

His Effect on Socialism

THAT GEORGE, AN AMERICAN APOSTLE OF FRONTIER INDIVIDUALISM and free trade, should have come down in history as a catalyst for British Socialism seems a startling paradox. The Webbs were not alone in acknowledging the debt of Socialism to him. Joseph Clayton asserted that the "attractive work, *Progress and Poverty*, an argument for the nationalization of rent, brought many to socialism."¹ According to Beer, the transition from land reform to Socialism occurred between 1880 and 1890, when "young intellectuals and intelligent workingmen passed from meetings addressed by the American land reformer, Henry George, to those addressed by H. M. Hyndman, and Sidney Webb."²

George inspired the Fabian Society when it was young, and he also taught Fabians to associate standard politics with new ideas. This dovetailing of ideas and ideals into practical politics was his "extraordinary merit"; he made it clear that the social revolution "was to be accomplished by a political method, applicable by a majority of the voters, and capable of being drafted as an Act of Parliament by any competent lawyer."³ R. C. K. Ensor attributed the Fabian Essays of 1889 to the influence of George, and thought that "Out of Henry George by either Bellamy or Gronlund' was a true pedigree of the convictions held by nearly all the leading propagandists who set Socialism on its feet between 1886 and 1900."⁴

Socialist pioneers agreed that George was a powerful influence upon them, though one and all rejected his remedy. George Bernard Shaw, George's most famous convert, admitted that his "attention was first drawn to political economy as the science of social

salvation by Henry George's eloquence, and by his *Progress and Poverty*, which . . . had more to do with the Socialist revival of that period in England than any other book."⁵ Tom Mann, in his *Memoirs*, said *Progress and Poverty* was "an effective answer to Malthus," and "enabled me to see more clearly the vastness of the social problem, to realize that every country was confronted with it, and the capable and comprehensive analyses of the population question supplied me with what I had not then found in any book in this country before."⁶

Philip Snowden first fell under George's spell at a public assembly in Aberdeen in 1885. He believed that *Progress and Poverty* not only "captured" the Scottish Radicals of that day, but led many of George's readers to Socialism.⁷ And William Morris reported that whenever he asked a Socialist group what had made them Socialists, everyone spoke of reading *Progress and Poverty*.⁸

Such unanimity of opinion regarding George's stimulating effect makes it important to trace his connections with Socialism during the decade of agitation in Great Britain. When he first went to Ireland, only one active Socialist organization existed—Hyndman's Social Democrats, founded in 1881, and known after 1884 as the Social Democratic Federation. From the beginning, George was in close contact with the Social Democrats; in his *Irish World* dispatches he praised them for their support of land nationalization, and spoke on their platform in Glasgow.

Two additional Socialist groups emerged in the early 1880's after George and *Progress and Poverty* had become prominent: the Christian Socialists and the Fabian Society. George's influence was strongly felt by both organizations, especially by the Fabians.

Christian Socialists were a moribund group in 1877, when the Reverend Stuart D. Headlam, an Anglican clergyman, had rallied clergy with Socialist leanings to join his Guild of St. Matthew. Only with George's rise to prominence did the Guild of St. Matthew become an active organization. Reverend Headlam was among those who formed the Land Reform Union; and a subcommittee of Christian Socialists in the Union issued the first number of the *Christian Socialist* in June, 1883. Until the appearance of *Justice*, it was the only Socialist magazine in Britain.⁹

The extent to which George must be credited with stimulating the activity of Christian Socialism is suggested by the fact that, although the Guild of St. Matthew was founded in 1877, it did not hold its first annual meeting until September, 1884. At this meeting, the group adopted this resolution: "That whereas the present

contrast between the condition of the great body of workers who produce much and consume little and of those classes who produce little and consume much is contrary to the Christian doctrines of Brotherhood and Justice, this meeting urges on all churchmen the duty of supporting such measures as will tend to . . . restore to the people the value which they gave to the land."¹⁰

The Fabian Society, established in the winter of 1883-84, also was influenced by George early in its history. Shaw's conversion is not the only evidence of this. In 1883 two original members of the society, Frank Podmore and Edward R. Pease, had discussed George's teachings.¹¹ At the society's second meeting, in January, 1884, George's January 9th London lecture was analyzed and discussed.¹² Of the three Socialist organizations, the Fabians alone accepted the results of George's campaigns without criticizing his failure to adopt the Socialist program. They later supported his proposal to tax land values, especially as it pertained to urban property.

