



Henry George's British Mission

Author(s): Elwood P. Lawrence

Source: *American Quarterly*, Autumn, 1951, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Autumn, 1951), pp. 232-243

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3031197>

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>



The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Quarterly*

JSTOR

by ELWOOD P. LAWRENCE
an associate professor of English at Michigan
State College he is completing a study of Henry
George's INFLUENCE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Henry George's British Mission

HENRY GEORGE and *Progress and Poverty* came to Great Britain without much fanfare, but his invasion was to have a profound effect on the social and political temperature of that nation. The English edition of his book appeared in London in 1880; in 1881 Henry George also crossed the Atlantic, having been engaged by the New York *Irish World* to observe at firsthand the activities of the Land League in Ireland and to write weekly dispatches for its Irish-American readers. A year later the book began to sell in large quantities, and during the decade George returned to England by invitation four times to agitate for the land reforms set forth in *Progress and Poverty*.

In *Progress and Poverty* George had demonstrated that in the modern world the depths of poverty were to be found side by side with the greatest commercial and industrial progress. He further stated that the source of all wealth was land, and that the inequalities in wealth which "progress" fostered were due to a monopoly of the land by the few. Such a condition was more than unfortunate, it was unjust, for the land belonged to the people by natural right. The people should reassert their title, snatched from them some time in the past by the robber ancestors of the present landlords, not by dividing up the land physically, but by imposing a tax equivalent to the total value of the land. Moreover, landlords were to receive no compensation for the virtual expropriation of their property, for, declared George, you do not reimburse a thief when the police recover the swag.

In its simplest form this was the message contained in *Progress and Poverty*; it was also the substance of what George said in more than one hundred speeches in Great Britain. The only significant additions were his use of the phrase "virtual nationalization" to describe the effect of his tax proposal; his suggestion that the tax on land should be applied

HENRY GEORGE'S BRITISH MISSION

gradually, beginning with a mere four shillings on the pound; and his adoption in 1888 of the label "single tax" for his proposal. It is easy to imagine how this message, if preached eloquently to the right people and at the right time, would arouse violent reactions.

Publication records alone show that *Progress and Poverty* had a tremendous vogue in Great Britain.¹ During the 1880's Kegan Paul, Trench and Company, the British publishers, sold 108,955 copies of the work. The cheap editions accounted for most of this sale: 39,930 at one shilling, and 52,148 at six pence. This suggests that most of the readers belonged to the lower income group, the very people George was trying to reach. Add a probable large hand to hand circulation, and the fact that William Reeves of Charing Cross Road, London, also published the work in a cheap edition in 1884, and it seems likely that the total circulation of *Progress and Poverty* in Britain during the 1880's was much greater than the available figures indicate.

Three events date the emergence of George and *Progress and Poverty* as factors in the British reform movement of the 1880's. He received much publicity from his arrest in Ireland on August 5 and August 6, 1882, as a suspicious character. His first London speech on September 5, 1882, associated him with subversive British movements. Since the meeting was sponsored by Dr. A. R. Wallace's Land Nationalization Association, George was billed in the London press as a radical and a land nationalizer. Finally, a three and one-half column review of *Progress and Poverty* in the *London Times* insured a wide audience for his work.² When he left for America in October 1882, George was a public figure in Great Britain and his book was selling like wildfire.

The British reaction to George's message had three phases: a period of discovery in September 1882, when George and his book first rose over the British horizon; a period of shock and outraged fear during George's second and third appearances, when it seemed possible that his radical land views might be translated into practice; and a third period represented by George's visits in 1888 and 1889. By this time his agitation had lost its razor edge, the support earlier given to him by revolutionary socialists had been withdrawn, and he was identified with a recognized political group, the Parliamentary Radical party.

The initial reaction to George in Great Britain was a mixture of curiosity and dissent.³ It is important to recognize that in the beginning

¹For the record of the sales of *Progress and Poverty* in England I am indebted to the firm of Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., of London.

²"*Progress and Poverty*," *The Times* (London), September 14, 1882, pp. 3-4.

³The newspaper citations in this article are taken directly from the files of the newspapers. It should be noted, however, that the *Henry George Scrapbooks*, which are part of the collection of Henry George material in the New York Public Library, contain many of the references I have used.

