
Henry George and British Labor Politics

Author(s): Peter d'A. Jones

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Apr., 1987, Vol. 46, No. 2 (Apr., 1987), pp. 245-256

Published by: American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3485997>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*

JSTOR

Henry George and British Labor Politics

By PETER D'A. JONES*

ABSTRACT. *Henry George*, the American social reformer and *Single Tax* advocate, made six visits to *Britain* in the last quarter of the 19th century, a period crucial in *British labor politics*. George became locked in contest for the minds and hearts of British *working men and women*, as well as all classes, with the advocates of *Christian and moderate socialism* and with *Karl Marx* and *Frederick Engels*, the chief advocates of *State socialism* through *political revolution*. Though it was Marx's adopted country, George won out for a time, and it was his program for *competitive capitalism*, with *socialization* limited to industries unsuited for *market discipline*, which influenced development of a *mixed economy*. New research complementing *E. P. Lawrence's* traces George's decisive impact on the founders of the *British labor parties*, some leaders of which almost achieved George's fiscal program. But it was the *Liberals* who later fought for his full program.

I

IN THE 1880s, a decade crucial in the history of American and British economics and thinking about socialism, Henry George, economist and social reformer, made six visits to Britain. Three of these visits were highly-organized and very extensive lecture tours, covering Ireland, England, Scotland and Wales.¹ *Progress and Poverty* (which George published in America in 1879, and in Britain in 1880) was a world's best-seller in economics and social reform, with a distribution at its highest estimate of seven million copies in ten languages.

The time was most propitious in England, and George's message was of great importance to the middle-class social reformers and middle-class socialists of every description. Queen Victoria, it is said, read it. But *Progress and Poverty* and George's personal appearances were deeply inspirational to the mass of working-people, and of their leaders, who were looking for some hope and direction. He wrote in *Progress and Poverty* the first genuinely *working-class* textbook in economic principles. It was not meant for workers alone, but in Britain its publication came precisely when the Forster Education Act (1870) was reaching fruition, the aim of which had been to cover Britain with good schools, for the first time. Literacy was the aim. *Economic* literacy was one of the aims of *Progress and Poverty*.

* [Peter d'A. Jones, Ph.D., is professor of history, the University of Illinois at Chicago, 723 Science and Engineering Offices, Box 4348, Chicago, IL 60680.]

In addition, Henry George's powerful, Messianic appeal for social action in Britain had the merit of treating an age-old problem: land and land-ownership. His agitation was part of the greatest political issue faced by the British Parliament: Ireland. The clear, bold, destructive analysis of economic orthodoxy to be found in *Progress and Poverty* hit the establishment at its weakest moment.

But George's great success in the eighties was not merely good timing. It was a measure of his skill and amazing energy as an orator. In Ireland he was twice arrested, became a subject of a Parliamentary question, and took a decisive role in the split between the Parnell-parliamentary action group and the Davitt-land reform group which determined in large measure the future course of Irish political history. George held public debates in speech and print with the Duke of Argyll, Herbert Spencer, H. M. Hyndman, R. B. Cunninghame Graham and the Pope himself, adapting his style to Welsh miners, English intellectuals and Scots crofters. From Hyndman and William Morris to Sidney Webb, George Bernard Shaw and Keir Hardie, all the prominent socialists of the period, men with widely divergent concepts of what "socialism" meant, acknowledged the early influence of Henry George, and revealed him as a great educational force with the working-class.

A useful way of treating his work and influence might be to trace his impact first on the Marxian and revolutionary socialists, then on the Fabians and Christian socialists, the trade union leaders and Liberal-Radical socialists, and finally on the I.L.P. and Labor Party.

II

THE ONLY MARXIST BODY to gain significance in England before World War I was H. M. Hyndman's *Social Democratic Federation*. The SDF pursued to the bitter end the doctrines of 'scientific' socialism, and being blessed by neither Karl Marx nor Friedrich Engels, foundered on the rock of purity of creed. But Hyndman himself, like socialists of less rigidity, was a land reformer before he became a socialist. Unlike the majority of British socialists however, he was never a Georgist. Hyndman's intellectual roots were in Republicanism, Mazzini, the Paris Commune and Marx. All the same he was an intimate friend of the Georges, confirmed in his desire to form a proletarian society by the huge successes of Henry George's propaganda.

