of William Croasdale of the *Standard*, the national scheme moved faster. About 70,000 names were put on the petition in 1889. The climax of this effort came in September 1890, far ahead of the present story, when the leaders timed the first national single-tax conference to be in

session to greet Henry George when he returned to New York after his trip around the world.

Though problems of organization, strategy, and procedure developed, and the father of the single-tax movement had his preferences, he did not try to establish detailed personal control. He preferred always to speak his own thoughts first, and leave the follow-up to others. In January 1889, just as the organizational effort was getting well under way, he went off on a heavy schedule of winter lecturing. He was never a man to be held down by administrative undertakings.

He went to the Middle West this time. Chicago, Des Moines, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Three Rivers, and Columbus were all on the itinerary. The best meetings occurred in Columbus, where he and Tom Johnson and Shearman were invited to address the state legislature one day, and to appear before a ministers' union on the next. Each spoke in his characteristic manner before the legislators. George led off with general theory; Johnson talked in a businesslike way about the methods and advantages of land-value taxation; and Shearman discussed the faults in taxing personal property. George saw that his colleagues corrected any impression their hearers might have that the single tax was a device purely in behalf of labor. The ministers' meeting, and a third one in the same city, a conference of Ohio single-tax men, all pleased George a great deal.

In Des Moines, to be sure, things were less satisfactory. He wrote Annie about circumstances that sound like 1885: a small audience, the price of seats (50 and 75 cents) too high, and too small a return to the lecturer. His principal satisfactions there were the presence of the governor and other public men, and the compliments he received from a priest in the audience. In Minnesota, where he had wanted to go previously, he had a delightful time. He gave a lecture which satisfied him in the Opera House in Minneapolis; then he crossed the river to St. Paul and addressed a joint session of the legislature in the capitol building. Yet Charles A. Pillsbury's showing him the Pillsbury plant seems to have been a greater climax and satisfaction, for after their interview George concluded that the country's greatest miller was friendly to his teaching. He found single-tax groups in both Iowa and Minnesota. 'The good cause' is booming in the Northwest, George wrote Thomas Briggs, 'and the next fight will be on radical free trade lines.'

If as Democrat again he needed the single tax, the single-tax man did not forget his other interests.

-4-

It will be remembered that the New York City campaign had prevented George from going to England in 1886, even for a short visit. Though he kept up an active correspondence, and received favors both political and financial from across the Atlantic, two years passed before the question of another voyage came up in a practical way.

Then it rose suddenly and as a surprise. William Saunders, the newspaper man whom George now regarded as the prime spokesman for his ideas in the British Isles, passed through New York on his way home from Mexico. He persuaded George to cross with him, to be ashore for a couple of weeks, and then return to New York immediately. The campaign of 1888 was just over and George was tired and ready for a change. But he could hardly have refused, for Saunders seems to have paid all expenses. The voyage out was warm and pleasant.

Ashore there was no chance for rest. As the steamship Eider put into Southampton, a tender, emblazoned 'Welcome to Henry George,' brought a committee of members of the Radical Association and the Land Restoration League to meet their favorite

American. A crowd greeted him at Waterloo Station. And perhaps the greatest satisfaction of the trip was the attention he discovered his ideas were having when he spent several days visiting Parliament. He heard John Morley say in Commons that the landowners gained from all improvements, and that their taxes should be increased. He noticed that Saunders and Thomas Briggs 'and the most radical of the English single tax men' were willing 'to go a step at a time' with other liberals.

Even during so very short a visit George had several speeches to make, and considerable shuttling about to do. There were four or five appearances in London, and others in Glasgow and Liverpool, and a Knights of Labor meeting near Birmingham. The Liverpool meeting pleased him especially, no doubt because of his tribulation there in 1884. He discovered that the Financial Reform Association of that city, a free-trade body since 1848, was supporting land-value taxation. Introducing the American speaker, President

Muspratt said that the association now believed the first reform could not be had fully without the other. Naturally Henry George was elated.

Disappointments did occur. The hurry and haste bothered the traveler, and he was sorry to miss seeing Father Dawson. There was real pain to learn that Thomas Walker, his great and well-to-do friend, of Birmingham, objected to the new single-tax emphases. 'I cannot see finality in the land tax,' the manufacturer wrote; and his objections led to very full, anxious, and argumentative replies from George.

Yet the visitor had no doubt, when the quick trip, his fourth, was over, that men and ideas were swinging his way in Britain. Besides the personal appreciations he received, there was the testimonial of a new textbook in economics, written with a distinct Georgist slant, by his old correspondent, J. E. Symes of University College, Nottingham. There was also the dedication of the daily London *Star*, to the taxing of ground values; and more lecture invitations than he could begin to accept. Before he sailed for home George knew that he was going to be invited to Australia soon; and some of the arrangements must have been completed for his next visit to England. He said in the *Standard* that present appreciations of his ideas could be attributed, in part, to the recent public discussion of mining royalties, and to the falling due of many London leases.

George had Christmas at home with his family, and after that three months in the United States before he recrossed the Atlantic. Besides the speaking trip in the Middle West, which was reported in the last section, he gave at Harrisburg his fourth or fifth lecture before a state legislature. The single-tax effort was moving under its own steam; and to take care of the *Standard* during his absence George gave full power of attorney to Henry George, Jr. He himself promised to contribute a weekly letter, the 1882 kind of arrangement with the *Irish World* repeated. He solved the family problem, also, as he had done during that first trip, by taking his wife and daughters with him. Richard had married and set up independently the year before. George's affairs in early 1889, both public and private, were in tidier shape than usual.

On the British side, William Saunders took the lead again, and there was a large 'Henry George Campaign' committee, predominantly Radical in make-up. Yet people who were a little unhappy about certain prospects of the visit advised him most fully before he sailed. In a letter calculated to

forestall the factionalism which he thought the single-tax line might provoke, Thomas Walker warned against being too doctrinaire. Land-value taxation leaves ‘a slight twinge of doubt as to whether its very glibness is not deceptive,’ he said, and he claimed the support of Charles Wicksteed, the brother of Philip, in preferring land nationalization to Shearman-style taxation — for Britain at any rate. Yet Walker rose above his anxieties to say that George would infuse realism again into British politics. With Gladstone off in trivial matters, Henry George would give a thrust in the right direction.

From the new Fabian side, George received a long letter written by his slight acquaintance, Sidney Webb. Worried lest George carry into British fields his American war on socialists, Webb supplied elaborate information on present currents of leftward ideas and politics in Britain. ‘You will find us,’ the already famous civil servant wrote, ‘making progress in a direction which may generally be called socialistic, and, on the land question in particular, ordinary Liberal opinion is fast ripening. The Radicals and the town wage earners generally hardly need your visit, except

always by way of inspiration and encouragement. They are already pushing the party leaders as fast as they can.’