Up to 1887 all Socialists supported or encouraged George's agitation for land reform, but rejected his view that a land-value tax would solve all Britain's social problems. Both Social Democrats and Christian Socialists were inclined to scold him for his failure to adopt completely the Socialist program, and for a time Hyndman hoped that George would be a convert. After 1887 the Social Democrats, who were always internationally minded, began to attack him bitterly for his repudiation of American Socialists, for his open support of Cleveland and free trade in the presidential campaign of 1888, and for his approval of the death penalty for the Chicago anarchists. The Fabians, however, even after 1887, continued to support him, believing that his agitation aided the Socialist cause.

The real meaning of George's views on property in land, as he stated them up to the close of his third visit, eludes exact definition. Both the British press and Socialists assumed that he stood for land nationalization, and until 1887 he did nothing to correct this impression. Some confusion appeared over terminology. The first debate between George and Hyndman¹³ began with Hyndman's statement, "I think, as you know, that you expect far too much from nationalization of the land by itself." George, instead of denying the imputation, merely asked, "Why?" Later he said, "The point at issue between us is as to what would be the effects of nationalization of the land unaccompanied by nationalization of capital." This use of the word *nationalization* would seem to sug-

gest that he then did favor the use of the term *land nationalization* to identify his program. Yet he said in the same debate, "Taxation supplies the form for the virtual nationalization of the land." Clearly, up to the end of his third visit, he did not repudiate land nationalization as a *label* for his views, because he thought the taxing of land values was virtually the same thing as nationalization.

When he first appeared under Socialist auspices in Glasgow, in March, 1882, he said nothing to disavow either land nationalization or Socialism. On the platform with him were such ardent collectivists as Hyndman and Helen Taylor. The meeting unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Resolved that the aims of the Democratic Federation, being the destruction of unjust monopolies, particularly the great land monopoly, and the securing for the whole people of equal rights before the law, are deserving of the confidence and support of all lovers of liberty and justice; that private property in land is unjust and impolitic, and therefore no reform of the land laws can be satisfactory which does not proceed upon the principle of making the land the property of the nation; and that this meeting welcomes the formation of a branch of the Federation in Glasgow as an excellent means of spreading the principles of Democracy amongst the working classes of Scotland.¹⁴

According to the reporter, George endorsed all the points set forth in the program of the Democratic Federation.

The first public Socialist pronouncement on him appeared as his 1884 visit began. The article, "Rocks Ahead," revealed both the Socialist belief in the effectiveness of his agitation, and Socialist fear—later a reality—that he would be captured by the Radicals.¹⁵ According to the *Christian Socialist*, the "immense popularity of Mr. George's name" warranted the supposition that his three-months' campaign would be successful in increasing social unrest, a possibility which posed a potentially "great danger" for British Socialism. For if his "unsound" views on capitalism as stated in *Progress and Poverty* were not modified, his "persuasive powers may blind his audiences to the fact that the capitalist, not the landlord, is the chief villain in British society."

For a time after the first lecture of his 1884 visit, this anxiety disappeared. The Socialists were relieved to discover that the "capitalist press, Liberal, Conservative, and Radical, is unanimous in its condemnation of Mr. George. . . . There is to be no 'dishing' the landlord. The word has gone forth to the Liberal Clubs and Caucus that Mr. George is to be avoided and tabooed."¹⁶ The *Christian Socialist* pointed out the moral of this reception, if

George should be tempted to overlook it: ". . . if the question is one of policy with Mr. George, whether the landlord shall be attacked first, it must be abundantly evident to him by this time that he will not win the capitalists to his side, and therefore the truest wisdom will be to fight at once on the broad issues of Socialism, and not on the detail of confiscating rents." With encouragement, hope, and remonstrance, the Socialists accompanied George in spirit on his mission. The encouragement was largely in the faith that he was serving the Socialist cause and that his enemies were theirs; the hope was that he would see the Socialist light.