Many of Hyndman's followers in the SDF were Georgists, before they were socialists. The SDF was built up at first on London Radical clubs which stood chiefly for land reform and were strengthened by ex-followers of the International Working Men's Association (IWMA, dissolved in 1876) in which notions about land featured prominently. Land nationalization was "the only distinctively so-

cialist proposal” of the earlier SDF, wrote Sidney Webb nine years later.² Henry George’s direct convert, J. L. Joynes (a Master at Eton) who was imprisoned along with George in Ireland, hastened to join the SDF. One of the first acts of the Federation was to send a delegation to Ireland to report on Davitt’s Land League. Hyndman himself joined the League in Dublin and served as executive member of Davitt’s organization in Britain. Henry George was at this moment touring Ireland with Joynes and managed to get the two of them arrested.³

In February, 1882, Hyndman invited George to London for a month, and put him in touch with such people as Herbert Spencer, Walter Besant, John Bright and Joseph Chamberlain. Hyndman and George co-edited a new edition of Thomas Spence’s land pamphlet of 1792. Hyndman wrote:

“I admit that I was anxious to have him and his family with us . . . because I hoped quite mistakenly as afterwards appeared, to convert him to the truth as it is in Socialist economics.” George for his part, also wanted to convert Hyndman to the Single Tax.⁴ However, the “socialism” of Hyndman’s “Federation” was not yet clearly defined in 1882. At a Federation rally in Glasgow in March, George, Hyndman and Helen Taylor officiated while a purely land reform resolution was passed, with no mention of collectivizing capital; a Federation branch in Glasgow was mentioned as “an excellent means of spreading the principles of Democracy amongst the working classes of Scotland”⁵—not ‘Socialism’.

Hyndman wrote George in April 1883, about establishing a rival International, but the idea died on the vine. Hyndman’s conviction about Socialism as the only way out for human society was the stumbling block. Henry George thus appeared less useful to the Federation than before. *Justice*, which began publication in January, 1884, added the word “Social” to the “Democratic Federation” in August (not, it must be added, “socialist”).⁶ The SDF was born, and the game of playing for the wider sympathies of Radical-Liberal workingmen was now abandoned.

When George returned to England on December 31, 1884 he had to contend with socialist demands from SDF people within the formerly quite Georgist Land Reform Union. During 1883 Hyndman also published his *Historical Basis of Socialism in England* and his first public criticism of George’s plan—but not mentioning his old friend by name. The two men agreed to disagree, and *Justice* officially supported George until about 1887.

Hyndman viewed George as “a delightful personality” but “not by any means a first-rate intellect.” He did not accept Marx’s view that *Progress and Poverty* was “the capitalists’ last ditch.” Instead he wrote:

I recognized to an extent that Marx either could not or would not admit, the seductive attractiveness for the sympathetic half-educated mob of its brilliant high-class jounalese.

Hyndman agreed with Engels that George would do valuable work for socialism quite inadvertently, that he could “teach more by inculcating error than other men can impart by complete exposition of the truth.”⁷ Marx would not hear of this, but events proved him wrong. George was nearer to the British workingman—he did not alienate him with a doctrine of atheism or positivism, nor stifle him with a dialectical philosophy.

III

MEN OF ALL SORTS joined the SDF at this time, some staying but most passing on, to the Fabians, the Socialist League and eventually to the Independent Labor Party. Those who later became prominent trade unionists and leaders of the unemployed, Mann, Burns, Champion, Cunninghame Graham and Quelch, were all at one time connected with the Georgist movement.

Henry (‘Harry’) Quelch (1858–1913), the most Marxian, came across *Progress and Poverty* when, as an uneducated warehouse porter he had not read a single book of its kind.⁸ Its conclusion disappointed his radical nature, and he taught himself French to read an edition of *Kapital*. In 1883 he joined the SDF and met F. W. Soutter, one of the Federation’s first executive members. Soutter published a ‘plucky little advanced journal,’ the *Radical*, and one of his main contributors was William Webster, an ardent Georgist who had met George in America and used the *Radical* as the very first agency to distribute *Progress and Poverty* throughout the British book trade.⁹

The most famous of all George’s converts except Bernard Shaw was Tom Mann (1856–1941). In 1881 Mann joined the Amalgamated Society of Engineers and came up against Malthusian arguments that he could not answer. Writing much later (1923) he said:¹⁰

The Malthusian League was very active in these days . . . Everyone really concerned about social reform was sooner or later brought into contact with this question. For myself I did not feel equal to meeting the many arguments advanced . . .