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

George's views did not arouse the violent opposition which emerged in his second and third visits. Only the *Times* adopted a position, and this was tentative and inconclusive. George, an editorial stated, was "a gentleman whose opinions on economical and social questions were well worthy of attention."⁴ A few days later the reviewer of *Progress and Poverty* called it a book "wherein many accepted doctrines were pronounced erroneous and several novel doctrines were propounded with considerable show of plausibility and in a fascinating style." George's views, "though startling," were "not so novel as may be supposed." Spencer, it was pointed out, had written strictures on Malthus, and George's "views about the nationalization of the land are foreshadowed if not actually anticipated."⁵

In sharp contrast to later attacks, the *Times* described George's remedies for poverty as Utopian and therefore as harmless. They were classed with those of Sir Thomas More and Auguste Comte as designs for an earthly "paradise"; to all such views the reviewer made the answer: "Every proposal for restoring the world to its pristine perfection appears exceedingly attractive, but when put to the test, unforeseen obstacles mar its success, and it collapses as quickly and completely as the many-hued bubbles which look so lovely and are so evanescent. Mr. George's ideal will long be found in his book only. . . ." Yet the work "merits perusal" for its "shrewd suggestions" and "some criticisms of economic doctrines." George's reading had been wide, his reasoning was "acute," his style was "excellent," and there was much in the book which "readers will find highly suggestive."⁶ Never again was the *Times* to write so amiably of George.

Although there were no sharp attacks on George until his second appearance in England, Arnold Toynbee sounded an interim warning. In two lectures delivered in London on January 11 and 18, 1883, Toynbee pointed out that, with all his "warm and fierce sympathy" for human misery, George was a "fundamentally dangerous" man.⁷ The danger, thought Toynbee, lay in George's belief in the "economic harmonies," that is, the belief that, if private property be abolished, "individual interests will harmonize with common interests, and competition, which we know is often now a baneful and destructive force, will then become a beneficent one." Toynbee thought this belief dangerous because, if accepted generally, it would check the development

⁴Editorial, *The Times* (London), September 6, 1882, p. 5.

⁵"Progress and Poverty," *The Times* (London), September 14, 1882, p. 3.

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷Arnold Toynbee, *Progress and Poverty: A Criticism of Henry George* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., 1883).

HENRY GEORGE'S BRITISH MISSION

of unionism, the "extention [sic] of the protection of the State," and the scientific study of national problems.

The attitude of the *Times* and of Toynbee implied a rejection of George's views, though for different reasons. On the other side, George's first visit to England marked the beginning of a loose affiliation between him and two radical groups: the Social Democratic Federation, a socialist organization with which William Morris and Helen Taylor, the step-daughter of John Stuart Mill, were associated; and the Land Nationalization Association. Both these groups provided him with platforms. Moreover, the latter group was, by the end of September 1882, advertising *Progress and Poverty* as a textbook in the nationalization of the land. By the end of his first visit, therefore, George and his book had been damned with faint praise by conservatives and liberals like Toynbee, but welcomed and encouraged by groups of a subversive tinge.

During 1884 and 1885 George made two more visits to Great Britain for the purpose of airing his philosophy and of agitating for a reform of the land laws. On the first occasion he was sponsored by the Land Reform Union, a loose organization of socialists and nationalizers, and on the second by the group he himself had founded in 1884, the Scottish Land Restoration League. Because public pressure for an alleviation of poverty had increased since 1882, and since George was now regarded as the outstanding advocate of a radical remedy for the problem, he was the target for newspaper attack and abuse from the very day of his arrival.

Opposition to George may be divided into a minority which demanded a fair hearing for the American and a majority which violently attacked his views. Both recoiled with horror from the same items in George's program: that private property in land should be abolished, and that no compensation should be paid to landlords.

Among those who called for fair play were the proprietors of the Manchester *Guardian*. They argued that England was the most civilized country in the world and could afford a free discussion of its social problems, even from a man whose aims were "pure robbery."⁸ Frequently, also, George's critics admitted the truth of his descriptions of social conditions, and advocated counterreformation as the best means of checking the spread of subversive views. According to one London paper, George's "unreasonable demands have taken hold of the imaginations of large numbers of our people, and the best way of combating them is by reasonable reforms."⁹

⁸Editorial, Manchester *Guardian*, January 11, 1884, p. 5.

⁹Editorial, London *Daily News*, January 10, 1884, p. 5.