While he toured England and Scotland on his second visit, Socialist writers defended him from attacks in provincial newspapers. *Justice* declared that the criticism of his Plymouth speech in local papers was "typical of the attitude assumed by the whole capitalist press toward Mr. George. 'If,' says the *Western Daily Mercury*, 'Mr. George's scheme were carried out the commercial conditions of this country would receive an irreparable shock.'" ¹⁷ Instead of poor attendance at the Cardiff meeting, as was reported in the "capitalist" press, Socialists declared that George spoke to a large and enthusiastic audience.¹⁸

As George campaigned, speaking to large and enthusiastic audiences, Socialists beamed their approval. They announced that he "has done a noble work at a heavy strain on himself and the result of his labours will not be long in showing itself." ¹⁹

He returned to America in April, 1884, with the approval of no less a man than William Morris. Morris found it "impossible not to feel sympathy and regard" for him; there was an "attractive kindliness" in his most bitter attacks; the man, "rising from among the workers, throws the glamour of his own sincerity over the most callous, and forces them to look into the misery around them." For this, declared Morris, Socialists owed him thanks and esteem; he was "our friend and noble fellow-worker." ²⁰

George's third visit marked the height of Socialist enthusiasm for his cause. Though enthusiasm cooled thereafter, Socialists continued to regard him with favor. Both *Commonweal* and *Justice* reported the progress of his mayoralty campaign in New York in 1886. The good showing he had made with the aid of American Socialists was proof that "even amid the present outburst of middle-class cruelty in the United States, and in the presence of the anarchists condemned to be murdered in Chicago, Socialism is making way rapidly in America." ²¹ At the end of 1886 he was still "our noble friend."

But he never had a really secure place in the esteem of British

revolutionary Socialists. For one thing, they were amused at, and cynical about, his evangelistic approach to social problems, and of his use of the Bible generally (and of Mosaic law in particular) to prove that the land belonged to the people. *Justice*, at the height of George's popularity with Socialists, anticipated a forthcoming debate between George and Samuel Smith, Liberal M. P. from Liverpool. "Mr. George is no Philistine. . . On the contrary holy writ wells up from him unbidden, like petroleum in Oil City. Wherefore we gladly behold a truly Christian encounter, a veritable biblical tournament between the pious Samuel and the sainted Henry when the latter visits the chastened city of the cotton cornerers and the regrators at large." ²²

Yet extreme Socialists could have overlooked George's appeals to Old Testament morality and ethics, if their suspicion of the soundness of his views had not been based on deeper differences. From the beginning, they regarded as unsound George's belief in his land program, which he considered, they thought, an economic cure-all. Their encouragement of his agitation was mixed usually with counsel and criticism. They accepted him in the belief that he was advancing the cause of Socialism, but they seldom failed to point out what they thought of his errors, and they continually hoped (until the break in 1887) that he would embrace the Socialist program.

The review of his *Social Problems in Justice* shows this mixed attitude. The reviewer found that *Social Problems* displayed an advance toward Socialism in that George came out for nationalization of railways.²³ On the other hand, he deplored George's failure to see the true relation among land, labor, and capital, and how impossible it was to maintain the then rate of ruinous competition in free enterprise. But, he continued, "our duty is to secure a full hearing for those 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, if candid and intelligent, into acceptance of our whole programme." ²⁴

George's shortcomings were obvious, for, as the Socialists saw it, he believed in only one of the items in their program—land nationalization. Otherwise he was for free competition. But Socialists found it difficult to understand how anyone who echoed their description of the misery of the working class and who advocated what they thought of as land nationalization, could not see the necessity of going further and nationalizing industry as well. Why was

the landlord the sole villain; why not the middle-class capitalist as well? For "no one who thinks for a moment can believe that the landlord is the chief enemy of the labourer in our modern society."²⁵ Therefore, it was strange that George did not see that the worker was not merely destitute of land, but also of "tools, machinery, and raw materials wherewith to produce useful articles." This being true, a plan for the mere confiscation of rent was "a half-hearted, and go-nowhere measure."²⁶ Socialists labored to convince George of this, and that it was not a long jump from his present viewpoint to Socialism.