While in this unsettled state of mind . . . I read Henry George’s book *Progress and Poverty*. This was a big event for me; it impressed me as by far the most valuable book I had so far read, and . . . it seemed to give an effective answer to Malthus.

Like Shaw, Mann insistently repeated his acknowledgement to George (at least three times in books in England), although he could not and never did accept the Single Tax. Until he joined Burns’ Battersea branch of the SDF in 1884, Mann worked inside the Georgist movement, and he has the credit of writing the first account of the Labour movement specifically to reveal its Georgist debts.¹¹ Henry George, not Karl Marx, gave Mann what he was seeking: “a glorious hope for the future of humanity, a firm conviction that the social problem could and

would be solved." *Conviction*: "Never since have I had one hour of doubt," Mann wrote, "but that the destiny of the human race is assured, and that the workers will, in due time, come to occupy their rightful position."¹²

Tom Mann worked with two others in organizing the great London Dock Strike of August–September, 1889, Ben Tillett and John Burns. The last, who was a working-class bibliophile, claimed that *Progress and Poverty* was the finest book in his extensive collection. Burns' influence went far beyond the SDF, of course, as did that of H. H. Champion, the Tory-minded socialist and pioneer of the idea of separate labor representation. Champion was a member of the SDF from 1883 until 1888; but Hyndman grouped him with Joynes and R. P. B. Frost as the "Christian Socialist Trio," for he had helped to found the *Christian Socialist*, intended to be the chief organ of the Georgist Land Reform Union.

Certainly Champion's first interest in social problems dated from reading *Progress and Poverty* in 1881 when convalescing in the army. George led him to Smith, Ricardo, Mill and eventually Marx. "Gradually, step by step, I was driven to Socialism," he later admitted. Almost immediately he joined the Land Nationalisation Society, only to leave it in 1883 to establish the Georgist splinter-group, the Land Reform Union (16 April). He became Treasurer and principal contributor to the group's journal. Later in the same year, however, Champion was made Secretary of the SDF and publisher of *Justice* and *Today*. His ideas were expanding, and when Henry George returned to Britain in the New Year of 1884, Champion took the opportunity to raise the issue of nationalization of capital as well as of land, within the Land Reform Union's meetings. He was supported by R. P. B. Frost, S. Olivier and Bernard Shaw; but George refused to budge, as he had refused to accept conversion a year earlier by Hyndman. Champion withdrew his objections, but made the division abundantly clear in the opening number of *Justice* (January 19, 1884).¹³

The nationalisation of the land always has, and always will form an essential part of the programme of all Socialists—(but) . . . the worker is equally despoiled if he is destitute of the tools, machinery and raw materials wherewith to produce useful articles.

Champion concluded with the hope ". . . that Mr. George may himself come to see the Land Question from the Socialists' stand-point," a hope which explains his continued zeal for the Land Reform Union after he had long become a socialist. Unlike some other socialists, Champion's main difference with George was over Interest and Profits, rather than over techniques of "collectivization"; eleven years later he still maintained that land need not be nationalized outright, but could be collectively regulated simply by taxation of land values, rent-restriction and "compulsory efficiency standards of utilization"¹⁴—views which he had undoubtedly gained from *Progress and Poverty* in 1881.

The Secretary of the Land Reform Union who sided with Champion in the demand to George for a broadened front, was R. P. B. Frost, a little-known character who stayed in the socialist movement but a short while. Like Champion, Mann, Burns and the others, he was a Georgist graduate, and entered the Democratic Federation early in 1883. A more famous member, who owed his parliamentary seat for New Lanark to the Scots Georgists (the *Scottish Land Restoration League*, founded by Henry George himself in February, 1884), was R. B. Cunninghame Graham. M.P. from 1886 to 1892, Scottish laird, famous writer of bizarre travel tales, one-time gaucho, Cunninghame Graham was probably never a permanent member of anything. He helped William Morris lead an attack on the police in Trafalgar Square in November 1887 and was more strongly influenced by Henry George than by any other single writer.