While Webb thus said that George’s visit was not quite necessary to those who were arranging it, he had his own ideas about the directions in which the visitor could very profitably turn. ‘What holds things back is the great class of the middle class, religious! respectable! cautious, and disliking the Radical artisan. These need your instruction most, and you are of course just the man who can give it to them, without offense or resentment. Your visit will do immense good in stirring up the bourgeoisie — especially among the dissenting sects. Pray pay them special attention and remind all your committee to bring you into contact with all the ministers around.’

About the line of disagreement which concerned him most, Webb spoke with real candor. ‘I am afraid that you will be denounced by the wilder kind of socialists. Headlam, Pease [who was a member of the Henry George Campaign committee], and others beside myself are doing all we can to induce them to keep *quiet, as it would be fatal to arouse an antagonism, between the radical and socialist parties.* Many of us have

been working for you to keep the peace between them, and to bring them into line on practical politics. Neither the socialist nor any other party is here as in America, and the real force of the socialist movement works in lines you do not at all disapprove, and which are securing daily more and more recognition. See for instance the enclosed syllabus of lectures now being given at one of the best colleges in Cambridge University. How long will it be before Harvard does this?

‘Now I want to implore your forbearance, when you are denounced as a traitor, and what not, by Socialist newspapers; and “heckled” by Socialist questioners, or abused by Socialist orators, it will be difficult not to denounce Socialism in return. But do not do so. They will be only the noisy fringe of the Socialist Party who will do this, and it will be better for the cause which we both serve, if you can avoid accentuating your differences with Socialists.’ The final advice Webb gave, compatible with his famous studies of administration, was that, in England, George could ‘safely lay much more stress on the nationalization or “municipalization” of monopolies’ than was politically feasible in America. ‘Our Civil

Service and municipal government is much better fitted to bear the strain, and the people are quite ready.’

Considering Thomas Walker and Sidney Webb together, George approached this trip with adequate prompting, that he should get ahead with the main business and let argument about procedures lapse. For the most part he acted accordingly. At the close of the tour he did debate Henry Hyndman in St. James Hall, and did permit himself a sense of victory and satisfaction that he had spoken better for the single tax than his old associate had done for socialism. Such a debate can hardly have offended Webb and his colleagues, however, for with the passing years Hyndman’s Social Democratic Federation had splintered and had lost much connection with the Fabian Society. It is doubtful that George himself had anything to do with Fabians other than Webb and Pease; certainly he had nothing to say about the group. Yet an article by Frederic Harrison, which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, speaking of moderate socialism, gave it the character of Henry George’s *Social Problems*. There seems to have been still much in common between the American reformer and the British

gradualists, though there was no great fondness, especially on George's side.

As to travels and activities, this visit divides into three more or less equal parts. The first four or five weeks, in March and April, Henry George spent, except for a short excursion in Wales, in London and the vicinity. Next came an extended speaking tour in the Midlands and Scotland; and third, a trip to the Continent, principally for an international meeting of land reformers in Paris. The visit rounded off with a brief return to England and a pause in Ireland, before a mid-July passage home. Four months all together made it longer than any other visit since 1882; and of course his efforts then had concentrated on Ireland, and he had been more a journalist at that time, and hardly at all a public adviser on the problems of Great Britain.

The first ten days in London both surprised and pleased the visitor. Out of nine speaking engagements, three were before Radical Club audiences, which seemed to indicate middle-class rather than working-class interest. (A little later, after speaking before a specifically laboring men's audience at Lambeth Baths, George

wrote home that socialism had had very little influence on these people.) Five, or more than half, of the first series of speeches were before church meetings; and more often than not they were in dissenters' chapels, just as Sidney Webb had hoped. George's very first address, for instance, was in Camberwell Green Chapel. Two days later he lectured in the Congregational chapel at Wanstead, a suburb which reminded him of Orange, New Jersey; and very shortly he spoke at Westminster Chapel — which he believed to be the largest Congregational church in London. Several members of Parliament took part in the discussion. Thus he was able to write home that he was reaching English Liberals through the avenue of Mr. Shearman's church. This amounted to saying that he was trying an approach to social reform new in Britain, much the same as his approach in America. The time was ripe, he added, because the Conservatives might be expected to be displaced soon, and the Liberals would return to power.

Between speeches he found time, as during the preceding November, to see people in Parliament. Seated at the press table in the House of Lords,



George caught the irony of hereditary legislators listening to the testimony of working girls about the conditions of labor. Who were noblemen, the American wondered, to be judges and defendants, both, when social questions came up for decision. The visitor's sympathy for the poor seems to have been widely understood. Letters poured in, addressed to him through campaign headquarters. Communications came from ministers and newspapermen; he received requests for interviews and invitations to write; and there was a pathetic inquiry from a boy who wanted to emigrate to America.

On the intellectual side, George took special satisfaction from conferences with the distinguished economic historian, Thorold Rogers of London and Oxford, who was reading in the British Museum. Professor Rogers told him that one reason why British industry had developed further in the north of England than in the south lay in the history of taxation: taxes on machinery in one region, and exemptions in the other. 'Of all the thieves in the world, Professor Rogers says the landowners of England are the worst and most unscrupulous,' George reported in the *Standard*. This sympathy was the more welcome, because in earlier years George, who admired and borrowed from Rogers' findings, had thought the

scholar too cautious in interpretation, and had heard that he sneered at *Progress and Poverty*. Now he was able to say that the professor had spoken of the single tax 'with perfect fairness and evident sympathy.' He pleased George also by an invitation to come to Oxford — an opportunity regretfully foregone, for it might have established a happier association than the one of 1884.

So far as the record tells, Mrs. George and the girls were very inconspicuous during the London stage of this tour. Except for a special invitation to attend a couple of balls in London on St. Patrick's Day, so that they might see how the Irish working classes enjoyed themselves, we can only guess how they fitted in. But later, in the second, northern, stage of the trip, after George had taken nearly two weeks working his way from audience to audience, the whole family appears, having a splendid time. Some hosts arranged a picnic for them along the Roman wall, north of Newcastle-on-Tyne; and the sights of Scotland thrilled them. From the ancient capital city, Irish Annie George wrote her sister that she could not disagree with the Scots, their Edinburgh was the greatest city in the world,

‘interesting beyond compare.’ A stop at Melrose Abbey and Abbotsford interested her, but she was irritated at all the fee taking, and a little shocked to learn that Sir Walter had lived so luxuriously. As for her husband, ‘Henry George is certainly doing great work — holding wonderful meetings in a new place every night.’

George’s own excitement in Scotland seems to have been proportionate to place and previous association. Just south of the boundary he was stirred to have a speaking engagement at Alnwick, the seat of the Duke of Northumberland; and, in Campbelltown, during a short excursion into the Highlands, he felt a similar stimulation as he invaded the domain of the Duke of Argyll. ‘The Highlands are all right,’ he decided. ‘The reductions in rent and the sweeping away of arrears by the crofter commission are only whetting the appetite of the crofters for more ... It is a good thing for the men who have hitherto stood in dread of the power of landlords ... to sit at the same table with landlord or factor — to tell their story and hear the landlord or factor tell his, and then have the commission decide against the “higher orders” ... It is a new experience, and one that bodes no good to Highland landlordism.’