An even greater danger, from the Socialist viewpoint, was that his crusade against the landlords would strengthen the position of the middle class by making them sole owners of capital. At the very beginning of George's agitation, this possibility had been discussed, and only after a period of soul-searching did the Social Democratic Federation decide to support him. Certain acts by George finally alienated revolutionary Socialists, although for a time Fabians and Christian Socialists continued to give him grudging support.

Even while Socialists were declaring that they should emphasize their agreements rather than their differences with George, occasional voices were raised to warn him of the dangers ahead. His audiences, it was said, were becoming increasingly middle class. His reliance on land nationalization as a cure-all for the ills of society, they reasoned, would in the long run benefit capitalism. Capitalists would eventually make common cause with George. These fears were expressed by William Morris and repeated by other Socialists.²⁷

Before George left England in 1885, something happened which seemed to promise a firm collaboration between him and British Socialists. This was a discussion of reform between Hyndman and George, in a closed room in London with a stenographer in attendance. The issue was the familiar one: that George advocated "merely the confiscation of competitive rents" while Socialists wanted complete nationalization.²⁸ In particular, the Socialists believed the landlord was a hanger-on of the capitalist, who must also be expropriated.

The discussion must be interpreted as an effort by both reformers to find a common basis for co-operation in halting the exploitation of the worker, which they found in an analysis of economic conditions and in "the common desire which we all must have to work in common for the great end of the emancipation of our fellow-

men." To such a sentiment George could not do less than reply "Amen," and he said it so circumstantially that the ordinary worker might be forgiven for thinking that he was ready to join the Socialist camp. He replied to Hyndman: "With all your sentiments I heartily agree. . . Every man who looks at civilized society today must feel that the order that exists, and which you have so graphically described, is not the order which the Creator intended. The only question between us is the best way of substituting for it that order of things which will give free play to the powers, and full scope to the aspirations of mankind. . . The great work is to break up the 'pitiable contentment of the poor,' and rouse the conscience of the rich, to spread everywhere the feeling of brotherhood. And this your Socialists are doing. . . The greatest of all English revolutions has already commenced, and it means not merely revolution in England, but one which will extend over the whole civilized world."²⁹

This declaration did not prove him a Socialist. But, along with his public agitation, it must have aided the Socialists for, if the British laborer was to take his message seriously and act upon it, the only program he could look to; to satisfy his longings, was that of Socialism. This is what happened.

George and the Socialists were ostensibly in accord up to the summer of 1885. When he campaigned for mayor of New York City, he did so as a Labor-Socialist candidate. In the meantime he was regarded, in Britain, as the outstanding champion of Socialism in America, and his political record was considered a moral victory for Socialism.

British Socialists became alienated by certain acts which clearly indicated George's anti-Socialism. The first instance was his public rejection of American Socialist ideas and support in the United Labor Party. On August 6, 1887, in his newspaper, *The Standard*, he attacked social democracy and the Social Democrats. And at Syracuse, New York, in August, 1887, the Socialist delegates were "excluded" from the party congress.³⁰