IV

SO MUCH for some individual members of the Hyndman group. What of its *official* position towards George? In general the SDF remained favorable to him up to about 1887.¹⁵ Some sort of intellectual split had already been seen from 1884. Hyndman realized he could never convert George, but wrote to him in January, 1882, emphasizing the importance of maintaining a sense of unity in the social reform movement. Despite Champion's opening article, *Justice* began with complimentary reports of George's tour of 1884, and Hyndman had welcomed George in a warm letter of the previous year:¹⁶

I hear from Joynes that you are coming over here to lecture on Land Nationalisation. I am glad of it; though of course now that we have to deal with *terre capital* and not with *terre foncier*, I cannot possibly think the mere expropriation of competitive rents will benefit our country. In fact I know it will not. But you say many things which help on the wider cause and we English are always readier to hear a foreigner . . . I look forward to seeing you again; for whatever our differences may be economically, I recognize to the fullest extent your noble character.

The tour of 1884 marked the height of enthusiasm of the SDF and Socialist League members for George's work. The fervor was stimulated to some extent by the publication of George's *Social Problems*, a book which laid bare increasing economic concentration in the United States (especially the railroad monopoly) and seemed to be more radical in outlook. *Justice* reviewed it in these pragmatic terms:¹⁷

For the present our duty is to secure a full hearing of all who work in our direction, even though their views may be, in some respects unsound, assured that the logic of events as well as the logic of thought, will sooner or later force them . . . into acceptance of our whole programme. And this duty we discharge with especial pleasure in the case of Mr. Henry

George. First because in this handbook he shows an advance as decided as it was inevitable towards fully developed Socialism; and secondly, because this intellectual advance is accompanied by an equal, if not even greater, moral earnestness and aspiration . . . The wide circulation which we hope and believe this book will attain, cannot but help on that cause of International Socialism which *Justice* was established to champion.

On various occasions *Justice* defended George from attacks. It declared on January 16, 1884 that criticism of his Plymouth speech was "typical of the attitude assumed by the whole Capitalist Press towards Mr. George." The American could afford, it announced later (March 22) "to disregard alike the feigned contempt and the real hatred of the confiscating class. He has done a noble work at a heavy strain on himself and the result of his labors will not be long in showing itself." The organ of the SDF even admitted that "it was no very long step" from Georgism to socialism, as evidenced "by the experience of many who are now our most earnest workers in the cause"—and this, three months after George's blank refusal to support socialization of capital within the LRU programme, and a week after the socialist statement:¹⁸

No-one who thinks for a moment can believe that the landlord is the chief enemy of the labourer in our modern society.

Hyndman's personal friendship with the Georges placed him in a difficult position, and it fell to William Morris to dissect Georgism from a socialist standpoint. But even Morris at this stage had to admit: "However much and seriously we may differ from him we feel that his enemies are ours also." And long after George's return to the States, the paper continued to defend him. In July came a two-column review of his reply to the Duke of Argyll ("The Reduction to Iniquity"), regretting slightly his distinction between land and other private property. A more detailed criticism of this distinction appeared in August, but ended with the customary qualification:¹⁹

These few critical observations are not made in any spirit of hostility to land nationalisation, which the present writer (J. C. Foulger) regards as a very important step towards the more complete socialisation of human relations.

By now Henry George was deciding to dissociate himself more clearly from the socialists. He wrote to an English friend:

I have been reading Hyndman's "Historical Basis." It is a pity to see a man of such force following so blindly such a superficial thinker as Carl (sic) Marx. Marx's economics, as stated by Hyndman and all his other followers I have read, will not stand any critical examination . . . I think I will have to write something about these socialistic doctrines . . .

As to *Justice* itself, George wrote:²⁰

I got . . . tonight *Justice*, which I hardly needed as I get it regularly. It will be some time yet before I can do anything about socialism, perhaps a year or more. I appreciate their earnestness and energy as you do and would be quite willing to work along with these,

agreeing to disagree, but their intolerance is both provoking and I think injurious; and while I have no thought of denouncing them in any way I should like to point out what I think to be their fundamental errors. Their ideal is all right, but it seems to me that so far as they can they oppose the steps that are absolutely necessary to reach it.

Up to now this was a curious, friendly dispute in which each side recognized the zeal of the other but could not accept its economic beliefs.