The Land Restoration League, he could feel, was yielding a good crop.

During his nearly three weeks in Scotland, George for the most part toured the industrial Lowlands. He made speeches in many towns where he had spoken in 1884 and 1885 and where Land Restoration League units had been formed — in Edinburgh, Dumfries, Greenock, Paisley, and, two appearances each, in Glasgow and Dundee. Again he stressed the Bible accent; a mistake about announcing an address entitled ‘Thy Kingdom Come’ drew thousands to a hall in Glasgow a week before the actual date. This was one of George’s best speeches, and it has been reprinted and distributed from then until now.

Scotland was particularly Henry George’s country, and he discovered there vigorous ideological growth from his own previous planting. In the person of Keir Hardie, who very soon would make history as the founder of the Independent Labour party, he met the best representative of the early absorption of the ideas of *Progress and Poverty* into British working-class politics. Mr. Hardie told him that nine-tenths of the miners of Scotland lived in one-room houses. The report to the *Standard* which mentioned this also said that in Scotland the ideas of Henry George had safely passed the first

phase, that of seeming alarming and revolutionary. 'These men are nearly all men of influence in the Liberal Party here,' the chairman of a Glasgow banquet explained to Henry George, 'many of them capitalists and some of them landowners. I tell you this to show you how we are gaining influence as well as numbers since you were here last.' The single tax pleased this sort of audience.

In the English Midlands, George also sensed improvement for his cause. An accident of the road, apparently, he fell in with Philip Stanhope, who was the son of an earl and himself a prominent Radical in Commons. The conversation convinced the traveler that here, for once, was a sincere radical from the noble class, one deeply convinced that the land question was the real and burning issue of the time. George enjoyed a stop in Coventry, where the guildhall caught his fancy; from here he wrote home the Lady Godiva story, with its moral about taxation. Among the public meetings, the one at Birmingham greatly pleased him. This was successful partly because Thomas Walker was known to be his champion. But the meeting was held in the great townhall and, just as he liked, a Church of England clergyman presided, and there were other clergymen on the platform, from Unitarian to Roman Catholic. Symbols of acceptance meant much to George, on this trip especially.

The stop in Birmingham, moreover, set the stage for the third and most unusual phase of the whole tour. At the Walker home George was sought out by Michael Flurschein, a driving personality who was an ironmaster from Baden Baden, and a writer and reformer in the German *Land Liga* effort. Herr Flurschein had written to George during the autumn of 1888, to pay tribute to his leadership and to discuss reform procedures. With perhaps no more preliminary than this, the two men joined forces. Traveling a couple of weeks with the George party, Flurschein made several addresses; and, in his own self-estimate, he succeeded better than the American in replying to socialist hecklers. In his own mind a great partnership had been established: 'It was for me a memorable moment in which I looked for the first time into the noble clear eyes of the man to whom I owe so much, and for the first time pressed the forceful right hand of the hero who as commander in chief in the context of ideas, is leading forward.'

Though there is no indication that Henry George knew, beforehand, very much either about Flurschein or about the ten-year-old land-reform

movement in Germany, his letters do show that he had some knowledge of immediate backgrounds. Less than a week after the symbolic date, 4 July 1886, on which the *Land Liga* was established, Max Scheld, of Berlin, had informed him about the new organization, and told him that it greeted Henry George as its master. And recently he had received a good many letters which indicated that Europeans were interested in his books. During the preceding five years, *Progress and Poverty* had been translated into Swedish, Norwegian, French, and Italian; *Social Problems* had been translated into Dutch and Norwegian, and *Protection or Free Trade* into French and German. George had corresponded with most of the translators.

Sometimes his informants said that his ideas were having an effect on practical politics. About the time the *Land Liga* was founded, for instance, he had had a couple of letters from Norwegians. One of them spoke appealingly about the aid George's works could be expected to render to Norway's young and tender democratic institutions. A Danish correspondent reported that

major newspapers in Copenhagen were arguing free trade in the Henry George way, and that a little single-tax newspaper was being imported and read, from Norway. The same writer described a meeting of Scandinavian economists, at which a Swedish professor, seconded by a Danish one, spoke in endorsement of George's ideas, and of land nationalization. This is the kind of appreciation of George which the distinguished Norwegian historian, Halvdan Koht, has recently summarized as an important part of the impact of American ideas in Europe. George had had inquiries also, from interested people as far distant as Chile, and Turkey, and Siam.

Now in the English spring of 1889, Flurschein pressed an invitation which in a way drew these threads together. In June there would be in Paris an international conference of land reformers. George must have warmed to the promise that a group of Frenchmen would be present, men with ideas very close to his own, who regarded themselves as descendants of the Physiocrats of the eighteenth century. The invitation promised a Belgian delegation to be led by Agathon de Potter, already known to George; and Flurschein said there would be Germans, Dutch, Swiss, and Austrians as well.

Yet Flurschein warned George that the conference as a whole would not agree thoroughly with *Progress and Poverty*. The members would be more like himself, he said, in that they would think that *rent and interest together*, and not rent alone, deprive the producing classes and help to cause depressions. (Herr Flurschein had put his own theory in a book, *Auf Friedlichen Wege*, which appeared in 1884.) Though the warning may have been discouraging news, there is no sign of controversy between the two new colleagues. Flurschein thought that they got along famously, and George accepted the invitation.

When Henry George had last seen Paris, seven years earlier, as observer and participator in Irish Land League activities, his role had been a somewhat surreptitious one. This time he traveled completely in the open. Besides his wife and daughters, a number of American and British sympathizers went with him. The London Times said that 500 Americans had been expected, but that the small number who arrived did not signify that the republic was underrepresented, because the man to be chosen president of the conference was an American. The delegates convened in the Hotel

Continental, about 150 strong, and according to The Times, they were seated on gilded chairs.

In due course Henry George was actually elected honorary president. He was introduced with a tribute to his success in Britain; and, speaking with special confidence, George said in a keynote address that ‘single-tax men stand today where the anti-slavery men stood in 1856.’ Great victories might come first either in the United States or Great Britain, he could not be sure which.

As an indication of certain recognitions, widespread in Europe but limited in their political meaning, the Paris meeting does seem a high point in Henry George’s lifetime. Yet he actually attended only one or two sessions. On the second day, Jennie George came down with scarlet fever. The most the father could do, after she recovered a little, was to talk a good deal with French delegates who were especially sympathetic. He found freedom, before he left, to do some sight-seeing in the city.