Both Social Democrats and Christian Socialists in Britain reacted immediately. Hyndman set forth the sharp differences between George and Socialism, and charged that the American neither understood the operations of modern capitalism nor why mere "confiscation of competitive rents" would not benefit workers as a class. George was still regarded with some esteem: He was spoken of as morally earnest and generous, eloquent and forceful, though unsound; he was "too honest a man to be used as a tool" by capitalists.³¹ "Nobody," it was asserted, "could describe more graph-

ically and more truthfully the evils resulting from the present system . . . , but as soon as he comes to an analyzation of the cause, or to the remedy, his logic becomes of the same shoddy quality as British woolens are in our own day." ³² Though they regretted his defection, Social Democrats welcomed the issue: "The choice has to be made between out-and-out Socialism and mere tinkering with taxation and palliatives." ³³

These sentiments were repeated in two articles in the *Christian Socialist* in September and October, 1887, which expressed the added determination to "fight him as we would any other opponent." And great was Socialist glee when the results of the 1887 New York State election showed that George had polled only 38,000 votes without Socialist support, although in the 1886 mayoralty race in New York City, when Socialists had supported him, he had received 68,000 votes. ³⁴

Another cause of the change in the Socialist attitude toward George concerned the Chicago anarchists. In October, 1887, when a public meeting in New Jersey, called to express sympathy for the condemned men, was broken up by the police, George defended free speech in *The Standard*, but he also declared his belief (based on reading a review of the testimony in the Supreme Court decision upholding the conviction) in the guilt of the anarchists.

British Socialists reacted. The *Christian Socialist* quoted from the January 15, 1887, issue of *The Standard* to show that George then had condemned the manner of choosing the jury in the trial of the anarchists and had dismissed the conviction as indefensible on legal grounds. His recantation now in the midst of his political campaign was a "shameful action." ³⁵ This phrase was mild in contrast to Morris' terse condemnation: "Henry George approves of this murder; do not let anybody waste many words to qualify this wretch's conduct. One word will include all the rest—**TRAITOR!!**" ³⁶

Other reasons for Socialist disapproval were his introduction of single tax as a label for his program ³⁷ and his public profession of faith in free-trade principles in *Protection or Free Trade* (1886). His support of Cleveland in 1888 ³⁸ showed his guilt: He had gone over to the capitalists. On June 30, 1888, *Commonweal* summarized the details of his "backsliding" during the year. Another writer mourned: "It is sad to watch this steady deterioration of a man like Henry George, who certainly meant well; but seems to have no thoroughly well-grounded intellectual convictions to keep his moral sense on the right track." ³⁹

In his 1888 and 1889 visits, he naturally did not receive a

cordial welcome from British Socialists. He came now not as a delegate-at-large to represent the cause of the worker, but as a henchman of the British Constitutional Radicals, left-wingers of the Liberal Party. On November 17, 1888, *Commonweal* sounded a warning: "Look out! Mr. Henry George left New York in the 'Eider' on Saturday for England. If he comes to hold meetings he may be sure of a warm welcome from those who remember how he denounced the men of Chicago." When it became known in December, 1888, that George would return in 1889 for an extended speaking tour on behalf of Radical candidates for Parliament, *Justice* called on Social Democrats and Socialists generally to oppose "with a resolute and uncompromising hostility" this "salaried and befeasted lackey of the plundering capitalist class."⁴⁰ A week after his arrival, the same journal said: "It should be clearly shown to those political tricksters [Radicals] who are engineering this 'campaign,' that it is too late in the day to gull the workman with any scheme of mere tax reform."⁴¹

Christian Socialists did not, on this occasion, adopt the attitude of the Marxist Social Democrats. Their disenchantment over George's conduct toward the Chicago anarchists remained but they were willing to compromise to obtain the greatest good for the greatest number. Since George was to continue to preach land restoration, in spite of his Radical affiliation, they advised Socialists generally to "let him preach his gospel without let or hindrance. Whatever tends to destroy privilege or monopoly, whatever disturbs current beliefs about property and its 'rights,' makes for Socialism, and should be encouraged by us accordingly."⁴²

Hyndman and Morris were deaf to such counsel, and their outcries against George were as loud as their small membership and the devices of a well-organized minority permitted. The Liberal London *Daily News* reported on July 1, 1889, that "During his recent lecturing tour Mr. George has in several places been attacked with considerable bitterness by the Social Democrats, who consider that his proposals do not go far enough." The tactics used by the Socialists were those reported by a correspondent for the Manchester branch of Morris' organization, the Socialist League. George spoke in Manchester on "How to Get Rid of City Slums"; according to the Socialist League reporter, George believed that slums would disappear if taxes were removed from tea, coffee, gold and silver plate, and placed on land, and he raised the standard of Cobden and free trade.