V

HENRY GEORGE SAILED to England again for his third visit in the winter of 1884. In February, 1885, he held his famous debate with Hyndman in a closed room in London on "Socialism and Rent-Appropriation." In the form of a dialogue dictated to a shorthand writer, the debate was published in the *Nineteenth Century*.²¹ It ended in some form of agreement, but Hyndman "won" insofar as George failed to answer his charges except by the repetition of a belief in land as the source of all good and evil. They both agreed at least that *somebody* was confiscating the fruits of labor; the question was "which of the expropriating classes (landlord and capitalist) is dependent on the other?" For Hyndman the landlords were merely the "hangers-on" of capitalists, often taking a smaller percentage of ground-rents than capitalists took in mortgages. For George a kind of Californian physiocracy seemed to suffice: "Men can live in a crude fashion without capital," he said, "but cannot live without land."

Driven to a point, George did seem to waver. Hyndman asked simply: "What is the good of giving men access to land if they have to compete with other men who own much larger capital and therefore can undersell them by sheer force of cheaper production?" and George admitted:

I am quite with you as to the desirability of carrying on for public benefit all businesses which are in their nature monopolies, such as telegraphs and railways . . . I can understand how a society must at some time become possible in which all production and exchange should be carried on under public supervision and for the public benefit, but I do not think it possible to attain that state at one leap, or to attain it now.

This unconscious statement of Fabianism was the nearest George ever came to accepting the philosophy of socialism.

What came out of the debate was a feeling of goodwill which masked the real differences between the two men, and delayed an open split between George and the English socialists of the Marxist variety for another year. The SDF bade him farewell and expressed the hope that²²

On his return to America Mr. George will doubtless continue to urge forward the Social Revolution. He will tell the workers what he has seen here and will form one more connecting link between the two democracies.

VI

THE EQUILIBRIUM this set up was to be disturbed by at least five factors: George's book on and work for the Free Trade movement; the rejection of his ideas by a leading American socialist, Laurence Gronlund; his own public opposition to American socialists within the United Labor Party (whose candidate he was in 1886); his approval of the death-sentence on the Chicago anarchists, and finally, the passing of his British campaign into the hands of Liberal-Radicals during his last three visits (1888, 1889, 1890).

The beginnings of this change in outlook can be observed as early as December 1885. *Protection or Free Trade* was not published until 1886, but some chapters were serialized in a combination of newspapers in the fall and winter of 1885. Of these *Justice* felt compelled to write:²³

It will hardly be believed that this sincere and eloquent enemy of poverty has fallen into the errors of the stupidest "orthodox" economics. He coolly argues that because Robinson Crusoe would be benefited by Free Trade allowing him to live "with very little employment for his labour" the same thing applies to "sixty millions of people living on a continent" . . .

Nevertheless George received strong support for his candidature in the New York November elections of 1886:

We hope our friend will accept nomination. He is not a Socialist, but no-one can doubt his entire sympathy with the workers. A man whose honesty is unquestioned, a Unionist, a Knight of Labour, the best-known living American writer, and a man who has done much by his pen to popularize the rudimentary ideas of Social Democracy amongst the English-speaking masses.

The espousal of Free Trade was temporarily forgiven.²⁴

Two years later when George began to support Grover Cleveland for the Presidency, the SDF once more raised the Free Trade issue. *Justice* complained bitterly: "It is sad to watch this steady deterioration of a man like Henry George, who certainly meant well, but seems to have no thoroughly wellgrounded intellectual convictions to keep his moral sense on the right track." The division was not aided by George's own statement that "the German Socialism of the school of Marx . . . seems to me a high-purposed but incoherent mixture of truth and fallacy."²⁵

In the chapter on socialism in *Protection or Free Trade* he wrote:

I myself am classed as a Socialist by those who denounce Socialism, while those who profess themselves Socialists declare me not to be one. For my own part I neither claim nor repudiate the name, and realising as I do the correlative truth of both, can no more call myself an individualist or a Socialist than one who considers the forces by which the planets are held to their orbits could call himself a centrifugalist or a centripetalist.

Supporting this statement was a denunciation of George by the Revisionist, Laurence Gronlund.²⁶ Coming at the time of George's difficulties with socialists within the United Labor Party, and from a man well-known among English socialists, Gronlund's two pamphlets of 1887, (*The Insufficiency of Henry George's Theory* and *Socialism Versus Tax Reform*) led inevitably to greater cleavage between Georgists and Marxists in Britain. In the United States even Edward Bellamy now failed to agree with George, and the emergence of the "Progressive Labor Party" finally forced Hyndman to put friendship on one side, and to declare himself openly against George.²⁷

Mr. Henry George makes a definite attack on Socialism and Socialists . . . We are, it seems, the advocates of "confused theories and wild schemes" . . . In the conversation I had with Mr. George for the *Nineteenth Century* he made it quite clear that he did not in the least understand the operation of modern capitalism.