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

The more conservative London *Times* now treated George with contempt. George relied on eloquence rather than on logic, he was generous, but "at other people's expense," his whole program was founded on the belief that something could be gotten for nothing. According to this paper, poverty was the result, not of private ownership of land, but of "idleness, vice, folly, or incompetence." The conclusion was inescapable: George appealed only to the shiftless misfits in society.¹⁰

Two events showed how sharply the conservative wind was blowing against George. One was the withdrawal, under pressure, of *Progress and Poverty* as a textbook in political economy at the City of London College. When Lord Fortescue discovered it was being so used, he blasted the work in a letter to the *Times*. George's doctrines "are as immoral as they are unreasonable," they are "confiscation and plunder,"¹¹ he wrote. Lord Herbert counseled "my friend Lord Fortescue" to practice moderation,¹² but the work was doomed. The Reverend Richard Whittington, Principal of the College, publicly kissed the rod with the admission that *Progress and Poverty* had been included as a text only "with a view to the exposure of the fallacies of the arguments contained therein, and to warn students of the dangerous tendencies of its teachings."¹³ He promised that the book would be withdrawn.

The second event was an attack on the book by another member of the hereditary aristocracy, the Duke of Argyll. George had sent a copy to Argyll shortly after its publication in America; he got his reply in 1885 in an article entitled "The Prophet of San Francisco."¹⁴ Argyll set forth his opinion of George in some detail, but it can be summarized in a brief quotation: ". . . the world has never seen such a Preacher of Unrighteousness as Mr. Henry George. . . . Here is a man who probably sincerely believes he is a Christian, and who sets up as a philosopher, but who is not the least shocked by consequences which abolish the Decalogue and deny the primary obligations both of public and private honour."

The metropolitan and aristocratic rejection of George was matched on a lower level by the attitude of the provincial press, of which the comments in the *Aberdeen Journal* are a choice and typical instance. George was called "that latest Yankee adventurer and trader on

¹⁰Editorial, *The Times* (London), January 10, 1884, p. 9.

¹¹"Mr. George's Theories," *The Times* (London), January 29, 1884, p. 3.

¹²"To the State Land-Grabbers," *The Times* (London), February 5, 1884, p. 3.

¹³"The City of London College and Mr. George's Book," *The Times* (London), February 12, 1884, p. 4.

¹⁴Duke of Argyll, "The Prophet of San Francisco," *Nineteenth Century*, xv (April, 1884), 537-58.

HENRY GEORGE'S BRITISH MISSION

popular ignorance and cupidity";¹⁵ a "thief instead of an agrarian philanthropist";¹⁶ a "hack agitator," one who should be classed with "rogues and vagabonds, . . . thieves, garrotters, and impostors."¹⁷ He appealed only to the "uneducated and the superficial members of society," and encouraged the "lazy, improvident, and worthless."¹⁸

When George became irritated at a Peterhead, Scotland, meeting and announced that he did not come there to "talk to buffoons or inebriates," the *Aberdeen Journal* asked with an air of triumph: "Is that the language of a man who wishes to instill into his hearers great truths of whose value he himself is firmly convinced? Is it even the language of a gentleman addressing people who have done him the honour to listen to his nonsense?"¹⁹ And with true reactionary fervor the paper regretted that George was allowed to pursue "his cheerful and profitable occupation undisturbed by fear of arrest, while the dupes who have given his counsel a practical interpretation are fined or imprisoned."²⁰

But in the rising storm of conservative and reactionary disapproval George did not stand alone. His audiences were generally large and enthusiastic. Even British newspapers which denounced his views could not always conceal their admiration for his idealism and his effectiveness as a speaker. They would have been happy to be able to report evidence of a popular rejection of George at his meetings, but only two instances of hostile audiences are mentioned, at Peterhead, Scotland, and at Oxford University. And during this period George was actively supported by his own creation—the Land Restoration League, by land nationalizers, by socialists of every hue, by the socialist magazine *Justice*, and after January 1, 1885, by the *Pall Mall Gazette*. While this support was not numerically powerful, it represented a temporary coalescence around George of left wing political and social forces whose support increased the possibility that George's views might be carried into practice.

The support which George enjoyed from the Land Restoration League and from land nationalizers was demonstrated in practical ways: by contributions to defray the expenses of his tours, by attendance at his meetings, by spreading his ideas through local organizations and public discussions and by favorable publicity in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and *Justice*.