At the meeting he established a friendly relationship, too, with Jan Stoffels, a follower of Flurschein and the translator into Dutch of *Social Problems*. This led to a trip to Holland, about which George became quite

lyrical in the *Standard*. The canals, the sloping houses, the yachts, the museums, and the pictures fascinated him. But when he made an address, for which a large audience turned out in a splendid hall in Amsterdam, he was not at all satisfied. It was theory which concerned him. He decided that European radicalism, even when as friendly as this, was too much opposed to interest taking to suit his own position. Many think that interest on capital is quite wrong, he wrote home, but none knows how to capture it, except by the state operation of all business.

His own reservations to the contrary notwithstanding, he was given early reason to believe that he had been accepted as *the* man of the movement which the conference represented, and that the international work would go on. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, the distinguished French writer on economic institutions, though with reservations about many of George's ideas, presently paid tribute to *Progress and Poverty*, and to the author's 'enchancing vigor, his brilliant mind, and the apparent force of his style.' In August the news reached George that a Universal Land Federation was being set up, and that he himself would be its leader. All who had attended the Paris conference would be members, and all single-tax organizations wherever they might be. If Mr. George would contribute the necessary references, his recent Paris friend A. M. Toubeau requested on 22 August, the new federation would prepare a master list, covering the world, and it would include the names of newspapers.

While Jennie convalesced Henry George went back to England, keeping in touch by daily wire. The only important event in London this time was the public debate with Hyndman, which came off to his own satisfaction. Then he went to Ireland to make a couple of appearances. Michael Davitt took the chair at one of them, evidently with old injuries sufficiently mended to make the situation a friendly one. Back in England in July, George was honored by a farewell ceremonial in London, and by a farewell lecture before the Financial Reform Association in Liverpool.

During the last week abroad, the family, united in health, welcomed the voyage home. Part of their delight was anticipation of doing more traveling soon. George had been definitely asked to visit Australia and New Zealand. He would be paid £800; and he expected to bring home half, \$2000, to bank in New York in 1890, after a trip around the world.

This time a crowd was waiting to make him welcome when his vessel came into port; and there was a dinner in a Coney Island hotel. The good news was that throughout the country the single-tax petitions to Congress were lengthening by hundreds and thousands of signers.

But immediately he was confronted with a crucial situation at home. It concerned his newspaper and his doctrines. Though, unlike the San Francisco Post, the *Standard* did not represent his whole career and livelihood, it did mean much. He was the proprietor of a good-looking newspaper, a journal of opinion which practiced his old preachment in favor of having the contributors of ideas sign their own writings. And of course the *Standard* was the ideological center of the single-tax movement.

But in the summer of 1889, while the movement was growing, the *Standard* was in danger of its life. A glance at the history of the paper is necessary. It had begun with a debt, as we know, and at first the question of financial success had concerned George

deeply. Though he told Gutschow at that time that ‘on the day I started the *Standard* I was some thousands poorer than when I left San Francisco,’ he entertained grim hopes that the paper would support him, as his books had failed to do. We do not know much about the early financial history of the *Standard*, but it is clear that the pendulum swung several times during 1887 and 1888. Though the McGlynn affair lost subscribers in the long run, and the labor party defeat was a setback for the newspaper, George was able to announce at the close of 1888 that circulation was gaining. A fair number of subscriptions in Great Britain and Australia had raised sales from a low of 15,000 to about 20,000. In January 1888, when the interest was due on the Briggs note, George was able to pay; but two months later, things were very difficult. There were never any profits, yet there was always the belief that the need for the paper justified the effort.

Summing up at the time of the presidential campaign, George admitted that the transit out of labor politics had been ‘exceedingly depressing’ to the morale of the staff. As for himself, ‘the drag and worry have been indescribable, and though pressing myself to the limit of my strength I have felt that my energies have been frittered away and that I was not doing my

best work. The strain for the last ten years has been very great, and has I feel made me very much older. But I have told friends that I would go through till this year, or at least until this election was over.'

Yet in the autumn of all these anxieties, the *Standard* was given a new lease, and a new condition, of life. Tom Johnson was just entering politics, in the campaign in which he failed for election to the House of Representatives by about 600 votes. He subscribed \$500 to circulate the paper as a campaign effort; and W. J. Atkinson, a rich man in Philadelphia, did the same. The \$1000 subsidy was like a shot in the arm. The autobiography of Louis Post makes plain that very soon Johnson and Thomas Shearman and perhaps others were supporting the paper regularly, and that the old day-to-day worries never recurred.

Subsidization transformed the paper into a sort of institution, and changed the nature of Henry George's relation to it somewhat. He still presided in the rank of proprietor and editor; but in fact he was steward rather than risk-bearing capitalist, and he was chairman rather than director of the paper's daily routine. It was a natural time for delegating duties, and for tidying up in many ways. Before the 1889 tour in Great Britain George moved the *Standard's* offices to Union Square, and his household to East Nineteenth Street, near and convenient to one another. About the time he started for Australia, the essential platform of the paper was reduced to a formula and set forth in a box which appeared in the upper left-hand corner of the front page. A three-point program was announced: (1) *the single tax*, stated to mean land-value taxation, with all taxes on labor or the products of labor abolished; (2) *free trade*, defined as more than tariff reform, as world trade as free as interstate commerce in America; and (3) *ballot reform*, the Australian ballot, to be prepared by public authority, and to be cast by the voter in enforced secrecy.

Though these consolidations produced a less exciting paper than the fighter of 1887, they had the merit of winning approval from contemporaries who otherwise cared very little for the ideas of Henry George. The New York Tribune, which had earlier had the generosity to say that the *Standard's* 'subject matter is far above that in what usually are known as labor papers,' printed a warm endorsement of the journal's ballot-reform idea.



Evidently George felt at ease before he departed for the long absence of 1889, in Europe. But all too soon for peace of mind, while he was lecturing in Scotland, he began to hear of injured feelings and conflicts among the editors; and perhaps he perceived then that important differences of opinion were at the roots of the trouble. The stormiest of the discontented ones was Thomas M'Cready, who had been a leader of the Anti-Poverty Society and now had charge of a 'Men and Things' column of opinion of his own; and he was joined by a friend of Samuel Gompers, James L. Sullivan, who was the labor editor. The two together retained the spirit and intentions of Henry George's campaigns of 1886 and 1887; and when Henry George, Jr., refused to print some of their contributions, they poured out their resentment to the traveling chief, to whom M'Cready was especially devoted.

But the ranking editors in New York, Louis Post and William Croasdale, moved more willingly into the new emphases and strategies of the single tax; and they took the other side. They supported Henry George, Jr., George learned; and Tom Johnson, Shearman,

and August Lewis, in the role of advisers and guarantors, in turn supported them. The personal conflict came to a climax during the spring, when the 'two strong masterful men,' as Henry George, Jr., called M'Cready and Sullivan, descended on the George household and moved in, offering some previous invitation as excuse. Before George returned from Europe, however, Sullivan resigned from the *Standard*; and on his return, George fired M'Cready and sent Henry George, Jr., from New York for a vacation and a rest. Annie George's solicitous comment was that two of her husband's 'coworkers have proved treacherous — I wonder how this man retains any confidence in humanity — but he does — and he goes on doing his work to the best of his ability.'