To the German-American Marxist, F. A. Sorge, Engels wrote from London, delighted with the turn of events, and convinced that George's Single Tax movement would now merely become yet another "American sect." As for George: "His repudiation of the socialists is the greatest good fortune that could happen to us."²⁸ Insofar as George had effectively roused and educated the working-classes, and the Marxists could hope to use this fervor and knowledge for their own ends, one can see Engels' point. In the United States however, Georgism did not lead to a successful and widely-supported socialist labor movement, while in Britain the form that socialism was to take, would not please Marxists.

George's remaining three visits to Britain were notable for the support he received from the Chamberlain-Dilke Liberal 'left wing,' and for his complete rift with the SDF. In December 1888 *Justice* went so far as to ask Social Democrats to oppose George "with a resolute and uncompromising hostility" because he was "nothing better than the salaried and befeasted lackey of the plundering capitalist class . . ." Twenty-three years later Hyndman still felt strongly enough about the Single Tax to call it one of many "unsound and dishonest proposals . . . forced to the front by the plutocrats and their trustified Press, with the hope of postponing the decisive struggle for another generation at least."²⁹

Meanwhile in 1884 the SDF had itself split, mainly over personal issues, and the *Socialist League* was formed by William Morris, Bax, Aveling, Eleanor Marx and Joseph Lane. William Morris was already 46 when *Progress and Poverty* was published in England; he recognized its obvious importance but was himself unaffected by it. The same was true of E. B. Bax, who opposed all 'Lib-Lab' or 'palliative' measures short of full socialism. George's relations with the League were not unlike those with the SDF parent-body, except that its organ, Morris' *Commonweal*, denounced him more readily and more bitterly than *Justice*. The

League gave him grudging support until July 1887 when *Commonweal* published a long review of Gronlund's pamphlet. In September J. L. Mahon wrote two long reports on the split in the United Labor Party, hostile to George; a month later William Morris himself took up the pen to excoriate George over his treatment of the Chicago anarchists:³⁰

Henry George approves of this murder; do not let anyone waste words to qualify this wretch's conduct. One word will include all the rest—TRAITOR!!

The rejection was complete. In July 1889 a second debate between Henry George and Hyndman took place in St. James's Hall, London. This time all pretence was gone. George stood for the Single Tax, and Hyndman stood for Marxism.³¹

Notes

1. This article aims to give a fuller, more detailed picture of Henry George's impact on British Labor Politics and British Socialism and to place George and the Georgists in the somewhat wider context of the "labor movement". I met the pioneer student of Henry George, E. P. Lawrence, when I was first a graduate student in London in the early 1950s, and I was struck by his extraordinary kindness. My thesis, *Henry George and British Socialism, 1879-1931* (Manchester University) was completed in 1953. G. D. H. Cole was aware of it when he was writing the volume of his *History of Socialist Thought: Marxism and Anarchism, 1850-90* (London, 1954). Soon afterwards, C. A. Barker's *Henry George* (New York, 1955) appeared; it is good on Henry George's character, but is disappointing in its coverage of George in England. E. P. Lawrence published the leading work on *Henry George in the British Isles* (East Lansing, Michigan) in 1957. There is some information in Peter d'A. Jones, *The Christian Socialist Revival, 1877-1914: Religion, Class and Social Conscience in Late Victorian England* (Princeton, N.J., 1968).
2. *Socialism in England* (London, 1890), pp. 22-23.
3. J. L. Joynes, *Adventures of a Tourist in Ireland* (London, 1882).
4. *Record of An Adventurous Life* (London, 1911), pp. 240-241; Henry George Jr., *Life of Henry George* (New York, 1900), p. 368; C. A. Barker, *Henry George* (New York, 1955), p. 357.
5. *Glasgow Herald*, 21 March 1882.
6. Hyndman to George, April 6, 1883, Henry George Collection (New York Public Library); *Justice*, January 19, 1884.
7. Hyndman, *op. cit.*, pp. 280-82, 291-92; for one of Marx's comments on George see, for example, Marx to Swinton, June 2, 1881 and Marx to Sorge, June 20, 1881 in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: *Letters to Americans, 1848-1895*, (New York, 1953), pp. 127-28.
8. *How I Became a Socialist* (SDF publication, London, n.d.), pp. 75-76.
9. F. W. Soutter, *Reflections of a Labour Pioneer* (London, 1923), pp. 113-18.
10. *Memoirs* (London, 1923), pp. 27-28.
11. *From Single Tax to Syndicalism* (London, 1913).
12. *Ibid.*, p. 4.
13. *Justice*, January 19, 1884.
14. In his "The Root of the Matter." Henry Pelling, "H. H. Champion, Pioneer of Labour Representation," *Cambridge Journal* Vol. VI, No. 4, January 1953, pp. 222-38.
15. E. P. Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles*; and *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 11, October, 1951.