¹⁵Editorial, *Aberdeen Journal*, January 15, 1884, p. 2.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, January 2, 1885, p. 4.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, January 10, 1885, p. 4.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, February 21, 1884, p. 2.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, December 15, 1884, p. 4.

²⁰*Ibid.*, January 2, 1885, p. 4.

AMERICAN QUARTERLY

In 1884 the *Gazette* was accustomed to refer to George in such terms as "his Communistic apostulate."²¹ A year later, however, it was bending every effort to report George's views as a reflection of those of the left or Radical wing of the Liberal party,²² a change which indicates that George's crusade was forcing consideration of reform measures on a local as well as on a national level.

The practical influence of George's views at this time was chiefly through members of the Radical party. Joseph Chamberlain, the Radical chieftain whose name appeared in the title of the *Gazette* article, had been "electrified" by *Progress and Poverty* as early as 1882.²³ After reading this work he and John Morley, editor of the *Fortnightly Review*, agreed that the land question might have to be made the most important item in the new Radical program. Chamberlain was not a nationalizer, and he advocated compensation in place of George's confiscation. Otherwise he seems to have shared all of George's views on the need for social and economic reforms.

The closeness of the agreement between the Radicals and George was unveiled January 5, 1885, when Chamberlain delivered his famous "ransom" speech in the Birmingham Town Hall, warning landlords that they must expect to pay increased taxes for the security they enjoyed in their private property.²⁴ This speech explains why Chamberlain's name was linked with George's in the public press, both figuring as socialists. It also explains why the *Gazette* article on George's views, published nine days after the speech, bore the title "Mr. Chamberlain Translated into Plain English."

While Chamberlain was giving the Radical program a distinctly George-like tinge, George at the same time was modifying his program so that it seemed more like *bona fide* Radicalism. He came out for a land value tax of 4s. on the pound, advocated gradual increases in this tax, and predicted that with this program candidates sponsored by his Land Restoration League would sweep the municipal elections in Glasgow.²⁵ This practical modification of George's land program (nationalization through confiscation) brought it more in line with Radical proposals and made possible his closer affiliation with this group, culminating in their invitation to George in 1889 to speak in behalf of

²¹"Mr. Henry George on his Crusade of Plunder," *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 18, 1884, pp. 11-12.

²²See for a typical instance "Mr. Chamberlain Translated into Plain English," *Pall Mall Gazette*, January 14, 1885, pp. 1-2.

²³J. L. Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1933), I, 385.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 548.

²⁵"Mr. Henry George on his Crusade of Plunder," *op. cit.*

HENRY GEORGE'S BRITISH MISSION

Radical candidates in that year's election.²⁶

British socialists supported George from the very beginning of his agitation. This support was indicated in various ways. One of George's Glasgow speeches in March 1882 had been made from a socialist platform. George Bernard Shaw, who was to become one of the outstanding propagandists of the Fabian Society, attributed his conversion to socialism to George, and became one of the American's loyal supporters. And *Justice*, an organ of revolutionary socialism, publicized George's agitation, while at the same time urging him to move farther to the left.

The attitude of Socialists to George during 1884 and 1885 is well represented by an editorial written by William Morris on the eve of George's departure for America at the end of his second visit. It was, he said, "impossible not to feel sympathy and regard" for George. There was "an attractive kindliness" in his most bitter attacks. He had risen from the ranks of the workers, and he "throws the glamour of his own sincerity over the most callous and forces them to look into the misery around them." The great merit of *Progress and Poverty* was that it had caused the middle class to consider favorably an economic revolution. For these reasons, wrote Morris, "English socialists . . . give a hearty farewell to our friend and noble fellow-worker the American Henry George."²⁷

The icing on the cake of George's reception by socialists at this time was a verbatim report, published in the *Nineteenth Century*, of a debate between George and Henry M. Hyndman, leader of the Social Democratic Federation.²⁸ The debate gave the impression that George's differences with socialists were of minor importance compared with their agreement on objectives—to alleviate the miseries of the working class.

George left England early in the spring of 1885 and remained in America for more than three years. During this period he broke with the socialists of New York City after they had supported his candidacy for mayor in 1886, and he publicly refused to condemn the death

²⁶George's relation to the Parliamentary Radical party has never been fully worked out. We know from his son's official biography that in 1882 George was in touch with such radicals as Joseph Cowen, Thomas F. Walker, William Saunders, George O. Trevelyan, and John Morley; that George lunched and talked with John Bright and Joseph Chamberlain during the same year; and that in 1884 George expressed the view that he had won over the "Radical rank and file." For such scattered and incomplete references see: Henry George, Jr., *The Life of Henry George* (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1943), pp. 371, 389, 415, 421, 431, 452.