But the necessary remedy of conditions at the office opened to view, and even to public discussion, the conflict of ideas which was the serious part of the affair. In this respect Sullivan's actions had been more decisive than M'Cready's. The labor editor was disposed to be somewhat friendly toward the Bellamy Nationalist movement which had just appeared in the United States, and which had come to New York about the time of George's absence. In the wake of widespread reading of Edward Bellamy's *Looking*

*Backward*, a novel of greater social influence in America, probably, than any other except *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, the new socialism took the form of clubs and journals, all dedicated to preparing for a very utopian kind of American life. The Nationalist Clubs were particularly numerous in Massachusetts, where the movement began, and in New York and California.

Sullivan, as an editor of the *Standard*, identified himself with the Nationalists only so far, he says, as to protest when it seemed to him that Croasdale insulted them needlessly on the editorial page. Why should not the *Standard* in New York take as generous an attitude toward an American brand of socialism as Henry George in England was taking toward the Fabians? Must the whittling down of Georgism go on forever — as McGlynn and Pentecost, the Marxian socialists, the Anti-Poverty Society, and the United Labor party had been pared away? These and more like them were the labor editor's questions, as he took leave of the *Standard*, and of the Georgist movement, for good. His questions had considerable moral force before he weakened his case, as he did after George's return, by issuing an absurd pamphlet, 'Ideo Kleptomania, the Case of Henry George,' in which he set out to prove that *Progress and Poverty* was a plagiarism from Patrick Dove.

Meanwhile M'Cready did his share of spreading and publicizing the controversy. He appealed to ministers who shared with him a loyalty to the evangelical spirit of Anti-Poverty, which the single-tax movement had succeeded in quieting down. By turning to Hugh Pentecost, who was now editing a new journal of social reconstruction, *Twentieth Century*, and by publishing through him articles critical of the *Standard*, while he himself was still a member of the staff, M'Cready infuriated George. But the matter was a little different when he appealed to Father James O. H. Huntington, an Episcopalian priest of the Order of the Holy Cross, and a son of Bishop Frederic Dan Huntington, who had spoken for United Labor in 1887. On Henry George's return to New York, Father Huntington prayed his 'dear friend' to keep the *Standard* open to religious elements it had previously made welcome.

What had begun as an office row, the immediate result of an editor-proprietor leaving his newspaper to go abroad, thus widened into an ordeal for the Georgists of New York. Henry George himself can hardly have

needed letters from people he had recently seen in England, moreover, to understand that the troubles at home were similar if not identical with the differences of ideas which had come between him and Flurscheim and Stoffels on the Continent, and between Thomas Walker and himself, in the instance which disturbed him most of all. But Walker did write, in an irony which must have cut, to describe the single-tax antics of 'Dear old Cobdenite Briggs, Henry George worshipper Wood, Politician Saunders, Unpledged Recruit Reeves,' in England. Declaring himself to be still the man who loved and appreciated Henry George better than anyone else did on that side of the Atlantic, the Birmingham patron warned that the single tax was already tending 'to fossilize into a fetish.' He begged George to recall that as the author of *Progress and Poverty* he had been the first to make 'our movement' a matter of religion, and urged that old bearings be not lost, and that in England men like Durant and Wicksteed be kept in council. In similar vein but with lighter touch, Thomas Davidson presently warned that George would soon be known as the 'monotelist.' Why not come north, invited this Fabian, and buy a farm adjoining his own, the highest house in the Adirondacks? From that doorstep he could survey Lake Champlain, and gain balance and new perspective.

Even before George reached New York City, the *Standard* had proceeded in a democratic way to straighten out the snarls of doctrine as it could. Now inviting rather than excluding differences of opinion, space was given to Shearman, Pentecost, M'Cready, and Croasdale, and each summed up his own judgment about the best policy for the newspaper and the movement. Shearman said that he intended to be practical, and that he regarded the single tax as a hedge against anarchism and socialism; he denied that his plan reduced the George movement to being 'soulless, principleless,' and he asserted that it contained the leader's essential ideas. Cold reason was in order, the lawyer insisted, and he specified that he wanted the state to take only that share of economic rent needed for fiscal purposes, he estimated 65 per cent. The only disagreement he would admit existed between Henry George and himself was that George wanted to take nearly all the rent, say 85 or 90 per cent. Between them there would be no difference, said Shearman, if experience ever indicated that the community could use the larger return.

From the dissident side, M'Cready wrote with the greatest emotion. 'Friends ... I think we may as well leave statistics alone and stick to facts — the eternal facts that God is an equal-loving Father, and that men have equal rights of access to His bounties.' And when the next turn came, the minister of Unity Congregation objected to what he called the *Standard's* shifting to Shearmanism in Henry George's absence. Though he denied wishing 'organic union' with any socialists, Pentecost did advocate such 'sympathetic relations' as might be possible.

Managing editor Croasdale criticized both sides. Shearman missed the philosophy of natural rights in land, he said, and became a mere tax reformer. On the other hand, Henry George men could not go with Christian socialism any more than with other varieties. Whatever socialists might say, and however well they might agree with Georgism concerning land, they could not reconcile their other goals with the individualism which Henry George asserted. Croasdale refused to state a preference between George and Shearman on the question whether 65 or 90 per cent of rent ought to be confiscated. In his opinion, the George movement's first obligation was still as always to teach just principles of economic distribution. Other matters could wait on that.

At last in August, the master called the tune. After finishing with M'Cready, he stated his own judgments in the *Standard*. Toward the dissident side, while he omitted any blanket pronouncement against utopian socialism, he did object to the materialism, or threat of materialism, which he believed lay even in that phase of the socialist movement. He criticized Pentecost, saying that in his leftward course the minister had abandoned belief in immortality and had come to a position which was just about agnostic.

Facing the other side of the controversies, George admitted a difference from Shearman. He applied to the lawyer's 65 per cent the phrase 'Single Tax Limited,' a tag he had used before going to Britain; and he called himself an 'unlimited' single-taxer. Yet he did not press the difference very far. Limited or unlimited, the single tax was one scheme, and he and Shearman could work for it together, George asserted. He acknowledged that Shearman had brought great strength to the movement, from the moment in 1886 when he contributed money to circulate *Protection or Free Trade*.

During the midsummer clarification in the *Standard* office, George wrote a lead article on Bellamy's *Looking Backward*. 'A castle in the air, with clouds for its foundation,' it seemed to him, 'cool and tempting to travellers from afar ... A popular presentation of the dream of state socialism.' He saw much good in the Nationalist movement. Large numbers of people were learning new and necessary ideas; the clubs were driving them home; and *Dawn* and other journals were communicating them successfully. But George's final word, that *Looking Backward* was giving 'a strong impulse' to 'the idea of effecting social improvement by government paternalism,' was of course an adverse judgment.