16. Hyndman to George, January 9, 1882; Hyndman to George, March 14, 1883, HGC.
17. The style suggests Hyndman. The reference to International socialism may have been there to remind George of Hyndman's letter, April 6, 1883, requesting help with the building of an International Labour League, linking the workers of Britain, France, Germany and the U.S.A. Hyndman hoped George could influence T. V. Powderly. He later claimed having suggested the idea for *Social Problems* to George. See *Justice*, February 9, 1884 p. 3.
18. *Justice*, March 15, 1884, p. 1.
19. *Justice*, April 5, 1884, p. 4; May 17, 1884, p. 1; July 25, 1884, p. 3; August 2, 1884, p. 3.
20. George to T. F. Walker, June 26, 1884; George to T. F. Walker, 9 September 1884, HGC.
21. *The Nineteenth Century*, Vol. XVII, January–June 1885, pp. 369–80.
22. *Justice*, January 24, 1885, p. 2.
23. *Justice*, December 5, 1885, p. 1.
24. *Justice*, August 21, 1886, p. 1. In any case only the Marxists held his Free Trade views against George. Many Fabians, Municipalists and (later) ILP men were ardent Free Traders. H. W. Massingham (the Boer War journalist) linked Free Trade definitely with Labour, quoting from Henry George, in his *Labour and Protection* (London, 1907).
25. *Justice*, March 10, 1888, p. 1; *Protection or Free Trade*, (London, 1886), p. 342 n.
26. 1848–1899. Danish birth. Emigrated to U.S.A. 1867; teacher, barrister. Became socialist, unusually, after reading Pascal. Books include *The Coming Revolution* (1880), *Cooperative Commonwealth* (1884), *Our Destiny* (1890) and *The New Economics* (publ. posthumously, 1900).
27. *Justice*, August 20, 1887, p. 2. Four months earlier, Engels had bitterly complained about Hyndman's efforts to keep on friendly terms with George despite the American's increasing hostility to socialism. Engels to Sorge, April 23, 1887, *Letters to Americans*, *op. cit.*, pp. 183–84.
28. Engels to Sorge, September 16, 1887; *ibid.*, pp. 192–93.
29. *Justice*, 22 December 1888, p. 1; *Further Reminiscences* (London, 1912), pp. 532–534.
30. *Commonweal*, November 12, 1887, p. 230.
31. Bernard Newton, "Henry George and Henry M. Hyndman, I: The Forging of an Untenable Alliance, 1882–83" and "II: The Erosion of the Radical-Socialist Coalition, 1884–89", *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, July 1976 and July 1977. Dr. Newton's admirable account completes the picture of the unlikely friendship between the two men. See Henry George and H. M. Hyndman, *The Single Tax v. Social Democracy*, July 2, 1889 (London, 1889) and C. Tsuzuki, *Henry M. Hyndman and British Socialism* (Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1961), pp. 45–46.

Is Population Decline Fearsome?

FEAR OF POPULATION DECLINE emerged in complex ways during the period 1870–1940. During the postwar "baby boom" period, 1945–1964, such fears temporarily receded. Then fears of population decline appeared in Europe and America as the number of births dropped below historical levels. Michael S. Teitelbaum and Jay M. Winter consider these phenomena from a wide range of perspectives, demographic, economic, social, political, cultural and ideological. In addition to examining the data, they also analyze policy implications and responses. Altogether, the book, published by Academic Press, Orlando, FL 32887 at \$19.95 paper, \$34 cloth, is a model of realistic analysis. W.L.