²⁷William Morris, "Henry George," *Justice*, April 5, 1884, p. 4.

²⁸Henry George and H. M. Hyndman, "Socialism and Rent Appropriation: A Dialogue," *Nineteenth Century*, XVII (February, 1885), 369-80.

penalty for the Chicago anarchists who had been arrested in connection with the Haymarket bombing. Both these acts alienated radical support in Great Britain. In this same period George adopted "single tax" as a designation for his program. As a consequence, when George returned to Great Britain in 1888 and 1889, his political and social color seemed to have faded from deep red to a less offensive and more respectable pink. Doubtless the fact that his doctrines had not swept him into office in America had lessened the apparent danger of his views.

During George's fourth and fifth visits to Great Britain revolutionary socialists like Hyndman and Morris attacked him at every opportunity. For his attitude toward the Chicago anarchists Morris stigmatized him as "TRAITOR!"²⁹ Social Democrats were urged to attend his meetings and heckle him at every opportunity. He was called "mean, tricky, and treacherous" in his dealings with the working class.³⁰ His single tax program was "only another of the many red herrings used to draw the worker from the track of social revolution."³¹

On the other hand Fabian socialists like the Webbs and Shaw stood firm in their regard for George. When, for instance, Cunninghame Graham, a socialist, attacked George in the columns of the *London Star* for his refusal to condemn competition, Shaw stepped into the argument with the remark that "really knowing socialists" would support George's agitation because it could not help but benefit the cause of socialism.³² Shaw and the Webbs recognized that George's denunciation of social conditions in Great Britain was creating a climate of opinion which would bring support to trade unionism and socialism and aid them in pushing through reforms. Furthermore, they were gradualists like George, and they did not dissipate their energy in splitting doctrinal hairs.

George was still opposed by the center and the extreme right in social and political attitudes, but the zeal of this opposition had cooled when it became apparent that George's agitation was not going to result in the immediate overturn of society. London papers like the *Times* and the *Daily News* no longer sneered or thundered at him, they ignored him almost completely.

George's support now came from the Liberal party, and especially from the left wing of that party, the Parliamentary Radical party. One sign of this new coalition of viewpoints and of the increasing respectability of his position in Great Britain was his induction, along

²⁹William Morris, "Notes on the News," *Commonweal*, November 12, 1887, p. 1.

³⁰"The Capitalist's Last Ditch," *Justice*, March 2, 1889, p. 1.

³¹"Booming a Red Herring," *Justice*, December 8, 1888, p. 5.

³²G. Bernard Shaw, "Henry George and the Social Democrats," *London Star*, June 7, 1889, p. 4.

HENRY GEORGE'S BRITISH MISSION

with George H. Putnam and Charles Scribner, into the National Liberal Club as a temporary member.³³ Moreover, that the *London Star*, established in 1888 as the mouthpiece of the Radicals supported George's views was a sure indication that George was no longer considered to be a revolutionist.

A third sign of George's new standing was the fact that he made his last extended visit to Great Britain in 1889 for the express purpose of assisting in the campaigns of Radical candidates for parliament. In fact, George was urged to take up residence in England and stand for a Scottish constituency in the extreme Radical interest.³⁴ George was no longer a heroic figure, standing alone and rallying to his subversive banner all the dangerous elements in the working class. He was now, in the eyes of the British, allied to a recognized political party whose program included taxation of land values. The remedies which George had set forth in *Progress and Poverty* seemed far less dangerous when they were stated as a land value tax of four shillings in the pound.

No single reason can be advanced to account for the reception of George and *Progress and Poverty* in Great Britain. His sudden leap from comparative obscurity to a position at the storm center of British reform was caused by a combination of factors: the time at which he and his book appeared; the nature of his message; and his generally acknowledged skill in setting forth his arguments, whether in print or on the lecture platform.