To Manchester Social Democrats, he was "the unprincipled

'prophet of San Francisco.' " They came to his meeting, entertained the audience before his arrival by singing Socialist songs, heckled the speaker, and asked so many questions at the end of the talk that the chairman had to refuse answers because of the lateness of the hour. In the words of the Socialist reporter: "The amount of flimsy, albeit dramatic, rhetorical effervescence which he unburdened himself of, in place of arguments, to support his patent quack poverty cure, exceeded anything his fiercest opponents could have attributed to this versatile Yankee. To those who had known or heard him in the earliest days before he had deserted the people and become a party politician and stump orator for Radical capitalists, the man's present moral and intellectual degeneracy is pitiable to behold." ⁴³

The final scene in the uneasy eight-year relationship between George and the Social Democratic Federation was a public debate in London in July, 1889, between George and Hyndman. As usual, George merely set forth his single-tax proposal. Hyndman discussed the points of agreement and disagreement between Social Democrats and George. Beesly, of the Positivist Society, who chaired the meeting, accurately described the result of the debate, saying that "he agreed with neither party, and that in his opinion the best parts of the speeches were those in which the opponents destroyed each other's arguments." ⁴⁴

Yet George's influence on British Socialism was by no means over. The criticism in Socialist journals of the inadequacy of his land views and the attacks on him by revolutionary Socialists after 1887 attest to his continued effectiveness as an agitator. But beyond all this, there was the attitude of those whom George Bernard Shaw called "really knowing" Socialists, who respected him despite their differences with him. They realized his contribution to the reform movement; for British workmen, with a fine disregard for the logic of their actions, believed what he told them about the conditions under which they lived, and sought redress through Socialism and trades unionism.

What the "really knowing" Socialists thought of him and of the value of his agitation is suggested by the comments of two Fabians at the end of his last speaking tour, when Social Democratic opposition to him was at its peak. In March, 1889, Sidney Webb wrote to him:

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 only be the noisy fringe of the Socialist Party who will do this and it will be better for the cause which we both have at heart, if you will avoid accenting your difference with the Socialists.⁴⁵

And George Bernard Shaw, who had become a member of the Executive Committee of the Fabian Society in 1886, publicly acknowledged the close association, in spite of superficial differences, between George and British Socialism. Shaw seized his opportunity in an exchange carried on in the London *Star* among George, R. B. Cunninghame-Graham, and a half-dozen correspondents. Shaw's letter, published June 7, 1889, not only made clear the nature of this particular dispute; it also resolved the main issue between George and Social Democrats by showing a belief that, if the single-tax proposal were adopted, it would produce the results ardently desired by Socialists.

Shaw contended that the principal issue was not competition; Socialists and George used the word in two different meanings, and disputes over competition caused confusion. What really mattered was the possible effect of the single-tax proposal on the economy of England. In Shaw's belief, once the single tax was adopted its operation would not cease until it had absorbed the entire economic rent of the country, and when this happened the State would be in control of the revenue from which industry drew its free capital. The outcome would be State Capitalism.

Assuming this, he argued, "really knowing Social Democrats would let George alone." For "if the Socialist theory be correct, taxation of rent, the moment it went beyond replacing existing taxation, would produce Social Democratic organization of labor, whether its proposers foresaw or favored that result or not. And by his popularization of the Ricardian law of rent, which is the economic keystone of Socialism, and concerning which the published portion of Marx's work leaves his followers wholly in the dark, Mr. George is doing incalculable service in promoting a scientific comprehension of the social problem in England. Besides, the public, knowing that Mr. George advocates taxation of rent, will, if the Social Democrats attack him, simply conclude that Socialists oppose taxation of rent, which is, of course, a main plank in their platform."