Again a month later, commenting on remarks in *Harper's Weekly* which he presumed to be written by George William Curtis, George returned to this theme. Even in such lamb's clothing as Bellamy enclosed it, he said, socialism promoted state power. A revolution in property rights in land was desirable, he specified, but not the state management of land. In his own words in the *Standard*: 'If we do not believe in *laissez faire* as it is generally understood, letting things alone,' we do believe that policy should 'clear the ways, and then let things alone.'

In his recent letters to Walker, in his words and actions toward M'Cready, Pentecost, and Shearman, Henry George had become more completely a single taxer than Thomas Shearman ever was. He had widened his differences from the socialists, and had renewed his dependence on idealistic thought. He had not turned conservative, he had not reduced his loyalty to the broader doctrines of his books, and he had not been governed by the preferences of either branch of his followers. He had become a little more isolated, more lonely in the operations of his mind. Things would go that way for the remainder of his life.

-6-

Having cleared the situation sufficiently at the *Standard*, George was free to undertake some speaking, and to go on the road again. In a couple of appearances in New York, one of them before the Manhattan Single Tax Club, he spoke on tax reform, but he by no means confined himself to that subject. After a swing upstate and to Toronto, and a debate with a congressman in Rochester, he made a party of three with Tom Johnson and William Ivins — the man who as city chamberlain had tried to dissuade him

from running for mayor. They went together to Boston as leaders in the Australian ballot reform. They observed the first election in the hub city under the new system, and George wrote to his paper in delight. There had been no soliciting of votes, he said, and the Australian system must become the American one.

North of Boston George lectured in Lewiston, Lynn, Lawrence, and Worcester. In retrospect he acknowledged that single-tax organizations were growing slowly in that part of the country. Hamlin Garland was president of one in Boston, however, and Lloyd Garrison was working; and he discovered that some Brown University men were single taxers. He found people to convince him that the free-trade idea was increasing. He cheerfully reported that *Looking Backward* was popular and that the Nationalist Clubs were doing good work — asking the right questions and forcing discussion in New England.

During the last month of the year, touring this time in Ohio and Pennsylvania, George reported further indications of radicalism

rising in the country. He noticed the fact that certain officials of the Knights of Labor and representatives of the Farmers Alliance had met recently in Cincinnati. Today we can see in such gatherings a shadow cast by the coming event of Populism; and George caught something of this meaning. He was grateful when the Knights of Labor, meeting in general assembly, declared for the single tax — he called this the most important labor event in three years. Though his enthusiasm outran his judgment — and the *Journal of the Knights of Labor*, if he had read it, would have indicated to him much resistance to his ideas — he had received a real compliment, and his own responses show that, after all the purges, he still kept heart for organized labor. All things taken together, when the year drew to a close George felt quite content with the achievement of 1889.

By Christmastime the speech making was almost done and he shifted his sights to the long trip, which was to start about four weeks later. Recent news from Australia was altogether encouraging. Nine hundred pounds had been raised for his campaign, and he was invited to speak for the single tax ‘in its fullness,’ and even — in that country notorious for the protective tariff — to speak for free trade as well. ‘Everywhere your name evokes the wildest cheering,’ he was told.

During the final month at home George put his affairs, public and private, in order. He paid some debts; he approved plans, suggested by Mr. Jackson Ralston and others of the Washington group, for a national single-tax meeting in 1890; and he may have had something to do with setting up the Single Tax Brotherhood of Religious Teachers, which was announced in January. This effort gathered Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and other Protestant clergymen, and a few Catholic priests, into one organization for reform — a renewal of old procedures. As for the *Standard*, George wrote a new contract. He gave Croasdale full authority on the editorial side, for the period of his absence. He arranged to have Henry George, Jr., go to Washington and contribute a weekly letter.

At the point of departure from New York, Henry George received such a salute from the intellectual, professional, and upper- middle-class elements among his admirers as he had not since the Delmonico banquet of October 1882. At this dinner Lyman Abbot,

Beecher's successor in Plymouth Church, and other clergymen paid tribute; and so did George William Curtis of *Harper's Weekly*. Letters of good wishes were received from Texas Representative Roger Q. Mills and from ex-Speaker of the House John G. Carlisle, the two most prominent men in the recent Democratic effort for tariff reduction. Perhaps for the first time, university presidents joined in acclaiming him. Seth Low and E. Benjamin Andrews, the one just become the head of Columbia and the other, of Brown, joined in the pleasant send-off; and so did Professor Arthur Twining Hadley, who a decade later would be president of Yale. Terence Powderly, who was still grand master workman of the Knights of Labor but would soon begin his new career in law and federal government, more nearly than anyone else represented the kind of greeting Henry George in older days had been accustomed to receive.

This time Mr. and Mrs. George traveled without their daughters, free for a grand adventure. They routed themselves by way of St. Louis, where they visited Sister Teresa, and where Henry George was given a splendid dinner and reception, with many businessmen present. To family and followers at home, stories went back which were intended to sustain interest and morale: a meeting of a group of George enthusiasts at a Harvey restaurant stop in New Mexico; a hotbox and delay at Flagstaff; Mrs.

George taking snapshots, and keeping her husband straight as to hats and clothing, typewriter and papers, all the way. At Los Angeles Henry George missed a meeting by reason of the train's delay. He gave one speech, one hour and three-quarters long.

San Francisco warmed the Georges' heart. Dr. Taylor and about twenty friends met the train at Martinez; and, from Tuesday through Saturday of the first week in February, they had a triumph. Standing before a paying audience in Metropolitan Temple, the very hall in which, a dozen years earlier, he had half-failed in the address which began his speaking career, he scored a platform victory. Surrounded by 100 prominent citizens, facing a full house, and greeted with pandemonium, he spoke the thoughts which must have come with the easiest spontaneity. No longer, he said, did the movement depend on one person alone. 'It is sweet to a man long absent to be welcomed home ... Now so well forward is the cause ... that it makes no difference who lives or dies ... At last —at last, we can say with certainty that it will be only a little while before all over the English-speaking world, and then not long after, over the rest of the civilized world, the great truth will be acknowledged that no human child comes into this world without coming into his equal right with all.' Perhaps this was the occasion on which the speaker was presented with verses which Dr. Taylor had written, and which were printed and distributed to honor the visit.

George addressed a free meeting for working men in the Metropolitan Temple. It was very crowded. He crossed to Oakland for a speech; and he was dined and feted on every available occasion. He had no more than three hours sleep, any of those San Francisco nights, he said. In the press he became 'California's Political Economist,' and 'The Prophet of San Francisco' was used as a designation of honor in this place. As in days gone by the *Examiner* praised him cordially; and his old friends doted on his present recognition and power. A couple of hundred people waved the Georges off when they sailed, westbound, on the *Mariposa* — an American-built ship which the old India sailor found excellent.