Both George and *Progress and Poverty* arrived in Great Britain at a favorable moment. The nation was in the grip of an economic depression. In Ireland Captain Moonlight was abroad in the agricultural districts. Peasants, organized into the Land League, were resisting evictions; papers carried daily accounts of crop burnings and murders; the cry of "the land for the people" was being broadcast in America, where huge sums were contributed by Irish-Americans to carry on the agitation in Ireland. When George first arrived in 1881, two leaders of Irish nationalism, Davitt and Parnell, were in English prisons.

At this time George felt that as a reporter he was in no position to take an active part in the affairs of the Irish Nationalists. He made, by invitation, four speeches in their behalf, he openly criticized the Kilmainham pact and Parnell's determination to compensate landlords for their land, and his influence was an important cause of the subsequent split between Davitt and Parnell. On the other hand Parnell found George's extremely subversive land views unacceptable because their spread made it more difficult for him to achieve support

³³*London Star*, June 24, 1889, p. 1.

³⁴*London Star*, June 24, 1889, p. 1.

for his scheme of peasant proprietorship.

Elsewhere in the British Isles trouble was also brewing. In Scotland the crofters were stirring uneasily. In the large towns like Glasgow, Birmingham, and London, workers led a submarginal existence and waited for a Moses to lead them. Henry George and his book dramatized the discontent of all these elements, and his program seemed to be a signpost pointing toward the promised land of social and economic security. The timeliness of George's views was acknowledged in the declaration that "social Radicals like Mr. George will make the running and force the pace in the immediate future just as the political Radicals forced it fifty years ago."³⁵

Undoubtedly most of the British reaction to George can be attributed to the nature of his message. His eloquent description, both in *Progress and Poverty* and on the lecture platform, of social conditions in Great Britain aroused the workingman to a consciousness of his plight and a determination to secure his rights. This reaction to George hastened the passage of reform legislation in parliament; in 1892 led to the beginning of labor representation and led the Webbs to claim for George the distinction of "starting of the new current of thought" which produced modern British socialism and the Labor party.³⁶

In achieving this popular response George was aided by the religious fervor of his agitation. He constantly appealed to God and to the Mosaic laws to justify his claim that the land belonged to the people. Hyndman noted that George's "bump of reverence was of cathedral proportions,"³⁷ and another observer stated that George's meetings had the atmosphere of a Little Bethel.³⁸ In many cases it was the latent puritanism of the working class that sprang forward in response to George's claims.

On the other hand George's message accounted for the violent opposition of the more conservative and/or reactionary elements in the nation. There was no serious opposition to his description of conditions in England, but his remedy was another matter. From the beginning George had declared that the land belonged to the people by natural right, and that no compensation should be paid to landlords. It would be difficult to think of any two claims so likely to arouse opposition as these. The defenders of law and order immediately drew the conclusion that George was irreligious and a communist, and

³⁵*Pall Mall Gazette*, November 20, 1884, p. 4.

³⁶Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism* (London: Longmans Green and Co., 1920), p. 375.

³⁷H. M. Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1911), p. 291.

³⁸"Taxation and Nationalization," *London Star*, November 22, 1888, p. 4.

HENRY GEORGE'S BRITISH MISSION

George's later emphasis on a single tax did not cause them to change their belief.

When the uproar against George died down in 1888 and 1889 it was not because papers like the *Times* had been converted to his point of view. George's political failure in America made him seem less of an immediate danger to the institutions of the nation, and this feeling was strengthened by his alliance with the Parliamentary Radical party. If George had teamed up with socialists, the reaction might have been different.

Finally, George attracted attention in Great Britain because of the force, clarity, and sincerity of his arguments. We have noted praise for the style of *Progress and Poverty*; opposition papers said much the same thing about his lectures. "His style is so terse and emphatic, his statements are so direct and thorough-going, that his denunciations have all the effective merit of freshness."³⁹ George was not the first nor the last reformer whose views have been enhanced by eloquence.

If the testimony of the Webbs and other political and social historians of the period be taken at face value, then George builded better than he knew. It was an achievement for a man who was himself no socialist, to go down in history as the godfather of British socialism. The record of George's reception in Great Britain shows that he was roundly denounced at one time or another by people representing every shade of political and social views, from extreme right to extreme left. We can only conclude that the people who counted, the newly enfranchised working class, with a sublime disregard for the refutation of George's views as set forth in the public press, accepted his message of hope and went to the polls in large numbers to express their convictions. Probably no other American work or author has produced such an immediate and practical effect in Great Britain.

³⁹Editorial, *Edinburgh Evening News*, February 19, 1884, p. 2.