That any reader of George's works could have considered him a Socialist seems absurd today. The true picture of his relationship to

Socialism is to be seen in Webb's plea for forbearance and Shaw's views on the Graham-George controversy. As all Socialists admitted up to 1887, and as Webb and Shaw, representative Fabians, continued to believe, George's views on the land issue and his ability to put the case in simple, moving terms, gave him common ground with British Socialists.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 7

1. Joseph Clayton, *The Rise and Decline of Socialism in Great Britain, 1884-1924*. London: Faber and Gwyer, 1926, p. 12.
2. Max Beer, *A History of British Socialism*. London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1948, II, p. 242.
3. Edward R. Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society*. London: A. C. Fifield, 1916, pp. 11-20.
4. *England, 1870-1914*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936, p. 334.
5. Pease, *op. cit.*, pp. 259-60.
6. Tom Mann, *Memoirs*. London: Labour Publishing Company, 1923, pp. 27-28.
7. Philip Snowden, *An Autobiography*. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, Limited, 1934, pp. 48-49.
8. Godfrey Elton, *'England Arise!'*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1931, pp. 220-21.
9. For a history of this publication see "Epilogue," *Christian Socialist*, December, 1891.
10. Clayton, *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.
11. Pease, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
13. See "Socialism and Rent Appropriation: A Dialogue," *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1885.
14. "Democratic Federation," *Glasgow Herald*, March 21, 1882.
15. *Christian Socialist*, January, 1884.
16. "Henry George in London," *Christian Socialist*, February, 1884.
17. *Justice*, January 26, 1884.
18. *Ibid.*
19. "Mr. George and the Landlords," *Justice*, March 22, 1884.
20. "Henry George," *Justice*, April 5, 1884.
21. "A Virtual Victory," *Justice*, November 6, 1886.
22. *Justice*, January 11, 1884.
23. It escaped the reviewer's notice that George had already stated this view in *The Irish Land Question*.
24. "Social Problems," *Justice*, February 9, 1884.
25. *Justice*, March 15, 1884.
26. Henry H. Champion, "Henry George and the Land Question," *Justice*, January 19, 1884.
27. William Morris, "Henry George," *Justice*, April 5, 1884.
28. "Socialism and Rent Appropriation: A Dialogue," *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1885, p. 369.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 380.
30. Henry M. Hyndman, "Henry George's Attack on Socialism," *Justice*, August 20, 1887.
31. "Henry George," *Justice*, September 17, 1887.
32. *Commonweal*, October 22, 1887.
33. "The Split in the American Labour Party," *Justice*, October 1, 1887.
34. *Christian Socialist*, December, 1887.
35. *Ibid.*
36. *Commonweal*, November 12, 1887.
37. According to Anna George deMille, Henry George's daughter, the term "single tax" was "first used as the title of an address delivered before the Constitution Club of New York by Thomas G. Shearman, who took it from Book VIII, Chapter 4, of *Progress and Poverty*." The date of this address was June 18, 1887. (See her *Henry George*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1950, p. 160.) Titles of British articles about George also point to 1887 as the date for the adoption of this label. During his first three visits to Great Britain, "single tax" never appeared in a headline about George; during his last two visits it was used with increasing frequency.
38. *Commonweal* sourly reported, "Henry George is at present making stump speeches for the Democrats at 500 dols. a night."
39. "Henry George's Collapse," *Justice*, March 10, 1888.
40. "The Single Tax Fraud Again," *Justice*, December 22, 1888.
41. "The Single Tax and Henry George's Visit," *Justice*, March 16, 1889.
42. *Christian Socialist*, March, 1889.
43. "Henry George in Manchester," *Commonweal*, June 1, 1889.
44. "The Hyndman-George Debates," *Justice*, July 13 and July 20, 1889.
45. Quoted from Anna George deMille, *op. cit.*, p. 170.