California had seemed glorious and bright. During the three remaining weeks of February the tropical seas supplied the rest which the travelers needed. In a one-day stop the Georges saw Honolulu, and Waikiki and the Punch Bowl. Mrs. George thought the island spoiled from four decades earlier. In port a group of United States naval officers, some of whom



professed the single tax, took the Georges to dinner; and at sea Henry George was twice invited to explain his ideas to the people in the cabin. But this was all. The long run, south and west, from Honolulu to New Zealand was extremely quiet. The *Mariposa* slipped by Tutuila in the dark without a pause. Only at Auckland did Henry and Annie George get a first sign of the excitement to come.

Henry George's wish for that city was to see the seventy-eight-year-old Sir George Grey, who had spent four decades of his life as explorer, writer, and crown governor in Australia and New Zealand. During the last dozen years, and especially during 1877-9 as prime minister, he had emerged as a radical and philosophical-minded reformer. A present-day investigator, Mr. Peter Coleman, finds that, though Sir George lacked certain qualities which would have made him more effective in politics, he had a peculiar eloquence and power, not unlike Henry George's own, to make his countrymen aware of the economic dangers of land aggregation. Certainly he recommended *Progress and Poverty*; and before Henry George's arrival the book had been for a decade an influence in the land. Altogether the situation was favorable for the visitor; and we may anticipate that in years to come Henry George's ideas would again influence New Zealand tax policy.

Immediately on the *Mariposa's* putting in, Sir George took charge of Henry and Annie George. He charmed them. He took them to a gathering of the local Anti-Poverty Society and there publicly attested his belief in the visiting American's principles. George was presented with a handsome illuminated address. A few hours later, again at dockside, the two men could hardly part: the captain had to hold the *Mariposa* while they talked on the wharf. 'You have expanded a spark into a blaze of thought and unselfish conceptions which is spreading to every part and ennobling countless minds,' wrote Sir George Grey in a letter that followed.

On 6 March the outgoing voyage ended at Sydney. Every circumstance made this landing an exciting one: Sydney was Mrs. George's birthplace; and Australia meant rich associations for Henry George — memories of Hobson's Bay and Melbourne, 1855; his writing about the economic problems of the subcontinent in the *San Francisco Post*; the origin of the secret ballot; and recently a political venture into the public ownership of

railroads and communications. Henry George called the return to Australia a honeymoon, and so it truly proved.

Mrs. George was accustomed to a quiet place in the background, but this time she was presented with a red-and-gold shoulder ribbon, with 'Welcome, Australia's Daughter' marked on it in large letters. In his first address Henry George, the missionary, asked for yet more return traffic in the ideas of democracy. He reported on the instances of American states adopting the Australian ballot. 'If you can teach us more, for God's sake teach us. Advance Australia!' The effect of this speech, according to the *Sydney Daily Telegraph*, was 'at once remarkable and indescribable.' John Farrell, who was about to become editor of the *Telegraph*, the city's largest paper, wrote to the *New York Standard* that George's brilliance as orator, and the charm which did not wear thin under all the tension and pressure, pleased those who heard and saw beyond all expectation.

The reception at Sydney more or less set a pattern according to which Henry George was treated for three solid months. He was welcomed by colonial and city officials; he was managed by local committees; he was scheduled to speak frequently, and then many times induced to speak still more often; his engagements were separated only when travel required. In Sydney he was taken in charge by Charles L. Garland, member of the parliament of New South Wales and president of the Single Tax League of that colony. The two had met in England in 1889; and indeed this visit had much in common with that one. As he had under Mr. Saunders' auspices in the mother country, George lectured most frequently before Protestant groups and in middle-class circumstances — of course the prevailing ones in Australia. During this first stop in Sydney, he appeared several times at such places as Protestant Hall, the Pitt Street Congregational Church, or at a meeting of a Presbyterian conference, while he had but one session with labor people.

After nearly a fortnight in Sydney — which must have been longer than any single stopover in any other city of his visits, unless London is the exception — George headed inland, at first west and then south. He made a dozen or so speeches, usually one a day, on the way to Melbourne, the capital of Victoria, and the city he remembered from the past. There he

encountered at maximum force the principal hazard of his trip, the danger of falling out with people who would challenge his free-trade convictions and would perhaps reject him for those ideas though otherwise they might follow. As George analyzed the situation, in contrast with America, the masses were protectionist, partly he thought in protest against Great Britain. On the other hand, the landowners were the freetraders, and the people in closest touch and sympathy with home policy and ideas. But, as when dealing with the Irish in New York, George yielded nothing to the protectionists. Before a Melbourne Town Hall audience of working men, he spoke on 'Labour and the Tariff,' though he was advised not to do so. He surprised all concerned by winning an ovation; and he repeated the success a little later, in debate with a protectionist member of the colonial parliament.

There was more work to do, and more places to visit, than there was time to write his letters for the *Standard*, and accordingly our information runs a little short. Yet he was fascinated we know, and so was Mrs. George. Proud of her native land, she liked the cities better, as being neater and better kept, than American cities. In Melbourne, George ingratiated himself by reminiscing. There had been more ships in the harbor in 1855 than in 1890, he said, doubtless with a free-trade moral in mind; but he said also that a grim line of those vessels had been the transports for convicts out of England. He contrasted that grimness with the suburbs and villas now so pleasant along the waterfront, and with the changed face of the city.

After excursions out of Melbourne to places just west, George moved north to towns near Sydney, but much farther inland than he had gone on his way south. Then a week of travel took him to Adelaide, the capital of South Australia; and for the last ten days of April he was in and out of that city. The beauty of the place struck him; and so too did the power of a dour Scottish minister who was preaching the single tax there.

Before May was a week old, the traveler was back on the east coast again, where he had begun. From Sydney he went north, this time to Brisbane, capital of Queensland, where he was received by the mayor and by the Queensland Tax Reform Association. He made four or five speeches in the city. He seems to have discovered a special popularity in Marysborough, still farther up the coast. There, for one of several appearances, he was invited to talk to school children — an experience he

had not had before, and one which terrified him. Along every leg of his Australian travels, various unfamiliar phenomena of nature caught his eye — the kangaroos, of course, and, here along the upper east coast, the great reef which stretches far to north and west.

On his final return to Sydney, Henry George closed the tour for which he had contracted, on the last day of May, just short of a quarter of a year after he had begun it. For that occasion he selected as his topic, 'Protection a Fallacy, Real Free Trade a Necessity'; and the president of the Free Trade League, though denying discipleship, saluted him as having made his name a household word in Australia. This can hardly have been an exaggeration. Two nights later he was honored by the mayor, who was also a member of parliament; and he was bid farewell at still another meeting in the city.

As in New Zealand, Henry George's ideas had entered public

consciousness deeply enough to make a difference. An early commentator credited two Americans with great influence on the rise of collectivism in Australia — the larger influence to Edward Bellamy, and the lesser one to Henry George. But a recent scholar discovers that Georgist ideas, in unusually doctrinaire form, were written directly into a Queensland bill which, though not enacted, had considerable importance; and that very soon South Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland all enacted taxes on unimproved land, and so set a pattern which has become permanent in Australian policy. George's follower, Max Hirsch, kept up the effort for free trade, and his sizable book, *Democracy versus Socialism*, first published in 1901, is more elaborate than anything George ever wrote in setting forth the opposition of Georgist to socialist principles.

## -7-

In first planning the Australian trip, George had wanted the homeward voyage, still west bound, to include a stop in Africa. But now, at the actual point of departing, he would have liked still better to turn south and west, as he was invited, first to Tasmania, and then for a return visit to New Zealand. But he was very tired, and perhaps felt too committed to attend the coming single-tax meeting in New York to change direction. So the short stop the ship made in Colombo was the last the Georges saw of the part of the world they were so unlikely to return to. In Ceylon, as thirty-five years earlier in

and around Calcutta, Henry George observed Oriental life. He visited a Buddhist temple and noticed the intelligence in the dark faces.

The run up the Gulf of Suez gave a glimpse of Sinai, and of course the African shore, but the Georges stopped neither for the Holy Land nor for Egypt. Their plans called for three weeks, later July and early August, crossing Europe, and for two weeks in England. George had agreed to a couple of speeches there. They debarked at Brindisi.

In Italy for the first time, the travelers saw the backbone of the peninsula from a railroad-car window. The romantic in George and the economist, both, were fascinated. The mountain scenery and the hamlets, which he believed to be older than Rome, seized his imagination. Then the engineering of the railroad took per-

spective from the type of labor which subserved its very operation — for instance, women carrying stones and mortar on their heads to masons building bridges. He compared Australian farming with the intensive olive raising of Italy. Stopping at Naples, the Georges visited Pompeii, Herculaneum, Capri, and Sorrento. George wrote home of this as a tourist, with few reflections, with little else than the delight of travel to express.

Like many Americans before and since, the Georges looked at paintings in the galleries more from duty than from satisfaction. 'You would get sick of old masters,' Henry George wrote Dr. Taylor, but said that they had 'had a good time in our own way, unknown and unknowing, and working our way by signs largely.' Mrs. George wrote Sister Teresa that St. John Lateran appealed to her more than any other church in Rome, and that she found St. Peter's not a place to pray. She visited the catacombs. But she made no effort to get an audience with the Pope — it was hard for Americans she said, not mentioning that Henry George's works had recently been put before the Inquisition.

From Rome the couple hurried north by way of Florence, Genoa, Venice, and Lugano. On the way out of Italy the 'silent and soft beauty' of Lake Como made an unforgettable impression. Their train took them through the St. Gothard to Luzerne; and by a failure of communication which may have been intentional they missed seeing Michael Flurschein, who had been busy with single-tax writing and affairs, and who was anxious for a meeting as they passed so near to Germany. They had six days

in Paris — Mr. George's third visit and Mrs. George's second, but the first for either with a real opportunity to look about.

There could have been no expectation that the fortnight in Britain, Henry George's sixth visit in less than a decade, would turn into a personal or ideological triumph, as the visits of 1884 and 1889 had done. There had been no planning for that kind of tour this time. This short visit took rather the form of a general's inspection of forces he himself had established on foreign soil but no longer commanded directly. George heard from Poultney Bigelow, who was now settled in England for writing; and not unlikely the two met and renewed old times. He certainly saw Father Huntington, who must have reported on the situation at New York headquarters, and the two went together to call on General and Mrs. William Booth. George estimated the power of the Salvation Army more highly now than he had before, for he had seen it at work in Ceylon, and he hoped that the organization would in time become a rod and staff to him — a hope which was perhaps justified while Mrs. Booth lived, but which did not survive her early death. The Georges went to Birmingham and were entertained handsomely by Thomas Walker. The speeches this time were widely spaced: one in London, days after arrival; one in Glasgow, nearly a week later; one in Liverpool, on the eve of departure, before the Financial Reform Association once more.

This last visit in England, in 1890, confirms the picture of 1889, which showed him strongly entrenched among Radical and Protestant groups but out of the old familiarity with labor and socialist ones. Two interviews of the fortnight, however, raise new questions about old connections which were to have a bearing on his future. In London, George had a conference with Cardinal Manning, their second meeting. All that we are told about it is contained in Mrs. George's adjective put in a letter to her sister — it had been 'delightful.' One wonders. A year after the event, was Henry George uninformed that the Holy Office had found *Progress and Poverty* worthy of condemnation? Or, just possibly, could he have gone to the interview with that information and have come away with some nod which anticipated the decision, still many months in the future, that would lift Father McGlynn's excommunication? This seems improbable. One of the astonishing things about George's life was his capacity to make war on ideas and policies, and yet to keep in touch with people who believed in them.

Whatever the prince of the church may have said, George's visit with Thomas Walker produced definite results. In Birmingham the visitor was given a long memorandum, and it concerned the differences of opinion between visitor and host. George studied it while crossing the Atlantic, and he examined also a parcel of Fabian tracts which he had been given. The convictions of these Englishmen depressed him. He came home burdened with awareness of ideas he must somehow combat, on a larger scale than in the *Standard* office last year, and yet must do so without injuring the friends who held them.

Immediately on arrival in New York, on 1 September, he was taken to Cooper Union and presented to the first national single-

tax conference. He had acquiesced in such a meeting before leaving; Croasdale had taken charge, and now the show of strength was timed precisely for his return. Five hundred delegates from thirty-odd states were present, and the Single Tax League of the United States was at the moment of birth. The presence of friends, the excitement of a meeting, and work to do were reassuring things to come home to. George plunged in. On 2 September, his fifty-first birthday, he was greeted by an assembly of 3500, and Judge Maguire from San Francisco occupied the chair. Yet, from George's selection of subject for his own speech, one suspects a little detachment, a mood a shade different from simply wishing to acquiesce in the work at hand and from surrendering altogether to congratulation. He gave an address on free trade, not the single tax. The choice may have been directed entirely by its appropriateness for the voyager returned. But his son remembers George as having been somber at the conference. He noticed that when a voice at the birthday celebration cried out to wish him long life, George responded in intensity. 'But not too long. Life, long life, is not the best thing to wish for those you love. Not too long, but that in my day, whether it be long or short, I may do my duty, and do my best.'

Writing about the conference in the *Standard* of 10 September, George noted that the 'crank element' had departed, now, from his following, and that the general press, more friendly than earlier, was saying that the movement had abandoned its old extremism. He said he welcomed these changes. He believed that people's ideas were shifting, in a large way, in his own direction. He expected the movement to go forward, now, under its own power.

He himself planned to do some writing.